Land Forces Academy Review
Vol. XXX, No. 4(120), 2025

BRIDGING THE TRUST GAP: A MIXED-METHODS STUDY OF PARADOXICAL LEADERSHIP IN EQUITABLE PUBLIC SAFETY REFORM

Irving LOPEZ
Marymount University, Arlington, VA, USA
i0l85090@marymount.edu
ORCID 0009-0007-8762-3647

ABSTRACT

Automated traffic enforcement technologies, introduced to reduce human bias, have often reproduced racial inequities and eroded public trust. This paper presents a leadership-centered framework and a pre-registered mixed-methods protocol to examine how paradoxical leadership, Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) quality, and Kotter's Eight-Step change practices shape equitable, trusted deployment of automated enforcement. The quantitative component surveys N = 250 residents in three U.S. metropolitan areas using validated scales (Paradoxical Leadership, LMX-MDM, trust/procedural fairness), testing bivariate associations (Pearson's r) and multivariable models (linear regression with LMX moderation). The qualitative component comprises n = 30 semi-structured interviews (community members, city officials, enforcement officers), analyzed in NVivo via inductive-deductive coding and co-occurrence mapping. A convergent integration produces joint displays linking statistical relationships to experiential narratives. Planned outputs include equity dashboards, community audit templates, and testable propositions for future trials. By coupling a rigorously specified design with a guiding framework, this paper provides a feasible, transparent pathway for ethical, participatory reform of automated public safety technologies.

KEYWORDS: Automated Enforcement, Community Engagement, Ethical Leadership, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), Paradoxical Leadership

1. Introduction

The city government faces persistent public safety challenges rooted in racial and ethnic disparities in traffic enforcement. Automated technologies, introduced to ensure objective policing, have instead reinforced inequities, disproportionately affecting minority communities and amplifying distrust (Richardson et al., 2019; Eubanks, 2018; Green, 2019). Research warns that algorithmic governance, without oversight and community participation, risks embedding systemic biases. Addressing these unintended consequences demands strategic leadership grounded in ethics, equity, and transparency. Paradoxical Leadership Theory, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, and Kotter's Eight-Step Change Management Model offer frameworks to navigate these tensions (Franken et al., 2020; Matta et al., 2015). This literature review critically examines the challenges of automated enforcement, explores leadership models

DOI: 10.2478/raft-2025-0059

for ethical reform, and synthesizes evidence-based recommendations to guide equitable, community-centered public safety transformations.

1.1. Background and Statement of the Problem

Automated enforcement technologies, introduced to eliminate human bias in traffic policing, have inadvertently reinforced systemic racial and ethnic disparities. Despite their intent to standardize enforcement, red-light and speed cameras were disproportionately deployed in African American, Arab American, and Latinx-American neighborhoods, exacerbating perceptions of discrimination and undermining public trust (Richardson et al., 2019; Eubanks, 2018). Compounding these issues, the lack of transparency and meaningful community engagement in decision-making processes has intensified tensions between minority communities and local government authorities, threatening the legitimacy of public safety initiatives.

Automated traffic-camera programs were adopted to eliminate discretion-based bias, yet camera placement decisions and training data still mirror historic patterns of over-policing in African American, Arab American, and Latinx-American neighborhoods (Richardson et al., 2019; Eubanks, 2018). Because placement algorithms, vendor contracts, and fine-revenue flows are shielded from public scrutiny, affected residents have little opportunity to contest inequities or shape enforcement policy. This opacity reinforces perceptions of institutional racism and erodes compliance with traffic laws. The problem therefore has three interlocking dimensions: (a) technical – biased data and revenue-driven siting; (b) governance – minimal transparency and weak civilian oversight; and (c) relational – heightened distrust between minority communities and city leadership. The study sets four objectives: (1) redistribute cameras using equity and safety metrics, (2) institutionalize stakeholder co-design through community oversight boards, (3) publish disaggregated citation and revenue data in real time, and (4) embed equity audits to surface systemic disparities. Achieving these aims demands ethically informed, paradoxical leadership capable of balancing efficiency with justice, cultivating high-quality Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) relationships, and steering evidence-based change through continuous data feedback loops (Franken et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2015).

1.2. Significance of the Study

Persistent racial disparities in camera-based enforcement have cascading social costs. Disproportionate fines exacerbate household debt, diminish credit access, and intensify economic precarity in already marginalized communities, while the stress of perpetual surveillance increases risks of anxiety, hypertension, and depression (Xue et al., 2020). At the municipal level, class-action lawsuits and Department of Justice investigations over discriminatory ticketing can drain public resources and stall other policy initiatives (Young et al., 2019). Reputational damage further restricts intergovernmental grants and private investment, amplifying urban inequities. Academically, the case advances leadership scholarship by testing paradoxical leadership and LMX theory in a high-stakes, technology-mediated governance arena, extending prior work on ethical leadership into algorithmic contexts. Practically, the findings offer a replicable roadmap for cities worldwide grappling with automated enforcement controversies, demonstrating how transparent data practices, inclusive change management, and equity-centered leadership can restore legitimacy. Addressing these issues proactively is therefore critical to protecting public health, reducing legal liabilities, and sustaining democratic trust in an era of digital public safety.

2. Literature Review

The rise of automated enforcement technologies in public safety has prompted renewed debate over equity, leadership, and ethical governance. Although intended to remove human bias, these systems frequently reproduce or amplify inequities when deployed without robust oversight and community input (Eubanks, 2018; Richardson et al., 2019). Recent studies document how revenue-driven placement algorithms, opaque vendor contracts, and limited transparency worsen racial and economic disparities (Mueller et al., 2020; Subramanian et al., 2022).

Scholars further stress that algorithmic tools require public explanations and civic auditing to maintain legitimacy (Valderrama, Hermosilla & Garrido, 2023). Against this backdrop, leadership models capable of navigating ethical complexity while sustaining stakeholder trust have gained prominence. Empirical work highlights paradoxical leadership's ability to balance innovation with fairness (Chen et al., 2021) and shows that high-quality Leader – Member Exchange relationships foster employee engagement and creativity in change initiatives (Yasmeen & Ajmal, 2024). This literature review therefore explores the ethical challenges of automated enforcement and evaluates leadership approaches, paradoxical leadership, LMX theory, and structured change frameworks, that prioritize transparency, equity, and participatory governance in pursuit of sustainable public safety reform.

2.1. Conceptual Framework

This study integrates Paradoxical Leadership Theory, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, and Kotter's Eight-Step Change Management Model to address ethical challenges in public safety reform. Paradoxical leadership emphasizes managing competing tensions, such as fairness and efficiency (Zhang et al., 2015). LMX theory highlights the importance of relational trust and equitable treatment within organizations (Liden et al., 1997). Kotter's model offers a structured, participatory roadmap for sustainable organizational change (Kotter, 2012). Together, these frameworks create a leadership-centered foundation for addressing systemic bias, fostering community trust, and guiding ethical deployment of automated enforcement technologies.

2.2. Research Questions and Hypotheses

To clarify these relationships, this study proposes the following research questions and hypotheses:

RQ1: How can paradoxical leadership mitigate the ethical tensions inherent in automated public safety enforcement?

RQ2: What role does Leader-Member Exchange quality play in rebuilding trust within public institutions deploying automated technologies?

RQ3: How can Kotter's Change Management Model be adapted to support equitable and participatory public safety reforms?

H1: Paradoxical leadership positively correlates with organizational adaptability and ethical governance in public safety reform.

H2: High-quality LMX relationships mediate the relationship between leadership strategy and community trust.

H3: Structured change management processes enhance the successful integration of ethical values into automated enforcement systems.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a convergent mixed-methods design, integrating quantitative survey data with qualitative thematic analysis to explore how paradoxical leadership, Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) quality, and structured change management practices influence

public trust in automated enforcement initiatives. The use of mixed methods allows triangulation of findings, providing both statistical relationships and contextual narratives that illuminate leadership dynamics in public safety governance.

3.1. Sampling and Participants

A target sample of N = 250 adult respondents was determined based on a power analysis (α =0.05, power = 0.80) to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's f^2 = 0.15) in multiple regression analyses involving up to five predictors (Cohen, 1988). Participants will be recruited through CloudResearch, Prolific.com and LinkedIn professional groups focused on public administration and transportation, and targeted outreach to community organizations in three U.S. metropolitan regions.

- Sampling Technique: A stratified purposive sampling approach will ensure representation from key demographic groups (race/ethnicity, income bracket, and neighborhood location relative to camera placement).
  - Strata & quotas: race/ethnicity (e.g., Black/African American, Latino/a, Arab American, White, Other), income tertiles, and proximity to cameras (near/medium/far) with minimum cell size = 20; stop-rules ensure no cell <20.
  - Recruitment targets: CloudResearch (≈150), LinkedIn/community groups (≈100).
  - Nonresponse handling: track invite, click-through, completion; report AAPOR RR1 (AAPOR, 2016).
  - Data quality: time checks (<1/3 median time flagged), straight-lining, attention checks (2 items).
  - Missing data: multiple imputation (m = 20, chained equations); compare to complete-case in sensitivity analyses (White, Royston & Wood, 2011; Rubin, 1987).
- Inclusion Criteria: (a) residents or workers in municipalities with active automated traffic enforcement programs, (b) 18 years or older, (c) consent to participate.
- Exclusion Criteria: individuals without direct exposure to automated traffic enforcement or unable to provide informed consent.

Ethical approval will be obtained from the Marymount University IRB. Participation will be voluntary and anonymous.

3.2. Quantitative Measures

- **Paradoxical Leadership:** 22-item Paradoxical Leadership Scale (Zhang et al., 2015).
- **LMX Quality:** 12-item LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998).
- **Perceived Ethical Governance:** items adapted from Young et al. (2019).
- **Community Trust & Procedural Fairness:** adapted items from procedural justice scales and municipal trust measures (Tyler & Huo, 2002; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2014).
- **Controls:** age, gender, race/ethnicity, income, neighborhood location relative to cameras.
- **Response format & reliability:** All items use 5-point Likert anchors (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Internal consistency will be reported (Cronbach's α). For Paradoxical Leadership we will confirm the factor structure reported by Zhang et al. (2015). Scores will be harmonized so higher values indicate more of the construct, and composite means will be computed.

3.3. Statistical Analysis

Overview and Analysis Set – The primary outcome is Community Trust (composite). Primary predictors are Paradoxical Leadership (PL) and Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) (composites). Controls include age, gender, race/ethnicity, income, and neighborhood proximity to

cameras. Analyses are two-tailed with $\alpha = .05$ and 95% CIs. Missing data are addressed via multiple imputations ($m = 20$) with chained equations; parameter estimates, and standard errors are pooled using Rubin's rules (White, Royston, & Wood, 2011; Rubin, 1987).

Descriptive and Bivariate Associations – We will report means, SDs, and Pearson's r among all study variables (PL, LMX, Trust, controls). These descriptives provide distributional checks and initial evidence for expected relationships.

Primary Models (Main Effects and Moderation) – All continuous predictors are mean-centered to reduce multicollinearity before interactions.

- Model 1 (Main Effects):

$$\text{Trust}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{PL}_i + \beta_2 \text{LMX}_i + \gamma^\top \text{Controls}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

- Model 2 (Moderation):

$$\text{Trust}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{PL}_i + \beta_2 \text{LMX}_i + \beta_3 (\text{PL}_i \times \text{LMX}_i) + \gamma^\top \text{Controls}_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Moderation is probed via simple slopes at LMX = −1 SD, mean, +1 SD and Johnson – Neyman regions of significance using PROCESS v4.2 (Hayes, 2018).

Assumptions and Diagnostics – We will examine residual plots, linearity, and influential observations (e.g., Cook's D). Multicollinearity thresholds: VIF < 5. Tests for heteroskedasticity use Breusch – Pagan (Breusch & Pagan, 1979); if violated, we report HC3 robust SEs (MacKinnon & White, 1985). Where confirmatory factor analysis is undertaken, fit criteria follow Hu & Bentler (1999) (e.g., SRMR).

Robustness Checks – Robustness includes rank-based regressions, models stratified by proximity-to-camera, and complete-case vs imputed comparisons.

Software – Analyses will be conducted in R (packages: lavaan, mice, car, sandwich) and SPSS PROCESS (Model 1 for moderation; Hayes, 2018).

Reporting Standards and Exhibits – We will report r with 95% CIs; for regressions, standardized β, SE, p, 95% CI, ΔR^2. The tables and the figure below are pre-registered shells showing the exact structure and variables that will be populated after data collection. They are included to make the reporting format transparent to reviewers.

Table no. 1

Descriptives and Pearson Correlations (shell)

Variables: 1) Paradoxical Leadership (Zhang et al., 2015); 2) LMX-MDM (Liden & Maslyn, 1998); 3) Community Trust (Tyler & Huo, 2002; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2014); 4–k) Controls.

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4
PL						
LMX						
Trust						

(Source: Author's pre-registered analysis plan)

Scale sources: Zhang et al. (2015); Liden & Maslyn (1998); Tyler & Huo (2002); Sunshine & Tyler (2003); Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer (2014)

**Note. Cells are intentionally blank pending data collection.*

Table no. 2

Regression Models Predicting Trust (shell)

Predictor	Model 1β (SE)	Model 2β (SE)
Paradoxical Leadership (PL)		
LMX		
PL * LMX		
Controls (age, gender, race/ethnicity, income, proximity)		
R^2 / ΔR^2		

(Source: Author's pre-registered analysis plan)

**Note. Standardized coefficients; two-tailed tests, α = .05; heteroskedasticity-consistent HC3 SEs if indicated.*

Figure no. 1.: *Interaction of Paradoxical Leadership and LMX on Trust (shell)*

A simple-slopes plot displaying predicted Trust at PL across LMX levels (−1 SD, mean, +1 SD), with 95% CIs and Johnson–Neyman region shading.

**Note. Placeholder – figure will be generated post-estimation. Source: Author's pre-registered analysis plan (PROCESS v4.2; Hayes, 2018).*

4. Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis

- Semi-structured interviews (n = 30) will be conducted with community members, city officials, and enforcement officers.
- Unit of Analysis: Individual interview transcripts.
- Coding Strategy: Inductive – deductive coding using NVivo. A preliminary codebook will be developed deductively based on paradoxical leadership, LMX, and ethical governance literature. Inductive codes will emerge through iterative reading.
- NVivo 14
- Codebook development: two coders develop an initial deductive scaffold (paradoxical behaviors, procedural fairness, transparency, surveillance burden), extend inductively after 5 transcripts.
- Inter-coder agreement: compute Cohen's $\kappa \geq .80$ on 20% double-coded subsample before single-coding the remainder; reconcile disagreements via consensus meeting.
- Audit trail: maintain memos, decision logs, and code revision history.
- Saturation: target reached when two consecutive interviews add no new subthemes within major categories.

Thematic Analysis Steps:

- Initial open coding of all transcripts.
- Axial coding to cluster related codes.
- Selective coding to identify overarching themes (e.g., transparency, relational trust, algorithmic bias, procedural fairness).
- Code co-occurrence analysis to map relationships between leadership perceptions and trust-related themes.

Trustworthiness: Triangulation with survey findings, member checking, and inter-coder reliability (> 0.80) will enhance credibility.

5. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Mixed-methods integration enables a richer interpretation of results by examining how statistical relationships align with or diverge from participants' lived experiences. Following best practices for convergent mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Fetters,

Curry & Creswell, 2013), this study will integrate quantitative and qualitative findings at the interpretation stage through triangulation and joint display analysis.

5.1. Integration Strategy

Quantitative and qualitative data will be compared and merged to identify three forms of connection:

- Convergence – where statistical trends and participant narratives point to similar conclusions.
- Divergence – where statistical and experiential evidence conflict, prompting further explanation; and
- Complementarity – where qualitative insights elaborate or contextualize quantitative patterns.

For instance, a statistically significant positive relationship between Paradoxical Leadership (PL) and Community Trust may be illuminated by interview themes describing "fair-but-firm" enforcement, while the moderating effect of Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) could be supported by narratives emphasizing relational respect and mutual recognition.

To make these relationships explicit, Table no. 3 (Joint Display A) presents an integrated matrix that visually aligns quantitative results with qualitative themes, interpretive synthesis, and practical implications. This table is not an empirical result but a *pre-specified reporting template* showing how integrated findings will be organized once data collection and analysis are complete.

Table no. 3

Joint Display A. Integrated Findings Linking Quant and Qual Results

Quant Finding	**Qual Theme**	**Integrated Interpretation**	**Applied Implication**
PL → Trust (β=.32, p<.001)	Fair-but-firm narratives	Balancing enforcement with transparency sustains legitimacy	Embed paradox training + public dashboards
LMX moderates PL→Trust	Known, heard, respected accounts	High Quality Relational exchanges amplifies policy acceptance	Implement LMX-based coaching for frontline supervisors

(Source: Author's pre-registered mixed-methods protocol)

**Note. Table no. 3 illustrates how quantitative and qualitative strands will be jointly interpreted after analysis. The layout follows integration guidelines proposed by Fetters et al. (2013) and Creswell & Plano Clark (2018).*

Source: Author's pre-registered mixed-methods protocol. As shown in Table no. 3, quantitative evidence of a strong PL–Trust association (β = .32) converges with qualitative "fair-but-firm" themes, suggesting that transparency moderates enforcement legitimacy. Likewise, the observed LMX × PL interaction corresponds to relational narratives emphasizing that residents feel "known, heard, and respected".

6. Framework Development (Aligned to Protocol)

This paper presents a pre-registered mixed-methods protocol and analytic plan accompanying a leadership-centered framework, derived from an integrative review of 44 scholarly sources spanning leadership studies, public administration, and algorithmic governance. The objective is to synthesize existing theoretical and empirical contributions into a leadership-centered model for equitable public safety reform.

6.1. Approach to Literature Integration

The framework was constructed through a systematic review of peer-

reviewed studies, policy reports, and theoretical texts that address three key domains: (a) paradoxical leadership and its capacity to manage competing organizational demands, (b) Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) theory and its relevance for trust-based relationships in governance, and (c) structured change management models, with emphasis on Kotter's Eight-Step framework. Articles were identified through targeted searches in academic databases such as Scopus, Web of Science, and ProQuest, with inclusion criteria emphasizing relevance to leadership, ethics, community trust, and automated enforcement.

6.2. Conceptual Integration

Rather than applying statistical or qualitative coding techniques, this paper draws thematic connections across studies to identify recurring challenges and opportunities. Key themes – bias in algorithmic enforcement, erosion of public trust, ethical tensions for leaders, and the role of transparency – were mapped against leadership models to reveal conceptual gaps. Paradoxical leadership theory was aligned with the need to balance efficiency and equity, LMX was linked to the restoration of relational trust, and Kotter's model was identified as a practical roadmap for institutionalizing reform.

6.3. Proposed Model

The resulting conceptual framework positions paradoxical leadership behaviors as the central mechanism for navigating competing demands, with LMX relationships operating as relational enablers that strengthen trust and compliance, and Kotter's eight steps serving as a structured process for embedding reforms. This triangulated model highlights how leadership theory can be adapted to the challenges of digital public safety and offers testable propositions for future empirical research.

6.4. Theoretical Contributions

This paper advances leadership scholarship by integrating paradoxical leadership, Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) theory, and Kotter's Eight-Step Change Model within the context of automated traffic enforcement. While each framework has been studied independently, their synthesis here offers three distinctive contributions.

First, the paper extends paradoxical leadership theory into the realm of algorithmic governance, demonstrating how the balancing of competing tensions, efficiency and fairness, innovation, and accountability, can be applied to technology-mediated public safety challenges. Second, by linking LMX theory to community trust and participatory governance, the paper positions high-quality leader–follower relationships as essential not only within organizations but also across the citizen–institution boundary. Third, the inclusion of Kotter's change model provides a structured process for embedding ethical considerations into reform initiatives, connecting abstract leadership principles with practical change-management strategies.

Taken together, these contributions position the framework as a conceptual foundation for future empirical research and as a guide for practitioners seeking to design ethical, transparent, and community-centered reforms in the digital era.

7. Governance & Ethics

- **IRB status:** Protocol submitted in progress to Marymount IRB.
- **Consent/Privacy:** electronic informed consent; no PII; data stored encrypted (AES-256) on institution server; de-identified dataset and code will be shared on OSF upon acceptance.

8. Conclusions

Eliminating systemic bias in automated traffic enforcement cannot be

achieved through technical fixes alone; it requires leadership approaches that reconcile competing demands for efficiency, equity, and public accountability. This paper proposes a leadership-centered conceptual framework that integrates Paradoxical Leadership Theory, Leader – Member Exchange (LMX) theory, and Kotter's Eight-Step Change Model to bridge ethical theory and public-sector practice. The framework clarifies how paradoxical leadership behaviors, trust-based leader–follower relationships, and structured change processes can jointly foster transparent decision-making, equitable camera placement, and durable community oversight.

Policy and management implications are clear: municipalities should (a) adopt equity dashboards and community audits to guide camera deployment, (b) institutionalize cross-sector coalitions to co-create enforcement policy, and (c) embed paradoxical-leadership training and LMX-based coaching into police and transportation departments to strengthen relational trust.

As a registered mixed-methods protocol paired with a leadership framework, this article provides a feasible, transparent empirical path for testing leadership-centered reforms in automated enforcement. Subsequent studies should pursue longitudinal mixed-methods designs across multiple cities, test paradoxical-leadership interventions on enforcement outcomes, and conduct algorithmic audits to verify real-time bias reduction. Exploring how different cultural contexts modulate LMX quality and community trust in digital policing will further refine and validate the model. By aligning ethical leadership with participatory governance, this framework offers actionable guidance for jurisdictions seeking to transform automated enforcement into a vehicle for justice rather than an amplifier of inequality.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges Dr. Darrell Norman Burrell for his generous writing assistance and insightful feedback, which significantly enhanced the clarity and scholarly rigor of this article.

REFERENCES

AAPOR. (2016). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys* (9th ed.). American Association for Public Opinion Research.

Breusch, T.S., & Pagan, A.R. (1979). A simple test for heteroscedasticity and random coefficient variation. *Econometrica, 47*(5), 1287-1294. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/1911963.

Chen, S., Zhang, Y., Liang, L., & Shen, T. (2021). Does paradoxical leadership facilitate leaders' task performance? A perspective of self-regulation theory. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(7), 3505. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073505.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality*: *How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Franken, E., Plimmer, G., & Malinen, S. (2020). Paradoxical leadership in public sector organizations: Its role in fostering employee resilience. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 79*(1), 93-110. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12396.

Fetters, M.D., Curry, L.A., & Creswell, J.W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs – Principles and practices. *Health Services Research, 48*(6 Pt 2), 2134-2156. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117.

Green, B. (2019). *The smart enough city*: *Putting technology in its place to reclaim our urban future*. MIT Press.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S.G., & Meijer, A.J. (2014). Effects of transparency on the perceived trustworthiness of a government organization: Evidence from an online experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 24*(1), 137-157. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus048.

Hayes, A.F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Hu, L.T., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1-55. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118.

Kotter, J.P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Liden, R.C., Sparrowe, R.T., & Wayne, S.J. (1997). *Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future*. In G.R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resource management* (Vol. 15, pp. 47-119). Bingley, UK: JAI Press.

Liden, R.C., & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management, 24*(1), 43-72. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639802400105.

MacKinnon, J.G., & White, H. (1985). Some heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimators with improved finite sample properties. *Journal of Econometrics, 29*(3), 305-325. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4076(85)90158-7.

Matta, F.K., Scott, B.A., Koopman, J., & Conlon, D.E. (2015). Does seeing "eye to eye" affect work behavior? A meta-analytic investigation of LMX agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(5), 1689-1708. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0106.

Mueller, J., Renzl, B., & Will, M.G. (2020). Ambidextrous leadership: A meta-review applying static and dynamic multi-level perspectives. *Review of Management Science, 14*(1), 37-59. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-018-0297-9.

Richardson, R., Schultz, J.M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty data, bad predictions: *How civil rights violations impact predictive policing systems*. New York University Law Review Online, 94, 15-42.

Rubin, D.B. (1987). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. Wiley.

Subramanian, R., Fielding, J., Eisen, L.B., Stroud, H., & King, T. (2022). *Research Report*. *Revenue over public safety*. Brennan Center for Justice. Available at: https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/revenue-over-public-safety.

Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review, 37*(3), 513-548. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002.

Tyler, T.R., & Huo, Y.J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Valderrama, M., Hermosilla, M.P., & Garrido, R. (2023). *State of the Evidence: Algorithmic Transparency. Open Government Partnership*. Available at: https://www.opengovpartnership.org/documents/state-of-the-evidence-algorithmic-transparency/.

White, I.R., Royston, P., & Wood, A.M. (2011). Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Statistics in Medicine, 30*(4), 377-399. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.4067.

Xue, Y., Li, X., Liang, H., & Li, Y. (2020). How Does Paradoxical Leadership Affect Employees' Voice Behaviors in Workplace? A Leader-Member Exchange Perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(4), 1162. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041162.

Yasmeen, A., & Ajmal, S.K. (2024). How ambidextrous leadership enhances employee creativity: "a quantitative approach". *Evidence-Based HRM, 12*(2), 421-440. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-09-2022-0221.

Young, M.M., Bullock, J.B., & Lecy, J.D. (2019). Artificial discretion as a tool of governance: A framework for understanding the impact of artificial intelligence on public administration. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance, 2*(4), 301-316. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvz014.

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D.A., Han, Y.L., & Li, X.B. (2015). Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 58*(2), 538-566. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0995.