

## **A Strategic Perspective to Leadership Implications by Process**

### **Paradigm: An Empirical Study**

Hima Parameswaran

Department of Human Resource Management, City University College of Ajman, Ajman

\*Corresponding author's email: [h.parameswaran@cuca.ae](mailto:h.parameswaran@cuca.ae)

#### **Abstract**

Increasingly, organizations have realized that to bring about effective change, they need to emphasize leadership strategies. While leadership theories focus on key characteristics of the leadership experience, the leadership development interventions are not related to structural contingencies, and rarely connected to a particular leadership theory. The present study provides an integrated framework for linking leadership theories with specific developmental interventions. Accordingly, it was conducted in randomly selected companies in the UAE with the help of a closed-ended questionnaire. A stratified proportional sampling from 300 observations offers outlooks of employees in their organizational leadership styles. Also, a descriptive analysis using SPSS 24.0 maintains the significance level of the latent variables such as process paradigm and strategic human resource development to the independent variable, leadership interventions. The findings confirm the alignment of models extracted from the theories to the variables discussed in the questionnaire. Thus, the study proves that while responding to internationalization and rapid changes in the external environment, adopting a strategic-management approach to the provision of leadership is crucial. However, it also enlightens that the selected companies should restructure the traditional HRM function into strategic, operational, and functional levels. To operationalize the process, the existing HR strategies need to redesign with company strategies, right from HR practices, policies, and productivity goals. Future studies can be rendered by developing new strategies by leadership implications with optimal workforce utilization.

**Keywords:** Process Paradigm, Strategic Human Resource Development, Leadership Theories, Leadership Interventions.

## **Introduction**

Nowadays, organizations are in their evolving phase due to the strategic roles played by the management to gain and sustain its competitive advantage. The well-being of any society has a close relationship to the effectiveness of their organizations. Irrespective of the role or position, the present flexible, innovative, and turbulent environment calls for a leadership role in every human being. This statement urges a question, “Are leaders born or are they made?” It leads to many discussions on leadership theories and the possibilities for developing efficient leaders in organizations. According to Lynham (2000), most researches on leadership development has focused on leadership traits rather than the subject of leadership development. It is a dilemma that leadership development is often blended and perplexed with management development, and it necessitates a clear distinction regarding the purposes and outcomes of leadership (Sadler-Smith 2006; Mabey & Finch-Lees 2008).

Every organization strives to create an environment where all employees can interact and perform well to have a competitive advantage. Additionally, evidence support that to have a competitive edge, organizations must involve employees in the business of the organization (Lawler 1992; (Branzei & Thornhill 2006; Pietraszewski 2020). The recent interest in HR as a strategic ever to have economic viability is the effect on the bottom line by value creation. To create strategies, the companies need to utilize and mobilize all

resources internally and externally, which highlights the Resource-based view (RBV) (Wong & Karia 2009). Therefore, for building strategic change teams (SCTs), by combining goals, roles, and procedures, a mix of leadership styles are vital.

A great deal of knowledge has been generated about what contributes the leaders to their followers. Various leadership styles can impact morale, motivation, and challenging jobs to employees, resulting in more creativity and better performance (Hetland et al. 2018). Various leadership approaches reveal a unique combination of definition of success, type of predictors of success, and positioning for studying leadership. It highlights on the concern for task efficiency, human relations, and adaptive changes; develop interpersonal and intrapersonal competence; engage in transformational and charismatic behaviours; think and act in more complex ways; overcome deficiencies that limit success; seek wide variety of leadership experiences (Antonakis et al. 2004).

While dealing with management development, the strategic Human Resource Development (SHRD) has a long-term impact. The SHRD is the tactical management of training, and development of professional education along with full utilization of knowledge and skills of employees, to achieve the objectives of the organization (Garavan 1991). To support this SHRD view, Walton (1999) stresses the need for learning culture and stewardship in direction to core competencies. As a chunk of process paradigm,

company specific Human Resource Management (HRM) processes are created by developing and exchanging information throughout the entire organization. Moreover, the process paradigm is also connected with Resource-based View (RBV) and the best-practices theory to have a competitive edge.

Through this kind of organizational learning, it creates transfers and institutional knowledge throughout the organization, which increases adaptability (Amit & Belcourt 1999). Therefore, the study stresses the importance of leadership theories in selected organizations and identifies the developmental interventions through latent variables, strategic human resource development, and process paradigm. Additionally, it examines the developmental capabilities by linking leadership theories and developmental interventions. Considering the importance of leadership interventions, the objectives crafted for the study are as follows:

- To recognize the variables for strategic HRD in organizations,
- To identify the variables for process paradigm in organizations,
- To explore the significance of leadership implications in organizations for a competitive edge.

This study contributes towards developing an effective strategy to manage an organization's human assets considering employees as assets through varied leadership

styles. Moreover, it links the job performance and their reward system by combining process paradigm with leadership approaches. Through which, it facilitates cost-effective utilization of labor, particularly in service industries where labor is generally the greatest cost. Additionally, the analysis reveals that the latent variables have a strong correlation to leadership developments in the UAE context. The interpretations facilitate planning and assessment of environmental uncertainty and adaption to the forces that impact the organizations.

### **Literature Review**

Leadership is a complex and continuous process that revolves around all stakeholders. The term has broader meaning when it relates to management. For their part, Hinterhuber & Krauthammer (1998) highlights that the leadership process nurtures creativity and imagination of visions by searching for opportunities to capitalize on them. During uncertainties, the leadership interventions create a new paradigm by working on the systems and develop a natural unforced ability to inspire people by mutual trust. While considering the leadership roles, Mintzberg's ten managerial roles also emphasize various leader roles to accomplish organizational objectives. (Lussier & Achua 2004). It is quite surprising that more than 8000 research on leadership surfaced in the twentieth century (Steers 1996; Yukl 1998; Hughes et al. 2002; Yammarino et al. 2005). In individual model, i.e., between 1930s and 1940s, the studies on leadership looked at the issues related to trait-

based approach and was not very successful (Hunt 1992; Steers 1996). Likewise, the behavioral approach had contradictory results especially, the outcomes from two projects, namely the Ohio project and the University of Michigan research (Room & Plisken 1999). However, the situational-based approach, also referred to as contingency theory, was productive to leaders being flexible with their subordinates.

The internal restructuring, downsizing, rightsizing, etc., necessitates teamwork and employee empowerment, opens the way to group models of leadership. This approach shifts the old-power paradigm to Resource-Based View (RBV), which helps to develop the skills of the workforce to gain a competitive advantage (Hughers et al. 2002; Ulrich & Lake 1990). In the other group model, in cross-functional teams, employees are from different backgrounds, so they can generate various ideas and create solutions to the problems, but this can result in role conflicts while competing with the demands of the team members (Yukl 1998). According to Lovelace et al. 2007, in shared leadership in Self-managed teams (SMTs), point that the internal team leader is responsible for coordinating the team activities, and the team may also distribute the responsibilities to its members. The advantage of executive teams is that the team members can compensate for the weaknesses in the skills of the CEO of the organization by increased commitments and motivation, generating more creativeness, the sharing of risks, the transfer of expertise, the high level of social support. Still, it demands successful leadership activities such as governance,

developing strategy, leading strategic-change teams (SCTs), and creating a high-performance operating environment (Nadler & Spencer 1998). Though various models were evident in the literature, the complexities with those models urged leaders to develop new models in the 1980s and 1990s in the form of transactional-based (Bass & Avolio 1994; Pardey 2008), transformational-based approach (Epitropaki & Martin 2005; Den et al. 2007), charismatic-based approach, strategic-based approach (Shamir & Hooijkberg 2008), managerial-based approach (Flanagan and Thompson 1993), institutional-based approach (Deutsch 2009), strategic-based approach (Ireland & Hitt 1999) and E-leadership approach (Antonakis et al. 2004), all of them are part of an organizational model of leadership. Altogether the models throw light on the inspirational attributes, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration of leaders, coupled with leadership practices in defining the company's vision, developing human intellectual capital, preserving core competencies, sustaining organizational culture, embracing ethical practices, and creating balanced organizational controls (Steers et al. 1996; Vinger & Cilliers 2006). However, Cacioppe (1998) argues that there has been little research on establishing how much learning from leadership-development programs has been transferred back into the workplace. Additionally, many surveys supported this fact in the blockage of conversion of leadership theory into implications (Wellins & Byham 2001; Miles 2007; Avolio 2011). Hence the latent variables for the study, strategic HRD, and process paradigm can link with leadership theories to have sustainable developmental practices in organizations. To support the

significance of leadership implications in the UAE, it is noted that the UAE cabinet has approved a model for Government leadership, with three pillars, leadership spirit, outlook, and accomplishment and influence. It highlights the standards of the 21st-century leaders to reinforce the efforts of the UAE government to swift with international approaches and achieve the goals of the UAE Centennial 2071 strategy (UAE Cabinet, 2021).

The key priority in organizational approaches to HRD is to have a competitive advantage with return on investment (ROI). As mentioned earlier, all leaders need to work closely with their followers to reach their full potentials. To support this view, Anderson (2007) mentions that HRD professionals need to perform with senior managers in creating workplace learning that fits with organizational systems and in enhancing the bottom line. Literature provides numerous models mapping on the key characteristics of strategic HRD. The seminal model of strategic HRD by Garavan (1991, 2007) identified the need for collaboration between senior managers and line managers, top management's support in credibility, status, fiscal factors, alignment with organizational goals, and partnership with multiple stakeholders. For his part, Ulrich (1998, 2007) established a Human Capital Developer role in SHRD, where the HRD professionals shares various roles as a leader, employee advocate, strategic partner, and functional expert. McCracken & Wallace (2000) reexamined Garavan's (1991) SHRD model and identified that to implement the HRD strategy in organizations and monitor the external environment for opportunities and



threats, efficient leadership approaches are essential. The notion of partnership between HRD specialists and line managers is vital to ensure HRD interventions towards successful outcomes in the workplace (Harrison 2002). Moreover, Grievies (2003) stressed the importance of change management by an employee-centered approach and continuous learning approach. Nowadays, many leaders feel ill-equipped with the new roles and a bit confused with operational issues, especially in brownfield sites, where they are accustomed to specific forms of delivery and resistant to change. Therefore, it is imperative to confirm the role of SHRD in leadership developments and the first hypothesis to test is: H1: The strategic HRD in organizations has significant role in leadership interventions.

Several empirical studies in the literature confirmed the role of human resources towards organizational competitiveness (Burke 2005; Lawler 2009). To be specific, the process paradigm concentrates on company specific HRM processes, which are established by developing and exchanging information throughout the entire organization. These HRM processes are rooted in various procedures of the organizations, such as how it attracts, socializes, trains, and motivates the employees. This model is anchored both in both RBV and the best-practices theory (Amit & Belcourt 1999). In RBV, the performance of the employees is related to the motivation level of employees in the form of “level of interest alignment’, i.e., the degree of alignment of individual interest with organizational goal. This motivation can be achieved by extrinsic motivation level, hedonic intrinsic motivation

level, and normative intrinsic motivation level (Gottschalg & Zollo 2007). To achieve these various motivational levels, leaders need to create a positive work culture to accomplish individual goals. In the best-practices paradigm, it implies a direct relationship between specific HR approaches and company performance (Chow et al. 2008). Most studies focus on enhancing the skill base of employees through HR activities; selective staffing, comprehensive training, and broad developmental efforts like job rotation, job enhancement, and cross-utilization. Other issues include the promotion of empowerment, participative problem-solving, and involvement in team (Browning et al. 2009). Hence, three primary perspectives, namely, universal approach, contingency approach, and configurational approach have emerged, to have a competitive advantage in organizations. (Grobler et al. 2012). In this background, the second hypothesis created as follows: H2: The process paradigm has significant role in leadership interventions.

It is apparent from the literature that leadership is a multifaceted aspect with varied experiences. Critical theory of leadership drawn from Avolio (2007), who argues that leadership theories overlook the roles and support of followers, hence, a more integrated approach is required in developing leadership theories. According to Nadler et al. (1995), the institutional leader needs to be heroic and instrumental during tuning, adaptation, re-orientation, and recreation as a part of discontinuous organizational change. A study by Gill et al. (2010) observed a robust positive relationship between transformational leadership

and employee empowerment resulting in mutual trust, which also can fix organizational issues. Further, Garcia-Morales et al. (2008) concluded a constructive relationship between transformational leadership and two variables of organizational innovation and organizational performance. They identified that shared culture and open supportive structures encourage employee's creativity towards organizational learning. Another evidence shows that an individual's perception of the instrumental and socio-emotional support of their team leaders will affect their creativity (Oldham & Cummings 1996; Scott & Bruce 1994). To support the creativity aspect, Amabile et al. (2004) identified that individuals are likely to experience both constant and emotional reactions to leader behaviours. Moreover, informational feedback from leader's fosters creativity rather than controlled punitive feedback (Zhou 2003). If employees follow their supervisors in their role-modeling behavior for developing creativity, then it is critical for supervisors to demonstrate creativity and to foster a climate that supports their creativity. For these reasons, the next crafted hypothesis is: H3: The leadership developments have significant role in employee creativity.

### **Methodology**

The present study utilizes a deductive approach, i.e., first, it collects adequate theories based on leadership, strategic HRD, and process paradigm, and then based on that, three hypotheses developed for testing the significance level of latent variables to the dependent

variable, leadership developments. Then, a close-ended questionnaire (Table 1) from the literature was prepared and distributed amongst employees from randomly selected companies in the UAE for the relevant responses. A stratified sampling method consists of 300 respondents from diverse groups was considered. UAE. Firstly, a descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to estimate the reliability and validity of the measures used in the research. Initially, an input model was created using AMOS 18 graphics. Later, the study tested the proposed research model by assessing the contributions and significance of the manifest variables path coefficients. SPSS 24.0 was used to analyze the response from the samples. Alternatively, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) provides a confirmatory factor approach to the analysis of a structural theory bearing on some phenomenon. Moreover, the hypotheses are statistically tested to examine its consistency with the data through goodness of fit measures. The prediction of the factor structure/pattern of a test involves the number of factors and the specification of the test items that define each factor (the so-called indicators), i.e., those which are expected to have high to moderately high loadings (or beta coefficients) on the factor.

To cope with these complications and this problem, SEM experts have tried to devise other indices of “goodness of fit” or “approximate fit.” These should express the degree of approximation plus estimation discrepancy and provide an additional basis for the acceptance or rejection of a model (Prudon, 2015). This allows the examination of a series of

dependence relationships between exogenous (*independent*) and endogenous (*dependent*) variables simultaneously. This was done using the two-stage analysis in which the measurement model is first estimated and then the measurement model is kept fixed in the next step in which the structural model is estimated. The justification for this approach is that accurate representation of the indicators' reliability is best accomplished in two steps by avoiding interaction of structural and measurement models. According to the usual procedures, the goodness of fit is measured by checking the statistical and substantive validity of estimates, the convergence of the estimation procedure, the empirical identification of the model, the statistical significance of the parameters, and the goodness of fit to the covariance matrix. A level of 0.05 was established as a priority for determining significance. Kenny (2012) argued that CFI and TLI are artificially increased (suggesting better fit) when the correlations between the variables are generally high.

**Table 1. Measures for latent variables**

<b>Latent Variables</b>	<b>Related Factors</b>
Strategic HRD	Q1. Do you link work efforts to the organization's objectives?
	Q2. Do you use the organization's core values to guide your decisions and actions?
	Q3. Do you help others to understand their roles in the changing organization?
	Q4. Does your organization develop positive approaches to emerging needs?
	Q5. Does your organization ensure that work group or team undertakes appropriate planning activities?

---

	Q6. Do you have enough opportunities for technological advancement competencies through skill and knowledge development?
Process paradigm	Q7. Do you seek ideas and opinions from individuals throughout the organization?
	Q8. Does your organization help to ensure that people are involved in decisions that affect their work?
	Q9. Does your organization encourage employees to speak up when they disagree?
	Q10. Does your organization involve all relevant stakeholders when engaging in problem-solving?
	Q11. Does your organization help employees to learn and grow by providing feedback, coaching, and/or training?
	Q12. Does your company provide on suitable rewards?
	Q13. Do you have adequate social network?
Leadership developments	Q17. Does you have specific policy and strategies approved and well communicated by the top management?
	Q18. How do you feel about your commitment towards organizations' mission?
	Q19. How good the organization forecasts project, deadlines, and workloads?
	Q20. Do you feel self-confident n your tasks?
	Q21. Does your organization have performance appraisal and employee development methods?
	Q22. Do you have freedom for your task to complete?
	Q23. Do you feel that your company values your ideas and work?

---

A five-point scale ranging from 1 ('strongly disagree') to 5 ('strongly agree') was used for 23 indicator questionnaires for two latent variables to dependent variable, leadership developments (Bergmann et al. 1999).

## **Data Analysis**

The analysis part identifies various tests for the study. As the study is an empirical study, it uses a mixed approach, both; quantitative, and qualitative analysis, for hypothesis testing. As a first approach the data needs to test for the reliability and validity. Reliability means the stability and consistency of the scores obtained (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The study processed the instrument for multiple times and the scores are found to be almost equal. A measure of reliability as internal consistency is the Cronbach's alpha, frequently referred to as the alpha coefficient of reliability, or simply the alpha (Cohen et al. 2007) and the acceptable values of Cronbach's alpha range from 0.80 and above (Lim, 2007). The result is represented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Reliability Test**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Number of Items</i>
Strategic HRD	0.852	6
Process paradigm	0.986	7
Leadership interventions	0.957	7

*Source: Data Analysis*

The values for each variable are above 0.8, and thus, it confirms the reliability of the factors for the study. In confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), the most direct way of measuring

discrepancy between model and data is averaging the residuals of the residual correlation matrix (Joreskog & Sorbom 1988). Additionally, Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) has much more indirect relation with the residuals because it is based on  $\chi^2$ , df, and N. (Steiger, 1990). The Tucker-Lewis Index, also known as non-normed fit index (NNFI), belongs to the class of comparative fit indices, which are all based on a comparison of the  $\chi^2$  of the implied matrix with that of a null model (the most typical being that all observed variables are uncorrelated) (Tucker & Lewis, 1973). This part measures the fit for the model selected for the study.

**Table 3. Model fit Indices for CFA**

Variables	$\chi^2$	DF	P	Normed $\chi^2$	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	CFI	RMR	RMSEA
Strategic HRD	19.56	14	0.14	1.397	0.98	0.96	0.96	0.98	0.99	0.006	0.036
Process paradigm	16.64	8	0.58	0.830	0.99	0.97	0.97	1.02	1.0	0.009	0.00
Leadership interventions	17.59	7	0.01	2.513	0.98	0.93	0.97	0.95	0.98	0.008	0.071
<b>Recommended value</b>				<5	>0.9	>0.9	>0.9	>0.9	>0.9	<1	<1

From the above table 3, it is evident that three that significance level has reached for all attributes taken for the study. The measurement model is good enough to conduct this study as value of fit indices reaches its recommended value. To confirm this fact, the regression



coefficients for each variable were also analyzed, which is tabulated in Table 4.

**Table 4. The Regression Coefficients – Latent variables**

<b>Latent Variables (Dependent Variable)</b>	<b>Constructs (Independent Variables)</b>	<b>Regression Coefficient</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>Variance explained (%)</b>
	SHRD 2	0.599	11.92	<0.001	52.4
	SHRD 3	0.423	7.778	<0.001	17.9
	SHRD 4	0.748	16.689	<0.001	56.0
	SHRD 5	0.872	23.117	<0.001	76.1
	SHRD 6	0.754	17.121	<0.0001	57.5
Process Paradigm	PP 1	0.724	15.786	<0.001	52.4
	PP 3	0.599	11.919	<0.001	35.9
	PP 4	0.586	11.573	<0.001	34.3
	PP 5	0.713	15.394	<0.001	50.8
	PP 6	0.652	12.321	<0.001	42.5
	PP 7	0.787	16.382	<0.001	53.2
Leadership developments	LD 1	0.417	7.653	<0.001	17.4
	LD 2	0.483	9.080	<0.001	23.3
	LD 3	0.512	9.745	<0.001	26.2
	LD 4	0.814	19.625	<0.001	66.3
	LD 5	0.598	11.892	<0.001	35.7
	LD 7	0.549	10.632	<0.001	23.3

The table 4 validates the significance level of all measures in SHRD, except for SHRD 1

(P- value - 0.013), PP 2 (P-value 0.003), and LD 6 (P-value less than 0.4) all other attributes show its significance level as the value is <0.001. Hence, these constructs have no significant influence on leadership developments. The following Table 7 establishes the influence of two latent variables to leadership developments in organizations.

**Table 7. Model fit Indices for CFA-Leadership developments**

Variable	$\chi^2$	DF	P	Normed	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	CFI	RMR	RMSEA
				$\chi^2$							
<b>Leadership developments</b>	.471	1	.493	.471	.999	.992	.999	1.005	1.000	.023	.000

The value of the fit indices specifies a sensible fit of the measurement model with data.

**Table 8. The Regression Coefficient - Dependent and Independent Variables**

Path	Estimate	T	P	Variance explained	Average variance extracted	Composite reliability
Strategic HRD → LD	0.755	16.966	<0.001	57.0		
Process paradigm → LD	0.852	21.773	<0.001	72.7		
SHRD 1 → Strategic HRD	0.452	8.396	<0.001	20.4		

*A Strategic Perspective to Leadership Implications by Process Paradigm*

					32.25	0.59
SHRD 2 → SHRD	0.852	21.773	<0.001	72.6		
SHRD 3 → SHRD	0.414	7.590	<0.001	17.2		
SHRD 5 → SHRD	0.678	14.712	<0.001	47.9		
PP 1 → Process paradigm	0.722	15.714	<0.001	52.2		
PP 2 → PP	0.589	11.652	<0.001	34.7		
					45.8	0.61
PP 3 → PP	0.583	11.495	<0.001	34.0		
PP 5 → PP	0.770	17.584	<0.001	59.3		
LD 1 → Leadership development	0.418	7.674	<0.001	17.5		
LD 2 → LD	0.484	9.103	<0.001	23.4		
LD 3 → LD	0.513	9.768	<0.001	26.3		
					31.9	0.54
LD 4 → LD	0.810	19.423	<0.001	65.6		
LD 5 → LD	0.598	11.892	<0.001	35.8		

Moreover, the regression coefficient for dependent and independent variables is presented in table 8 proves that the SHRD has significant impact on leadership developments as the standardized direct effect is greater than the recommended value (0.4) and the value is 0.76. Similarly, the value of process paradigm is 0.85, and validates its significance level. Moreover, the values for reach the significance level as P-value is <0.001 and the reliability is 0.59, 0.61, and 0.54 for strategic HRD, process paradigm, and leadership development, respectively.

**Table 9. Regression Coefficient – Leadership developments**

Path	Regression coefficient	t	P value	Variance explained	Average Variance Extracted	Composite Reliability
Leadership developments → self-efficacy	0.979	39.171	<0.001	95.8		
Leadership development → Creativity	1.001	65.500	<0.001	100.2	91.1	0.60

The table 9 clarifies that the P-value for all the factors have the significance level (<0.001) and reliability as 0.60.

### Results and Discussion

The result clarifies that all objectives taken for the study have identified their importance. The two latent variables to its dependent variable, leadership development substantiates the significance level. The leadership development plans certainly, can act as a leverage in the mindset of employees towards their motivation, engagement, and talent management (Oldham & Cummings 1996; Amabile et al. 2004; Zhou2003; Jaussi & Dionne 2003). Moreover, the findings confirm that both latent variables mentioned in the study can lay a foundation for leadership development programs in the selected organizations. The values of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Table 4) prove the association of each attribute to

latent variables such as: strategic HRD and process paradigm in organizations as the values relate with the recommended value. Moreover, Table 5 confirms the regression analysis and significance level of SHRD in selected organizations as all the values are  $<0.001$ , except for SHRD 1. This confirms the need of collaboration between senior managers and line managers, top management's support in credibility, positions, rewards, alignment with organizational goals, and partnership with multiple stakeholders (Garavan, 2007). Likewise, Table 6 proves the correlation of process paradigm, where all attributes, except PP 4, reached the significance level as the value is  $<0.001$ . This proves the combined process of RBV and the best-practices theory with process paradigm (Amit & Belcourt 1999). Furthermore, the regression analysis shows a constructive result for leadership development as all factors, except for LD 6, attained its significance level (Table 7). The specific model stresses the role of leaders in enhancing self-confidence, emotional stability, and self-efficacy to their followers and provides a roadmap to establish creativity (Amabile et al. 2004; Zhou 2003; Jaussi & Dionne 2003). Thus, it supports the notion in creating leadership interventions in the companies (Oldham & Cummings 1996).

The value of the hypothesis tests from Table 7 & Table 8 reveal the significance of each latent variable to leadership developments in internal and external resource management. In addition, it clarifies the relationship of significant attributes to latent variables for the study. The result confirms that SHRD in selected organizations has significant influence on

leadership as standardized direct effect of this construct is 0.76, which is more than the recommended value of 0.4 (P-value is significant). Thus, H1 was accepted, and it proves that strategic measures factors are imperative. The values of all indicators confirmed that strategies are vital tool for aligning organizational goals and priorities and need to be well-structured and future oriented. Strategic HRD models and frameworks have proposed modifications for the activities of leaders; by creating a learning culture, articulating the vision in all levels (managers and business units) of the workforce, decentralized working structure, with an environmental scanning. Hence, the selected companies must ensure the practices of SHRD models (Garavan 1991, 2007; Ulrich 1998, 2007; McCracken & Wallace 2000; Harrison 2002; Grievies 2003) in their leadership interventions.

Similarly, the value for process paradigm is 0.85, also confirms the significance level. Thus, the hypothesis, H2, was accepted. Also, for the indicators, the outcome clarifies the significance as P-value is  $<0.001$ . Thus, it validates the impact of process paradigm in leadership developments in the selected organizations. In this unprecedented environment, HRM practices have a major role in the shift of leadership roles. The models addressed in this study could help to measure the sources of a competitive advantage which provide an eye-opener to company performance (Amit & Belcourt 1999; Chow et al. 2008; Browning et al. 2009; Grobler et al. 2012). Likewise, the value of leadership is 0.54. Moreover, the findings for regression coefficient from Table 9 elucidates the reliability is 0.60, which are

the derivatives of leadership, have the significance level ( $<0.001$ ), hence, H3 was also accepted. According to the organizational situations in the selected companies, each leadership theory can create benefits and defects. Companies can combine all theories relate to their internal and external environment, for instance, trait-based leadership for specific qualities, behavioral leadership for link task-oriented and relations-oriented behavior, and situational leadership for flexibility in the task (Steers 1996; Yukl 1998; Hughes et al. 2002). Finally, the study proves the significance of the organizational model of leadership; the contingent-reward and management-by-exception styles (transactional approach, Bass & Avolio 1994), high morale, and motivation between leaders and followers by an external review (transformational approach, Vinger & Cilliers 2006). Yet, the selected companies should tap the benefits of combining both transactional and transformational leadership styles, with an additional skill, situational sensitivity, through a managerial-based approach (Epitropaki & Martin 2005). Moreover, the empirical study by Bass & Avolio (1994) indicates that a leader can perform both transactional and transformational leadership styles with varying intensities and degrees. Furthermore, a transformational leader encourages a shared culture and supportive structures towards creativeness and organizational learning. Therefore, selected organizations can train leaders to develop and communicate a shared vision amongst their followers. This shared vision establishes a bridge between the present and future long-term commitment to organizational success. Equally, employees feel more comfortable and creative if

management adopts a participative and engaging style. (Oldham & Cummings 1996; Amabile et al. 2004; Zhou2003; Jaussi & Dionne 2003). The study has thrown light to assess the environment that hinder achievement of organizational goals, prepare a stakeholder transaction matrix with major cultural dimensions of each group, create a constant concern for improving quality of life of members, promote information sharing, participation, and communication.

## **Conclusion**

The changing landscape has forced leaders to relearn and reorient themselves to their organizations' portfolios of activity. Likewise, it urged them to create hands-on knowledge about work structure and internal dynamics. Therefore, the leadership function has realized that it needs to work proactively with organizational vision and work activities by return on investments (ROI). This study can be concluded with a notion that leadership development plays a dominant role in the strategic competitiveness of any business. This, however, can only be achieved with strategic HRD plans and programs with process paradigm. Further, the findings establish the relationship between each sub-variable to its dependent variables through various tests. Like any other resources, the HR investment perspective should be developed by intrinsic and extrinsic factors, to reach its maximum potentials. However, this study can be sustained with the help of resource-based views and stakeholder values. Hence, more industries can be chosen for a wider perspective in a long-



term basis. In a nutshell, it pinpoints that a better leadership with wide perspectives attract and retain key talents and engage them more in their jobs, satisfy HR agenda, and committed to achieve organizational goals. To operationalize these above-mentioned strategies, equal importance should be given for HR policies and procedures, and individual goals. Thus, organizations can look forward to having a competitive advantage and sustainable growth.

A more emphasis on subjective study like this has limitations in getting correct information from every respondent. Its ability to demonstrate the presence or the absence of actual bias reinforces more fairness. Creativity and self-efficacy of employees are interlinked with many HRD processes, while leadership interventions might not involve in every corner. An empirical study is time-consuming and needs to continue in changing situations to make it more relevant. Additionally, an open dialogue is crucial. Finally, the study is like the tip of the iceberg as only a marginal group were the respondents.

In this turbulent and swift economy, leadership interventions and creativity have profound impact in one's life. As strategic plans and programs are inevitable and evolving, there is scope for new models to come up for leadership interventions. The findings reveal that there are slight variations amongst the respondents for SHRD, proves paradigm and leadership indicators, which always opens a way for further studies, especially a

longitudinal study. Therefore, organizations must take initiatives by more mobility of people with increased opportunities in stimulating directions. More variables related to knowledge-sharing, managing diversity, training evaluation, career management, and many HR factors can consider for future research.

## References

- Amit, R. & Belcourt, M. (1999). Human resources management processes: a value-creating source of competitive advantage. *European Management Journal*, vol. 17(2), pp. 174.
- Anderson, V. (2007). Desperately seeing alignment: reflections of senior line managers and HRD executives. *Human Resource Development International*, vol. 12(3), pp. 263-277.
- Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T. & Sternberg, R.J. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications.
- Avolio, B.J. (2011). *Full range leadership development*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Thousand Oaks, California, Sage Publications.
- Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 17(3&4), pp. 541-554.
- Bergmann, H., Hurson, K. & Russ-EFT, D. (1999). Introducing a grass-root model for leadership. *Strategy & Leadership*, vol. 27(6), pp. 15-20.
- Burke, R.J. (2005). 'Human resources as a competitive advantage', in Burke, R.J & Cooper, C.I. (eds). *Reinventing HRM: challenges and new directions*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 17-33.
- Browning, V., Edgar, F., Gray, B. & Garrett, T. (2009). Realising competitive advantage through HRM in New Zealand service industries. *The Service Industries Journal*, vol. 29(6), pp. 741-760.
- Cacioppe, R. (1998). Leaders developing leaders. an effective way to enhance leadership development programs. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, vol. 19(4), pp. 194-198.
- Chow, I.H., Hvang, J.C. & Liu, S. (2008). Strategic HRM in China, configurations and competitive advantage. *Human Resource Management*, vol. 47(4), pp. 687-706.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203029053>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Caley, A. & Dewe, P. (2007). *Recruiting leaders: an analysis of leadership advertisements*.
- Deutsch, L. (2009). Are you a trusted leader? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, vol. 41(7), pp. 377-381.
- Epitropaki, O. & Martin, R. (2005). The moderating role of individual differences in the relation between transformational/transactional leadership perceptions and organizational identification. *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 16(6), pp. 569-589.
- Flanagan, H.D. & Thompson, D.J.C. (1993). Leadership: the swing of the pendulum. *The Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, vol. 14(1), pp. 10-11.
- Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Garavan, T.N. (1991). Strategic human resource development. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 15(1), pp. 21-34.
- Garavan, T.N. (2007). A strategic perspective on human resource development. *Advances in developing human resources*, vol. 9(1), pp. 11-30.
- Garcia-Morales, V.J., Matias-Reche, F. & Hurtado-Torres, N. (2008). Influence of transformational leadership on organizational innovation and performance depending on the level of organizational learning in the pharmaceutical sector. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 21(2), pp. 188-212.
- Gill, A., Fitzgerald, S.P., Bhutani, S., Mand, H.S. & Sharma, S.P. (2010). The relationship between transformational leadership and employee-desire for empowerment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 22(2), pp. 1-19.

- Grieves, J. (2003). *Strategic human resource development*. London: Sage.
- Gottschalg, O. & Zollo, M., (2007). Interest alignment and competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 32(2), pp. 421.
- Grobler, P., Bothma, R., Brewster, C., Carey, L., Holland, P. & Warnich, S. (2012). *Contemporary issues in human resource management*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. Oxford University Press, pp. 42-43.
- Hetland, J., Hetland, H., Bakker, B.A. & Demerouti, E. (2018). Daily transformational leadership and employee job crafting: The role of promotion focus. *European Management Journal*, vol. (36), pp-746-756.
- Jöreskog, K. G. & Sörbom, D. (1988). *LISREL 7: guide to the program and applications*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Chicago, IL: SPSS.
- Harrison, R. (2002). *Learning and Development*. London: CIPD.
- Hinterhuber, H.H. & Krauthammer, E. (1998). The leadership wheel: The tasks entrepreneurs and senior executives cannot delegate. *Strategic Change*, vol. 7(7), pp. 150.
- Hughes, R.L., Ginnet, R.C. & Curphy, G.J. (2002). *Leadership: enhancing the lessons of experience*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, Irwin.
- Lim, C. (2007). *Penyelidikan Pendidikan. Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill Education.
- Ireland, R.D. & Hitt, M.A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: the role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Perspective*, vol. 13(1), pp. 43.
- McCracken, M. & Wallace, M. (2000). Exploring strategic maturity in HRD: rhetoric, aspiration or reality? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, vol. 24(8), pp. 425-437.
- Lawler, E.E. (2009). Make human capital a source of competitive advantage. *Organizational dynamics*, vol. 38(1), pp. 1-7.

- Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C.C. & Alves, J.C. (2007). Work stress and leadership development: the role of self-leadership, shared leadership, physical fitness and flow in managing demands and increasing job control. *Human Management Resource Review*, vol. 17, pp. 374-387.
- Lussier, R.N. & Achua, C.F. (2000). *Leadership: theory, application, skill development*. Minnesota: South Western/Thomson Corporation, pp. 9-12.
- Lynham, S. (2000). *Leadership development: a review of the theory and literature*. Paper presented at the Academy of Human Resource Development Conference. Raleigh-Durham, North Carolina, 8-12 March.
- Mabey, C. & Finch-Lees, T. (2008). *Management and Leadership Development*. London: Sage.
- Miles, R.E. (2007). Innovation and leadership values. *California Management Review*, vol. 50(1), pp. 192-201.
- Nadler, D.A. & Spencer, J.L. (eds). (1998). *Executive teams*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Nadler, D.A., Shaw, R.B. & Walton, A.S. (1995). *Discontinuous change: leading organizational transformation*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass, pp. 217-231.
- Room, C. & Plisken, N. (1999). The role of charismatic leadership in diffusion and implementation of e-mail. *The Journal of Management Development*, vol. 18(3), pp. 278.
- Pardey, D. (2008). Next generation leaders. *Strategic HR Review*, vol. 7(3), pp. 32-36.
- Prudon P. (2015). Confirmatory factor analysis: a brief introduction and critique. *Comprehensive Psychology*, vol. 4(10).
- Pietraszewski, D. (2020). The evolution of leadership: leadership and followership as a solution to the problem of creating and executing successful coordination and cooperation enterprises. *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 31(2).
- Sadler-Smith, E. (2006). *Learning and development for managers: perspectives from research and practice*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Shamir, B. & Hooijckberg, R. (2008). Strategic leadership as management of meanings. *Perspectives for managers*, 154(154), pp. 1-4.

- Steers, R.M., Porter, L.W. & Bigley, G.A. (1996). *Motivation and leadership at work*. 6<sup>th</sup> edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 167.
- Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: an interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, vol. 25, pp. 173-180.
- Tucker, L. R. & Lewis, C. (1973). The reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, vol. 38, pp. 1-10.
- Ulrich, D. (1998). A new mandate for human resources. *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 76 (1), pp. 124-34.
- Ulrich, D. (2007). Dreams: where human resource development is headed to deliver value. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, vol. 18(1), pp. 1-8.
- Ulrich, D. & Lake, D. (1990). *Organizational capability: competing from the inside out*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 260.
- Vinger, G. & Cilliers, F. (2006). Effective transformational leadership behaviours for managing change. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 4(2), pp. 1-9.
- Wellins, R. & Byham, W.C. (2001). The leadership gap. *Training*, March, pp. 98-106.
- Yammarino, E.J., Dionne, S.D., Chun, J.U. & Dansereau, F. (2005). Leadership and levels of analysis: a state-of-the-science review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 15(6), pp. 879-919.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. 4<sup>th</sup> edn. New Jersey, Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, pp. 82.
- Wong, C.Y. & Karia, N. (2010). Explaining the competitive advantage of logistics service providers: a resource-based view approach. *International Journal of Production Economics*, vol. 128(1), pp. 51-51.
- Zhou, J. (2003). When the presence of creative co-workers is related to creativity: role of supervisor close monitoring, developmental feedback and creative personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88(3), pp. 413-422. <https://uaecabinet.ae/en/details/news/uae-model-for-government-leadership>