

“COMPARING CORPORATE BUSINESS AND HUMANITARIAN LEADERSHIP: CROSS-SECTORAL LEADERSHIP INTEGRATION THROUGH TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP”

Research Paper

Dr. Lesly Dieuveille, Virginia, United States, dawencih86@gmail.com

“Abstract”

This paper conducts a comparative assessment of corporate business and humanitarian leadership. It also examines how transformational leadership theory can be used to help facilitate cross-sectoral collaboration. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, the study is interested in studying two different cases: Pfizer as a corporate entity and UNICEF as a humanitarian organization. Using a secondary research design, the research compares how each organization responded to the crisis by applying transformational leadership components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Findings show that transformational leadership bridges the gap between business efficiencies and humanitarians' humanity. In doing so, the study points to the opportunity for corporate innovation working with humanitarian values, thus strengthening how global crisis response is carried out. The study recommended that measures need to be incorporated into policy development to ensure that social responsibility projects are accounted for in global health crises.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Cross-Sector Collaboration, Corporate Leadership, Humanitarian Leadership

1 Introduction

The contribution to filling the gap between corporate and humanitarian leadership in the global crisis is introduced in the first part of this section. This study analyzes how transformational leadership can potentially link two leadership models by dealing with the challenges and opportunities of cross-sector collaboration for the purpose of an improved crisis response. Approaches to leadership in light of the COVID-19 pandemic are explored through the lens of a case study as an anecdotal example of the disparities in competent leadership approaches during a global crisis, along with combining corporate innovation and humanitarian values during a crisis context.

1.1 Background information

Corporate business leadership is the quality of competence required by corporate managers regarding the strategies and administration of corporate leadership in business operations and profitability (Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). Also, it concerns efficiency and innovation and cares for value creation, which is evaluated in terms of indicators such as revenue growth, market share, and return on investment (Karaszewski and Drewniak, 2021; Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). Meanwhile, humanitarian leadership is concerned with humanitarian principles and empathetic and moral decisions that promote the benefit of vulnerable populations and uphold dignity (Patel et al., 2020). The corporate leaders aim to satisfy shareholders' expectations for better organizational effectiveness, whereas the humanitarian leaders direct all efforts for fair resource distribution and the long term well being of the communities they serve for sustainability purposes. The main point of difference between the two styles of leadership lies in the major difference in focus on stakeholders and goals. The focus in humanitarian

leadership should be social impact and ethical responsibility, where the purpose is driven by profit and competitive advantage (Karaszewski and Drewniak, 2021; Patel et al., 2020).

In this research, the study of cross-sectoral leadership collaboration is illustrated through the case studies of Pfizer and UNICEF to investigate the challenges and opportunities in the collaboration of cross-sectoral leadership. The speed of development of Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccines, for example, proved the success of corporate innovation, as well as strategic planning and use of resources in relation to meeting urgent health needs (Lewis et al., 2023). However, the tepid distribution of these vaccines around the world also required a larger range of skills and ethical considerations in which UNICEF has long built a capacity (Reuge et al., 2021), thanks to its experience in global health programs and community-based interventions. It is meaningful to examine the degree to which these two organizations' leadership approaches overlapped and diverged so that the reasons why collaboration is important, and ways in which it might be fostered through transformational leadership can be understood. In the end, this is a study to design a framework that draws on the strengths of both corporate and humanitarian leadership and thereby enhances global crisis response.

1.2 Research problem and questions

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed a major loophole in the collaborative leadership between the corporate and humanitarian sectors, a situation that resulted in widespread inefficiencies and below-par quality of global response to the crisis. While corporations like Pfizer proved to be highly capable organizations with polished corporate leadership strategies of innovation and resource mobilization, others struggled to keep up (Ombrosi et al., 2019). However, humanitarian groups like UNICEF dedicated their focus to the ethical issues of vaccine distribution, including equity and community resilience (Jain et al., 2024). Although both of these sectors are very complementary with respect to their strengths, they lack an integrated approach to leadership, effectively leaving the door open for missed opportunities for collaboration (Hermann and Pagé, 2016). This gap showed up in the delays (Weintraub et al., 2021), unequal vaccine access (McClellan et al., 2021), and logistical problems (Dai et al., 2021), especially in low-income countries where vulnerable populations did not have easy access to timely medical interventions.

The global effort to combat the pandemic was very much affected by the absence of cross-sector leadership integration (Weintraub et al., 2021). If humanitarian organizations' resources and efficiency could have been added to the corporate sector's speed in rolling out the global vaccine rollout, and if the corporate sector's efficiency and resources could have been added to humanitarian organizations' emphasis on fairness and community engagement, the vaccine could have been distributed more equally (Wang et al., 2021). Yet this missed synergy did not only render some of the critical responses ineffective but rather constrained the extent of the impacts of these sectors in triggering response measures to a global health crisis.

Further, there is such a gap in the case of crosssectoral leadership collaboration between the corporate and humanitarian organizations (Bauer et al., 2022) on an effective way to operate. In addition to responding to global crises and building sustainable systems, both sectors share the same challenges (Arslan et al., 2021). However, there is no framework for multidisciplinary integration of their leadership models (Latonen et al., 2013). Fulfilling this gap, this research aims to investigate how transformational leadership establishes the linkage between corporate and humanitarian leadership on the establishment of future collaborative work and outcomes in global crises. Two research questions are attempted to address in this study and they include:

RQ1: How do corporate business leadership and humanitarian leadership differ?

RQ2: How can transformational leadership theory integrate corporate business and humanitarian leadership to enhance cross-sectoral collaboration?

1.3 Research significance

This research is important because it offers a possible gap filler between corporate leadership and humanitarian leadership practices, particularly in times of global crises. The management of resources, providing equitable outcomes, and ethical responses to crises sometimes prove to be a challenge to humanitarian organizations like UNICEF (Nyarko et al., 2024). However, corporate organizations like Pfizer have good leadership strategies in their innovative strategies, resource optimization, and operational efficiency (Ombrosi et al., 2019). Nonetheless, the lack of synergy between these two sectors makes it difficult for collective leadership to work well together and respond to global challenges sustainably and opportunistically (Bauer et al., 2022). By understanding how transformative leadership can fill this gap, this research can help both sectors learn ways to close the gap in the future in order to be more effective in collaborating when another crisis occurs.

This study is very important for humanitarian organizations since it presents a valuable framework that may assist global health emergency or natural crisis decision-making and resource allocation. By studying how corporate leadership approaches, like innovation or efficiency, can be linked to humanitarian values of equity and community resilience, humanitarian organizations may be able to do a better job, reducing inefficiencies in their responses (Horwitch and Milicsevics, 2018). Moreover, humanitarian leaders could develop a better ability to engage with their corporate counterparts in order to respond quicker and more comprehensively to global challenges.

From the standpoint of corporate organizations, the research is important because it elucidates the possible advantages of collaboration with humanitarian groups and the integration of ethical considerations in corporate decision-making. Understanding the role of social responsibility and ethical decision-making in the global crisis would enhance the immediate public image and long-term sustainability of corporate leaders.

2 Theoretical Framework

Transformational leadership is one of the leadership theories that emphasize that leaders have the talent to urge their groups to lead society (Korejan and Shahbazi, 2016). This theory consists of four basic characteristics—idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Kwan, 2020). An effective transformational leader should motivate people that there is a vision that will push the people collectively, challenge the thinking to enable the creation of the new that will be innovative, and demonstrate commitment to the personal and professional development of followers. The main strengths of transformational leadership lie in having long-term goals and intrinsic motivation, thus making it ideal for an organization that operates in a complex dynamic environment like a business or a humanitarian organization (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020).

The questions in this research can be addressed through the theoretical lens of Transformational Leadership because this model can be applied to both corporate and humanitarian sectors (Turnnidge and Cote, 2018). Transformational leadership principles within a corporate leadership context typically lead to innovation and strategic vision to develop operational efficiencies that make their organizations remain viable, financially sustainable, and competitive (Korejan and Shahbazi, 2016). Meanwhile, humanitarian leaders rely on the same principles as motivators of resilience, ethical decision-making, and social responsibility, where the needs of the vulnerable always come first over financial performance (Kwan, 2020).

This study attempts to investigate how the different corporate and humanitarian leadership styles, each seeking a different outcome, may, in fact, share the common ground of fostering a vision, motivation, and change by applying the transformational leadership theory. The theory provides a missing link in the gap between leadership by demonstrating how leaders of corporations can incorporate ethical responsibility into their strategic framework to improve performance and how humanity can learn from the efficiency of corporate-style innovation (Shafique and Kalyar, 2018; Kabetu and Iravo, 2018). By applying transformational leadership that will streamline cross-sector collaboration with

humanitarian ethics, corporate efficiency can be integrated into services to generate a leadership model that is sustainable socially and impactfully (Bonsu and Twum-Danso, 2018; Shafique and Kalyar, 2018).

The application of Transformational Leadership from a corporate and nonprofit perspective separately is well known (Boukamcha, 2019; Mburu et al., 2024; Bonsu and Twum-Danso, 2018). However, applications for cross-sectoral leadership collaboration are inadequately researched. It augments the body of academic knowledge regarding the process of integrating corporate business and humanitarian leadership through the process of transformational leadership. Although studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of transformational leadership solely within individual, organizational environments, this study will address its influence in the mediating of two separate leadership paradigms.

The transformation leadership theory application to crisis response scenarios in the context of corporate and humanitarian leadership integration is still a less-emphasized area of research. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic brought up gaps in communication of leadership coordination between a multinational corporation (Pfizer) and a humanitarian organization (UNICEF) (Jain et al., 2024). This study addresses this gap and shows how transformational leadership principles, especially intellectual stimulation, and idealized influence, can be applied to identify the necessity and enabling opportunities to harness collective intelligence for cross-sectoral collaboration. This research, therefore, contributes to the transformational leadership literature by providing empirical insights into how this theory can be practically applied and also provides actionable recommendations to policymakers, business executives, and humanitarian leaders.

Though it is clear that transformational leadership has the power to change a culture and support everyone moving forward, the theory still has its shortcomings. As noted in one of the major critiques (Korejan and Shahbazi, 2016), it is difficult to clearly operationalize the concept of transformational leadership because it is broad and difficult to measure consistently across different sectors. Because transformational leadership is subjective, it is very difficult to perform in a standardized manner as it depends on an individual's leadership style.

It is also a further important criticism of possible over-idealization. Transformational leaders are typically perceived as charismatic and visionary (Turnnidge and Cote, 2018); however, their 'vision' sometimes has the propensity of creating dependence on an individual leader and not building sustainable organizational structures. To give an example, transformational leaders in a corporate setup, may get so engrossed in pushing for a change that they ignore necessary checks like considering the constraints like financial limitations or regulatory compliance (Korejan and Shahbazi, 2016). Also, in humanitarian organizations, too much emphasis on inspiration and ethical thinking may sometimes result in inefficiency in operational delivery (Kwan, 2020). Despite these critiques, transformational leadership does present a valuable base from which to observe leadership integration across corporate and humanitarian sectors.

3 Literature Review

This research presents the findings of the literature review, which explores the main themes and concepts that ground the inquiry, including the dividing line between corporate business leadership and humanitarian leadership and the possibility of their integration into global crises. This review will discover how these two leadership models work, their basic differences, and how critical cross-sector collaboration is to handling intricate worldwide issues, for example, the COVID-19 epidemic.

3.1 Corporate business and humanitarian leadership

Corporate Business Leadership and Humanitarian Leadership are the two distinctive but influential leadership models meant for organizing entities pursuing their missions. Corporate business leadership is the strategic and operational direction of commercial enterprises emphasizing financial performance, competitiveness in the market, and shareholders' value (Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). It is

based on efficiency, innovation, and long-term profitability, sometimes resting on structured hierarchies and performance-oriented incentives to achieve organizational targets (Moldoveanu and Narayandas, 2019). On the other hand, humanitarian leadership is based on ethical consideration, social responsibility, and the urgent situations of vulnerable people (Bollettino et al., 2019). It focuses on equitable, sustainable development and enhanced resilience and prioritizes human welfare above financial profit during a crisis (Bollettino et al., 2019).

The basic purposes of a corporate business leader are to grow, scale, and expand our market. Strategic planning, operational efficiency, and financial sustainability are very important to corporate leaders, as the company must maintain a competitive and profitable edge (Kuratko and Neubert, 2018). An apt leadership style for this is when someone relies heavily on data-driven decision-making, risk assessment, and stakeholder management to help optimize business performance (Saha et al., 2020). In contrast, humanitarian leadership relates more to tackling social problems, promoting human rights, and reacting to natural disasters, public health emergencies, and crises, including war (Wang et al., 2021). Humanitarian leaders concentrate on ethical decision-making, the ability to collaborate, and identifying and implementing sustainable solutions to global challenges. Mobilizing resources, coordinating with government and other major international agencies, and maintaining due transparency and accountability in delivering aid are their operational priorities (Patel et al., 2020).

Corporate business leadership can be evident in multinational corporations such as Apple Inc. and Pfizer Inc.; Apple has corporate leadership qualities based on its innovation, market power, and strategic product development, which has led to world dominance in the consumer technology sector (Stier, 2024). Pfizer also provided corporate leadership when it came to the COVID-19 pandemic by expeditiously developing and deploying the vaccines while mobilizing the appropriate resources, conducting the necessary research, and managing the supply chain (Lewis et al., 2023). On the contrary, humanitarian leaders are NGOs like UNICEF and Doctors Without Borders (Médecins Sans Frontières - MSF). UNICEF not only advocates children's rights fights for better global health and strives for equitability in vaccine distribution but in poor-income countries (Jain et al., 2024). MSF is mainly known for its emergency medical assistance in war zones and disaster areas, never putting financial concerns before ethical medical care and humanitarian aid (Orbinski, 2018).

3.2 Difference between corporate business and humanitarian leadership

Decision-making, resource management, ethical and stakeholder engagement within corporate business leadership, and humanitarian leadership are quite fundamental. This can be attributed to the different goals and priorities that each sector wants to reach. Corporate leaders make their decisions based on data analysis to make a profit, follow market trends, and manage risk (Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). What is typical about their behavior is that they choose efficiency and downward cost effectiveness, aiming to deliver financial success quickly and excellence too quickly (Karaszewski and Drewniak, 2021). On the other hand, humanitarian leaders make decisions with a view to societal impact over the long term, distributional equity, and ethical responsibility (Patel et al., 2020). Stakeholders are consulted in decision-making based on the requirements of marginalized communities and the long-term well-being of affected communities in crisis situations (Saleh et al., 2022). Humanitarian decision-making is much more about values, and so the result is to be outcomes that support social justice and human dignity.

In the area of resource management, corporate leadership is necessary to optimize the resources for maximum output, either by reducing cost, maximizing production, or raising profitability (Saha et al., 2020). The key objectives are efficiency and scalability; resources are ordered in line with the company's strategic goals. Humanitarian leadership, however, places greater emphasis on equitable resource distribution, often in situations of scarcity or urgent need (Hermann and Pagé, 2016). Due to the nature of the humanitarian sector, in which limited resources are allocated without professional supervisors and among the most vulnerable populations in crisis contexts where logistics and infrastructure issues make this task difficult, it is important for humanitarian leaders to balance resources and ensure proper distribution of aid to the most vulnerable populations (Wang et al., 2021).

The contrast between the two leadership styles is also indicated by ethical considerations. Corporate leaders often focus on generating financial gains and expansion in the market, making tradeoffs that, on grounds of ethics, might be injurious despite environmental impacts, labor practices, and even pricing strategies (Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). On the other hand, humanitarian leaders' philosophy is based on ethical decision-making, emphasizing fairness and justice and following the humanitarian principles of 'do no harm' (Patel et al., 2020). They are a group that is motivated by a strong commitment to core human rights, dignity, and equity.

Finally, there are different ways of handling stakeholder engagement in the sectors. A corporate leader's main interaction is with shareholders, customers, employees, and investors, with the aim of making financial returns and growing the business (Karaszewski and Drewniak, 2021). But humanitarian leaders work with a wider set of stakeholders: with vulnerable populations on the one side and with government agencies, donors, and other international organizations on the other, in partnership, in a transparent manner, and for long-term social impact (Saleh et al., 2022). In the end, corporate leadership is profit-oriented. It emphasizes reasonable market efficiency and shareholder value (Kuratko and Neubert, 2018). In contrast, humanitarian leadership is value-oriented and emphasizes equity and ethical responsibility, a firm commitment to social welfare, and community well-being (Hermann and Pagé, 2016). Although they are at similar stages of development, the fundamental differences underlying each sector create the diverging way each operates and how they may be able to cooperate.

3.3 Cross-sectoral leadership integration during crises

The concept of Cross-sectoral leadership integration deals with organizations' leaders of different sectors, e.g., humanitarian organizations and corporate businesses, focusing on addressing complex global issues (Korhonen-Kurki et al., 2016). The combining of the strengths of these sectors has resulted in a more efficient, effective, and ethical approach to handling crises. Corporate leaders generally have experience in resource mobilization, logistics, and innovation (Saha et al., 2020); humanitarian leaders in equity, community resilience, and social responsibility (Saleh et al., 2022). When these two different leadership approaches are combined, it may be possible to deliver more holistic and meaningful solutions to the problems of the world in times of global emergencies.

The COVID-19 pandemic provides a clear example of both successful and failed attempts at cross-sectoral leadership collaboration. Pfizer, for example, is a multinational pharmaceutical company whose corporate leadership enabled a swift development of a COVID-19 vaccine and ramping up production (Sampat and Shadlen, 2021). Important to the management of the health crisis was their leadership strategy in innovation research and resource management. While Pfizer's corporate efficiency was necessary for vaccine development, the company struggled with distributing it, especially in low-income countries where UNICEF, a humanitarian organization, assumed a key role in guaranteeing that vaccines were rolled out equitably (Lennox et al., 2021). This is where UNICEF placed its leadership: promoting fairness in how vaccines are distributed, addressing how to get them to the people in need, and advancing ethical principles to the inequalities of global health (Reuge et al., 2021; Lennox et al., 2021).

Yet, despite these efforts, Pfizer and UNICEF's collaboration wasn't fully integrated, thus making the global vaccine rollout that much less efficient (Fernando et al., 2022; Renyoet et al., 2023). Lack of coordinated leadership between the corporate sector and humanitarian sector mainly caused delays in the distribution of the vaccine, logistical bottlenecks, and inequitable access to it. Pfizer, on the other hand, did amazingly well at the innovation and resource management technology (Druehl et al., 2021), but UNICEF encountered difficulty in scaling this technology given the resource constraints – something that appears to be crucial for both innovation and resource management (Reuge et al., 2021).

Because both sectors bring unique strengths to the table—efficiency from the corporate sector, innovation, and strategic planning from the business sector—but also moral and ethical commitment, equity, and community focus from the humanitarian one—a more integrated leadership approach is

needed to improve crisis response and resilience (Wang et al., 2021). In combination, there are leadership models that both satisfy the immediate needs of a crisis as well as long-term structural challenges that further vulnerability and perpetuate inequity on the road to a more resilient and equitable recovery.

3.4 Barriers to cross-sectoral leadership integration

While there are many barriers to cross-sectoral leadership integration between corporate and humanitarian organizations, these mainly emerge from the differences in the organization's culture, goals, and operational structure. Firstly, the divergence in organizational cultures is one of the main barriers (Hermann et al., 2012). Humanitarian organizations are value-driven and ethical (Wang et al., 2021), whereas corporate organizations are often pushed by performance metrics, efficiency, and profitability (Moldoveanu and Narayandas, 2019), which are sometimes in opposition. Cultural differences can lead to misunderstanding and mistrust with each other making it hard to collaborate (Eisenbeib and Brodbeck, 2014). The priorities of social impact, equity, and community benefit tend to sit uncoupled with human profitability for these corporate leaders.

The shared goals and priorities are also a barrier (Hong et al., 2024). Yet, their underlying objectives are different despite the fact that both sectors may have a common interest in responding to global crises. Corporate leadership is about scaling solutions fast and maximizing return on investment (Saha et al., 2020), versus humanitarian leadership, where fairness, but also the ability to keep it around for a long time, and the key part being that nobody gets left behind, is essential. This is because these differing priorities can act as an impediment to the required alignment for efficient collaboration (Takalo et al., 2023).

Ultimately, obstacles can be created in resource allocation and accountability structures (Kapucu and Ustun, 2018). Typically, corporations are rigid in their financial structure as well as in performance-driven frameworks, while humanitarian organizations are often dependent on donor funding and may have challenges regarding resource management. Efficiencies in the joint allocation of resources, such as both sectors working under different constraints and accountability systems, make cooperation complicated.

4 Methodology

In this chapter, we bring forth this research's methodology, which is secondary data analysis on the integration of corporate business and humanitarian leadership. It has emphasized the review of existing literature, case studies, and reports that pertain to leadership in the context of the global crisis, the COVID-19 Pandemic. This study aims to explore the differences and similarities of the different leadership approaches from different sectors to determine the opportunities for cross-sector coordination using the theory of transformational leadership.

4.1 Research design and approach

The argument of this research is based upon a secondary research design in which all the work was done from the existing literature, case studies, and reports and examined the corporate business and humanitarian leadership integration. This study is particularly suitable for secondary research since there is no need to collect primary data, and a researcher can build on existing knowledge and theory (Hunziker and Blankenagel, 2021). Clearly, the space of scholarly resources on leadership is quite enormous; thus, this approach is effective for insight regarding the interplay of leadership styles of both sectors within the context of the contingency as witnessed in global crises such as the present COVID-19 Pandemic (Sreejesh et al., 2014).

The secondary research design allows the consolidation of all views on corporate and humanitarian leadership derived from selected authoritative resources (Adebiyi and Abayomi, 2016). The study then seeks to synthesize these insights to better see the offered benefits and weaknesses of leadership integration across sectors. The research drew on real-world cases of crisis leadership, including Pfizer

and UNICEF, in response to the pandemic to offer guidance on how leadership models of these organizations can be brought into alignment to strengthen such crisis response. In addition, the use of secondary data ensures that the findings are based on past research in leadership theory and practice (Avella, 2016).

4.2 Data sources and selection criteria

The study is based on the major data sources: academic articles, case studies, organizational government and NGO report publications, and referenceable newscasts. To ground the study in existing leadership theories and empirical research both on corporate and humanitarian leadership literature, academic writing, academic articles, and peer-reviewed journals were used as resources. The databases that the sources were drawn from included JSTOR, Google Scholar, Science Direct, and others. Real-world examples were provided through case studies of organizations like Pfizer and UNICEF, which went into further detail about leadership during a crisis dealing with a pandemic through COVID-19 (Paradis et al., 2016). White papers and internal assessments of the sector organizations were utilized as a means of identifying operational strategies and leadership models employed by both sectors (Feng et al. 2021).

Additionally, these sources were selected on the basis of their credibility and the relevance of their content to the research questions, as well as the focus on leadership integration during a crisis (Saunders et al., 2015). Reputable organizations reporting findings and verifying case study results were utilized. This was done by choosing sources related to leadership in the corporate or humanitarian world in order to gain a deep understanding of leadership views (Paradis et al., 2016). However, afforded priority were the most recent journal articles of leadership integration to ensure the sources are up to date, as the sources were published within 5 years of the year being written (2018 to 2023).

4.3 Data analysis method

A secondary research was carried out in this paper for the comparison of corporate and humanitarian leadership in terms of cross-sectoral integration using comparison strategy, and the transformational leadership theory was taken as a reference framework. The study analyzed the leadership styles, approaches, and outcomes of leadership in one of the corporate organizations (e.g., Pfizer) with reference to leadership in the humanitarian entity (e.g., UNICEF) during crises (e.g., COVID-19).

The lens used to examine both leadership models was the transformational leadership theory. One of the most important approaches highlighted by the theory was vision, inspiration, motivation, and innovation that could encourage innovation, which would provide solutions during the crisis, as mentioned by Latonen et al. (2023) and Korejan and Shahbazi (2016). This research was done to investigate which sector of leadership has coherent or incoherent principles of transformational leadership, like creating a shared vision, empowering others, and promoting an organization's changes, respectively (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020).

Leadership actions of each of the two sectors were categorized as transformational leadership components such as idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation, and data were analyzed. It then went further to analyze where the two leadership models could be integrated so as to enhance crisis response. Finally, the results were presented by the commonalities as well as disparities that were found that served to offer the knowledge on how transformational leadership can assist the connection between corporate business and humanitarian leadership in future global crises.

5 Results And Analysis

This chapter analyzes Pfizer and UNICEF's leadership responses during the COVID-19 pandemic from the transformational leadership perspective. These results intend to identify the strengths and

weaknesses of both corporate and humanitarian leadership in confronting global problems; and, thus, utilizing the principles of transformational leadership to improve cross-sectoral collaboration.

5.1 Comparative analysis of crisis response: corporate and humanitarian leadership in action

The COVID-19 pandemic has brought an unprecedented crisis, and effective leadership is needed across the sectors. Pfizer's corporate leaders and UNICEF's humanitarian leaders had to change with the landscape, which was changing very quickly. By looking at these organizations concerning transformational leadership, it is clear to see how one response impacted a different outcome than another and how closely their actions aligned with the four components of transformational leadership (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration).

Idealized influence entails leaders that provide a model for followers by gaining respect and trust from them (Korejan and Shahbazi, 2016). When Pfizer's leadership team, including its CEO Albert Bourla, acted by idealized influence too on quickly mobilizing resources and expertise to develop and distribute the COVID-19 vaccine (Faheem and Dutta, 2020). During the run-up to clinical trials in Kenya, Pfizer's commitment to strong, character-orientated leadership and public health was reinforced by the public and government's trust that it could withstand global scrutiny (Ateghang-Awankem et al., 2021). Pfizer's leaders were presented as highly credible, highly trustworthy people because of their transparency, their commitment to scientific excellence, and their focus on the common good (Faheem and Dutta, 2020).

At the same time, UNICEF leadership took a very moral stance and launched a fair and just effort on vaccine access. Although the organization did not have the same scientific resources as Pfizer, it argued for equitable distribution, especially in low-income countries (Acharya et al., 2021). According to Samarasekera (2022), upon the assumption of the leadership within UNICEF, who are inspired by the humanitarian values under the presidencies of Henrietta Fore, they positioned themselves to champion vulnerability. UNICEF leadership prioritized the greater good and, as a result, idealized influence; they accomplished this by advocating for equity within the nonprofit sector and inspiring trust from them in the commitment to promote equity (Samarasekera, 2022).

Inspirational motivation, on the other hand, refers to leaders who are able to give a vision that can inspire others to make it come true (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020). Leaders at Pfizer, especially when the vaccine development process had just begun, made a daring and audacious verdict to fast-track the development of a vaccine within the shortest possible period (Thorn et al., 2022). This determined a vision of 'ending the pandemic' that brought to life from employees at Pfizer to partners, to governments, and beyond; everyone was determined to make this happen (Faheem and Dutta, 2020). Pfizer's use of clear communication and urgent action led people to feel a shared responsibility for global health in a climate that encouraged cooperation between different sectors.

Also, behavioral inspiration was provided by UNICEF's response, but it was more focused on equity and fairness. The vision that the organization's leadership wrote involved not just the need to end the pandemic but, in doing so, to do so equitably (Acharya et al., 2021). Across partners (governments and NGOs) in its global network, UNICEF made it clear how it would make sure that at-risk communities have access to vaccines (Privor-Dumm et al., 2023). Although UNICEF's influence was less action than advocacy, its ability to mobilize governments and corporate organizations, including Pfizer, to begin considering ethics still showed the organization to be in the leadership position in the propagation of shared impunity toward global justice.

Intellectual stimulation entails that leaders encourage employees to challenge existing assumptions and innovate (Kwan, 2020). One example of intellectual stimulation was presented by Pfizer's leadership, which consistently challenged the boundaries of scientific innovation. Using mRNA technology for the vaccine was a revolutionary step in biotechnology to reduce significantly the time for the development (Faheem and Dutta, 2020). Pfizer's leaders ensured to create a culture of experimental and creative thinking that accelerated the discovery process through collaborations with BioNTech.

Although UNICEF was not in the business of producing new scientific innovations, it also stimulated the intellect by encouraging new ways to tackle global health inequities (Acharya et al., 2021). Besides, they promoted innovative solutions for the distribution of vaccines, mainly in the place of remote and underserved areas (Hopkins et al., 2023). UNICEF partnered with different stakeholders, including governments and private companies, to actively promote new strategies to achieve equitable access to vaccines, including the COVAX initiative that aims to achieve fair access to vaccines in low and middle-income countries (Giersing et al., 2021). The global gap in vaccine distribution was dealt with with the help of this strategic and intellectual stimulation.

Individualized consideration refers to the leader's attention to the development of individual followers and their well-being, coaching, mentoring, and personalized support (Turnnidge and Cote, 2018). Individualized consideration was mainly shown through Pfizer ensuring the health and safety of its employees during the pandemic (Faheem and Dutta, 2022). Besides, the company continued to put importance on diversity and inclusion in its recruiting procedures to guarantee that diverse perspectives were considered when making critical choices in the midst of the pandemic (National Institutes of Health, 2022).

In another context, UNICEF's leadership also showed individualized consideration. The leaders of the organization placed emphasis on how to serve the wellness of vulnerable communities, especially children and marginalized groups (Acharya et al., 2021). The aid delivery mechanisms of UNICEF always adapted to each community's specific needs, where cultural, geographical, and economic factors were also considered (Privor-Dumm et al., 2023). Given the organization's commitment to equity, its approach was tailored to the circumstances of the individual to better advocate for the most vulnerable populations further impacted by the pandemic, including children in conflict zones and refugee camps.

5.2 Barriers to cross-sectoral leadership integration

Integrating corporate and humanitarian leadership styles (especially the transformational leadership perspective) encounters several barriers, especially during the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic.

A key barrier lies in the differences between the priorities of both profit-driven leadership of the corporate world and equity-focused leadership of humanitarianism (Wang et al., 2021). As a profit-driven corporation, Pfizer concentrated on the speedy development and conveyance of the Covid 19 antibody so the organization could complete it rapidly, be first in the market, and make the most measure of income (Lewis et al., 2023). However, the main concern for UNICEF was fair vaccine distribution, especially to underrepresented communities (Acharya et al., 2021). Because there is an inherent tension between collaboration where individuals want different metrics (profit vs equity), this difference in priorities is a fundamental one. However, the gap between a transformational leader's vision of ensuring the quality of care and a corporation's objective to drive the bottom line is simply too wide to be bridged through the mechanisms of the typical transformational leader, one who relies on a shared vision and collective motivation.

The corporate and humanitarian sector players do not have the same decision-making procedures. Data drove Pfizer's decision-making, focusing on speed and fits of scientific innovation (Sampat and Shadlen, 2021), and on the other hand, UNICEF based its decision on the values of social justice and human welfare (Sommariva et al., 2021). However, this divergence caused a barrier to applying transformational leadership principles as the two organizations were not able to jointly agree on common goals or follow a common crisis management approach.

Lastly, there is an ethical concern. The structure of Pfizer's leadership was marked by adherence to business ethics, focusing on the interest of shareholders and ensuring the balance between efficiency and responsibility (Faheem and Dutta, 2022). Attention to UNICEF's structure of leadership was more based on the ethical responsibility towards vulnerable populations (Privor-Dumm et al., 2023). This difference in ethical frameworks can cause false approaches to resource allocation, transparency, and accountability, all of which hinder collaboration and the effective integration of transformational leadership strategies during the crisis.

5.3 Opportunities for enhancing cross-sectoral leadership collaboration

Transformational leadership offers an opportunity to bridge the gap between corporate and humanitarian leadership and, therefore, to collaborate, respect one another, and develop shared goals. Knowing the vision, inspiration, and individual empowerment leadership style can help the sectors work in collaboration and keep their priorities aligned, particularly in global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic.

Creating a shared vision can be one of the central principles of transformational leadership and it is a potential powerful agent of unifier between the corporate and humanitarian sectors (Siangchokyoo et al., 2020). Similarly, transformational leaders in Pfizer and UNICEF can help both organizations pay greater attention to long-term outcomes rather than short-term gains by helping them focus on things that they both share, such as saving lives and making vaccines more equitable (Kwan, 2020). Pfizer might have to make sure that the rollout of the vaccine puts the most vulnerable populations first and that UNICEF learns from Pfizer's distribution channels to reach further by increasing the efficiency of UNICEF's humanitarian work. By setting a vision collaboratively, transformational leaders can resolve the conventional tradeoff between profit and equity and, therefore, create a basis for monadic alignment of the resources and efforts of both sectors, with a goal of maximum impact (Boukamcha, 2019).

Another transformational leadership component that might promote collaboration between the two sectors is inspirational motivation. Pfizer leaders and UNICEF leaders can inspire their teams by expressing a powerful vision of what can be accomplished together (Yucel, 2021). Transformational leaders can inspire commitment and enthusiasm from corporate teams as well as humanitarian teams by focusing on the larger purpose of their actions, such as helping vulnerable populations navigate through a global crisis (Zaman et al., 2020). Finally, this shared sense of purpose would yield better coordination as the two sectors are both seeking to meet the same overarching goals.

Another key transformational principle focuses on individualized consideration, in other words, understanding and going to the needs of all stakeholders. This would also allow both Pfizer and UNICEF to serve marginalized communities with respect to their unique needs (Suprapti et al., 2020). So, corporate leaders would be able to leverage the nuances of the humanitarian challenge better — most concerned with innovation and operational excellence — and humanitarian leaders could integrate the best of the corporate world: data-driven, efficient decision-making processes (Yucel, 2021). A two-way dialogue could help ensure that the distribution of vaccines and public health are done with sensitivity to the unique needs of vulnerable populations.

In addition, intellectual stimulation creates an atmosphere where creativity and ingenuity are promoted as they are essential for solving crisis problems. Transformational leaders within both sectors can encourage their teams to think of creative solutions to problems with logistical hurdles, poor distribution, and vaccine hesitancy (Santoso et al., 2022; Suprapti et al., 2020). Thus, Pfizer would bring technological expertise and supply chain capabilities to innovate the distribution of vaccines in remote areas, and UNICEF could offer insights on how to overcome the barriers to accepting vaccines in various communities. The exchange of ideas between the two groups would lead to more comprehensive and effective crisis responses.

Both sectors have to realize that there is a complementary power in whatever they do. So, not one community should be left behind by Pfizer's distribution of equity in vaccine production and UNICEF's ethical responsibility for equitable distribution. An idea might be the creation of joint leadership programs where the executives from the two sectors are trained on one another's objectives and ways of working. A better understanding of the way to pragmatically combine profit-driven strategy with ethical, humanitarian goals.

6 Discussion

The comparisons of Pfizer's and UNICEF's responses to the COVID-19 pandemic answer the research questions on the differences between corporate business leadership and humanitarian

leadership and the possibility of transformational leadership to generate effective collaboration between sectors. Though both sectors met transformational leadership principles, their leadership style focused considerably in different directions because of different organizational priorities. As a multinational corporation, Pfizer aimed to be highly efficient, fast, and innovative when it came to responding to the pandemic. The COVID-19 vaccine was developed and rapidly distributed under the leadership of CEO Albert Bourla, which closely matched the intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation parts of transformational leadership (Faheem and Dutta, 2020). Pfizer used mRNA technology, which received a great emphasis on the corporate focus on innovation (Kwan, 2020). Furthermore, Pfizer's leadership focused more on operational performance, the competition in the market, and the ability of the company to maintain financial sustainability to make strategic decisions and responses toward the crisis.

On the other hand, the humanitarian organization UNICEF focuses on equity, social responsibility, and the welfare of vulnerable populations. Overall, Henrietta Fore's leadership in UNICEF strove towards ethical thought, social justice, and access to resources for poorer countries (Acharya et al., 2021). However, UNICEF's leadership style through the approach of moral persuasion and collective responsibility, therefore idealized influence, showed the importance of a shared vision as underpinned in both organizations (Samarasekera, 2022). It is true in the humanitarian space as well, where the focus on equity and fairness meant the importance of inclusive decision-making, while corporate leaders who led the likes of Pfizer were focused on efficiency and speed.

The differences between corporate leadership and humanitarian organizations are shown here, which are inherently contrary to the profit motive of the former and the ethical mission of the latter. In general, corporate leaders are more focused on the results and have the resources to push innovation boundaries (Ciulla and Ciulla, 2020). At the same time, humanitarian leaders focusing on social impact and servicing communities that are most marginalized frequently demand an approach that is less tuned into financial returns in the near term (Wang et al., 2021).

Through the unifying framework of transformational leadership, it is possible to forge a common understanding between corporate and humanitarian leaders despite having different priorities and challenges. Both sectors work on the common ground of four core components of transformational leadership, namely ideas of influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Pfizer, via UNICEF, instilled trust in the subject of successful public relations as they had established their credibility. Transparency from Pfizer in its vaccine development work and UNICEF in its advocacy for equitable distribution of the vaccine helped build up trust with stakeholders like governments, NGOs, etc. (Faheem and Dutta, 2020; Acharya et al., 2021). Inspiration was the motivation by both organizations to get the teams and partners on the same goal of overcoming the pandemic. Pfizer's bold vision of 'ending the pandemic' and UNICEF's vision to distribute vaccines equitably to vulnerable populations inspired action (Privor-Dumm et al., 2023).

Intellectual stimulation drives innovation on both sides of the sector. Such a culture of creativity and scientific innovation was fostered by Pfizer's leadership, which had the capacity to rapidly develop mRNA technology for vaccine production (Faheem and Dutta, 2020). Moreover, UNICEF pushed for innovative ways of vaccine distribution, including leveraging technology to access remote areas and fighting for policy changes to ensure equitable vaccine access (Hopkins et al., 2023). In enabling the sharing of knowledge and resources, both organizations showed that intellectual stimulation is how collaboration and problem-solving can take place to bridge the gap between corporate efficiency and humanitarian ethics.

Finally, leadership in each organization was also based on the central consideration of individualized consideration, although in unique ways. Similarly, UNICEF took advantage of vulnerable communities, and Pfizer concentrated on employee empowerment along with providing resources for doing scientific research. The leadership of UNICEF showed individualized consideration when they backed up the local leaders and came up with solutions to fit vulnerable populations' needs (Acharya et al., 2021). There is an opportunity here to leverage this effort to personalize leadership responses in

cross-sectoral collaborations to ensure the dual objectives of corporate and humanitarian goals are achieved.

7 Conclusion

This research compares the application of a theory of transformational leadership to corporate and humanitarian leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic. It looks into how Pfizer and UNICEF have taken different approaches to achieving their targets and depicts their strengths, challenges, as well as potential for cross-sectoral collaboration. The findings are synthesized in this section, and practical and policy recommendations are put forth as well as recommendations for future research.

7.1 Practical implications

This study has important practice implications for leaders in both the corporate and the humanitarian sectors. Corporate leaders can make their organization's social responsibility sustainable in the long term by integrating transformational leadership principles. Without a doubt, Pfizer's innovation during the pandemic emphasizes the need to have transparent leadership following a culture of creativity. The research demonstrates the effectiveness of taking into account ethical considerations together with an operational focus to make greater and more beneficial contributions to the resolution of global crises by corporate leadership.

The study suggests that humanitarian leaders benefit from borrowing from corporate leadership, especially in innovation and efficiency, if they are to achieve better outcomes and delivery of services. UNICEF's equitable vaccine distribution was successful, showing that partnerships with the private sector are possible to a certain extent. Instead of serious efforts to involve entities, humanitarian leaders should focus on how better involvement of corporate bodies can be first amenable to innovation and, second, ethical integrity. Devised through the integration of corporate efficiency and humanitarian ethics, there is the potential for a global response to crises that is effective and has further reach.

7.2 Policy implications

The research emphasizes that policymakers need to make a firm effort to craft stronger frameworks that promote partnering between corporate businesses and humanitarian organizations. Policymakers should support developing partnerships that build upon the best qualities of both sectors and combine the innovation and efficiency of corporations with humanitarian organizations' equity and social responsibility. Governments might have to further incentivize these private-public partnerships, maintain companies like Pfizer will invest in global health, and follow humanitarian organizations' ethical guidelines like UNICEF.

Moreover, measures need to be incorporated in policy development to underscore the role of the corporate entities in ensuring that social responsibility projects are accounted for in global health calamities. Governments can push resources to be optimized by creating a policy environment that results in more equitable and efficient responses to global challenges such as pandemics, climate change, and poverty by promoting cross-sector collaboration.

7.3 Recommendations for future research

There is a need for future research to examine the application of transformational leadership in other cross-sector collaborations, including climate change and global poverty. More studies are also necessary to discern how ethical responsibility can be incorporated in a crisis response by corporate leadership yet not to the detriment of efficiency. The study of long-term partnership strategies, after a crisis especially, would be insightful in to being challenged by the challenges of sustaining cross-sector partnerships post-crisis.

Reference

- Acharya, K. P., Ghimire, T. R., and Subramanya, S. H. (2021) 'Access to and equitable distribution of COVID-19 vaccine in low-income countries.' *npj Vaccines*, 6(1), p. 54.
- Adebiyi, J., and Abayomi, T. (2016) 'Research design: A review of features and emerging developments.' *European journal of business and management*, 8(11), pp. 113-118.
- Arslan, A., Golgeci, I., Khan, Z., Al-Tabbaa, O., and Hurmelinna-Laukkanen, P. (2021) 'Adaptive learning in cross-sector collaboration during global emergency: conceptual insights in the context of COVID-19 pandemic.' *Multinational Business Review*, 29(1), pp. 21-42.
- Ateghang-Awankem, B., DeLuca, L., Shadzeka, E., and Anchang, K. Y. (2021) 'Good participatory practice, clinical trials awareness and COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Sub-Sahara Africa.' *American Journal of Public Health Research*, 9(3), pp. 90-95.
- Avella, J. R. (2016) 'Delphi panels: Research design, procedures, advantages, and challenges.' *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 11, p. 305.
- Bauer, Z., AbouAssi, K., and Johnston, J. (2022) 'Cross-sector collaboration formality: the effects of institutions and organizational leaders.' *Public Management Review*, 24(2), pp. 159-181.
- Bollettino, V., Kenney, A. B., Schwartz, S., and Burnham, G. (2019) 'Humanitarian leadership.' *Social Science Protocols*, 2, pp. 1-12.
- Bonsu, S., and Twum-Danso, E. (2018) 'Leadership style in the global economy: A focus on cross-cultural and transformational leadership.' *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 9(2), pp. 37-52.
- Boukamcha, F. (2019) 'The effect of transformational leadership on corporate entrepreneurship in Tunisian SMEs.' *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 40(3), pp. 286-304.
- Ciulla, J. B., and Ciulla, J. B. (2020) 'The importance of leadership in shaping business values. *The search for ethics in leadership, business, and beyond*, pp. 153-163.
- Dai, D., Wu, X., and Si, F. (2021) 'Complexity analysis of cold chain transportation in a vaccine supply chain considering activity inspection and time-delay'. *Advances in difference equations*, 2021, pp. 1-18.
- Druedahl, L. C., Minssen, T., and Price, W. N. (2021) 'Collaboration in times of crisis: A study on COVID-19 vaccine RandD partnerships.' *Vaccine*, 39(42), pp. 6291-6295.
- Eisenbeib, S. A., and Brodbeck, F. (2014) 'Ethical and unethical leadership: A cross-cultural and cross-sectoral analysis.' *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122, pp. 343-359.
- Faheem, H., and Dutta, S. (2022) 'Albert Bourla: leading Pfizer's successful vaccine rollout to tackle the Covid-19 pandemic.' *The CASE Journal*, 19(1), pp. 26-48.
- Feng, Y., Duives, D., Daamen, W., and Hoogendoorn, S. (2021) 'Data collection methods for studying pedestrian behaviour: A systematic review.' *Building and Environment*, 187, p. 107329.
- Fernando, K., Menon, S., Jansen, K., Naik, P., Nucci, G., Roberts, J., ... and Dolsten, M. (2022) 'Achieving end-to-end success in the clinic: Pfizer's learnings on RandD productivity.' *Drug discovery today*, 27(3), pp. 697-704.
- Giersing, B., Shah, N., Kristensen, D., Amorij, J. P., Kahn, A. L., Gandrup-Marino, K., ... and Menozzi-Arnaud, M. (2021) 'Strategies for vaccine-product innovation: Creating an enabling environment for product development to uptake in low-and middle-income countries.' *Vaccine*, 39(49), pp. 7208-7219.
- Hermann, M. G., and Pagé, C. (2016) 'Leadership and behavior in humanitarian and development transnational non-governmental organizations.' *Politics and Governance*, 4(2), pp. 127-137.

- Hermann, M. G., Lecy, J. D., Mitchell, G. E., Page, C., Raggo, P., Schmitz, H. P., and Vinuela, L. (2012) 'Transnational NGOs: A cross-sectoral analysis of leadership perspectives.' Available at SSRN 2191082.
- Hong, M., Chen, T., and Jia, Y. (2024) 'A case study on a novel cross-sectoral complementary merger in China: from the perspectives of leadership'. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 25(2), pp. 527-540.
- Hopkins, K. L., Underwood, T., Iddrisu, I., Woldemeskel, H., Bon, H. B., Brouwers, S., ... and Lihemo, G. (2023) 'Community-based approaches to increase COVID-19 vaccine uptake and demand: lessons learned from four UNICEF-supported interventions.' *Vaccines*, 11(7), p. 1180.
- Horwitch, M., and Milicsevics, M. (2018) 'Incumbent Firm Capacity Building in Analytics: Strategy, Structure, and Innovation Management Perspectives.' In *2018 Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology (PICMET)* (pp. 1-19). IEEE.
- Hunziker, S., and Blankenagel, M. (2021) 'Research Design in Business and Management.' *Wiesbaden: SpringerGabler*, 1.
- Jain, A., Aggarwal, K., and Sagar, D. (2024) 'UNICEF: Towards Ethical Excellence.' *Leadership Ethics*, 81.
- Kabetu, D. G., and Iravo, M. A. (2018) 'Influence of strategic leadership on performance of international humanitarian organizations in Kenya.' *International Academic Journal of Innovation, Leadership and Entrepreneurship*, 2(2), pp. 113-135.
- Kapucu, N., and Ustun, Y. (2018) 'Collaborative crisis management and leadership in the public sector.' *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(7), pp. 548-561.
- Karaszewski, R., and Drewniak, R. (2021) 'The Leading traits of the modern corporate leader: Comparing survey results from 2008 and 2018.' *Energies*, 14(23), p. 7926.
- Korejan, M. M., and Shahbazi, H. (2016) 'An analysis of the transformational leadership theory.' *Journal of fundamental and applied sciences*, 8(3), pp. 452-461.
- Korhonen-Kurki, K., Brockhaus, M., Bushley, B., Babon, A., Gebara, M. F., Kengoum, F., ... and Maharani, C. (2016) 'Coordination and cross-sectoral integration in REDD+: experiences from seven countries.' *Climate and Development*, 8(5), pp. 458-471.
- Kuratko, D. F., and Neubert, E. (2018) 'Corporate entrepreneurial leadership: Addressing critical challenges in a disruptive age.' In *The challenges of corporate entrepreneurship in the disruptive age* (pp. 89-109). Leeds: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Kwan, P. (2020) 'Is transformational leadership theory passé? Revisiting the integrative effect of instructional leadership and transformational leadership on student outcomes.' *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 56(2), pp. 321-349.
- Latonen, S. H., Suominen, R. M., Juppo, A. M., Airaksinen, M., and Seeck, H. (2023) 'Organisation of cross-sector collaboration and its influence on crisis management effectiveness among pharmaceutical supply chain stakeholders during the COVID-19 pandemic.' *Public Health*, 222, pp. 196-204.
- Lennox, J., Reuge, N., and Benavides, F. (2021) 'UNICEF's lessons learned from the education response to the COVID-19 crisis and reflections on the implications for education policy.' *International Journal of Educational Development*, 85, p. 102429.
- Lewis, L. M., Badkar, A. V., Cirelli, D., Combs, R., and Lerch, T. F. (2023) 'The race to develop the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine: from the pharmaceutical scientists' perspective.' *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, 112(3), pp. 640-647.

- Lewis, L. M., Badkar, A. V., Cirelli, D., Combs, R., and Lerch, T. F. (2023) 'The race to develop the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine: from the pharmaceutical scientists' perspective.' *Journal of pharmaceutical sciences*, 112(3), pp. 640-647.
- Mburu, L. N., Ragui, M., and Ongeti, W. (2024) 'Influence of Transformational Leadership on Millennial Workforce Engagement in Compliant International NGOs in Kenya.' *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 13(2).
- McClellan, M., Udayakumar, K., Merson, M., and Edson, G. (2021) 'Reducing global COVID vaccine shortages: New research and recommendations for US leadership.' *Reducing Global COVID Vaccine Shortages: New Research and Recommendations for US Leadership*, 2021-04.
- Moldoveanu, M., and Narayandas, D. (2019) 'The future of leadership development.' *Harvard business review*, 97(2), pp. 40-48.
- National Institutes of Health. (2022) 'How Does Diversity Affect Innovation in Pharma?' <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK604147/>
- Nyarko, G., Marnicio, A., and Bollettino, V. (2024) 'Understanding leadership challenges faced by humanitarian aid workers: insights from the experiences of NNPHL training participants.' *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 9(1), p. 15.
- Ombrosi, N., Casprini, E., and Piccaluga, A. (2019) 'Designing and managing co-innovation: the case of Luccioni and Pfizer.' *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 22(4), pp. 600-616.
- Orbinski, J. (2018) 'AIDS, Médecins Sans Frontières, and access to essential medicines.' In *Civil Society in the Information Age* (pp. 127-138). London: Routledge.
- Paradis, E., O'Brien, B., Nimmon, L., Bandiera, G., and Martimianakis, M. A. (2016) 'Design: Selection of data collection methods.' *Journal of graduate medical education*, 8(2), pp. 263-264.
- Patel, P., Meagher, K., El Achi, N., Ekzayez, A., Sullivan, R., and Bowsher, G. (2020) 'Having more women humanitarian leaders will help transform the humanitarian system: challenges and opportunities for women leaders in conflict and humanitarian health.' *Conflict and health*, 14, pp. 1-15.
- Privor-Dumm, L., Excler, J. L., Gilbert, S., Karim, S. S. A., Hotez, P. J., Thompson, D., and Kim, J. H. (2023) 'Vaccine access, equity and justice: COVID-19 vaccines and vaccination.' *BMJ Global Health*, 8(6), e011881.
- Renyoet, C. C., Suryanti, M. S. D., and Muttaqin, M. Z. (2023) 'Humanitarian Action of United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) in Jayapura During the Covid-19 Pandemic.' *Insignia: Journal of International Relations*, 10(1), pp. 83-93.
- Reuge, N., Jenkins, R., Brossard, M., Soobrayan, B., Mizunoya, S., Ackers, J., ... and Taulo, W. G. (2021) 'Education response to COVID 19 pandemic, a special issue proposed by UNICEF: Editorial review.' *International Journal of Educational Development*, 87, p. 102485.
- Reza, M. H. (2019) 'Components of transformational leadership behavior.' *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(3), pp. 119-124.
- Saha, R., Shashi, Cerchione, R., Singh, R., and Dahiya, R. (2020) 'Effect of ethical leadership and corporate social responsibility on firm performance: A systematic review.' *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 27(2), pp. 409-429.
- Saleh, S., Brome, D., Mansour, R., Daou, T., Chamas, A., and Naal, H. (2022) 'Evaluating an e-learning program to strengthen the capacity of humanitarian workers in the MENA region: the Humanitarian Leadership Diploma.' *Conflict and Health*, 16(1), p. 27.
- Samarasekera, U. (2022) 'Challenges ahead for new UNICEF leader.' *The Lancet*, 399(10320), pp. 130-131.

- Sampat, B. N., and Shadlen, K. C. (2021) 'The COVID-19 Innovation System: Article describes innovations that emerged during the COVID-19 pandemic.' *Health Affairs*, 40(3), pp. 400-409.
- Santoso, N. R., Sulistyningtyas, I. D., and Pratama, B. P. (2022) 'Transformational leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic: Strengthening employee engagement through internal communication.' *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 01968599221095182.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2015) 'Research Methods for Business Students (7th New ed).' *Research methods for business students*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Shafique, I., and Kalyar, M. N. (2018) 'Linking transformational leadership, absorptive capacity, and corporate entrepreneurship.' *Administrative Sciences*, 8(2), p. 9.
- Siangchokyoo, N., Klinger, R. L., and Campion, E. D. (2020) 'Follower transformation as the linchpin of transformational leadership theory: A systematic review and future research agenda.' *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(1), p. 101341.
- Sommariva, S., Mote, J., Ballester Bon, H., Razafindraibe, H., Ratovoanany, D., Rasoamanana, V., ... and Sani, M. (2021) 'Social listening in Eastern and Southern Africa, a UNICEF risk communication and community engagement strategy to address the COVID-19 infodemic.' *Health security*, 19(1), pp. 57-64.
- Sreejesh, S., Mohapatra, S., Anusree, M. R., Sreejesh, S., Mohapatra, S., and Anusree, M. R. (2014) 'Business research design: Exploratory, descriptive and causal designs.' *Business research methods: An applied orientation*, pp. 25-103.
- Stier, B. G. (2024) 'Applying Steve Jobs's Insights on Innovation, Leadership, and Technology toward an Apple-Inspired Law School.' *Notre Dame JL Ethics and Pub. Pol'y*, 38, p. 217.
- Suprapti, S., Asbari, M., Cahyono, Y., Mufid, A., and Khasanah, N. E. (2020) 'Leadership style, organizational culture and innovative behavior on public health center performance during Pandemic Covid-19.' *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Research*, 1(2), pp. 76-88.
- Takalo, T., Laine, T., Hakko, H., Niemelä, M., and Räsänen, S. (2023) 'Evaluation of Psychometric Properties of a New Research Instrument for Measuring Collective Impact Based Cross-Sectoral Collaboration and Leadership: Oulu Collective Impact Study.' *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 2023(1), p. 2516746.
- Thorn, C. R., Sharma, D., Combs, R., Bhujbal, S., Romine, J., Zheng, X., ... and Badkar, A. (2022) 'The journey of a lifetime—development of Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccine.' *Current opinion in biotechnology*, 78, p. 102803.
- Turnnidge, J., and Cote, J. (2018) 'Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review.' *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16(3), pp. 327-342.
- Wang, D. C., Hall, M. E. L., Shannonhouse, L. R., Mize, M. C. B., Aten, J. D., Davis, E. B., ... and Annan, K. (2021) 'Why humility is vital to effective humanitarian aid leadership: a review of the literature.' *Disasters*, 45(4), pp. 797-818.
- Weintraub, R. L., Subramanian, L., Karlage, A., Ahmad, I., and Rosenberg, J. (2021) 'COVID-19 Vaccine To Vaccination: Why Leaders Must Invest In Delivery Strategies Now: Analysis describe lessons learned from past pandemics and vaccine campaigns about the path to successful vaccine delivery for COVID-19.' *Health Affairs*, 40(1), pp. 33-41.
- Yucel, I. (2021) 'Transformational leadership and turnover intentions: the mediating role of employee performance during the COVID-19 pandemic.' *Administrative Sciences*, 11(3), p. 81.

Zaman, M., Novitasari, D., Goestjahjanti, F. S., Fahlevi, M., Nadeak, M., Fahmi, K., ... and Asbari, M. (2020) 'Effect of readiness to change and effectiveness of transformational leadership on workers' performance during COVID-19 pandemic.' *Solid State Technology*, 63(1), pp. 185-200.