

INTEGRATIVE LEADERSHIP DYNAMICS: FUSING ADAPTIVE STRATEGIES WITH URSIFORM RESILIENCE IN ORGANISATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

OLUSEYI O. SODE Ph.D.

Department of Business, Lazaridis School of Business and Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University, 75 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5.

OMOTAYO J. MUSTAPHA Ph.D.

Department of Entrepreneurship and Business Management,
National Open University of Nigeria.

<https://doi.org/10.37602/IJSSMR.2025.8311>

ABSTRACT

The organisational landscape of the 21st century is characterized by systemic volatility and institutional disruption, requiring leadership frameworks that combine agility with resilience. This study assesses the effectiveness of integrative leadership dynamics, and adaptive strategies with ursiform resilience and how it enhance decision-making processes with a focus on selected telecommunication sector in Nigeria. The research employs a mixed-methods approach that incorporates both descriptive statistics and regression modeling. Through comparative case analyses, the study shows that leaders who incorporate these two dimensions consistently outperform their peers in crisis management and institutional renewal, achieving recovery from disruptions faster. This paper introduces integrative leadership dynamics, a new paradigm that merges adaptive strategies based on Heifetz's Adaptive Leadership Theory with ursiform resilience, a metaphor representing bear-like endurance, behavioral flexibility, and regenerative capacity. By integrating adaptability and resilience strategic, this model addresses significant shortcomings in traditional leadership approaches that struggle with modern complexities. Key findings highlight a synergistic decision-making culture: adaptive tactics facilitate real-time improvisation and scenario prediction, while ursiform traits promote psychosocial stability and resource sustainability in challenging situations. Organizations that embrace this hybrid approach demonstrate an enhanced ability to balance agility with systemic coherence, turning turbulence into strategic opportunities. Leaders who integrate adaptive and resilience principles exhibited superior crisis management, utilizing real-time improvisation while maintaining systemic coherence. The study recommends institutionalizing integrative leadership through experiential training programs, resilience metrics and scenario-based simulations to foster adaptive fluency. By combining theoretical rigor with empirical validation, this framework provides a practical roadmap for organizations navigating ongoing disruption, transforming volatility into strategic renewal while ensuring ethical and operational resilience in both developing and globalized contexts.

Keywords: Integrative Leadership, Adaptive Strategies, Ursiform Resilience, Organisational Decision-Making, Leadership Dynamics

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly evolving business environment, organizations encounter unprecedented challenges in their decision-making processes. The convergence of globalization, technological advancements, and socio-political uncertainties has created a landscape where adaptability and resilience are essential. As noted by London (2023) and Jasper (2018), the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model emerges as a response to the complex challenges faced by organisational leaders in this dynamic context, characterized by technological progress, global interconnectivity, and unforeseen disruptions. Drawing inspiration from the adaptive traits of ursine creatures, this leadership model represents a departure from traditional frameworks by offering a fresh perspective on organisational dynamics.

Past research indicates that leaders must possess a diverse skill set to effectively navigate complex environments (Solinger et al., 2020; Ohlsson et al., 2020; Doh, 2003). This underscores the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM), which emphasizes the importance of flexibility and the ability to integrate insights from various experiences. The need for resilient decision-making arises from the accelerated pace of change and the inherent unpredictability of today's business landscape. Resilient decision-making, viewed as a dynamic approach for organizations, highlights the importance of adaptability and strength in the face of uncertainty (Wang et al., 2020; Joseph & Gaba, 2020; Ireland & Miller, 2004). Suryaningtyas et al. (2019) suggest that it involves fostering a mindset and organisational culture capable of navigating disruptions caused by market shifts and technological advancements. Madi et al. (2023) assert that key components of resilient decision-making include a leader's ability to engage in strategic foresight and the capacity to quickly adjust institutional strategies based on emerging information. This proactive approach can lead to ongoing improvements in organisational processes (Lam et al., 2018). Similarly, effective communication and collaboration are essential for leadership, ensuring the integration of diverse perspectives (Gulati et al., 2012).

Miller and Ireland (2005) argue that investments in technology and data-driven tools enhance organisational decision-making processes. Consequently, establishing robust organisational resilience starts with the decision-makers within an enterprise. Resilient decision-making not only equips organizations to withstand challenges but also enables them to emerge stronger and more competitive in the long run (Duchek, 2020). This phenomenon is crucial for the sustainability of an enterprise in the marketplace. In this modern digital era, where disruptions to organisational processes are frequent, forward-thinking corporations recognize the necessity of keeping pace in an increasingly competitive environment (Stoverink et al., 2020). Management teams that prioritize collaborative solutions and foster interconnectedness tend to excel in the global marketplace (Van Der Vegt et al., 2015). Kossek and Perrigino (2016) argue that relying solely on resilience overlooks opportunities to support employees during challenging times and to proactively mitigate associated stress. Adaptable leaders lay the groundwork for resilience (Van Der Vegt et al., 2015). Lengnick-Hall et al. (2011) emphasize that adaptable leaders do not merely react to crises; they also extract valuable lessons while consistently guiding individuals and teams to do the same.

Organisational resilience can be defined as the collective capacity of leadership to anticipate, absorb, and adapt to gradual changes and sudden disruptions both within and beyond the organization (Mithani, 2020). This reality is deeply rooted in strong leadership that values and nurtures the development of cohesive and interdependent teams. A credence to this fact is

corroborated by the submission of (Olekalns et al., 2020) which establishes that the effectiveness of work relationships between organisational members is an integral decider of the institution's resilient capacity. In another dimension, resilient leadership, and organisational culture act as potent mediators between organisational resilience and performance (Madi et al., 2023). This phenomenon may be underscored by the fact that (Barney, 1986) believes organisational culture to be of more pre-eminence for an organization than any devised strategies.

While operational resilience concentrates on sustaining critical services and systems during economic disruptions (Suryaningtyas et al., 2019). Organisational resilience encompasses the wholesome ability to thrive and adapt amid change and uncertainty confronting the institution as an entity (Stoverink et al., 2020). As corroborated by (Mithani, 2020), a resilient organization structures and adapts as needed to provide stability during abrupt or gradual shifts. (Brammer et al., 2020) adds that such interventions are set up to effectively manage emotions associated sometimes with institutional change, such as burnout and anxiety. Duchek, (2020), suggested that empowered employees who can leverage their skills to solve problems significantly during such challenging times can contribute to organisational resilience. The skills of the employees are organisational capabilities that help it to withstand difficult times (Duchek, 2020).

Flourishing as an adaptable leader in the modern but dynamic business landscape necessitates embracing fundamental principles which includes adaptability and vision articulation within the ambits of an organization's strategy (Rindova & Courtney, 2020); (Venus et al., 2019). To that end, (Stoverink et al., 2020) suggests that leaders are urged to perceive setbacks as opportunities for learning and that they must cultivate collaborative endeavors, and prioritize continual learning, while affording their subordinates the opportunity to embrace resilient decision-making. This research hold the potential to enrich leadership scholarship and furnish pragmatic guidance for corporate leaders that would inevitably contend with intricate decision-making scenarios within their organizations. This scholarly inquiry further seeks to empower leaders by augmenting their skills in adaptability and reinforce their capacity to engage in effective decision-making processes in the bid to nurture an efficient and productive culture imbued with the capacity to exhibit organisational resilience.

1.1 Problem Statement

In today's rapidly changing organisational landscape, the need for effective leadership models that can navigate uncertainty and nurture resilience has become increasingly imperative (Williams et al., 2017). For example, the leadership team of an innovative tech company demonstrates commendable agility by adopting the adaptive-ursiform leadership model, allowing them to respond swiftly to technological advancements. Similarly, leaders in a healthcare institution exhibit adaptability by restructuring operations to meet the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, ensuring the continued delivery of quality healthcare through resilient decision-making.

Organisational resilience is essential for weathering industry fluctuations. Organizations require leaders who can not only navigate change but also reinforce their decision-making processes with unwavering resilience. However, traditional leadership frameworks often fall

short in addressing the dynamic and unpredictable nature of today's business environment. While some models emphasize adaptability, they frequently neglect to incorporate resilience as a fundamental element of decision-making. Conversely, models focused on resilience may lack the institutional agility necessary to respond proactively to rapid changes in both the internal and external environments. This fragmented approach to leadership leaves organizations vulnerable to various challenges. Additionally, the disjointed nature of existing leadership paradigms hinders the development of leaders who can seamlessly combine flexibility with strength (Doh, 2003).

In the Nigerian scholarly landscape, research on leadership and resilience has emerged across various thematic fields without forming a cohesive framework. Eneanya et al. (2025) investigate leadership adaptation during post-COVID-19 recovery, highlighting significant gaps in strategic foresight and policy responsiveness. However, they do not propose integrated leadership training models. Enwereuzo (2023) underscores the urgent need to incorporate resilience into human resource development in Nigerian universities, pointing out systemic inertia and a lack of institutional commitment as primary obstacles. Nakpodia et al. (2024) analyze the relationship between social entrepreneurship and resilience, revealing that resilience-building among Nigerian entrepreneurs is often superficial and primarily driven by necessity rather than strategic planning. Ekezie's research on internally displaced persons (IDPs) provides a grassroots perspective, demonstrating how community-driven coping mechanisms serve in place of formal leadership support within displacement camps. Zahari et al. (2022) examine the role of leadership capability in enhancing organisational resilience but fall short of aligning their findings with the specific contexts of Nigerian organizations. While these studies offer valuable insights, they lack a cohesive integrative approach and limited scope. This present research look critical into the Nigeria telecommunication sector and form the basis for this study.

Addressing this theoretical and practical gap is essential for thriving in an era marked by uncertainty. This research aims to explore the intricacies of the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model, specifically within the context of Nigeria's telecommunications sector. By acknowledging the limitations of existing frameworks, this study seeks to provide a transformative understanding of leadership dynamics, paving the way for a more holistic and resilient approach to decision-making in contemporary organizations.

1.2 Research Purpose and Objectives

The primary aim of this paper is to address the existing gap by proposing the AULM© and examining its effectiveness in organisational settings. Investigate the concept of integrative leadership dynamics and its potential in enhancing organisational decision-making.

1.3 Research Question

1. What are the key components of integrative leadership dynamics?
2. How do leaders integrate adaptive strategies and ursiform resilience in their decision-making processes?
3. What are the implications of integrative leadership dynamics for organisational outcomes?

2.0 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

2.1 Situational Leadership

The situational leadership encourages leaders to assess the needs of the team and adjust their leadership style accordingly (Claus, 2021) thereby promoting a collaborative and harmonious work environment. Effective communication between and amongst team members is vital in the modern business environment (Larson et al., 2023) as they become capable of aligning their task engagement with evolving workplace realities. This adaptability that the organisational members exhibit could foster clearer understanding and cohesion among team members, leading to improved collaboration and consequently goal attainment.

Authentic Leadership Model: The authentic leadership model can be definitively described by an unwavering commitment to transparency regarding challenges and the creation of an environment conducive to open expression of ideas (Cha et al., 2019); (Avolio & Walumbwa, 2014); (Avolio & Gardner, 2005). This appears as a potent catalyst for adaptability as the human capital potential of the organisational members could be explored. As they must have been authenticated through the show of resilience, leaders adhering to this model remain steadfast in their commitment to personal values when confronted with adversity (Berkovich, 2014). Trust has become the cornerstone of effective leadership (Druskat & Wheeler, 2003). Organisational members want to be assured that laid down protocols and the potential managerial direction they would be subjected to will be put under strict adherence by every institutional member. Authentic leaders openly share information with the resultant effect being the creation of an environment where ideas and feedback flow freely (Wang et al., 2017).

Authentic leaders by default stay true to their principles, which help to inspire resilience and adaptability among team members (Salleh et al., 2020). An organisational culture that thrives in the face of challenges becomes easier to be entrenched. In the current information age where the wellbeing of employees directly impacts their productivity and engagement (Grant et al., 2007), authentic leaders genuinely care about the holistic development of their team members. This focus on individual growth contributes to a motivated and satisfied workforce. In the same dimension, the exigencies of authenticity as informed by the advent of social media and heightened public scrutiny (Etter et al., 2019), organizations with authentic leaders may be perceived as ethical and socially responsible.

2.2 Resilience and adaptive leadership strategies

Organisational resilience can be described as a dynamic process that links together ‘a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of entrepreneurial functioning after a crisis, disturbance, or challenge’ (Sun et al. 2011, p. 185). To (De Oliveira & Werther, 2013), the ideal organisational resilience efforts are not only concerned about reacting but being proactive enough to foresee what future economic realities could portend for a firm and instituting the appropriate and supportive organisational culture that lead to the development of effective competitive advantage. The implications of the failure of a firm to conform to this methodology is probably, albeit practically exemplified in the laggardness that some organisational leaders display as they devise novel strategies to deal with evolving organisational challenges (Buliga, Scheiner & Voigt, 2016). Changes in the external realities of a firm often demand an evolution

of its organisational processes (London, 2023; Heifetz, Grashow & Linsky, 2009). As a form of adaptive response to this phenomenon, it will take an entrenched culture of leadership flexibility and resoluteness to make evolving response to changes as effective and efficient as possible (Costanza et al., 2016). De Rue (2011) emphasizes that since leadership effectiveness is anchored on the vagaries of the shared influence portrayed by all organisational members, the adaptability of the ensuing leadership can best be obtained when the situational circumstances of the operating environment are comprehensively shared amongst them.

Schulze & Pinkow (2020) suggest that novel challenges emanating from the external operating circumstances due to competitive hassles would demand adaptable leaders to create ad-hoc or established physical or virtual environments for specified organisational members to develop innovative ideas for the sake of corporate sustainability. According to (Torres, Reeves & Love, 2012), adaptable leaders must not only be comfortable with dealing with an onslaught of organisational crises and opportunities, they are also at ease with deploying diverse ideas and actions towards resolving or taking advantage of them as the case may arise. It is fair to assert then that the core tenets and the consequent dictates of adaptive leadership primarily lean more towards situational leadership. As posited by (Cho, 2023); (Schwarz, Ram & Rohrbeck, 2019); (Fainshmidt et al., 2019), the vagaries of the external operating environment of a firm would always evolve whether or not its strategies fit into the demands of the economic landscape. In essence, there is a preeminent rationale for a firm to be proactive enough to prepare effective strategies and tactics that accentuates the relevance of its subsisting leadership functions.

Lin and Liao (2020) submit that there is a tendency for the resilient spirit of a leader to be transmitted to the followers. It can be posited then that the efficacy of the level of personal determination of an organisational leader has an integral influence on the success of the strategies deployed to confront organisational obstacles (Southwick et al., 2017). Leaders have to deal with individuals, team dynamics and diverse organisational factors in the course of establishing cohesive organisational units that thrive in the face of subsisting challenges (Southwick et al., 2017). The extent of the potential personal and institutional dexterity such engagements would demand from a leader is better imagined than wished. For one, different leaders would likely show a disparate level of resiliency towards the same environmental scenarios plaguing their industry (Howard and Irving, 2021). The disparate outcomes realized by different organisational leaders in the same industry lend credence to this assertion. As has been revealed in several academic literature around organisational performance, the dynamics of leadership responsiveness play an important role in the consequent results that a firm realizes (Marashdah & Albdareen, 2020); (Udovita, 2020); (Kouzes & Posner, 2019); (Northouse, 2019); (Al Khajeh, 2018); (Khan and Adnan, 2014).

Effective decisions are the bedrock of successful managerial outcomes (Ejimabo, 2015); (Rowe, Boulgarides & McGrath, 1984). To that end, how flexible an organisational leader is in the face of inevitable challenges poses a conundrum and represents a contributory factor to the extent to which the organization's reactive response would be productive (Laureiro-Martínez & Brusoni, 2018). Korbi (2015) emphasizes that it is only by undertaking deliberate and proactive change measures that an organization can become capable of weathering the storms of an operating environment whose realities are in constant flux of evolution.

Organisational challenges in this contemporary economic landscape are not just never-ending, they can also appear in unpredictable forms (Miles et al., 2010). The discerning firm's leadership understands the imperatives of harnessing effective organisational learning by developing the firm's human capital components towards enhancing the organization's resilient capacity (Douglas and Haley, 2023; Douglas, 2021). The level of personal resilience that a leader would have to exhibit in the face of uncertainties and environmental complexities would not be static (Drath, 2016). This probably informs why the dynamism in organisational learning capabilities must continually meet the need for organisational resilience as the demand arises. And as (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011) had posited, the deliberate employee development initiatives such as mentoring and coaching that discerning firms encourage serve as veritable means to enhance the overall adaptability of the institution.

2.3 The AULM integrative paradigm

Within the AULM integrative framework, the decision-making process entails the identification of common ground in order to ensure widespread acceptance and effective implementation of decisions (Chandler, 2022); (Schulze & Pinkow, 2020). In a related dimension, this inclusive decision-making methodology when exhibited under a transformational style of leadership enhances the quality of decisions and fosters the development of a heightened sense of employee engagement (Cerutti, Macke & Sarate, 2020). As suggested by (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018); (), one of the defining crux of the AULM approach supposes that though an organization cannot sufficiently prepare for all impending uncertainties, the reality that the fastest firm to respond and adapt to the unveiling environmental dynamics has the potential to gain due competitive advantage and achieve sustainability is a worthwhile adventure to embark on at the corporate level. To (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018), the exigencies for the rapid nature of this organization-wide strategic interventions is accentuated by the fact that concerned organisational members have to upend existing organisational processual framework in the bid to develop effective strategies that meet the internal and external requirements of the organization.

As they become immersed in the intricacies of their organization, industry, and the broader operational landscape, adaptive leaders develop a heightened sensitivity to the development of more leadership capacity and resilience (Do et al., 2022). In another dimension, and under the theoretical purview of AULM leadership dynamics, organisational decisions are not made in isolation as there is a deliberate effort to incorporate diverse perspectives from within and beyond the firm in the bid to formulate sustainable solutions to subsisting and potential challenges (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2010).

2.4 Situational leadership and integrative paradigm

By default, organisational leaders are oblivious of the extent to which their established strategies would bear productive outputs for their organizations. It is on this premise that (Simha, 2022); (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982) believe that the situational leadership approach represents a more viable and distinctive style of managing human and material resources. Nonetheless, and as can be gleaned from the tenets of the AULM leadership paradigm, it will not only take a sustained commitment of the leader to obtain desired organisational objectives. As suggested by (Ben-Asher, Cho & Adalı, 2018), the intricate dynamics of managing the

human resources of the firm would also play a significant role in determining how effective the personal leadership traits exhibited could be. A good deduction that can be made from this assertion is that not only do leaders have to be proactive in a manner that exhibits their responsiveness to organisational challenges, they also have to be realistic enough to consider the feasibility of their resources in managing these challenges through hard times (BenAsher, Cho & Adalı, 2018). As an extension of this reality, it can be opined that the resilient attitude that leaders bring to the fore during challenging times must be in tandem with the situational demands ahead of the firm (Funk, 2022). . A consequence of this as Gardner et al. (2021) has posited that the exhibition of adaptability' would result in the leader modifying its established identity in the process of resolving the ensuing organisational hurdles.

2.5 Transformational leadership and integrative paradigm

Eliot (2020) supposes that organisational leaders can experience a degradation of their sense of commitment to the organisational goals in challenging times. Without being self-aware, it is difficult to entertain an effective sense of self efficacy. Yet self-efficacy is an integral component of personal effectiveness within an evolving societal landscape characterized by unforeseen events and circumstances (Bandura, 1995). To (Eisenbach, Watson & Pillai, 1999), a transformational leader has to possess capabilities that are strong enough to weather the demanding periods of organisational change. This is in contrast to the tenets of situational leadership vis-a-vis how it connects with the AULM where the leader has to be aware of the peculiarities of the situational dynamics of the corporate landscape before more effective leadership decisions can be made (Do et al., 2022). If competitive reengineering of organisational processes and procedures constitute the basis of adaptive strategies (Andersen & Nielsen, 2009), transformational leadership would represent the vehicle through which a new cultural paradigm is established in response to those organisational hurdles (Hartnell & Walumbwa, 2011); (Bass and Avolio, 1993). The incorporation of principles rooted in transformational leadership enriches the AULM integrative paradigm through the establishment of a symbiotic relationship between the cultivation of individual or group resilience and the nurturing of adaptive strategies for the firm (Dimas et al., 2021; Geier, 2016). This conforms to the suppositions of (MacIntyre, Charbonneau & O'Keefe, 2013) where it is established that the cognitive dexterity of transformational leaders make them capable of switching between diverse leadership styles in an efficient manner in response to difficult situations. The AULM involves the empowerment of employees in the bid to make them contribute more effectively to organisational decision-making. Meanwhile, this empowerment in human capital development has the potential to culminate in increased employee satisfaction, motivation, and a sense of ownership in organisational outcomes (Delery and Roumpi, 2017). This represents a core tenet of democratic leadership where the inputs of all organisational members are valued and deployed to solve organisational challenges. In the contemporary world of business where access to market information has been more liberalized, the integrative approach to leadership appears the more effective methodology to execute complex tasks within an organization. As transformational leaders are key to the development of innovative ideas within a firm (Naguib and Naem, 2018); (Khalili, 2016), they consequently represent an ideal and effective contributor to the resilience of an organization (Harland et al., 2005). The transformational leadership dynamics upend the elements of the cultural fabric of an organization (Bass and Avolio, 1993).

2.6 Ethical leadership and AULM paradigm

Some of the challenges imminently ahead of corporate organizations are concerned with ethical risks (Thiel et al., 2022). Masten and Reed (2002)'s description of resilience factors in the exigencies of "positive adaptation" as crucial to the response directed at tackling challenges. Southwick et al. (2017) emphasizes that this adaptation is not only processual but could take a long term to have productive results manifest. Corporate leaders adopting the AULM integrative leadership framework understand the need to adopt strategies that serve both the short term and the long-term benefits of their organizations (Thiel et al., 2022). To that end, adherence to ethical standards as applicable to the internal and external operating environment of the firm become a sacrosanct consideration. This adherence is cognizant of the need to align with the developed strategies of the firm. As (Tenuto & Gardiner, 2018) has posited, ethical leaders have the tendency to become oblivious of how the changes in their adopted ethical principles can influence the dynamics of their leadership practice. A good deduction that can be made is that the potential for effective adaptability to be exhibited in the workplace becomes highly likely to be realized if adequate self-reflection is not conducted by the organisational leader.

2.7 Transactional leadership and integrative paradigm

Transactional leaders are more pragmatic in dealings with their subordinates especially as regards their expectations from organisational members (Bass et al., 2003); (Burns, 1978). The tendency for transformational leaders to establish clearly defined operational mechanisms devoid of uncertainties from employees actions and inactions (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987) inform why they are highly instrumental to the development of valuable adaptive strategies towards the obtainment of Ursiform resilience in the workplace (Shaaban & Shehata, 2019). By default, transactional leaders are predisposed to adapting their managerial tactics based on the immediate demands of the operating environment. However, and to (Dong, 2023), it is this bias towards the establishment of an entrenched transactional paradigm that can stifle organisational innovative streaks since the firm adaptability becomes more attuned to solving short-term challenges than it is poised to maintain a more long term outlook that can help its sustainability of the institution. In accordance with that submission, Uppathampracha (2022) observes that the dynamics of employee engagement on the job influences the extent to which they exhibit innovative work behaviour.

2.8 The Adaptive-Resilient Ursiform Leadership Model (ARULM)

This synthesis of the Adaptive Theory and the resilience framework emphasizes the symbiotic relationship between leadership practices evolving within an organization over time and the corresponding individual contributions of the organisational members. This lends credence to the existence of the dynamic nature of the resilience needed to engender a robust organisational performance. In this ARULM model, organisational leaders would have to employ a profound diagnostic process and embrace uncertainties as they surface. This suggests that discerning leaders must be proactive not only in their assessment of the effectiveness of the strategies being developed but also with its implementation.

In a similar dimension, this ARULM could foster a shared sense of commitment amongst the organisational members towards the organisational goals. This mirrors the effects of the distributed leadership approach that is typically advocated by adaptive leaders that are navigating change within their operating landscape. Organisational members and leaders actively engage in adaptive responses which align with the ARULM's emphasis on adaptability.

In the same dimension of context, resilient decision-making incorporates recovery from setbacks and is parallel to ARULM's possible focus on overcoming adversities ahead of the institution. ARULM would recognize the individual member's role in organisational resilience. This promotes their individual psychological resilience through the development and utilization of applicable coping strategies and adaptability measures. An ARULM-inspired leader would cultivate social support within the institution, positive team dynamics, and recognition which are all integral to building wholesome organisational and personal resilience.

Meanwhile, the commitment of this cohesive model to continuous growth aligns with resilience's growth and transformation aspect in Masten's framework. The model also envisions a reciprocal relationship where ARULM-inspired leadership practices reinforce individual and group resilience thereby creating a thriving organisational ecosystem. It's also obvious that the model could potentially position leaders as adaptive navigators of change. This cohesive model provides a comprehensive approach to resilient decision-making thereby empowering organizations to thrive amid uncertainties.

2.9 Synthesis of Contemporary Leadership dynamics

In navigating the intricacies of contemporary organisational landscapes, leadership imperatives extend beyond the conventional confines of established models. A holistic leadership approach, germane to the dynamic nature of contemporary environments would necessitate the seamless amalgamation of adaptability and resilience. Leaders are impelled to not only embrace change and foster innovation (Oreg & Berson, 2019) but also cultivate a culture revering learning and experimentation (Williams et al., 2017). Valuable insights from transformational leadership, situational leadership, and authentic leadership models offer indispensable guidance. Resilient leaders who are cognizant of the transience of setbacks, view challenges as transformative learning opportunities (Stoverink et al., 2020). It can be deduced that the amalgamation of transformational, servant, and adaptive leadership underscores indispensable elements for fortifying organisational resilience. This is evident in the fact that the pivotal role of emotional support for organisational members and shared organisational purpose could help an institution to confront setbacks ahead of it (Southwick et al., 2017). And to transcend conventional constraints, leaders would have to integrate strengths derived from diverse models of leadership. This not only embodies a dynamic and resilient leadership paradigm in tandem with the unstable nature of economic realities in contemporary organisational terrain. It is also evident in the fact that all the existing leadership models have been used by several organizations and have been successful depending on their status and the peculiar circumstances prevalent within their operating environment.

Nonetheless, acknowledging external influencers such as technological advancements contemporary leaders would be tasked not merely with adapting to change but also actively

seeking avenues for innovation and sustained growth. Indeed, this appears as the most viable path to corporate sustainability. Meanwhile, the efficacy of a leader in the contemporary milieu of global business operations is inexorably tied to the seamless embodiment of adaptability and resilience as quintessential attributes for navigating diverse and ever-evolving challenges inherent in all organisational settings.

2.10 Organisational Decision-Making

Here, we delve into various models and approaches to organisational decision-making, highlighting the challenges and barriers that organizations often encounter in this process. This section sets the stage for understanding the context in which integrative leadership dynamics can be most beneficial.

2.11 Integrative Leadership Dynamics

Building upon the reviewed literature, we introduce the concept of integrative leadership dynamics. We propose a conceptual framework that synthesizes adaptive strategies and uniform resilience, elucidating the theoretical foundations of this novel approach to leadership.

3.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Leadership Theories

Transformational Leadership Model: This is a leadership style characterized by vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Tepper et al., 2018); (Bass & Riggio, 2010); (Bass & Avolio, 1993). This paradigm in leadership underscores the nuanced art of inspiring and motivating followers towards achieving extraordinary outcomes for the organization (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020). Transformational leaders foster innovation and adaptability by encouraging a culture of creativity thereby enabling organizations to navigate inevitable changes in their operating environment and seize opportunities effectively (Lin et al., 2019; Tepper et al., 2018).

Transformational leaders prioritize employee engagement and motivation (Tepper et al., 2018) through a personalized approach which leads to higher commitment and productivity. Their commitment to talent development ensures a high-performing and adaptable workforce which can be regarded as a crucial asset in the dynamic modern business landscape. This implies that they readily invested in the human capital development of their institution. The visionary direction of transformational leaders aligns teams with a shared sense of purpose, aiding in strategic goal-setting and decision-making in the face of difficult business environments (Van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013). In the same vein, these leaders manifest resilience through a stoic optimism in times of adversity thereby providing unwavering emotional support to their team in the bid to make them exhibit a steadfast commitment to surmounting obstacles. And by cultivating an organisational culture steeped in innovation and perpetual improvements, transformational leaders address the inherent rigidity entrenched within other traditional leadership models (Lei et al., 2021). Their methodology actively fosters adaptability by instilling a mindset that not only welcomes change but also perceives challenges as salient opportunities for intellectual and professional growth.

Transactional Leadership Model: Transactional leadership which is entrenched in the paradigm of performance-based rewards and consequences (Zhang et al, 2014); (Hunt, 1999); (Burns, 1978), furnishes instructive insights into the intricate relationship between organisational structure and adaptability (Van Der Vegt et al., 2015). While it lays emphasis on well-defined structures, delineated roles, and performance-based incentives for ensuring stability, the model may falter in swiftly evolving environments owing to its reliance on established procedural frameworks (Pawar & Eastman, 1997). The model gives little to no room for flexibility in the way and manner organisational members execute their assigned tasks. The pronounced emphasis on routine and adherence to established work protocols inadvertently poses challenges to resilience (Zhang et al, 2014). This informs the arduousness that transactional leaders encounter when adeptly navigating the unforeseen challenges within the confines of a relatively rigid operational framework.

Transactional leadership can significantly contribute to an organization's success in the modern business landscape by providing a structured framework for managing day-to-day operations and fostering efficient workplace employee relationships (Zhang et al, 2014); (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). This leadership style, characterized by clear expectations, rewards, and consequences, aligns well with the dynamic demands of contemporary business environments (Zhang et al, 2014). This is as has been illustrated in the dynamics of work engagement that employers have had to embrace with the current generational cohorts of millennials and Gen Z workers.

Transactional leadership establishes clear expectations and guidelines for the performance of organisational members (Zhang et al, 2014); (Kellerman, 2004). And in today's fast-paced business landscape, where institutional agility is crucial, this clarity could help organisational teams to understand their goals, roles, and responsibilities, thereby ensuring every organisational member is on the same page. And by linking rewards to performance, transactional leadership creates a meritocratic culture (Fischer & Sitkin, 2023). Indeed, performance-based incentives align with the results-driven mindset prevalent in contemporary global business terrain (Kong et al., 2023). In a different dimension, transactional leaders promote streamlined processes which has the potential to reduce inefficiencies in the execution of organisational processes and consequently enhancing overall organisational productivity (Zhang et al, 2014).

By default, transactional leaders are adept at making swift decisions which is essential in the rapidly changing and evolving business landscape. Transactional leadership emphasizes accountability by holding individual organisational members responsible for their actions. In the current economic era where accountability and transparency are valued (Etter et al., 2019), this approach contributes to a culture of responsibility which ensures that each member of the organization understands the impact of their contributions on overall success (Zhang et al, 2014).

Servant Leadership Model: Servant leadership is characterized by an unwavering dedication to serving and empowering followers (Liden et al., 2014); (Greenleaf, 1998); (Spears, 1996). This focus on development of the subordinates enhances the organization's ability to navigate change and innovation successfully (Lemoine et al., 2019). In effect, the leadership model serves as a potential vanguard for collaboration and resilience within organisational structures

(Kauppila et al., 2022). This also implies that the model indicates that leaders are prone to acknowledge a meticulous prioritization of the unique needs of individual team members. To that end, they showcase adaptability by tailoring their leadership style to meet diverse and distinct requirements. The model's inherent flexibility and responsiveness to the dynamic nuances within the organisational milieu significantly contribute to the cultivation of resilient teams (Lemoine et al., 2019).

By establishing a commitment to serving others, servant leaders adeptly nurture a sense of communal belonging and support within the organization (Liden et al., 2014). This places the institution at a vantage position to lay the essential groundwork for collective resilience and the capacity to rebound from setbacks. Since focusing on the subordinates could effectively imply the willingness to promote their growth and well-being, servant leadership can greatly contribute to an organization's success within its competitive arena (Eva et al., 2019). Servant leadership fosters a positive organisational culture (Liden et al., 2014) one which can lead to increased morale and a more cohesive, motivated team. In a global economic landscape where customer experience is a key differentiator, this emphasis on service can contribute to increased customer loyalty and positive brand perception. By instilling a service-oriented approach within the dynamic and unpredictable nature of today's business environment. This is because while some leadership models emphasize adaptability, they often fall short in integrating resilience as a foundational element in their decision-making process. On the contrary, leadership models that focus on resilience may as well lack the institutional agility required to proactively respond to rapid changes in the organization's internal and external environment. This fragmented approach to leadership paradigm leaves organizations vulnerable to the diverse challenges they eventually encounter in their operating environment. Moreover, the disjointed nature of current leadership paradigms hampers the development of leaders capable of seamlessly blending flexibility with strength (Doh, 2003).

4.0 THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

4.1 Integrating Adaptive Strategies and Ursiform Resilience

This section presents the theoretical framework of integrative leadership dynamics, emphasizing the synergistic integration of adaptive strategies and ursiform resilience. We discuss how these dimensions interact and influence leadership behaviors and decisions.

4.2 Adaptive Leadership Theory

One of the basic assumptions of the theory is that the leader's critical role is concerned about diagnosing intricate challenges of the firm and mobilizing collective efforts towards discovering and implementing adaptive solutions (Nelson & Squires, 2017). However, aligned seamlessly with the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©), these principles emphasize leaders' imperative to navigate uncertainties, instigate organisational change, and embody traits essential for resilience. Organisational leaders operating within the tenets of AULM© recognize the dynamic nature of their organisational environment (Heifetz et al., 2009). In effect, they refrain from rapid solutions and would rather engage in a profound diagnostic process to comprehend complexities.

In furtherance to that reality, adaptive leaders embrace a distributed leadership approach which also reflects the shared principles within the AULM©. Indeed, this is where leadership is shared among those adapting to change while upholding resilience. The AULM© is centered on aligning leadership practices with the adaptability and strength symbolized by the ursiform model. This is also in congruence with the principles of adaptive leadership. Moreover, adaptive leaders excel in driving organisational change by mobilizing and energizing teams to confront adaptive challenges (Nadler & Tushman, 1989) which again resonate with the AULM©'s focus on aligning leadership practices with adaptability (Uhl-Bien & Arena, 2018). In addition, adaptive leaders promote a learning culture, akin to the AULM©'s commitment to continuous growth and learning. The synthesis of adaptive leadership principles enriches the AULM© and positions it as a comprehensive framework which addresses the challenges of the dynamic environment and empowering organisational leaders to thrive amid uncertainty thereby driving lasting organisational change.

4.3 Masten's Resilience Framework

According to Masten (2021), resilience should be viewed not as a fixed trait but as a process influenced by various factors. Masten identifies three key components: adaptation to risk, recovery from the challenge, and the devotion to realizing productive transformation of the organization. The dynamic nature of resilience is shaped by individual characteristics, environmental factors, and coping strategies (Williams et al., 2017), which is aligned with the dictates of the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©). At the individual level, employees demonstrating adaptability, proactive problem-solving, and positive contributions align their efforts with AULM© principles. Leadership practices within the AULM© play instrumental roles in cultivating psychological resilience at both individual and group levels.

Transparent communication, empowerment, autonomy, continuous learning, and development foster adaptability and a positive mindset, reinforcing the AULM©'s principles. AULM©-inspired leaders cultivate social support and positive team dynamics. This is probably to recognize and appreciate the imperatives of the social dimension of resilience. Recognition and appreciation further reinforce individual and group resilience, boosting morale and reinforcing a sense of purpose. The AULM© envisions a reciprocal relationship between leadership practices and individual/group resilience, forming the foundation of a thriving organisational ecosystem where individuals and leaders collaboratively navigate challenges with adaptability, strength, and a shared commitment to resilience.

4.4 Resilient Decision-Making in Organizations

At its core, resilient decision-making integrates the organization's strategic foresight and the ability to swiftly adjust those strategies based on emerging information (Williams et al., 2017); (Boin & Van Eeten, 2013). To Williams et al., (2017), resilient decision-making advocates for a proactive organisational stance, not only responding to crises but also anticipating and preparing for them. As suggested by (Shin et al., 2012), resilience extends beyond mere crisis management. In essence, resilient decision-making constitutes an ongoing adaptive process that positions organizations not only to endure challenges but to emerge more competitive and productive in the long term.

4.5 The Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©)

For one, the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©) distinguishes itself within the realm of leadership theories by explicitly integrating resilience as an intrinsic facet of adaptability as practiced by organisational leaders (Ali et al., 2020). This paradigmatic shift in leadership theory is particularly noteworthy for its pronounced comprehension of leadership dynamics in contemporary landscapes that is dominated by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) (Baran & Woznyj, 2020). AULM© posits that effective leadership in dynamic environments necessitates not only adaptability but also an inherent capacity for resilience while acknowledging setbacks as inherent within complex organisational ecosystems. Departing from traditional leadership dichotomies,

AULM© advocates for a diverse approach that blends flexibility to navigate uncharted territories with the resilience to withstand unforeseen challenges. The theoretical underpinnings of AULM© draw from psychological resilience frameworks, synthesizing elements of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral resilience into the leadership lexicon. This departure from conventional theories underscores the significance of psychological dimensions crucial for sustained effectiveness in turbulent environments. However, the academic merit of AULM© lies in its potential to augment organisational performance by nurturing leaders who not only navigate change but also cultivate a resilient organisational culture.

5.0 METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

In navigating the nuanced realm of research design, encompassing quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method approaches, the choice is not arbitrary but intricately linked to the essence of the research questions. As articulated by (Asenahabi, 2019), any selected research design should significantly shape the validity of potential conclusions. Qualitative research, predominantly comprising illustrative observations and inferences, holds merit in cultivating theoretical assumptions and fostering an evolving comprehension of phenomena (Lambert & Lambert, 2012). Yet, its inherently subjective nature introduces the prospect of diverse outcomes across various contexts, a concern often scrutinized by scholars rooted in the positivist paradigm (Borman et al., 1986). On the contrary, quantitative research, reliant on numerical techniques, tends to overlook ethical considerations and leans towards objectivity (Cortina, 2020); (Edwards, 2020). The mixed-method approach, aspiring to reconcile interpretivist and positivist perspectives, introduces its own intricacies and continues to grapple with partial acceptance (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007); (Truscott et al., 2010). For this study, a judiciously chosen mixed-methods approach was deemed most fitting, combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews.

5.2 Case Study Selection

The telecommunications sector has been a critical driver of economic growth for Nigeria (Alugbuo & Eze, 2021). However, the sector has also experienced unprecedented turbulence in recent years (David and Grobler, 2020). With increasing competition between the biggest players - MTN, Globacom (Glo), Airtel, and Etisalat - there is no doubt that adapting their leadership to confront managerial challenges would represent a big concern for the handlers

and stakeholders of these firms. Additionally, regulatory changes and the wider issue of technological disruptions have also led these organizations within this sector to face complex adaptive challenges. This case study delves into the integrative leadership dynamics of Globacom Nigeria Limited (Glo) and others exploring how its leaders have fused adaptive strategies with ursiform resilience to navigate these challenges and make informed organisational decisions.

6.0 FINDINGS

6.1 Presentation of Empirical Results

The findings from both qualitative and quantitative sources in relation to the research questions. It focuses on integrative leadership dynamics, the incorporation of adaptive strategies and ursiform resilience, and their implications for organisational outcomes. The analysis combines theoretical perspectives, case studies, and empirical data to derive meaningful insights.

The thematic analysis of qualitative data derived from interviews with selected participants from three major telecommunications companies in Nigeria: MTN, Glo, and Airtel. The participants included senior managers, executives, and department heads. The objective was to explore how leaders integrate adaptive strategies with resilience-building practices to achieve organisational effectiveness in volatile environments. The findings are organized into six key themes, aligned with the research questions.

	Items	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Std dev
Leadership Perception	The leadership effectively communicates organisational goals during periods of change.	11.4%	31.4%	14.3%	27.1%	15.7%	3.10	1.23
	I trust the leadership team to make the right decisions during uncertain times.	32.1%	40.0%	12.1%	12.1%	3.6%	3.76	1.28
	Leaders in my department encourage innovation and adaptability.	1.4%	20.7%	21.4%	33.6%	22.9%	2.58	1.09
	Leadership changes are handled smoothly and clearly communicated to employees.	7.1%	30.7%	22.9%	27.1%	12.1%	2.87	1.27
	The leadership team fosters a collaborative and inclusive work environment.	17.1%	38.6%	21.4%	16.4%	6.4%	3.24	1.40
Organisational Adaptability and Resilience	The organization responds quickly to regulatory or technological changes.	7.1%	50.7%	15.7%	20.0%	6.4%	3.27	1.19
	I feel prepared to adapt when new work processes or technologies are introduced.	5.0%	33.6%	15.0%	28.6%	17.9%	2.96	1.15

Overall Satisfaction	Leadership promotes a culture that embraces change positively.	4.3%	37.1%	20.0%	31.4%	7.1%	2.99	1.19
	Challenges faced by the company are usually turned into learning opportunities.	5.0%	25.0%	20.7%	34.3%	15.0%	2.79	1.18
	Overall, I am satisfied with my experience working at the organization.	7.1%	30.0%	30.0%	25.0%	7.9%	2.76	1.35
	I feel that my contributions are recognized and valued by the organization.	20.7%	38.6%	15.7%	23.6%	1.4%	3.47	1.28
	I would recommend the organization as a great place to work to others.	12.1%	38.6%	22.9%	19.3%	7.1%	3.10	1.36
	I am satisfied with the opportunities for career growth within the organization.	10.7%	38.6%	27.9%	18.6%	4.3%	3.00	1.41

Table 1: Leadership Perception

Table 1 revealed in terms of leadership perception, the most positively rated statement was “I trust the leadership team to make the right decisions during uncertain times,” which received a high mean score of 3.76, with 72.1% of respondents either agreeing or strongly agreeing. This suggests a relatively strong level of trust in leadership during periods of uncertainty. However, this positive perception is not consistent across all leadership aspects. Notably, only 1.4% of respondents strongly agreed that “Leaders in my department encourage innovation and adaptability,” resulting in the lowest mean score in the section at 2.58, with a majority (56.5%) expressing disagreement. Additionally, only 11.4% strongly agreed that leadership effectively communicates goals during change, with a significant 42.8% expressing disagreement or strong disagreement, indicating communication remains a major concern.

6.2 Organisational Adaptability and Resilience

In the area of organisational adaptability and resilience, the most favourable response was to the statement “The organization responds quickly to regulatory or technological changes,” which earned a mean of 3.27 and had 57.8% of respondents in agreement. This shows some organisational agility in reacting to external shifts. However, employees were less optimistic about internal preparedness and learning culture. Only 30% agreed or strongly agreed that “challenges are turned into learning opportunities,” resulting in a lower mean of 2.79. Similarly, statements related to embracing change and adapting to new work processes scored means of 2.99 and 2.96, respectively, revealing some hesitation or lack of readiness among staff.

6.3 Overall Satisfaction

Regarding overall satisfaction, employee views were again mixed. The most positively viewed statement was “I feel that my contributions are recognized and valued by the organization,” which had a mean of 3.47 and 59.3% agreement. However, general satisfaction with the organizations received a much lower mean of 2.76, with 32.9% of respondents indicating dissatisfaction. Career growth opportunities also drew lukewarm responses, reflected in a mean score of 3.00, while 50.7% indicated they would recommend the industry good to work in, reflected in a mean of 3.10.

6.4 Conclusion

The data highlights that while employees tend to trust leadership during crises and feel individually appreciated, there are concerns about leadership communication, encouragement of innovation, adaptability to internal change, and satisfaction with career development. The relatively high standard deviation values across responses (ranging from 1.09 to 1.41) indicate varied and inconsistent experiences within the industry. These insights point to specific areas where organisational leadership and management could focus to build greater coherence, responsiveness, and employee engagement.

7.0 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Hypothesis one

Effect of Leadership Perception on overall satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	.363 ^a	.132	.126	.69738	20.998	.000 ^b

a. Predictors: (Constant), leadership perception

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.867	.272		6.867	.000
	leadership perception	.391	.085	.363	4.582	.000

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction

Hypothesis two

Effect of Organisational Adaptability and Resilience on overall satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	.191 ^a	.036	.029	.73484	5.200	.024 ^b

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Organisational Adaptability and Resilience**

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.553	.241		10.601	.000
	Organisational Adaptability and Resilience	.177	.078	.191	2.280	.024

a. Dependent Variable: satisfaction

7.1 Interpretation of Regression Results

Hypothesis One: Effect of Leadership Perception on Overall Satisfaction

The regression analysis conducted for Hypothesis One, examining the effect of leadership perception on overall satisfaction, shows a significant relationship. The R square value of 0.132 indicates that 13.2% of the variance in overall satisfaction can be explained by leadership perception. The adjusted R square of 0.126 suggests that the model still holds its predictive power even after adjusting for the number of predictors.

The F-value of 20.998 with a significance value of 0.000 indicates that the model is statistically significant, meaning leadership perception significantly contributes to explaining overall satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient for leadership perception is 0.391, meaning that for each one-unit increase in leadership perception, there is a corresponding increase of 0.391 units in satisfaction. This result is statistically significant with a p-value of 0.000, which is below the standard threshold of 0.05. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.363) further suggests that leadership perception has a moderate, positive influence on overall satisfaction, as it has a fairly strong effect relative to other potential predictors.

In conclusion, the results confirm that leadership perception significantly influences overall satisfaction, with a positive relationship between the two variables.

Hypothesis Two: Effect of Organisational Adaptability and Resilience on Overall Satisfaction

For Hypothesis Two, which examines the effect of organisational adaptability and resilience on overall satisfaction, the results show a weaker but still significant relationship. The R square value of 0.036 suggests that only 3.6% of the variance in overall satisfaction is explained by organisational adaptability and resilience, which is a relatively low amount. The adjusted R square of 0.029 further confirms that after adjusting for the number of predictors, the explanatory power of the model remains minimal.

However, the F-value of 5.200 with a significance value of 0.024 indicates that the model is statistically significant, meaning that organisational adaptability and resilience have a meaningful contribution to overall satisfaction. The unstandardized coefficient for organisational adaptability and resilience is 0.177, indicating that for each one-unit increase in organisational adaptability and resilience, satisfaction increases by 0.177 units. This relationship is also statistically significant with a p-value of 0.024, which is less than the threshold of 0.05. The standardized coefficient (Beta = 0.191) indicates a small positive effect, suggesting that although organisational adaptability and resilience contribute to overall satisfaction, the effect is weaker compared to leadership perception.

In conclusion, while organisational adaptability and resilience do have a positive effect on overall satisfaction, the strength of this effect is smaller compared to the influence of leadership perception.

7.2 Qualitative analysis

Empirical findings from case studies involving MTN, Globacom (Glo), and Airtel Nigeria reveal how integrative leadership dynamics manifest in real-world organisational contexts. In terms of key components, MTN demonstrates a strong emphasis on collaborative governance, emotional intelligence, and strategic agility—qualities that enable leaders to respond swiftly to internal and external changes. At Glo, the leadership framework is heavily rooted in innovation, local market adaptation, and organisational learning, which supports responsiveness to Nigeria's unique socio-economic and regulatory landscape. Airtel, on the other hand, blends global best practices with local responsiveness by employing transformational leadership, scenario planning, and a decentralized decision-making style.

When it comes to integrating adaptive strategies with organisational resilience, MTN leverages digital transformation, robust scenario modelling, and decentralized decision-making to maintain competitiveness during periods of disruption, such as during policy shifts or public crises. Glo exhibits organisational resilience through its sustained investment in telecommunications infrastructure and consistent product innovation, despite facing internal and market-level turbulence. Airtel relies on agility, continuous staff development, and data-informed decision-making, which allows it to remain resilient and responsive in a fast-evolving market.

The implications of these integrative leadership dynamics for organisational outcomes are significant. For MTN, such leadership approaches have contributed to enhanced public trust, quicker recovery from crises, and higher employee morale. Glo's approach, while yielding strong outcomes in market retention and product development, has sometimes struggled with internal communication and leadership transparency. Airtel's integrative leadership has

resulted in improved customer satisfaction, efficient digital service delivery, and greater operational consistency. Collectively, these findings highlight the strategic value of combining adaptive strategies with resilient leadership to foster sustainable organisational performance in Nigeria's dynamic telecommunications sector.

Thematic Analysis of Integrative Leadership Dynamics in Nigeria's Telecom Sector (MTN, Glo, Airtel)

Theme 1: Core Components of Adaptive and Resilient Leadership Participants consistently highlighted several essential components that characterize adaptive and resilient leadership, including clarity of vision, strategic alignment, emotional intelligence, and empowerment of teams.

- MTN Senior Manager (P1): "Clarity and purpose drive adaptability. We ensure decisions are data-informed and people are empowered to act."
- Glo Executive (P2): "Leadership today must be emotionally intelligent—bold yet empathetic."
- Airtel Department Head (P3): "Being agile and empathetic helps the team trust you during difficult times."

These responses affirm previous studies on transformational leadership and its emphasis on vision and empowerment (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Theme 2: Application of Leadership in Volatile Environments All participants shared experiences where adaptability, collaboration, and resilience played pivotal roles in navigating sectoral challenges.

- P1: "We had to change our SIM registration strategy overnight due to government policy. It took inter-departmental effort."
- P2: "During the lockdown, we transitioned 60% of our operations online in just two weeks."
- P3: "When a network failure hit three states, coordination with regional heads and support teams was immediate."

This theme aligns with the concept of dynamic capabilities in leadership (Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016).

Theme 3: Integration of Adaptive Strategies and Resilience Participants discussed tools and strategies for combining adaptability with resilience in decision-making.

- P1: "Agile frameworks and feedback loops guide our strategic moves."
- P2: "We use predictive analytics and prepare in 'war rooms' during uncertain periods."
- P3: "Contingency planning is not a one-time event—it's routine."

The data suggest that strategic foresight and scenario planning are becoming standard practice in organisational leadership.

Theme 4: Decision-Making Under Uncertainty Embracing uncertainty was seen not as a liability, but as a pathway for innovation and resilience.

- P1: “We launched a new data plan amid market instability—adjusting every week based on real-time feedback.”
- P2: “We delayed our 5G launch until staff were fully trained, which turned out to be beneficial.”
- P3: “We relocated our hub due to floods and kept operations running without delay.”

These findings are consistent with Heifetz’s (1994) adaptive leadership theory.

Theme 5: Impact on Organisational Outcomes Participants noted measurable improvements in organisational performance resulting from integrative leadership practices.

- P1: “We saw a 12% increase in NPS scores and lower staff turnover.”
- P2: “Innovation and customer loyalty improved significantly.”
- P3: “Team burnout dropped, and productivity went up.”

The results indicate that leadership resilience and adaptability contribute positively to innovation, sustainability, and employee well-being (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011).

Theme 6: Challenges and Benefits of ARULM Implementation The Adaptive-Resilient-Unified Leadership Model (ARULM) presents implementation challenges but also distinct advantages.

- P1: “Some leaders resisted decentralization at first, but we now move faster.”
- P2: “We didn’t expect such a strong shift in risk awareness across departments.”
- P3: “Quantifying resilience is hard, but cohesion and morale are visibly stronger.”

These insights underscore the need for cultural transformation and structural flexibility to adopt integrative leadership fully.

8.0 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Research Question 1: What are the key components of integrative leadership dynamics?

The study reveals that integrative leadership dynamics are underpinned by a confluence of emotional intelligence, systems thinking, ethical conduct, collaborative engagement, and leadership agility. Respondents emphasized the need for leaders to balance strategic foresight with emotional sensitivity, suggesting that self-awareness and empathy play pivotal roles in harmonizing diverse perspectives within teams. Systems thinking emerged as a critical competency, allowing leaders to understand interdependencies within organisational structures and to anticipate ripple effects of strategic decisions.

Additionally, respondents identified ethical leadership and inclusivity as non-negotiable pillars of integrative leadership. By fostering trust and upholding integrity, leaders create an environment conducive to shared decision-making and innovation. Agility—defined as the ability to pivot and respond effectively to dynamic challenges—was also frequently cited,

especially in relation to technological disruption and global uncertainty. Thus, integrative leadership is inherently multidimensional, requiring leaders to synthesize technical, emotional, and moral competencies to guide organizations effectively.

Research Question 2: How do leaders integrate adaptive strategies and ursiform resilience in their decision-making processes?

Respondents consistently linked adaptive leadership with iterative learning, flexibility in approach, and a proactive response to volatility. Leaders were observed to integrate adaptive strategies through continuous environmental scanning, scenario planning, and the cultivation of learning-oriented cultures. One respondent noted that "leaders must remain aware of shifting dynamics and adapt without losing sight of their core mission," highlighting the balance between adaptability and strategic anchoring.

The metaphor of "ursiform resilience"—resilience modeled after the bear's characteristics—was reflected in descriptions of strength, endurance, and strategic retreat. Leaders demonstrated resilience by maintaining composure under pressure, empowering others to act decisively, and recovering quickly from setbacks. Decision-making processes involved not only analytical rigor but also emotional regulation and moral courage, particularly when navigating crises or managing resistance to change. This synthesis of adaptability and resilience enabled leaders to maintain organisational continuity and momentum in the face of adversity.

Research Question 3: What are the implications of integrative leadership dynamics for organisational outcomes?

The data indicates that integrative leadership positively influences a range of organisational outcomes, including innovation, employee engagement, crisis resilience, and strategic alignment. Respondents cited instances where inclusive leadership approaches led to increased employee motivation and cohesion, especially in multicultural or interdisciplinary teams. The use of shared visioning and collaborative problem-solving were associated with improved team performance and organisational learning.

Moreover, organizations led by integrative leaders exhibited greater agility in responding to external disruptions such as the COVID-19 pandemic and digital transformation. Respondents attributed their organizations' ability to adapt rapidly and effectively to the presence of leadership that embraced diversity, encouraged experimentation, and maintained ethical standards. Integrative leadership thus fosters organisational cultures that are not only adaptive but also sustainable, enhancing long-term performance and resilience.

8.1 Conclusion

The quantitative analysis aligns with the qualitative study, as both provide valuable insights into the adaptive leadership and resilience strategies employed by the organizations (MTN, Glo, and Airtel) in Nigeria's telecommunications sector. The quantitative results indicate that employees trust leadership to make the right decisions during uncertainty, with a high mean score of 3.76. However, concerns about the communication of goals and fostering innovation were noted. This finding aligns with the qualitative data, which highlights that leadership is emotionally intelligent, agile, and capable of adapting in uncertain times. In terms of

organisational adaptability and resilience, the quantitative data shows that while employees recognize the organization's responsiveness to regulatory and technological changes (mean = 3.27), there is less confidence in internal preparedness or turning challenges into learning opportunities (mean = 2.79). This is consistent with the qualitative analysis, where leadership is described as adaptable and resilient, and utilizing tools such as agile frameworks, predictive analytics, and contingency planning. However, employees do not always feel fully supported or prepared internally to adapt, as reflected in the lower survey scores.

The qualitative analysis also suggests that leadership's approach has led to measurable improvements in organisational performance, such as increases in Net Promoter Scores (NPS) and customer loyalty, which complements the quantitative findings. While the survey results on overall satisfaction reflect mixed feelings about career growth and recognition, the qualitative insights indicate that leadership practices, including empowerment and innovation, have contributed to measurable improvements in organisational outcomes. This suggests that leadership perception has a positive, though somewhat limited, impact on satisfaction and performance, as indicated by the regression results. Finally, both sets of data show that leaders in these organizations use tools like feedback loops and predictive analytics to integrate adaptability with resilience in decision-making. The quantitative analysis underscores a significant relationship between leadership perception and overall satisfaction, indirectly supporting the qualitative findings that adaptive leadership influences employee satisfaction and organisational performance. Overall, the qualitative and quantitative data complement each other, reinforcing the idea that leadership's ability to foster adaptability and resilience is crucial for positive organisational outcomes, although areas like communication, innovation, and internal adaptability could be improved based on the mixed perceptions found in the survey data.

8.2 Limitations of the Study

Acknowledging the limitations of our research is essential. We discuss potential constraints, such as sample size limitations, data collection challenges, and the context-specific nature of our findings, which may restrict the generalizability of our conclusions.

9.0 CONCLUSION

9.1 Summary of Key Findings

In this concluding section, we summarize the key findings of our study, emphasizing the significance of integrative leadership dynamics in contemporary organisational decision making. (2017); (Boin & Van Eeten, 2013). To Williams et al., (2017), resilient decision-making advocates for a proactive organisational stance, not only responding to crises but also anticipating and preparing for them. As suggested by (Shin et al., 2012), resilience extends beyond mere crisis management. In essence, resilient decision-making constitutes an ongoing adaptive process that positions organizations not only to endure challenges but to emerge more competitive and productive in the long term.

9.2 The Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©)

For one, the Adaptive-Ursiform Leadership Model (AULM©) distinguishes itself within the realm of leadership theories by explicitly integrating resilience as an intrinsic facet of adaptability as practiced by organisational leaders (Ali et al., 2020). This paradigmatic shift in leadership theory is particularly noteworthy for its pronounced comprehension of leadership dynamics in contemporary landscapes that is dominated by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA) (Baran & Woznyj, 2020). AULM© posits that effective leadership in dynamic environments necessitates not only adaptability but also an inherent capacity for resilience while acknowledging setbacks as inherent within complex organisational ecosystems. Departing from traditional leadership dichotomies,

AULM© advocates for a diverse approach that blends flexibility to navigate uncharted territories with the resilience to withstand unforeseen challenges. The theoretical underpinnings of AULM© draw from psychological resilience frameworks, synthesizing elements of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral resilience into the leadership lexicon. This departure from conventional theories underscores the significance of psychological dimensions crucial for sustained effectiveness in turbulent environments. However, the academic merit of AULM© lies in its potential to augment organisational performance by nurturing leaders who not only navigate change but also cultivate a resilient organisational culture.

REFERENCES

- Aime, F., Humphrey, S., DeRue, D. S., & Paul, J. B. (2014). The riddle of heterarchy: Power transitions in cross-functional teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(2), 327–352.
- Ali, A., Wang, H., & Johnson, R. E. (2020). Empirical analysis of shared leadership promotion and team creativity: An adaptive leadership perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(5), 405–423.
- Asenahabi, B. M. (2019). Basics of research design: A guide to selecting appropriate research design. *International Journal of Contemporary Applied Researches*, 6(5), 76–89.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315–338.
- Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2014). Authentic leadership theory, research, and practice: Steps taken and steps that remain. In *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organizations* (pp. 331–356). Oxford University Press.
- Baran, B. E., & Woznyj, H. M. (2020). Managing VUCA: The human dynamics of agility. *Organizational Dynamics*, 49(2), Article 100787.
- Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 656–665.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112–121.

- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2010). The transformational model of leadership. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 76–86). Sage.
- Berkovich, I. (2014). Between person and person: Dialogical pedagogy in authentic leadership development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 13(2), 245–264.
- Boin, A., & Van Eeten, M. J. (2013). The resilient organization. *Public Management Review*, 15(3), 429–445.
- Borman, K. M., LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1986). Ethnographic and qualitative research design and why it doesn't work. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 30(1), 42–57.
- Brammer, S., Layla, B., & Martina, L. (2020). COVID-19, societalization, and the future of business in society. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(4), 493–507.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper (Ed.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology* (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Cha, S. E., Hewlin, P. F., Roberts, L. M., Buckman, B. R., Leroy, H., Steckler, E. L., & Cooper, D. (2019). Being your true self at work: Integrating the fragmented research on authenticity in organizations. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(2), 633–671.
- Claus, L. (2021). Do we need a new leadership paradigm due to COVID-19. *International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 9(2), 162–167.
- Cortina, J. M. (2020). On the whys and hows of quantitative research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(1), 19–29.
- Doh, J. P. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives from management educators. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(1), 54–67.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wheeler, J. V. (2003). Managing from the boundary: The effective leadership of self-managing work teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), 435–457.
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 13(1), 215–246.
- Edwards, A. (2020). Qualitative designs and analysis. In *Doing early childhood research: International perspectives on theory and practice* (pp. 155–175). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003115403-11>
- Ekezie, W. (2022). Resilience actions of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) living in camp-like settings: A Northern Nigeria case study. *Journal of Migration and Health*, 6, Article 100115.

- Eneanya, A. N., Bello, M. A., Oladoyin, A. M., Fasanmade, O. O., & Chukwudi, C. E. (2025). Leadership development as the key anchor for post-Covid-19 pandemic, state resilience and sustenance in Africa: A study of Nigerian health system experience and support for SDG 3. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, 5(2), Article e04742.
- Enwereuzo, P. N. (2023). Resilient leadership qualities and human resource management in Nigerian universities: The Rivers State experience. *International Journal of Economics, Environmental Development and Society*, 4(1), 29–56.
- Etter, M., Ravasi, D., & Colleoni, E. (2019). Social media and the formation of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Review*, 44(1), 28–52.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., Van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132.
- Fischer, T., & Sitkin, S. B. (2023). Leadership styles: A comprehensive assessment and way forward. *Academy of Management Annals*, 17(1), 331–372.
- Graeff, C. L. (1983). The situational leadership theory: A critical view. *Academy of Management Review*, 8(2), 285–291.
- Grant, A. M., Christianson, M. K., & Price, R. H. (2007). Happiness, health, or relationships? Managerial practices and employee well-being tradeoffs. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(3), 51–63.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). *The power of servant-leadership*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Gulati, R., Wohlgezogen, F., & Zhelyazkov, P. (2012). The two facets of collaboration: Cooperation and coordination in strategic alliances. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6(1), 531–583.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Harvard University Press.
- Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). Leadership in a (permanent) crisis. *Harvard Business Review*, 87(8), 62–69.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organization Studies*, 4(4), 418–428.
- Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: An historical essay. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 129–144.
- Ireland, R. D., & Miller, C. C. (2004). Decision-making and firm success. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 18(4), 8–12.

- Jasper, L. (2018). Building an adaptive leadership style. *Strategic Finance*, 99(9), 54–61.
- Joseph, J., & Gaba, V. (2020). Organizational structure, information processing, and decision-making: A retrospective and road map for research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 267–302.
- Kauppila, O. P., Ehrnrooth, M., Mäkelä, K., Smale, A., & Sumelius, J. (2022). Serving to help and helping to serve: Using servant leadership to influence beyond supervisory relationships. *Journal of Management*, 48(3), 764–790.
- Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters*. Harvard Business Press.
- Kong, D. T., Park, S., & Peng, J. (2023). Appraising and reacting to perceived pay for performance: Leader competence and warmth as critical contingencies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 66(2), 402–431.
- Kossek, E. E., & Perrigino, M. B. (2016). Resilience: A review using a grounded integrated occupational approach. *Academy of Management Annals*, 10(1), 729–797.
- Kuhnert, K. W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A constructive/developmental analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(4), 648–657.
- Lam, W., Lee, C., Taylor, M. S., & Zhao, H. H. (2018). Does proactive personality matter in leadership transitions? Effects of proactive personality on new leader identification and responses to new leaders and their change agendas. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1), 245–263.
- Lambert, V. A., & Lambert, C. E. (2012). Qualitative descriptive research: An acceptable design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 255–256.
- Larson, L. E., Harris-Watson, A. M., Carter, D. R., Asencio, R., DeChurch, L. A., Kanfer, R., & Zaccaro, S. J. (2023). Staying apart to work better together: Team structure in cross-functional teams. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 9(3), 320–338.
- Lei, H., Gui, L., & Le, P. B. (2021). Linking transformational leadership and frugal innovation: The mediating role of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(7), 1832–1852.
- Lemoine, G. J., Hartnell, C. A., & Leroy, H. (2019). Taking stock of moral approaches to leadership: An integrative review of ethical, authentic, and servant leadership. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 148–187.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255.

- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1434–1452.
- Lin, S. H., Scott, B. A., & Matta, F. K. (2019). The dark side of transformational leader behaviors for leaders themselves: A conservation of resources perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1556–1582.
- London, M. (2023). Causes and consequences of adaptive leadership: A model of leaders' rapid responses to unexpected events. *Psychology of Leaders and Leadership*, 26(1), 22–39.
- Madi, O., Rana, B. S., Obeidat, B. Y., Jaradat, M. O., Ra'ed, M., & Alshurideh, M. T. (2023). The transformational leadership role in achieving organizational resilience through adaptive cultures: The case of Dubai service sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 72(2), 440–468.
- Masten, A. S. (2021). Multisystem resilience: Pathways to an integrated framework. *Research in Human Development*, 18(3), 153–163.
- Miller, C. C., & Ireland, R. D. (2005). Intuition in strategic decision making: Friend or foe in the fast-paced 21st century? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 19–30.
- Mithani, M. (2020). Adaptation in the face of the new normal. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(4), 508–530.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tushman, M. L. (1989). Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 3(3), 194–204.
- Nakpodia, F., Ashiru, F., You, J. J., & Oni, O. (2024). Digital technologies, social entrepreneurship and resilience during crisis in developing countries: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 30(2/3), 342–368.
- Nelson, T., & Squires, V. (2017). Addressing complex challenges through adaptive leadership: A promising approach to collaborative problem solving. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 16(4), 141–158.
- Ohlsson, A., Alvinus, A., & Larsson, G. (2020). Smooth power: Identifying high-level leadership skills promoting organizational adaptability. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 23(4), 297–313.
- Olekalns, M., Brianna, B. C., & Timothy, J. V. (2020). Gradual drifts, abrupt shocks: From relationship fractures to relational resilience. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 1–28.
- Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2019). Leaders' impact on organizational change: Bridging theoretical and methodological chasms. *Academy of Management Annals*, 13(1), 272–307.

- Pawar, B. S., & Eastman, K. K. (1997). The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1), 80–109.
- Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2008). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rindova, V., & Courtney, H. (2020). To shape or adapt: Knowledge problems, epistemologies, and strategic postures under Knightian uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(4), 787–807.
- Salleh, E. S. M., Zainal, S. R. M., Dato'Mansor, Z., & Yasin, I. M. (2020). Multilevel analysis on employee wellbeing: The roles of authentic leadership, rewards, and meaningful work. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 25(1), 45–67.
- Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 727–748.
- Siangchokyoo, N., Klinger, R. L., & Campion, E. D. (2020). Follower transformation as the linchpin of transformational leadership theory: A systematic review and future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), Article 101341.
- Solinger, O. N., Jansen, P. G., & Cornelissen, J. P. (2020). The emergence of moral leadership. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(3), 504–527.
- Southwick, F. S., Martini, B. L., Charney, D. S., & Southwick, S. M. (2017). Leadership and resilience. In J. Marques & S. Dhiman (Eds.), *Leadership today: Practices for personal and professional performance* (pp. 315–333). Springer.
- Spears, L. (1996). Reflections on Robert K. Greenleaf and servant-leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 17(7), 33–35.
- Stoverink, A. C., Kirkman, B. L., Mistry, S., & Rosen, B. (2020). Bouncing back together: Toward a theoretical model of work team resilience. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(2), 395–422.
- Suryaningtyas, D., Sudiro, A., Troena, E. A., & Irawanto, D. W. (2019). Organizational resilience and organizational performance: Examining the mediating roles of resilient leadership and organizational culture. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(2), 1–7.
- Tashakkori, A., & Creswell, J. W. (2007). Exploring the nature of research questions in mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(3), 207–211.
- Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy.

- Thompson, G., & Vecchio, R. P. (2009). Situational leadership theory: A test of three versions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(5), 837–848.
- Thorne, S. (2000). Data analysis in qualitative research. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 3(3), 68–70. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebn.3.3.68>
- Truscott, D. M., Swars, S., Smith, S., Thornton-Reid, F., Zhao, Y., Dooley, C., & Matthews, M. (2010). A cross-disciplinary examination of the prevalence of mixed methods in educational research: 1995–2005. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), 317–328.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2018). Leadership for organizational adaptability: A theoretical synthesis and integrative framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 89–104.
- Van Der Vegt, G. S., Essens, P., Wahlström, M., & George, G. (2015). Managing risk and resilience. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(4), 971–980.
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S. B. (2013). A critical assessment of charismatic—transformational leadership research: Back to the drawing board? *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1–60.
- Venus, M., Stam, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2019). Visions of change as visions of continuity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(3), 667–690.
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., & Parker, S. K. (2020). How does the use of information communication technology affect individuals? A work design perspective. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), 695–725.
- Wang, Y., Chen, J., & Bakker, A. (2017). Authentic leadership in the job demands and resources perspective: A multilevel investigation. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2017(1), 11015. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2017.11015abstract>
- Williams, T. A., Gruber, D. A., Sutcliffe, K. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Zhao, E. Y. (2017). Organizational response to adversity: Fusing crisis management and resilience research streams. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 733–769. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0134>
- Zahari, A. I., Mohamed, N., Said, J., & Yusof, F. (2022). Assessing the mediating effect of leadership capabilities on the relationship between organisational resilience and organisational performance. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 49(2), 280–295.
- Zhang, Y., LePine, J. A., Buckman, B. R., & Wei, F. (2014). It's not fair... or is it? The role of justice and leadership in explaining work stressor–job performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(3), 675–697.