Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology
ISSN: 1001-4055
Vol. 45 No. 2 (2024)

Transformational Leadership a Real Paradox on Strategic Innovation

Morakinyo Patrick Ilo [1], Dr. Humphrey Akanazu [2]
[1] *Eurasian Business Management & Administration (EMAS) Moscow, Russia*
[2] *Rome Business School Nigeria RBSN, Lagos, Nigeria*

Abstract:- The study aims to analyze how the paradox of transformational leadership model affects strategic innovation within organizations. The data was analyzed using the regression technique and the regression result shows that diplomat transformational leadership model and expert transformational leadership model have a significant effect on strategic innovation. The study concluded that the transformational leadership model is a propellant for strategic innovation. As a result, the study recommended that captain of industries and stakeholders of business organizations should ensure that diplomat transformational leadership model in the organization should be their main concern, so as to increase the organization strategic innovation and creativity. Also, it is recommended that expert transformational leadership should be taken into due consideration in the organization as this will go a long way to boost the organizational strategic innovation via every employee handles a designated task and responsibilities based on their areas of expertise.

Keywords*:* Transformational Leadership Model; Diplomat Leadership Model; Expert Leadership Model; Innovation; Strategy.

1. Introduction

Effective leadership plays a crucial role in the success of organizations as it shapes the direction, culture, and efficacy of both teams and entire companies. It is becoming more and more important to comprehend and modify leadership models as the business and management landscape changes. This research explores the history of modern leadership models and looks at their creation, use, and effects on organizational results. The emergence of the digital era has given rise to new leadership considerations. Digital leadership models priorities adaptability, creativity, and efficient technology utilization to propel organizational achievements. Even though these modern models provide insightful information, problems still exist. It is necessary to investigate how well leadership models adapt to various organizational contexts, the significance of cultural quirks, and how outside factors affect the efficacy of leadership.

The intersection of strategic innovation and leadership models has garnered significant attention in modern organizational settings. The leadership model has garnered recognition for its capacity to stimulate transformation in organizations. However, it is acknowledged that strategic innovation is a key component of long-term competitive advantage and commercial success (Kindström, 2010). But the point where these two ideas converge creates a conundrum that demands closer examination. The central puzzle of this research centers on the possible conflict between the organized procedures and methodologies that frequently support strategic innovation and the leadership paradigm. Although leaders promote an environment that values creativity, risk-taking, and unconventional thinking, strategic innovation necessitates methodical processes, goal-setting, and alignment with corporate objectives. The inverse connection between strategic innovation and salient unconventional leadership models poses a significant obstacle for companies looking to fully utilize both ideas (Osborn & Marion, 2009). It necessitates a thorough analysis of the conflicts, opportunities, and compromises that executives encounter while balancing innovation with rigid strategic planning procedures.

A puzzle that necessitates further study arises from the junction of the Diplomat Transformational Leadership Model and its effects on strategic innovation. Given its focus on harmony, creating connections with others, and

reaching consensus, the Diplomat Leadership Model may be incompatible with the demanding and frequently intricate nature of strategic innovation in organizations. The challenge is to balance the basic qualities of the Diplomat Leadership Model, which promote secure, cooperative workplaces, with the adaptable, risk-taking character necessary for strategic innovation (Kucuk et al., 2017). This raises a number of important issues, such as if the conciliatory and diplomatic facets of the Diplomat Leadership Model conflict with the disruptive and demanding qualities that are frequently necessary for the growth of strategic innovation? by posing the question, "How can leaders using the Diplomat Model foster innovation while upholding the stable organizational environment that is hallmark of this leadership style?" to strike a balance between disruption and stability. What effects on risk tolerance, openness to change, and exploration of novel ideas does the Diplomat Model have on the structure and culture of the organization? How can leaders applying the Diplomat Model modify their strategies to foster and inspire an innovative culture without jeopardizing the peaceful and cooperative culture they uphold? What effect does the Diplomat Leadership Model have on an organization's ability to bounce back from disruptive innovation and changes in the industry, especially in settings that are extremely competitive and dynamic? When taking into account the possible resistance to change that comes with adopting a leadership style like the Diplomat Model, how can leaders foster and maintain strategic innovation? Does the Diplomat Leadership Model help or hinder organizations in developing and implementing innovative strategies? In an international or multicultural organizational setting, how does the Diplomat Leadership Model take into account and embrace various cultural quirks and perspectives on innovation?

The unresolved puzzle that leaders using the Diplomat Transformational Leadership Model encounter in the context of strategic innovation highlights a crucial knowledge void on the complex interplay between leadership philosophies and an organization's potential for transformative innovation (Kelley, 2010). It will be extremely beneficial to organizational effectiveness to comprehend how two seemingly incompatible methods of innovation and leadership may survive and support one another, adaptability and continuous development in the face of quick changes and advances in technology.

A thorough investigation is required to resolve the dilemma that arises from the interaction between the Expert Transformational Leadership Model and Strategic Innovation. The deep expertise, customized coaching, and mentorship that define the Expert Leadership Model may be incompatible with the organizational dynamics needed to develop breakthrough strategic innovation. The challenge is finding a way to balance the deep expertise and individualized guidance that are fundamental to the Expert Leadership Model with the risk-taking and dynamic elements that are necessary for strategic innovation to thrive (O'Leary, 2012). This paradox raises a number of crucial questions. This contradiction raises questions about conflicting approaches, making it challenging to determine whether the expert leadership model's hands-on, specialized characteristics conflict with the disruptive and exploratory qualities that are frequently necessary for strategic innovation to succeed. The difficulty of juggling knowledge and innovation also stems from how difficult it is to figure out how leaders may use the Expert Model to foster an innovative culture without sacrificing the value of individualized expertise and thorough direction.

Determining the impact of an expert model on an organization's culture and structure with regard to innovation pursuit, risk-taking, and the promotion of varied ideas gives rise to problems of cultural and structural implications.

The challenge for leaders using the expert model is to modify their methods to encourage creativity and taking calculated risks without losing sight of their area of expertise and one-on-one mentoring. This makes the adaptation of expertise a serious issue. What effect does the expert leadership model, particularly in fast-paced and competitive situations and have on an organization's ability to withstand disruptive innovation and industry changes (Mumford et al., 2007)

Furthermore, given the possible propensity towards old approaches ingrained in such leadership styles, the function in catalyzing change of the expert model after this transformational approach is challenging to generate and sustain strategic innovation. It is unclear how the expert leadership model balances in-depth expertise with embracing and promoting breakthrough innovation, particularly in a constantly changing, technologically driven

business environment, and whether it helps or hinders the development and execution of innovation strategies within organizations.

The difficulty that leaders encounter while implementing the expert transformational leadership model in the context of strategic innovation draws attention to a critical knowledge gap concerning the complex interplay between leadership philosophies and an organization's potential for transformative innovation (Le & Lei, 2019).

Understanding how two seemingly incompatible leadership philosophies may complement one another will be crucial for organizational flexibility, forward-thinking invention, and long-term success in the face of constant change and shifting consumer needs.

The objective of this research is to examine this paradox, clarify its consequences, and offer guidance to leaders on how to successfully manage the intricate relationship between the Expert Leadership Model and Strategic Innovation for the success of their organizations. Also, this study aims to analyze this paradox, reveal its ramifications, and provide leaders with guidance on how to successfully navigate the nuanced link between strategic innovation and the diplomat leadership model. This research aims to add to the current corpus of knowledge by offering a thorough analysis of modern leadership models. Organizations may make well-informed decisions on succession planning, leadership development, and cultivating a culture that is in line with their strategic goals by comprehending the origins, applications, and consequences of these models.

Organizational leaders, academics, and practitioners who want to leverage transformational leadership's impact while making sure that innovation projects stay in line with their organizations' larger strategic goals and objectives must comprehend this paradox. The purpose of this study is to investigate the intricacies of this paradox and offer insights that can guide leadership techniques and tactics for encouraging strategic innovation in the context of contemporary company.

Goodall (2012), studied the expert leadership theory. The study combines current actual data with conceptual work. It implies that when people in charge of an organization have a thorough awareness of its main operations, the organization functions more efficiently. The study supports the idea that having a general manager with the necessary skills is insufficient; expert leaders possess three key competencies: industry experience, which comes from years of practise and technical expertise in the core business; leadership capabilities, which include management skills and innate traits of a leader; and industry knowledge, which comes from time and practise within the core business industry. This essay critiques the emergence of the generalist CEO and professional management. It contends that knowledge-based planning, standard-bearing, fostering an atmosphere that benefits core employees, and taking the long view are all ways that expert leaders enhance organizational performance.

Goodall and Pogrebna (2015), examined knowledgeable leaders in a dynamic setting. This long-term study investigates how leaders affect performance in the renowned, technologically advanced, and highly competitive Formula One industry. A first-order requirement is proposed by the developing theory of expert leadership, which assesses the evidence by stating that leaders must possess constant management and leadership experience as well as expert knowledge of the core business of the organizations they are to lead. The results of the study offer compelling evidence in favour of the "expert leader" theory. Those who began their careers as drivers tend to be the most successful F1 principals. Furthermore, within the subsample of ex-drivers, the most successful leaders were those who had the longest driving histories. Findings from the expert-leader study support the theory that when a leader's knowledge and experience align with the main business activity of the company, long-term performance improves.

Hanif et al. (2020), studied leadership based on expertise. According to the study, in order for developing nations to effectively address sustainability concerns, public administration executives must demonstrate expertise-based intuitive leadership attributes. Public sector leaders in underdeveloped nations may lack the explicit and tacit information that is known to support expertise-based intuitive decision-making. Examining the causes of deficiencies in leadership abilities is essential to determine corrective measures, such improved executive development programs. In order to address the question of how to develop expertise-based intuitive leadership traits in public administration executives, this study conducted 28 in-depth interviews with managers, executive

training professionals, and leaders in the field in Pakistan. The primary conclusions draw attention to gaps in soft skills and domain-specific expertise. Deficit of the detrimental effects of cultural preconditions combined with deficiencies in leaders' formal training creates explicit and implicit knowledge gaps that impair intuitive decision-making based on expertise. Building on earlier models, a "iceberg of expertise-based leadership" model is developed to explain the intangible part that explicit and tacit knowledge play in the outward display of leadership abilities. This concept is relevant for the accomplishment of sustainable development projects spearheaded by the public sector.

Szilagyi et al., (2022), studied the role of expert leadership during the COVID-19 epidemic. To determine expert opinion on important chaplain leadership factors, the study brought together an international panel of experts. The integration, perceived value, and contributions of chaplains during the pandemic were critical factors in determining six leadership themes: professional confidence, engaging and trust-building with executives, decision-making, innovation and creativity, building integrative and trusting connections with colleagues, and promoting cultural competencies. The panel determined the elements that shaped the integration of chaplains and the value or perceived value of chaplains' efforts during the epidemic, based on the opinions of international experts in chaplain leadership. The panel discussion's themes help us comprehend the chaplain leadership qualities and components that stood out as essential and significant during the COVID-19 response. These elements, nevertheless, may be more widely applicable and speak to issues beyond this current crisis. The results lay the foundation for further investigation into the characteristics of highly effective chaplain leadership and the skills chaplains should possess. Ensuring that leaders and practitioners in chaplaincy are adequately trained to lead with confidence in organizational and transdisciplinary spiritual care roles is crucial. Of the twelve invited experts, ten took part in the panel discussion. They were researchers on spiritual care from the United States (3), Australia (3), Ireland (1), the Netherlands (1), Sweden (1), and the United Kingdom (1). The facilitators, AV, CS, and JV, were originally from the Netherlands, Belgium, and the US. The author information of this report includes each panelist's institutional affiliations. These specialists contributed to this report as panelists, collaborators, and co-authors, outlining the main conclusions reached by the expert panel.

Friedrich et al., (2009), looked at the dominant approach to leadership research. The study emphasised that a team may have more than one person acting in a formal or informal leadership role, and that the decision to transfer leadership duties is frequently based on whose experience is most applicable to the current issue. The current study contributes to the rapidly expanding corpus of research on the division of the leadership position among several people. The study examined pertinent prior research and put forth a comprehensive framework for comprehending the process of collective leadership. Additionally, the study used an information and expertise-based method to construct this framework, proposing that the distribution of the leadership role, or collaborative leadership, is a function of choosing whatever information or specialised skill that members within the network process. An evaluation of the framework yields 55 propositions about the collective leadership process, along with recommendations for additional research.

Blagoev and Yordanova (2015), develop a model that assesses the innovative leadership of the organization. There are now several innovation indexes available, but they all gauge innovativeness at the macro level as opposed to the organizational level. The absence of any form of evaluation technique that could assist businesses in assessing their own performance, efforts, and innovative capacities is what makes such a model necessary. Additionally, a nation's innovation performance is mostly determined by the innovation-related activities of its enterprises, and no systematic approach has yet been developed to enhance and accurately evaluate the innovation potential and performance of companies. To differentiate between business leadership and innovative leadership, the study first develops a model for measuring company leadership. Next comes the proposal of a model for innovative leadership in a corporation. By employing this technique, it is possible to compare the company's leadership to its innovative leadership by comparing the two models. It is also possible to use the model to summarise some of the company's innovative leadership best practises. It is an example of a well-balanced innovation development and performance paradigm. Nonetheless, the model's primary goal is to assess and gauge the inventive leadership of the businesses and to contrast various firms based on that particular criterion. Once the concept has been applied to specific industrial sectors or areas, it can also be utilised as an innovative leadership index for companies.

Ryan and Tipu (2013) investigate, for a sample of 548 individuals, the relationship between leadership and innovation propensity as well as the leadership characteristics of the full range leadership model in Pakistan. The results of data analysis utilizing structural equation modelling, confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis, and transformational and transactional leadership do not uncover the leadership dimensions of these three styles of leadership. Instead, the study distinguishes between two different leadership facets passive-avoidant leadership and aggressive leadership—and investigates the relationship between these facets of leadership and inclination for innovation. The findings indicate that propensity for innovation is significantly and favourably impacted by active leadership. On the other hand, the propensity for innovation is significantly but moderately positively impacted by passive-avoidant leadership. According to the study's findings, these leadership philosophies provide a distinctive perspective on the characteristics of leadership behaviours in Pakistani companies and how those behaviours affect a company's propensity for innovation.

Sacavém (2019), analyse the kind of leadership that can work better for creative companies. In this instance, the research topic can have a big impact on organizations since innovation is crucial to their ability to compete; nevertheless, innovation is fraught with difficulties and frequently fails due to the leadership style of the organization. "Which are the most effective leadership styles for innovative organizations?" is the research question in this context. Using a qualitative approach based on an integrative literature review, and the findings demonstrate that the most successful leaders are those that are democratic, real, and paternalistic when it comes to encouraging the adoption of novel procedures in businesses.

Zuraik (2017), there are specific leadership behaviours that firms can adopt to increase their potential for innovation. The goal of the study is to identify the best leadership stance that fosters innovation in contemporary businesses. It highlights the issue that exists in both academics and managerial practise: a lack of consensus regarding the best ways for leaders to promote and encourage innovation in their companies. This study's main goal is to confirm and investigate the roles that ambidextrous and transformational leadership play in team and organizational level innovation, respectively, within an organizational environment that fosters innovative practises. The results demonstrate how CEOs' transformative leadership behaviours may support and foster innovation at the organizational level of their businesses. Moreover, team leaders' ambidextrous leadership styles can influence the results of innovation at the team level. However, an encouraging work environment has a separate function in driving innovative activities within teams as well as within organizations. Organization executives will become more aware of the need to define specific strategies and a set of abilities to develop and maintain organizational innovation as a result of these insights into a holistic and multilevel view.

Adjei (2013) examined the process of innovation leadership, which entails combining several leadership philosophies in businesses to motivate staff members to generate original concepts, goods, services, and solutions. Innovation leadership is a strategy for organization development that can help a group or organization fulfil its vision or goal. Organizations are finding it more and more important to think creatively in order to secure their ongoing success and maintain their competitiveness in a world where new technologies and processes are constantly emerging. The necessity for innovation in organizations to adapt to new changes has led to a renewed emphasis on the role of leaders in determining the character and outcome of creative endeavors. Without innovative leadership, businesses are probably going to have trouble. The conventional organizational practices of the 20th century, which discouraged inventive behavior on the part of employees (Wang & Cheng, 2010), have given way to a new push for creativity in the workplace that reflects this transformation of innovative thinking as a potentially powerful influence on organizational performance in the 21st century.

The great man theory, commonly referred to as the trait theory of leadership, asserts that good leaders have a set of innate qualities that set them apart from non-leaders (Zehndorfer, 2013). According to this hypothesis, people are born with certain features that make them more likely to become leaders, and these attributes largely hold true in a variety of contexts. The early 20th century is where the trait theory first emerged, even if it has since changed throughout time.

The goal of the trait theory's early proponents was to pinpoint a set of universal characteristics shared by effective leaders (Nawaz & Khan, 2016). Among the essential qualities are knowledge, assurance, willpower, moral rectitude, and sociability.

Although trait theory served as the basis for leadership study, it has been subject to various criticisms and limitations. Its oversimplified premise that effective leaders have a set of characteristics in common is one of its main criticisms. This viewpoint downplays the impact of contextual elements and the dynamic character of leadership. Furthermore, the idea frequently ignores how followers' traits, organizational culture, and environmental factors affect leadership effectiveness (Dugan & Komives, 2011).

The latest versions of the leadership theory recognize its shortcomings and offer a more sophisticated explanation. According to recent studies, context is far more important than certain attributes when it comes to a leader's performance. For example, the significance of particular attributes might change based on the leadership context (Avolio et al., 2022). Moreover, the trait theory has been broadened to encompass the interplay between the qualities and behaviors of leaders.

Despite its criticism, trait theory has helped identify traits that people who want to be leaders can work on developing. Programs for developing leaders frequently include elements of trait theory by emphasizing the development of particular qualities like emotional intelligence, flexibility, and communication abilities (Judge et al., 2009).

Although trait theory served as a foundation for leadership study, it is imperative to view it critically. A thorough grasp of leadership effectiveness necessitates taking into account the complex interactions between situational conditions and qualities, as traits do not define a leader in isolation.

2. Methods

Research Philosophy This study used positivism research philosophy. Under positivism research philosophy this study was able to test the research hypotheses because the study was able to investigate what truly happened in the organizations through scientific measurement of people and system behaviours (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2006). To test these hypotheses, the study translated the underlying concepts, idealized influence and inspirational motivation, and staff performance into measurable forms (Galliers, 1991). Additionally, under positivism research philosophy the study would be able to generalize its research findings (Alavi & Carlson, 1992).

Quantitative research is employed in this study. The research design used in this study is survey research, and the method adapted under this survey is cross-sectional in nature.

The instruments used for measuring diplomat and expert transformational leadership were adapted from the work of (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1999) scale for measuring strategic innovation was adapted from the work of (Galindo-Rueda & Van Cruysen, 2015). The following analyses were carried out in the study; the correlation coefficients, correlation matrix, descriptive statistics, multicollinearity test, and regression equation model are examples of the quantitative analytical tools used in this study.

3. Results

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test was conducted in the study using VIF need to be conducted in a study, as it may lead to misleading findings. Multicollinearity exists where two or more independent variables are highly correlated (Hair et al. 2014). This study utilised VIF to test for multicollinearity (Kothari & Garg, 2014). According to Kothari and Garg (2014), a VIF figure above ≥ 5 shows serious multicollinearity.

Table 1.

Collinearity Statistics

	Variables	Tolerance	VIF
1	Diplomat TLM	.609	1.642
	Expert TLM	.609	1.642

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation

From table 1, it is clearly seen that the entire VIF coefficient are less than 5. Thus, the independent variables in this study are not highly correlated; hence, it is assumed that the study is free from multicollinearity the result is presented on the table below.

Validity and reliability statistics

Cronbach's alpha value is used in this study to indicate the reliability and internal consistency of the scale, when the Cronbach alpha value is equal to or above 0.7. it means that, the variables utilised in this study have Cronbach's alpha values over 0.7, indicating that there is a strong internal consistency and reliability Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson (2010). As a consequence, the construct reliability of the variables employed in this study is good the result is shown on table below.

Table 2.

Reliability statistics

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha If Item Deleted	Numbers Of Items	Verdicts
Strategic Innovation	.769	8	Reliable
Diplomat TLM	.811	9	Reliable
Expert TLM	.791	6	Reliable

Source: field work (2023)

The outcome is presented on the table below and it indicated that all the value of the cronbach's alpha is between 0.769 and 811 as shown below that means that the constructs cronbach values are all reliable.

Correlation Analysis

The Pearson correlation between strategic innovation and diplomat transformational leadership model, expert transformational leadership model which are presented on the table 3 below.

Table 3

Correlations value

Variables		diplomat TLM	Expert TLM	strategic innovation
diplomat TLM	Pearson Correlation	1	.625**	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	282	282	282
Expert TLM	Pearson Correlation	.625**	1	.683**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	282	282	282
strategic innovation	Pearson Correlation	.655**	.683**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	282	282	282

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The findings of the correlation study showed a strong positive link (r = 0.625**, p<.01) between the diplomat transformational leadership paradigm and strategic innovation. Expert transformational leadership model and strategic innovation have a substantial positive link of (r = 0.655*, p<.05), and there is a significant relationship (r = 0.683, p>.05) between strategic innovation and the independents factors. Since most scholars regard correlations of 0.7 and higher to be strong (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010), there is no indication of multicollinearity across the independent variables. As a result, all of the independent variables qualify for multiple regression analysis

Hypotheses Testing

Table 4

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.743[a]	.551	.548	.74662

a. Predictors: (Constant), Expert TLM, diplomat TLM

The regression coefficient in this study with an R^2 of 0.551, this indicated that an increase in the independent variables in the model of this study diplomat transformational leadership model and expert transformational leadership model would result in an increase in organizational strategic innovation, this result presented in the table above implies that a strong positive relationship exist between the independent variables (diplomat transformational leadership model and expert transformational leadership model) and strategic innovation. An increase in the independent variables would cause 55.1% increase or variance in strategic innovation, and vice versa. Therefore, diplomat transformational leadership model and expert transformational leadership model account for 55.1% variation or fluctuation in strategic innovation, the remaining 44.9% maybe is caused by other factors that were not included in this study. The next table then includes information pertaining to the ANOVA of the study.

Table 5

ANOVA

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	191.131	2	95.566	171.437	.000[b]
	Residual	155.525	279	.557		
	Total	346.656	281			

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Expert TLM, diplomat TLM

Data regarding the F statistics in this study, the F statistics value of (171.437) is significant at 0.000 levels, indicating a significant level less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the regression model used in this study meets the requirements of Goodness of Fit of Diplomat transformation leadership model and expert transformation leadership model have a simultaneous/joint effect of diplomat transformation leadership model and expert transformation leadership model on strategic innovation in the population of the study as noted from the result presented below; consequently information concerning the coefficient of regression is presented on the next table.

Summary of coefficient of regression.

Table 6.

Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.936	.182		5.134	.000
	diplomat TLM	.361	.050	.374	7.282	.000
	Expert TLM	.441	.051	.449	8.735	.000

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation

The independent variable (diplomat transformational leadership model) has a regression coefficient Beta value of 0.374, which implies that, a percent rise or increase in diplomat transformational leadership would increase organizational strategic innovation of enterprises by 37.4%. Thus, the null hypothesis that stated, diplomat transformational leadership model has no significant effect on strategic innovation was therefore rejected because the significant value is less than 5%, this shows that there is sufficient statistical evidence that an increase in diplomat transformational leadership model might result in an increase in organizational strategic innovation with the *P* value < .05.

The regression coefficient on the relationship between expert transformational leadership models has a beta value of 0.449 indicating that if other variables are kept constant, an increase in expert transformational leadership would result in a 44.9% expansion in organizational strategic innovation of enterprises. Furthermore, the significant value is less than five (5%) level of significance; this demonstrates that there is enough statistical evidence for the assertion that increasing on expert transformational leadership model might improve strategic innovation with the *p* value < 0.05.

4. Discussion

This study examined the concept of strategic innovation and how it was influenced by diplomat transformational leadership model and expert transformational leadership model. Results of the study have revealed that, the first hypothesis, diplomat transformational leadership model has no significant impact on strategic innovation was empirically rejected. The finding of the first hypothesis is consistent with previous research findings by Cohen (1995); Damanpour (1992) who found out in their studies that diplomat transformational leadership model is a significant variable that might influence strategic innovation of the organization.

It was equally discovered that the second hypothesis, that stated expert transformational leadership model has no significant impact on strategic innovation was rejected. This second hypothesis's finding is consistent with other past researchers' findings (Chartier, 1998; Chen & Peng, 2017) that found that using an expert transformational leadership would improve an organizational strategic innovation in the contemporary settings.

The finding from this study has a numbers of managerial implications, it is important for the managers of organization should recognize both the short and long-term benefits of diplomat transformational leadership model in organization as it has a numbers of implications on the strategic innovation of organization, these benefits of diplomat transformational leadership includes among the following; increase in the organization innovation activities and creativity easy solution to the organization problems and problems proper allocation of the organizational responsibilities among the employee, poll of skills among the employee. Hence, this goes a long way to improve the organizational strategic innovation. Theoretically, this study contributes to the body of knowledge via plethora reviewed of extant literatures in organizational behavior variables, theoretical and empirical literatures were reviewed in this study.

5. Conclusion

It is concluded that this study differs from previous studies on leadership as it takes a unique approach by examining leadership model by employing data which is an added value of the analysis in the field of leadership. Therefore, on the bases of the findings in this study, the following conclusions were drowning. The study's findings have proven that, there is a positive and significant relationship between diplomat transformational leadership model and strategic innovation of the organizations; hence, the study concludes that diplomat transformational leadership model is an important variable to be used in an organization. It was further revealed that, expert transformational leadership model is a significant variable that might influence organizational strategic innovation. Therefore, it was on the bases of the following findings that, the following recommendations were drown based on the findings, it was revealed that diplomat transformational leadership model is a significant variable that may affect organizational strategic innovation, and hence it was recommended that captain of industries and stakeholders of business organizations should ensure that diplomat transformational leadership model adoption should be their main concern, so as to increase the organization strategic innovation and creativity. The study equally revealed a positive and significant relationship between expert transformational leadership and organizational strategic innovation, therefore, on the bases of the above findings, it was recommended that expert transformational leadership should be taken into due consideration in the organization as this will go a long way to boost the organizational strategic innovation via every employee handles a designated task and responsibilities based on their areas of expertise.

Declaration of Competing Interest

No conflicts declared.

List of abbreviations

Not applicable

Reference

[1] Chen, D., & Peng, X. (2017). Research on the Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Government Service Innovation. *Open Journal of Leadership. http://www.scirp.org/journal/ojl*
[2] Cohen, W. (1995). Empirical studies of innovative activity. In, Handbook of the Economics of Innovation and Technological Change, Stoneman P (ed). Blackwell: Oxford pp.182–264.
[3] Damanpour, F. (1992). Organizational size and innovation. Organ. Stud. 13: 375–402.
[4] Galindo-Rueda, F. & A. Van Cruysen, (2015). Testing innovation survey concepts, definitions and questions: findings from cognitive interviews with business managers, mimeo.
[5] Gumusluoglu, T. Ilsev, A. (2009). Transformational leadership, creativity and organizational innovation. J. *Bus. Res. 62: 461-473.*
[6] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis. 7th Edition, Pearson, New York.
[7] Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2014). Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). UK: Pearson New International Edition.
[8] Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). Research Methodolgy; Methods and Techniques (3rd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International Limited.
[9] Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 607-610. DOI: 10.1177/001316447003000308.

Appendix

REGRESSION

/MISSING LISTWISE

/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA

/CRITERIA=PIN (.05) POUT (.10)

/NOORIGIN

/DEPENDENT VAR00001

/METHOD=ENTER VAR00002 VAR00003

Regression

Notes

Output Created		10-NOV-2023 15:55:42
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet0
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	282
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics are based on cases with no missing values for any variable used.
Syntax		REGRESSION /MISSING LISTWISE /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10) /NOORIGIN /DEPENDENT VAR00001 /METHOD=ENTER VAR00002 VAR00003.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.50
	Memory Required	2896 bytes
	Additional Memory Required for Residual Plots	0 bytes

Appendix 1

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.743[a]	.551	.548	.74662

a. Predictors: (Constant), Expert TLM, diplomat TLM

Appendix 2

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	191.131	2	95.566	171.437	.000[b]
	Residual	155.525	279	.557		
	Total	346.656	281			

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Expert TLM, diplomat TLM

Appendix 3

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.936	.182		5.134	.000
	diplomat TLM	.361	.050	.374	7.282	.000
	Expert TLM	.441	.051	.449	8.735	.000

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation

```
CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=VAR00002 VAR00003 VAR00001
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
```

Correlations

Notes

Output Created		10-NOV-2023 15:57:11
Comments		
Input	Active Dataset	DataSet0
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	282
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each pair of variables are based on all the cases with valid data for that pair.
Syntax		CORRELATIONS /VARIABLES=VAR00002 VAR00003 VAR00001 /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.00
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.04

Appendix 4

Correlations

		diplomat TLM	Expert TLM	strategic innovation
diplomat TLM	Pearson Correlation	1	.625**	.655**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	282	282	282
Expert TLM	Pearson Correlation	.625**	1	.683**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	282	282	282
strategic innovation	Pearson Correlation	.655**	.683**	1

Appendix 5

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic
strategic innovation	282	1.00	5.00	4.2092	.06614	1.11070
diplomat TLM	282	1.00	5.00	4.0674	.06849	1.15015
Expert TLM	282	1.00	5.00	4.0887	.06729	1.12996
Valid N (listwise)	282					

Appendix 6

Reliability Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
strategic innovation	8.1560	4.225	.742	.769
diplomat TLM	8.2979	4.224	.698	.811
Expert TLM	8.2766	4.229	.718	.791

Appendix 7

Coefficients[a]

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	diplomat TLM	.609	1.642
	Expert TLM	.609	1.642

a. Dependent Variable: strategic innovation