

**EFFECTS OF INNOVATION LEADERSHIP ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCY (A STUDY OF ACCESS BANK PLC UMUAHIA)**

**Lekan-Akomolafe Chika<sup>1</sup>, Alamba Chukwuma Samuel.<sup>2</sup> and Enya Alphonsus Azubuiké<sup>3</sup>**

*Department of Business Administration<sup>1&2</sup> & Department of Banking and Finance<sup>3</sup>  
Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, P.M.B 7267, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria*

*\*chikaakomolafe@gmail.com, Tel no: 08036892849<sup>1</sup>*

*\*alambacs@gmail.com, Tel no: 08035823792<sup>2</sup>*

*Correspondent author's Email: enya\_alphonsus@yahoo.com, Tel no: 07067434989*

**ABSTRACT**

The study examines the effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency. The study aimed at determining the effects of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency. The study adopted survey research methods and sourced its data from both primary and secondary sources. The study focused in Umuahia the capital city of Abia State using Access bank Nigeria Plc as a case study. Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics, regression analytical technique and ANOVA. The result of the analysis shows that there is a positive effect of innovation leadership on organizational effect at a statistically significant level of 0.05. Following the empirical result of the analysis the study recommends the need for leaders to be creative and innovative at all time in carrying out their duties sequel to the effect of innovation leadership on organizational productivity.

**Keywords:** Innovation, leadership, efficiency, organization

JEL: H32, L20, M14, M19

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Almost all organizations today are faced with a dynamic environment characterized by rapid technological change, shortening product life cycles, and globalization. It is apparent that organizations, especially technology-driven ones, operating in this kind of a market environment need to be more creative and innovative to survive, to compete, to grow, and to lead. Innovation through creativity is essential for the success and competitive advantage of organizations as well as for strong economies in the recent times (Nasution and Mavondo, 2012). Hence, an increasing premium is placed on creativity and innovation in today's world (Bass, 2014). This has led to a number of practitioners and scholars being attracted to this topic in the recent decades.

Innovation is defined as the successful implementation of creative ideas within an organization (Kehinde and Banjo, 2014). It has been suggested that leadership is among the most important factors affecting innovation (Pradeep and Prabhu, 2011). This might be through leaders' effect on organizational characteristics such as culture, strategy, structure, reward systems, or resources, or through a direct effect of their behaviour on employees'

creativity, and motivation (Robins, 2013). Leaders can help their followers to exhibit higher levels of creativity at work, establish a work environment supportive of creativity, create an organizational climate serving as a guiding principle for more creative work processes, and develop and maintain a system that rewards creative performance through compensation and other human resource-related policies (Salin, 2013). Furthermore, leaders can have an impact not only on innovation within the firm but also on marketing the innovative products.

Recently, there has been an interest in the influence of leadership innovation on business performance. Innovation leaders are those leaders who transform followers' personal values and self-concepts, move them to higher levels of needs and aspirations, and raise the performance expectations of their followers (Anees, 2015). This leadership has four components; charismatic role modelling, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation (Robins, 2013). Using charisma, the leader instils admiration, respect, and loyalty, and emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission. By individualized consideration, the leader builds a one-to-one relationship with his or her followers, and understands and considers their differing needs, skills, and aspirations. Thus, transformational leaders meet the emotional needs of each employee (Robins, 2013). By inspirational motivation, the leader articulates an exciting vision of the future, shows the followers the ways to achieve the goals, and expresses his or her belief that they can do it. By intellectual stimulation, the leader broadens and elevates the interests of his or her employees, and stimulates followers to think about old problems in new ways (Anees, 2015).

The challenges of coping with today's uncertain business environment have put many organizations on their toes to struggle for survival in the heat of competition. The driver of such strategic move towards surviving the competition is the leadership provided by managers who are expected to influence others in achieving organizational goals and also boost employee's performance. Bass (2014) explained the importance of leadership in organizations and especially on human beings who are apparently the biggest asset of any firm; the main drivers of organizations are usually employees, they give life to the organizations and provide goals (Kehinde and Banjo, 2014). It is very paramount to provide workers with direction and psychological satisfaction to get the best from them, this direction can only come from leaders. In Nigeria innovative leadership has been the major challenges of organizations both publicly and privately owned. When people occupying various leadership positions are not competent and lack continuous strategic innovation skills, such organizations continuous to drag along as seen in most organizations across various sectors of the nation. Sequel to globalization and increased trading across nations, there is a need to improve on what is been done in organizations through leadership innovation to take advantage of what the new business environment presents rather than been overtaken by vibrations emanating from the various innovations and advancements.

Furthermore, various attempts have been made by scholars to ascertain the relevance of leadership in enhancing the efficiency of various organizations. However, a closer view reveals that these studies focused on leadership style, structure and authority transfer without

less emphasis on leadership innovation considering the volatility existing in the business environment especially in the banking sector. Therefore, this study focused to examine the effects of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency in order to increase the empirical evidence from Nigeria. The main objective of the study is to examine the effects of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency. The specific objectives include;

- i. To determine the effects of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency.
- ii. To ascertain the relationship between collaborative role and organizational efficiency.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Concept of Innovation Leadership and Organizational Performance**

Wheelwright and Clark (2014) suggests that intense international competition, fragmented and demanding markets and diverse and rapidly changing technologies play key role in shaping today's global and dynamic competitive environment and product innovation. Companies' ability to offer products, services and ideas that meet the needs of customers and market product more efficiently and faster than their competitors are in better position to create competitive advantage (Hamel and Prahalad, 2016). Barney (2014) highlighted that innovation will generate new, valuable, rare and inimitable resources within the firm that are difficult to imitate. Cho and Pucik (2015) found that innovation leads to enrichment of a firm's strategic resources and sustainable competitive advantage an important aspect for organizational performance. Previous research findings on the link between innovation and organizational performance have revealed mixed results. Gooding, Goel and Wiseman (2016) found the decline of organizational performance was due to innovation. They highlighted the link between innovation and organizational performance based on the arguments in terms of; interpretation of innovation - managers may frame innovation as opportunities and develop a willingness to adopt risky innovation, organization performance may generate future organizational slack that is used for exploration of new alternatives, and Low performance may be due to insufficient resources, motivation and cognitive capacity.

### **Leadership Styles and Organizational Performance**

Leadership has been a frequently repeated issue for academicians and practitioners and widely researched by scholars. Numerous studies have found that leadership has a positive effect on organization performance despite a significant impact and influence on individual and organizations. Bass (2014) stated that leadership style and behaviors of individual may contribute to important subordinates' outcomes such as performance, satisfaction and perception towards leaders' effectiveness. Although literatures have revealed the significant influence of leadership styles on organizational performance, in recent years, the focus of the leadership studies have been shifted and accompanied by the acceptance of the distinction between classical, transactional and transformational leadership. According to Hartog and Koopman (2013) transactional and transformational leadership styles have been found to be related to employee satisfaction and performance, organizational effectiveness,

employee turnover and customer satisfaction. Wheelwright and Clark (2014) argue that companies may face difficulties to proportionate their internal resources and capabilities. Further, organizational dedication is the critical success factor in generating the internal capabilities and resources and organizational performance. Creating such organizational intent or vision to achieve organizational performance require strong leadership (Hamel and Prahalad, 2016). Bass (2013) suggests that leadership and a company's vision become the catalyst that harnesses the power of market place and organizational performance. Thus, leading and managing such a diverse workforce and challenging environment are among the critical factors in determining a high performance of companies. Bass (2013) suggested that innovation leadership is the core component of successful leadership behavior to influence organizational performance. Although many studies have addressed leadership styles and their outcomes, the results have not been conclusive. Goodwin and Wofford (2016) for example found a positive and significant relationship between innovation leadership style and followers' commitment, satisfaction and organizational performance. Likert (2015) share the same view that innovation leadership is more effective than transactional leadership for organizational improvement. Toor and Ofori (2014) argue that the participative style is more productive in any culture and environment. Sim and Yap (2016) conclude that there is no best leadership style in all situations and it is difficult to determine the best leadership style for organizational performance.

## **2.2 Theoretical Paradigm**

### **Participatory Democratic Theories**

Participatory democracy can be traced to the works of Jon Elster in 1998 on deliberative Democracy, where he demonstrated that a society can maintain equity in governance only when large part of such society get involved in the activities of the society. The human relations and participatory democratic theories are adopted to guide our discussion on workers participation in management decision making. The human relations theory stems from the understanding that the co-operation of workers is desirable for the attainment of the objectives of high productivity and industrial peace. It contends that workers would be better motivated if they are treated like human beings rather than as irrational objects. For instance, by making them have a feeling that the organization accords them recognition by involving them in the decision making process. In the light of the theory the workers are to be perceived in terms of their membership of a social group rather as an individual (Kehinde and Banjo, 2014).

### **2.3 Empirical Review**

Vissanu and Sarinthree (2014) study examined the relationship between the demographics of respondents, leadership styles, organisational innovation, and organisational performance, and discusses which styles of leadership are supportive to business. The research sampled 419 managers by survey questionnaire; in analysing the data, the statistical technique of hierarchical multiple regressions was applied. Results show that leadership

styles do have an influence on organisational performance. In addition, they indicate an association between leadership styles and organisational performance, mediated by organisational innovation. They concluded that effective leadership can be achieved through a suitable hospitality leadership development training programme, and recommend that any organisation desiring to improve its organisational performance may need to encourage its managers to maintain organisational innovation.

Anees (2015) in a study was to find out the impact of leadership behaviours on organizational performance. The research also described the performance of the organizations in service sector because of the good leadership qualities. Both the qualitative and quantitative research method was used in the study. The Survey questionnaire was sent to the employees and interview with the CEO of DandR Cambric Communication was conducted for the research. Empirical study was conducted by sending a questionnaire to the employees of DandR Cambric Communication. There were 29 respondents out of a total 54 employees in the company. The results driven from the research showed that there is a strong impact of leadership behaviours on organizational performance. The behaviour of the CEO of the DandR Cambric Communication with the employees of the company was one of the major reasons for the company's success. Finally leadership behaviours were found out to be very important key factors for the growth of the companies in the service sectors.

Edoka (2012) study examined the impact of effective leadership on organizational performance in Nigeria using National Youth Service Corps Kogi State office. The evaluation was done through the use of questionnaire and structured interview question, tailored towards: determining the impact of effective leadership on the performance of the organization; assessing the effect of the relationship between effective leadership and organizational performance in promoting maximization of the objectives of the organization examining whether three are leadership obstacles that hamper organizational performance in the Kogi Sate NYSC. The study employed survey research design in the work. A sample size of 82 was selected from a total population of 103 and stratified random sampling was used to select the respondents. The study revealed that there are no leadership obstacles that hamper organisational performance in the Kogi State NYSC resulting from the structure of the organisation management. However, there are other factors that affect organizational performance. These factors are lack of good office, equipment, insufficient funds and poor work environment. The study recommended that all those things the people need to enable them perform at high level should be put in place for them.

Sarminah (2014) study assessed the relationship between innovation, transformational leadership and organizational performance. Further, the study determined the influence of innovation and transformational leadership on organizational performance. Data in the study was collected from a sample of 150 managerial staff in Malaysian logistics companies. The obtained data were analyzed using SPSS Version18. The study found that transformational leadership and innovation were related to organizational performance. Both transformational leadership and innovation were found to be the significant influence to organizational performance. This shows that transformational leadership and innovation have significantly

enhanced the organizational performance in Malaysian logistics companies. This study also revealed that charisma aspect of transformational leadership and product or service innovation emerged as the most important factors that influence performance of organization.

Megat, Hadijah, and Noraini (2015) research assessed the relationship between innovation and organizational performance in the construction industry. The instruments in measuring innovation and organizational performance specific to the construction industry were developed by adapting measures introduced by several scholars in these fields. While innovation is represented by innovative design solution, innovative project practices and advanced technology utilization, organizational performance is represented by project and business performance. Contractors and consulting companies were the sampling frame of this study and the samples were selected based on a stratified sampling method to gauge representation of the different groups in the population. The results revealed that principally innovation is significantly positive in influencing organizational performance. Nevertheless, innovative design solution and advanced technology dimensions were insignificant in influencing project performance and business performance respectively.

Penalva (2021) examined innovation and leadership as design; a methodology to tend and exceed an ecological approach in Higher Education. The study makes a substantial distribution between innovation and effectiveness; it considers main assumptions of dominant educational research on this matter and shows that they seek effectiveness and conversely lack an adequate methodology to innovation. The study suggests that a more consistent and useful approach to innovation and leadership springs from the perspective of the science of the design along with rationality of action.

Katarzyna (2020) examined the role of a leader in stimulating innovation and its resultant effect on organizational performance. To achieve the aim of the study deductive inference, the analysis of the subject literature and the author's own questionnaire were used. The research was carried out with an original questionnaire to assess the role of a leader in stimulating innovative activity consisting of 28 statements. The analysis of the results of the empirical research has confirmed the research hypotheses that the role of a leader is to stimulate the creativity of employees and reward their innovative behaviour.

Alosani, Yusoff and Al-Dhaafri (2019) empirically examined the joint effect of innovation and strategic planning on organizational performance of Dubai police. To examine the hypothesized model of the study, a survey questionnaire was used, the total number of 150 questionnaires were distributed out of which 95 usable questionnaires were returned and used for analysis. The regression analysis through SPSS was used to analyze the data and the results confirmed the effect of strategic planning and innovation on the organizational performance of Dubai police.

Li, Makhdoom and Asim (2020) based on social cognitive theory aimed to explore the impact of entrepreneurial leadership on employees' innovative work behaviour through the

moderating path of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in technology based SMEs. The study also explains the mechanism through which a firm's innovative environment mediates the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and employees' innovative work behaviour. Based on social cognitive theory and specific continuum of self-efficacy theory, a conceptual model was developed and hypotheses were tested with the help of SPSS 20. The empirical finding recommends a significant positive effect of entrepreneurial leadership on employees' innovative work behaviour. The study suggested that firm's innovative environment mediates the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and the employees' innovative behaviour.

### **3. Methodology**

The study employed survey research methods, which involved comprehensive and detailed act of obtaining data from the mapped area and exploring the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The study focused in Umuahia the capital city of Abia state in Nigeria because of the high level of economic and business activities in the area using Access bank with six branches in the city area. The study made use of primary and secondary source of data in data collation and analysis. The random sampling technique was employed in the study with a sample size of 184 out of a population of 340 workers.

#### **Methods of Data Analysis**

The collected data were sorted, coded and analyzed descriptively. Analysis started by profiling the characteristics of the sample population according to the variables collected like age, marital status and education. Data collected by the researcher for the study were presented using statistical tools used for data analysis. The description statistic such as percentages, frequency distribution tables are used in analyzing study questions, while Regression Analysis using ANOVA was adopted to analyze leadership relationship variables under study. The software package used for data analysis is Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

#### **Model Specification**

This study will build extensively with modifications on the model adopted by Sarminah(2014) which linked organizational efficiency to innovation, transformational leadership, and technological management.

$$OEF = f(INN, TRL, TMG) \dots\dots\dots 1$$

The model for the study is therefore stated thus in functional form:

$$OEF = f(LIN, SRO, TMG, HST) \dots\dots\dots 2$$

$$OEF = \alpha + \beta_1 LIN + \beta_2 SRO + \beta_3 TMG + \beta_4 HST \dots\dots\dots 3$$

To account for other indices not included in the model we introduce the stochastic variable.

$$OEF = \alpha + \beta_1 LIN + \beta_2 SRO + \beta_3 TMG + \beta_4 HST + e \dots\dots\dots 4$$

Where:

OEF = Organizational Efficiency

LIN = Leadership Innovation

SRO = Supervisory Role

TMG = Technological Management

HST = Hierarchy Structure

$\alpha$  = slope,  $\beta_1 - \beta_4$  = Coefficients and  $e$  = stochastic variable, which shows the influence of other indices affecting the dependent variable.

### **Description of Variables**

Leadership innovation (LIN): this has to do with the philosophy and technique that combines different leadership styles to influence employees to produce creative ideas, products and services.

Supervisory Role (SRO): is the act of overseeing the subordinates at work at the factory level ensuring the effective and efficient productivity of the products.

Technological Management (TMG): this entails getting employees and technologies working together to do what people are expecting, which is a collection of systematic methods for managing the process of applying knowledge to extend the human activities and produce defined products.

Hierarchical Structure (HST): refers to an organizational chain of command, typically from senior management and executives to general employees.

The independent variables above best describe innovation leadership in the area of study as it influences organizational efficiency.

## **4. Result and Discussion of Findings**

**Table 4.1 Return rate of Questionnaire**

<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Questionnaire Distributed</b>	<b>Percentage Rate of Return (%)</b>
Correctly Filled and Returned	<b>171</b>	<b>93</b>
Not correctly filled and returned	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018



Table 4.1 shows that total of 184 questionnaires were distributed. 171 were correctly filled and returned with a percentage rate of 93% and thirteen (13) were not properly filled and returned with the percentage rate of 7%. Therefore the researcher made use of 171 questionnaires with high percentage return of the questionnaire could be attributed to the researcher’s carefulness and cooperation from the respondents while filling the questionnaire.

**Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Respondents**

The socio-economic characteristics of the respondents are presented in tables in this section. The analysis is done using cumulative frequency and simple percentages.

**Table 4.2: Distribution of Respondents by Sex**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	81	47.5	47.5	47.5
Valid Female	90	52.5	52.5	100.0
Total	171	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018

From table 4.2, it is observed that out of one hundred and seventy one (171) respondents, Ninety (90) were female representing 52.5 percent, while eighty-one (81) were male representing 47.5 percent. This however, depicts that the organization has averagely balanced gender workforce.

**Table 4.3: Distribution of Respondents Based on Age**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 20 - 30 Years	44	25.8	25.8	25.8
31 - 40 Years	67	39.2	39.2	65.0
41 - 50 Years	18	10.8	10.8	75.8
51 Years and above	42	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	171	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018

From table 4.3 it could be observed that 44 respondents representing 25.8 are between the ages of 20 – 30, 67 representing 39.2 percent are between the ages of 31 – 40 years, 18 respondents which represented 10.8 percent were between the ages of 41 – 50, while 43 respondents representing 24.2 percent are 51 years and above. This suggests that Access bank Plc. has largely mature people in their workforce.

**Table 4.4: Distribution of Respondents by Educational Level**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
a	8	4.4	4.4	4.2
l	40	23.3	23.3	27.7
i	109	63.9	63.9	91.6
d	14	8.4	8.4	100.0
Total	171	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018

Table 4.4 above, indicated that only 8 of the respondents representing 4.4 percent of the total population were holders of Senior School Certificate/National examination council (SSCE/NECO), 40 representing 23.3 percent have National certificate examination/ordinary National diploma (NCE/OND), 109 representing 63.9 percent were holders of Higher National Diploma and Bachelor of Science (HND/B.Sc) and 14 respondents representing 8.4 percent were holders of Masters degree and Ph.D. The data unveiled that respondents of the sample group were predominantly people who could read, write and interprets, meaning that the workforce is largely literate.

**Table 4.5: Distribution of Respondents by Employment Status**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid				
Permanent	83	48.6	48.6	48.6
Contract	64	37.6	37.6	37.6
Casual	24	13.8	13.8	100.0
Total	171	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018

Table 4.5 above, revealed that out of one hundred and seventy one (171) respondents randomly drawn from the organization, 83 representing 48.6 percent were permanent staff, 64 representing 37.6 percent were contract staff, while 24 representing 13.8 percent were casual staff.

### **Responses to the Questionnaire Items**

- 1. The guiding principles in Access Bank Plc, Umuahia supports independent leadership style for employees.**

**Table 4.6**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Likert scaling</b>
Strongly Agree	28	140
Agree	22	88
Undecided	19	57
Disagree	47	94
Strongly Disagree	55	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>434</b>
<b>Mean</b>		<b>2.54</b>

**Source:** Field survey 2018.

From table 4.6 above it could be seen that the mean value of 2.54 is less than 3.00 which depicts that the guiding principles in Access Bank Plc, Umuahia does not support independent leadership style for employees that lead to organizational efficiency.

**2. Leadership innovation drives operations in all departments of the organization.**

**Table 4.7**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Likert scaling</b>
Strongly Agree	73	365
Agree	48	192
Undecided	6	18
Disagree	12	24
Strongly Disagree	32	32
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>631</b>
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.69</b>

**Source:** Field survey 2018.

From table 4.7 above, the mean value of 3.69 implies that it is acceptable to state that leadership innovation drives operations in all departments of the organization. This implies that leadership innovation is very important in the effective and efficient operation of all departments of the organization.

**3. Innovation leadership in the organization enhances organizational productivity.**

**Table 4.8**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Likert scaling</b>
Strongly Agree	59	295
Agree	42	168
Undecided	17	51
Disagree	23	46
Strongly Disagree	30	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>590</b>
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.45</b>

**Source: Field survey 2018.**

Tables 4.8 above assess the influence of innovation leadership on organizational productivity. From the analysis above the mean value of 3.45 indicates that innovation leadership in an organization enhances the organizational productivity. Hence, it is paramount to attach great importance to innovative leadership in an organization for efficiency.

**1. Collaborative role in the organization enhances employees’ commitment to work.**

**Table 4.9**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Likert scaling</b>
Strongly Agree	63	315
Agree	71	284
Undecided	12	36
Disagree	15	30
Strongly Disagree	10	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>675</b>
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.95</b>

**Source: Field survey 2018.**

From table 4.9 above, it shows that collaborative role in an organization enhances employees commitment to work. The mean value of 3.95 implies that it is acceptable to recommend that collaborative role in the organization enhances employees’ commitment to work. Therefore, the need for cohesion in an organization cannot be over-emphasized.

**5. Key Planning strategy in the organization supports collaboration across all units.**

**Table 4.10**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Likert scaling</b>
Strongly Agree	46	230
Agree	60	240
Undecided	21	63
Disagree	32	64
Strongly Disagree	12	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>609</b>
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3.89</b>

**Source: Field survey 2018.**

Table 4.10 above assesses the influence of key planning strategy in an organization in supporting collaboration across all units. The mean value of 3.56 implies that key planning strategy in the organization is essential for effective collaboration across all units in an organization.

**Hypotheses Testing**

**Result Presentation and Analysis**

**4.11 Model Summary**

Model	R	RSquare	AdjustedRSquare	Std. ErroroftheEstimate
1	.709 <sup>a</sup>	.502	.490	.59952

a. Predictors: (Constant), Innovation \_Leadership, Hierarchy \_Structure, Collaborative \_Role, Technological \_MGT

**4.12 ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	60.243	4	15.061	41.903	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	59.664	166	.359		
	Total	119.906	170			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational \_Efficiency

b. Predictors: (Constant), Innovation \_Leadership, Hierarchy \_Structure, Collaborative \_Role, Technological \_MGT

4.13 Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.751	.303		7.017	.006
Hierarchy _Structure	.677	.071	.585	9.531	.000
Technological _MGT	.808	.043	.793	8.089	.011
Collaborative _Role	.538	.072	.512	6.294	.031
Innovation _Leadership	.553	.069	.536	8.232	.027

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational \_Efficiency

Table 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 above present the result showing the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. This will lead to hypotheses testing to ascertain the statistically significance of the relationship.

In view of the main objective of the study, the research hypotheses will be tested;

**Decision rule:** *Reject the null hypothesis if the Sig. level (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05 significant level.*

**H0<sub>1</sub>:** There is no significant effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency.

**H1<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency.

**Table 4.14**

Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob.
Innovation _Leadership	0.553	8.232	0.027

**Source:** Computed from table 4.13

The result of the regression estimate from table 4.14 above indicate that there is a positive effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency. This is evidenced by coefficient value of 0.553. Statistically, the p-value of 0.027 is lower than the acceptable significance value of 0.05. Following the empirical result the study revealed that innovational leadership has a positive relation with organizational efficiency with a coefficient value of 0.553. This positive relationship was found to be significant. We therefore reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency.

This result is in consonance with the fact that, organizational productivity and profitability increases when managers and those in authoritative positions are strategically innovative.

**H0<sub>2</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between collaborative role and organizational efficiency.

**H1<sub>2</sub>:** There is a significant relationship between collaborative role and organizational efficiency.

**Table 4.15**

Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	Prob.
Collaborative _Role	0.538	6.294	0.031

**Source: Computed from table 4.13**

The result of the regression estimate from table 4.16 above indicate that there is a positive relationship between collaborative role and organizational efficiency. This is evidenced by the coefficient value of 0.538. Statistically, the prob. (value) of the relationship .031 is lower than the acceptable significance value of 0.05.

The result reveals that collaborative role exhibits a positive relationship with organizational efficiency with coefficients of 0.538. We therefore reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between collaborative role and organizational efficiency. The result suggests that a strategic synergy among members of the workforce in an organization increases the workers morale and enhance more commitment to duty hence accelerates their level of productivity.

## **5. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations**

The study examines the effects of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency with particular reference to Access Bank Plc. It empirically examined four essential variables – Innovation leadership, Supervisory Role, Technological Management, and Hierarchy Structure.

The result of our findings has been homogenous in terms of uniformity. The result shows that innovation leadership, collaborative role, technological management, and hierarchical structure are prime drivers of organizational efficiency and productivity. This is critical since innovation leadership shows a positive and significant relationship with organizational efficiency. From the result, the strategic innovation leadership can promote the coordination of an organization as can be seen in the regression result. The result of the study agrees with the findings of Anees, 2015; Vissanu and Sarinthree, 2014; and Sarminah 2014 that innovative leadership styles have significant influence on organizational performance but however contradicts the findings of Edeka, 2012. This then means that with the implementation of innovative ideas from management of corporations, there would be overall profitability in the institution. Innovation at each level brings efficiency and economy in the working of the business enterprise.

## **Conclusion**

The study assessed the effect of innovation leadership on organizational efficiency using Access Bank Plc., Umuahia. This study has shown that innovation leadership is a pace setter in the business environment especially in the manufacturing firm sequel to the significant role it plays across departments and production processes. Armed with this strategic knowledge, innovation leadership needs to be given the desired level of attention it deserves.

Organisations are established for specific purpose and objectives, people also join organisations to satisfy their needs, and in so doing they contribute to organizational performance to achieve the objectives of the organization. Therefore, it is the responsibility of every leader to build an organization that will function effectively because the extent to which he/she succeeds will depend considerably on innovation, creativity and competency which will increase subordinates willingness to cooperate with him/her.

### **Recommendations**

From the findings and conclusions drawn, the following recommendations have been offered:

- (1) There is a need for leaders to be creative and innovative at all time in carrying out their duties sequel to the effect of innovation leadership on organizational productivity.
- (2) Integration of manpower and machines across various departments in the organization is advocated in order to increase collaborative efforts and benefits in organization.

### **REFERENCES**

- Alosani, M. S., Yusoff, R., and Al-Dhaafri, H. (2019). The effect of innovation and strategic planning on enhancing organizational performance of Dubai police. *Innovation and management review, vol 17(1), 2-24*
- Anees, U. K. (2015) Impact of Leadership on Organizational Performance; A Case Study of DandR Cambric Communication. *Business Economics and Tourism 2015*.
- Barney, J.B (2014) Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management; vol 17 (1): 99-120*.
- Bass BM. (2014) Does the transformational – transactional leadership paradigm transcend organizational and international boundaries? *American Psychology Journal; vol 52: 130-139*.
- Cho H, and Pucik V. (2015) Relationship between innovativeness, quality growth, profitability and financial performance. *Industry Marketing Management Journal; 26(1): 555-575*.
- Edoka J. (2012) Effective Leadership and Organizational Performance: A Case Study of National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) Kogi State. Unpublished theses in Department of Public Administration and Local Government University of Nigeria Nsukka.
- Gooding, R. Z, Goel, S, and Wiseman, R. M. (2016) Fixed versus variable points in the risk return relationship. *Journal of Economic Behaviour in Organization; 29(1): 331-350*.
- Goodwin, W.L, Wofford, J.C, (2016) A theoretical and empirical extension to the transformational leadership construct. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour; 22(1) 759-774*.



- Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C. K. (2016) Competing for the future. *Harvard Business Review* 41(2): 53 -65.
- Hartog, D.N, and Koopman, P.L, (2013). Leadership in organization. *Organizational Psychology*; 2(1) 166-187.
- Jon Elster (1998) *Deliberative Democracy* (Cambridge Studies in the Theory of Democracy). Cambridge University Press.
- Katarzyna, K. N. (2020). The role of a leader in stimulating innovation in an organization. *Journal of administrative sciences* 10(59): 81-95, *Doi: 10.3390/admsci10059*
- Kehinde, H. and Banjo, P. (2014) Leadership innovation and organizational productivity in Nigerian Firms. *Journal of Economics and Financial Management*, 4(2): 76 – 91.
- Li, C., Makhdoom, H. U. R., and Asim, S. (2020). Impact of entrepreneurial leadership on innovative work behaviour: examining mediation and moderation mechanisms. *Journal of psychology research and behaviour management*, 13(4), 105-118
- Likert, R. (2015). *New ways of managing conflict*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Megat, Z., Hadijah, I. and Noraini, I. (2015) Relationship Between Innovation and Organizational Performance in Construction Industry in Malaysia. *Universal Journal of Industrial and Business Management* 3(4) 87-99.
- Nasution, H. and Mavondo F.T. (2012) Organizational capabilities: antecedents and implications for customer value. *European Journal of Marketing*; 42(4):477-501.
- Penalva, J. (2021). Innovation and leadership as design: a methodology to lead and exceed an ecological approach in higher education. *Journal of knowledge economy*, 10(1):13-31 DOI: 10.1007/S13132-021-00764-3
- Pradeep, D. D., and Prabhu, N. R. V. (2011). The relationship between effective leadership and employee performance. *Journal of Advancements in Information Technology*, 20(1): 198-207.
- Robins, S. P. (2013) *Organizational behaviour: concepts, controversies, applications*. 7th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Salaman, G., Storey, J. and Bills, B. (2005). *Strategic Human Resource Management: Theory and Practice*. 2nd Edition. Sage Publications Ltd
- Salin, D. (2013). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human relations*, 56(10), 1213-1232.
- Sarminah, S. (2014) The Influence of Innovation and Transformational Leadership on Organizational Performance. *International Conference on Asia Pacific Business Innovation and Technology Management. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 57(2): 486 – 493
- Sim, A. B, and Yap, T. H (2016) Strategy types in Malaysian industrial companies. *Malaysian Management Review*; 32: 1-10.
- Tellis, G. J, Prabhu, J. C., and Chandy, R. K. (2015) Radical innovation across nations: The pre-eminence of corporate culture. *Journal of Marketing* 73(1): 3-23.

- Thushel, J. (2015) Impact of Work Environmental Factors on Job Performance, Mediating Role of Work Motivation: A Study of Hotel Sector in England. *International Journal of Business and Management* 10(3): 18 – 34.
- Toor, S. and Ofori, G. (2014) In Quest of leadership in the construction industry: New arenas new challenges. In the conference proceedings, *Dubai: British University*.
- Vissanu, Z. and Sarinthree, U. (2014) The Influence of Leadership Styles on Organisational Performance Mediated by Organisational Innovation: A Case Study of the Hospitality Industry in Thailand; *International Conference on Economics, Management and Development* (5): 45 – 52.
- Wheelwright, S. C, and Clark, K. M. (2014) Revolutionizing product development. Quantum leaps in speed. Efficiency and quality. *New York: The Free Press*.