



THE INFLUENCE OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AND RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP ON INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOUR OF EMPLOYEES IN HIGHER INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING IN GHANA

Aliata Issahaq Mumuni¹,

George Obeng Appah²,

Kennedy Afenyo Biaku³ⁱ

¹Dean, Business School,
Department of Secretaryship and Management Studies,
Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University,
Wa, Ghana

²Assistant Head Master,
Department of Administration,
Achimota Senior High School,
Accra, Ghana

³Accountant,
Accounts and Finance Department,
Quantum LC Company Limited,
Accra, Ghana

Abstract:

This study studies the relationship between organisational climate, responsible leadership, and innovative behaviour and their subsequent impact on employee performance. The study uses hypothesis testing research design based on quantitative research designs and sampled 145 employees from Simon Diedong University of Business and Integrated Development Studies (SDD UBIDS) and Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Wa (DHLTU-Wa) in the Upper West region of Ghana. Key findings in this study are: (1) organizational climate has an insignificant positive effect on innovative behaviour (2) responsible leadership significantly and positively influences innovative behaviour (3) management systems and social environment do not significantly impact innovative behaviour (4) physical environment has a significant positive effect on innovative behaviour. The study reveals that organisational climate and responsible leadership are significant predictors of innovative behaviour, with a strong correlation (0.768) between these variables. The regression analysis shows that 59.1% ($R^2 = 0.591$) of the variance in innovation is explained by organisational climate and responsible leadership, while 40% is attributed to other factors. Overall, this quantitative study highlights the crucial role of responsible leadership and the physical environment.

ⁱ Correspondence: email balungma@yahoo.com, stappah@gmail.com, kenbiaku@gmail.com

Keywords: organisational climate, responsible leadership, employees, innovative behaviour, influence

1. Introduction

The conditions that make many employees feel comfortable in the workplace are the effective utilization of the organisational climate and responsible leadership. As Liman *et al.* (2017) emphasizes, effective leadership marks serving others by investing in employees' well-being to achieve shared goals. Employee performance, as opined by Sunari (2019), involves the quality and quantity of work accomplished by employees in fulfilling their assigned responsibilities.

Research (Hameed & Waheed, 2011) opined that the human resources of an organisation serve as its fundamental factor (Cohen & Karen, 2018). Enhancing the quality of human resource performance is, therefore, crucial to achieving predetermined goals and objectives. Two key drivers of improved human resources are characteristics of responsible leadership and innovative behaviour exhibited by employees (Omar, & Davidson, 2019). To deliver value to customers, organisations should, therefore, integrate their service strategy with internal management practices that foster a range of beneficial behaviour within the organisation (Kumar & Sharma, 2019).

There are numerous difficulties and challenges in managing organisational processes effectively and efficiently in order to achieve vision-mission statements and become competitive. Though organisations can face external challenges in regard to the behaviour of employees that they have recruited (Bos-Nehles *et al.*, 2017), innovation is the key factor for organisations as they are required to adapt to rapid environmental changes, innovative behaviour of employees therefore needs to be developed (Prieto *et al.*, 2014). Innovative work behaviour deals with employees developing, adopting, and implementing new ideas and work methods; this is considered an important determinant of organisational success (Yuan *et al.*, 2010). Innovative behaviour is critical to organisational effectiveness and survival, which ultimately leads to sustainable organisational development (Kumar & Sharma, 2019; Oldham *et al.*, 1996). The use of innovation has been used as a solution for organisations to overcome these challenges by creating a competitive advantage and improving employee performance (Storey, *et al.*, 2016).

According to research, the traditional hierarchical structures of public organisations often hinder innovation, prompting the need for employee-driven innovative behaviour (Bos-Nehles *et al.*, 2017). Among technological advancements and budget constraints, the public sector must deliver efficient services, requiring innovative solutions (De Vries *et al.*, 2016). To foster sustainable organisations, human resource policies should encourage innovative work behaviour through rewards and creative culture initiatives (Kim & Park, 2017). Effective innovation enables businesses to meet customer needs, ensuring organisational sustainability (Bos-Nethles *et al.*, 2017). Innovative work behaviour involves generating ideas to solve problems, driving growth

through entrepreneurship and continuous innovation (Bednall *et al.*, 2018 & Ireland *et al.*, 2009). Employee innovative behaviour is crucial for corporate entrepreneurship and improvement (De Jong & den Hartog, 2010). Key characteristics of innovative behaviour include employee risk-taking, facilitated by job characteristics that promote creative conduct (Hornsby *et al.*, 2009). Recent studies emphasize the importance of employee empowerment (Gol *et al.*, 2022), leadership support (Javed *et al.*, 2022) and organisational culture (Khan *et al.*, 2022).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Social Exchange Theory and Individual Behaviour

According to Saxton *et al.* (2016), human workplace interactions generate obligations where two or more people exhibit behaviour, and each is reinforced by the behaviour of the others. This kind of behaviour demonstration creates obligations for performance within an organisation on which the five Ps (Principle of Reciprocity, Principle of Equity, Principle of Cost-Reward, Principle of Alternatives, Principle of Investment) of social exchange theory are based. The following five propositions explain the behaviour and performance within employee-manager relationships and between individuals and team members as the success prepositions of strategy:

- 1) indicating that the more an action is rewarded, the more it is repeated
- 2) indicating that if a stimulus has led to a person's actions being rewarded, the person will likely repeat the actions
- 3) stating that if a person has received a particular reward often in the recent past, any further unit of that reward will be less valuable
- 4) indicating that if the result of an action is valuable to a person, it is more likely that the action will be performed
- 5) stating that in choosing between alternative actions, a person will choose the one perceived to be of the highest value based on the result and its probability (Hornans, 1961; Blau, 1964; Emerson, 1976).

Motivational theories also explain why individuals in working situations strive for specific goals or outcomes. Latham & Pinder (2005) view motivation as psychological forces driving behaviour. According to them, intrinsic motivation stands out as a crucial factor in psychological situations, making individuals desire to engage in activity for personal satisfaction, enjoyment or interest rather than external rewards or pressures (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Research studies again opine that self-efficacy emerges as a strong psychological tool for motivating human resources, aligning with motivational theories and practice (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy beliefs influence effort, persistence, and expectations, and the three components that comprise self-efficacy are:

- 1) judgment, which assesses capabilities,
- 2) dynamics, which mobilizes resources and

- 3) mobilization, which takes action. Intrinsic motivation's role in innovative behaviour is to impact job satisfaction and performance (Gao *et al.*, 2022).

2.1.2 Innovative Behaviour: A Process of Problem-Solving and Improvement

The concept of innovative behaviour is about creativity and improvement in the workplace. The study of Farr & Ford (1990) defines innovative work behaviour as “*the intentional introduction of new ideas, processes or procedures*”. Innovative behaviour involves creating and improving products, services or processes driven by risk-taking and creativity (Kanter, 1988). This concept has become essential for businesses as it enhances employees' future-oriented attitude and competitiveness (Shanker *et al.*, 2017). According to research, some of the factors that influence innovative behaviour are structural, psychological and social conditions, knowledge sharing and teamwork (Kanter, 1988), responsible leadership and support (Mustafa *et al.*, 2007 & Javed *et al.*, 2022). Recent studies also hold the view that factors influencing innovative behaviour at work are cognitive and emotional processes (Cristofaro, 2021) and organisational culture (Khan *et al.*, 2022).

2.1.3 Employee Innovative Behaviour: Individual Characteristics

The concept of individual differences plays a crucial role in shaping work performance, with certain characteristics influencing employee innovative behaviour (EIB) (Jalil *et al.*, 2015). Three key individual differences that drive employee innovative behaviour are:

- 1) self-leadership: the processing of motivating oneself, controlling behaviour, and leading oneself to achieve personal and organisational goals through cognitive and behavioural strategies (Manz, 1986),
- 2) self-efficacy: an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks,
- 3) proactive traits: the tendency to take initiative.

Opined by research, the effects of self-leadership on performance reveal that employees with high self-leadership motivate themselves regardless of the situation (Stewart *et al.*, 2011) and perceive self-benefit enhancing work engagement (Lovelace *et al.*, 2009).

According to Furtner *et al.* (2011), self-leadership can be observed at both team and individual levels, while Houghton *et al.* (2012) theorize self-leadership as a multidimensional measure consisting of three strategic categories, which are behavioural focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies.

2.1.4 Organisational Climate

The climate of an organisation refers to the functioning of the organisation as a whole from the perspective of employees (Astuti & Tantowi, 2017). The point of view with regard to organisational climate is the pattern felt in particular experiences and the behaviour of people in the organisation (Shafarila & Supardi, 2016). Organisational climate refers to an individual's perception of a set of descriptive characteristics that

distinguish an organisation and influence its innovative behaviour, which also includes a set of measurable traits of a work environment that is either directly or indirectly perceived by employees working in an organisational environment (Shafarila & Supardi, 2016).

2.1.5 Responsible Leadership

Leadership encompasses diverse perspectives on managing individuals and teams within organisation. Effective leadership involves influencing followers to achieve predetermined - goals through strategic guidance (Northouse, 2021).

According to Hersey & Blanchard (1988), situational leadership theory remains a seminal framework, emphasizing the importance of matching leadership style to follower maturity, and this approach recognizes leadership as a dynamic process requiring adaptability to foster growth and success.

2.1.6 Related Works

Understanding innovative work behaviour, research has categorised Innovative Work Behaviour (IWB) into three stages: idea generation, idea promotion and idea implementation (Mustafa *et al.*, 2007). According to them, innovative workers generate new solutions to problems, advocate for and share new ideas and execute and realised new ideas. Mustafa *et al.* (2007). They further argued that these stages represent distinct aspects of the innovation process and may be influenced by different antecedent factors. Trait activation theory explains how individual personality traits influence work behaviour and proposes that specific personality traits are activated by relevant work situations, leading to corresponding behaviour (Tett & Guterman, 2000). The key components are:

- 1) stable individual characteristics such as extraversion,
- 2) activation; work situations or cues that trigger trait-related behaviour,
- 3) behaviour; resulting in work behaviour such as leadership and teamwork (Tett, & Burnett, 2003) and opine that the implications for the trait activation theory can predict job performance, work situation and can activate or suppress trait-related behaviour

Another study on innovative work behaviour showed that personality traits in IWB predict different dimensions. Conscientiousness predicts particularly idea generation, promotion and realization for early-tenure employees; disclosure predicts idea generation for longer-tenure employees but has lower ratings for early-time employees; personality traits influence IWB differently depending on employee tenure (Woods *et al.*, 2013).

3. Material and Methods

This study is guided by the following hypothesis:

H1: Organisational Climate has no significant effect on the innovative behaviour of employee.

H2: Responsible leadership has no significant effect on the innovative behaviour of employee.

H3: Management system has no significant effect on employee performance.

H4: Physical environment has no significant effect on the innovative behaviour of employee.

H5: Social environment has no significant effect on the innovative behaviour of employee.

The study used a hypothesis testing research design, which is based on quantitative research designs and hypothesis testing (Sumaedi *et al.*, 2014), combined with a correlational research model. The correlational research model describes a current situation and investigates the correlation between two or more variables and the degree of this correlation (Gay *et al.*, 2012). It determines the impact of a variable on the other variable. In the present study, the impact of organisational climate and responsible leadership on the innovative behaviour of employees is investigated among employees of tertiary institutions of the Wa Municipality in the Upper West Region, Ghana.

3.1 Population and Research Samples

The population is the entire element to be suspected of its characteristics, while the sample is part of the population to be tested for characteristics (Sugiarto, 2018). The target population of the study is employees of SDD UDS and DHLTU, Wa, in the Upper West region of Ghana.

Leedy & Ormrod (2021) describe a sample as a subset of people or things chosen for analysis from a broader population. Sampling is the process of choosing respondents for the research. The term sampling in a study implies the process of obtaining all individuals (respondents) who will take part in a research study. Therefore, the research employed a simple random and purposive sampling of 145 employees from the tertiary institutions in the Wa Municipality to respond to the questionnaire with regards to organisational climate, and responsible leadership on innovative behaviour of employees.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 1: Correlation

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.768 ^a	.591	.576	.499

The table shows a strong correlation (0.768) between organisational climate, responsible leadership and innovative behaviour. The result also indicated the determination coefficient of the magnitude of $R^2 = 0,591$. Thus, the influence of (Predictors) on innovative behaviour is 59.1%. The remaining percentage (100% - 59.1% = 40.9%) is influenced by other factors, such as the management system's physical and social environment.

Table 2: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	49.985	5	9.997	40.088	.000 ^b
	Residual	34.663	139	.249		
	Total	84.648	144			
a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Behaviour						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Environment, Management System, Leadership, Physical Environment, Organisational Climate						

Based on Table ANOVA table shows the F test value of 40.088 and a significance value of (P. Value= 0.00 < 0.05). The significance value is less than the alpha (0.05). Hence, the decision is to reject the null hypothesis so it can be concluded that simultaneously, independent variables (organisational climate, responsible leadership and other predictors) significantly influence the innovative behaviour of employees.

Table 3: Regression 1

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.929	.932		5.292	.000
	Organisational Climate	-1.291	.248	-.312	-5.195	.000
	Leadership	1.027	.078	.786	13.092	.000

The coefficient for the regression equation is shown in Model 1:

$$I. \text{ Behaviour} = 4.929 - 1.291(\text{Organisational Climate}) + 1.027(\text{Responsible Leadership})$$

The constant's value of 4.929 states that if there is no increase in the value of the predictors, variables (organisational climate and responsible leadership), then the value of innovative behaviour is equal to 4.992. The coefficient of responsible leadership is 1.027. indicates that the increase in value of 1% of responsible leadership will increase innovative behaviour by 1.027. However, an increase in value of 1% of organisational climate will decrease innovative behaviour by 1.291. Again, when viewed from the value of significance, the P-values are less than alpha (0.05) so as to give the decision to reject

Ho, which concluded that responsible leadership and organisational climate variables have a significant effect on innovative behaviour.

Table 4: Regression 2

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.999	1.026		4.872	.000
	Organisational Climate	-1.349	.303	-.326	-4.450	.000
	Responsible Leadership	.908	.086	.694	10.540	.000
	Management System	-.025	.050	-.027	-.496	.621
	Physical Environment	.283	.082	.238	3.452	.001
	Social Environment	-.106	.238	-.034	-.447	.656

a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Behaviour

The additional predictor's coefficient for the regression equation is shown as Model 2:

$$I. \text{ Behaviour} = 4.999 - 1.349(\text{Organisational Climate}) + 0.908(\text{Responsible Leadership} - 0.025(\text{management systems}) + 0.283(\text{Physical environment}) - 0.106(\text{Social environment})$$

The constant's value of 4.999 states that if there is no increase in the value of the predictor variables (organisational climate and responsible leadership), then the value of innovative behaviour is equal to 4.999. The coefficient of responsible leadership is 0.908, which indicates that an increase in the value of 1% of responsible leadership will increase innovative behaviour by 0.908. However, an increase in value of 1% of organisational climate will decrease innovative behaviour by 1.359. The coefficient of the management system is -0.025, indicating that the increase in value of 1% of the management system will decrease innovative behaviour by 0.025. Next, an increase in the value of 1% of the physical environment will decrease innovative behaviour by 0.283, and an increase in the value of 1% of the social environment will decrease innovative behaviour by 0.106

Furthermore, when viewed from the value of significance, the P-values are less than alpha (0.05) so as to give the decision to reject the null hypothesis, which concluded that all predictors influenced innovative behaviour except management system and social environment with p-values greater than alpha value of 0.05 for which we failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 5: Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Influence	Standardized Coefficients B	t- Calculate	P- Value	Remarks
H1	Organisational Climate	-1.349	4.450	.000	Rejected
H2	Responsible Leadership	.908	-10.540	.000	Rejected
H3	Management System	-.025	-.496	0.621	Evident
H4	Physical Environment	0.283	3.452	.001	Rejected
H5	Social Environment	-.106	-.447	.656	Evident

The above table shows the remarks of the hypothesis indicating that only the management system and social environment failed to reject the null hypothesis, implying that both have no significant and do not influence the innovative behaviour of employees.

5. Recommendations

The study recommended that managers focus on effective leadership behaviour such as motivation, monitoring and evaluation of employees, considering employees' welfare and strategic creativity and finally, giving attention to recognition of the various activities of employees. Again, the study also recommends that management systems and social environment factors should be given the necessary attention and reviewed to improve the performance of employees. Future work is to consider the impact of innovative behaviour on employee job satisfaction. Aside from the various findings, little attention is given to the understanding of human thriving, self-employment and the relationship with innovative behaviour which reflects the cognitive learning and affective vitality foundations for personnel. The outcome of future work will manifest the significance of generated ideas for the improvement of an organisational vision or direction.

6. Conclusion

The study focused on the influence of organisational climate and responsible leadership on the innovative behaviour of employees in the tertiary institutions in Ghana, more specifically, the employees within the higher institutions -Simon Diedong University of Business and Integrated Development Studies (SDD UBIDS) and Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University- Wa (DHLTU) in Wa Municipality in the Upper West Region of Ghana. The study considers other predictors within the organisational climate, such as management systems and physical and social environment. The results indicated that management systems and social environments do not influence the innovative behaviour of employees. However, with regard to the main predictors, both organisational and responsible leadership influence the innovative behaviour of employees.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Almighty God for His divine guidance and blessings throughout our research endeavor.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the following individuals for their invaluable contributions towards the successful publication of this article: Sir Prof. Elias N.K. Sowley -the Vice Chancellor, Prof. Baba Insah- the Pro-Vice Chancellor of Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, for providing visionary leadership and an enabling environment that fostered our research.

Mr. Rashid Fadulilahi Ismail, Assistant Lecturer, Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Information and Communication Technology (FICT), Simon Diedong Dombo University of Business and Integrated Development Studies (SDD-UBIDS), for his expert technical guidance, meticulous review, and constructive feedback that significantly enhanced the quality of our manuscript.

Mr. Seidu Azizu, Teacher, Wenchi Methodist Senior High School, and PhD Candidate in Applied Mathematics, C.K. Tadam University of Technology and Applied Sciences (CKT-UTAS), Navrongo, for his vital contributions to data analysis and interpretation of results, providing insightful comments and suggestions during the conceptualization phase of our research and ensuring the accuracy and validity of our findings.

Their contributions have been instrumental in shaping our research and ensuring the accuracy, validity, and relevance of our findings.

We also appreciate the support and resources provided by Dr. Hilla Liman Technical University, SDD-UBIDS, and CKT-UTAS.

Thank you for your selfless contributions.

May God reward you abundantly.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author(s)

Aliata Issahaq Mumuni holds her PhD in Management. She is a Senior Lecturer at Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, Wa a teacher by profession. She is currently the Dean for Business School at Dr. Hilla Limann Technical University, WA. She is a distinguished academic and researcher with expertise in management, business and entrepreneurship studies.

Rev. Fr. George Obeng Appah (PhD) is a Catholic Priest and an educationist. He is currently the Assistant Headmaster, Administration of Achimota School. He holds a BA in Sociology and Religions from the University of Ghana Legon, BA in Sacred Theology from the Pontifical Urbaniana University, Rome, Med in Guidance and Counselling from the University of Cape Coast, MA in Religious Studies and Pastoral Ministry from the Catholic University of Ghana, MBA from the Open University of Malaysia and Doctorate in Business Administration from the Swiss Management University, Switzerland.

Kennedy Afenyo Biaku is a committed financial administrator with a strong background in finance and management, holding multiple qualifications, including a PGD, DBA, MSc, BSc, and HND, and currently pursuing a PhD. He works as an Accountant at Quantum LC Company Ltd. and a part-time lecturer at the University of Education and the University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

References

- Amo, B. W. (2006). The influence from corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship on white-collar workers' employee innovation behaviour. *International journal of innovation and learning*, 3(3), 284-298. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2006.009223>
- Astuti, H. W., & Tantowi, R. (2017). The Effect of Organisational Climate on Employee Performance at Pt. Bank Danamon Simpan Pinjam Unit Metro. *Darmajaya Business Journal*, 3(2), 163-172. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.darmajaya.ac.id/index.php/JurnalBisnis/article/view/878>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman and Company. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1997-08589-000>
- Bednall, T. C., A. E. Rafferty, H. Shipton, K. Sanders and C. J. Jackson (2018). Innovative behaviour: how much transformational leadership do you need? *British Journal of Management*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12275>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *The social foundations of thought and action*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-98423-000>
- Bharadwaj, S., and Menon, A. (2000). Making innovation happen in organisations: individual creativity mechanisms, organisational creativity mechanisms or both? *J. Prod. Innov. Manage.* 17, 424–434. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782\(00\)00057-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0737-6782(00)00057-6)
- Bos-Nehles, A., Bondarouk, T., & Nijenhuis, K. (2017). Innovative work behaviour in knowledge-intensive public sector organisations: the case of supervisors in the Netherlands fire services, *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* 28(2) (2017) 379–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244894>
- Carmeli, A., Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behaviour at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1), 75-90. Retrieved from <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/01437720610652853/full/html>
- Cropanzano, R. and M. S. Mitchell (2005). Social exchange theory: an interdisciplinary review, *Journal of Management*, 31, pp. 874–900. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>
- Cristofaro, M. (2021). Organisational sensemaking: a systematic review and a coevolutionary model. *Eur. Manag. J.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2021.07.003>
- De Jong, J. P. J. and D. den Hartog (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19, pp. 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x>
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Innovative work behaviour: Measurement and validation. *EIM Business and Policy Research*, 1-27. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23528607_Innovative_Work_Behaviour_Measurement_and_Validation

- De Vries, H., Bekkers, V., & Tummers, L. (2016). Innovation in the public sector: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Public Administration*, 94(1), 146–166. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12209>
- Furtner, M. R., Rauthmann, J. F., & Sachse, P. (2011). The self-loving self-leader: An examination of the relationship between self-leadership and the Dark Triad. *Social Behaviour and Personality: An International Journal*, 39(3), 369-379. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2011-11727-008>
- Hornsby, J. S., D. F. Kuratko, D. A. Shepherd and J. P. Bott (2009). Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions: Examining perception and position, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, pp. 236–247
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.
- Houghton, J. D., & DiLiello, T. C. (2010). Leadership development: the key to unlocking individual creativity in organisations. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*, 31(3), 230-245. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-08452-003>
- Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., and Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for creativity: a quantitative review. *Creative. Res. J.* 19, 69–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10400410709336883>
- Idrus, H. and Salleh, R. (2017). Perceived self-efficacy of Malaysian ESL engineering and technology students on their speaking ability and its pedagogical implications. *The English Teacher*, 15. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277876311_PERCEIVED_SELF-EFFICACY_OF_MALAYSIAN_ESL_ENGINEERING_AND_TECHNOLOGY_STUDENTS_ON_THEIR_SPEAKING_ABILITY_AND_ITS_PEDAGOGICAL_IMPLICATIONS
- Ireland, R. D., J. G. Covin and D. F. Kuratko (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33, pp. 19–46. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00279.x>
- Joost, B. & van der Horst, E. (2019). Innovative Work Behaviour: To What Extent and How Can HRM Practices Contribute to Higher Levels of Innovation Within SMEs? <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.68433>
- Jalil, S. W., Achan, P., Mojolou, D. N., and Rozaimie, A. (2015). Individual characteristics and job performance: Generation y at SMEs in Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 170(27), 137-145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.023>
- Kanter, R. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: structural, collective, and social conditions for innovation in organisations. In Staw, B.M. and Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in Organisational Behaviour* (pp. 169-211). Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Research_in_Organizational_Behavior.html?id=RKkxJnn73UoC&redir_esc=y

- Kaplan, S. (2008). Framing contests: strategy making under uncertainty. *Organ Sci.* 19, 729–752. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1070.0340. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25146214>
- Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 284–296. Retrieved from <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/EUM0000000005660/full/html>
- Liman, H., Yaphar, N. L., & Widjaja, D. C. (2017). Analysis of the Influence of Servant Leadership on Employee Job Performance at Hotel X Surabaya. *Journal of Hospitality and Management Services*, 5(1), 1-15. Retrieved from <https://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/manajemen-perhotelan/article/view/5234>
- Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. 2005. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the 21st Century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 485-516. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142105>
- Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C. C. and Alves, J. C. (2007). Work stress and leadership development: The role of self-leadership, shared leadership, physical fitness and flow in managing demands and increasing job control. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(4), 374-387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.08.001>
- Litchfield, R. C., Ford, C. M., and Gentry, R. J. (2015). Linking individual creativity on organisational innovation. *J. Creat. Behav.* 49, 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.65>
- Liu, Y., Wang, W., and Chen, D. (2019). Linking ambidextrous organisational culture to innovative behaviour: a moderated mediation model of psychological empowerment and transformational leadership. *Front. Psychol.* 10:2192. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02192>
- Manz, C. (1986). Self-leadership: toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organisations, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 585-600. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1986-28794-001>
- Manz, C., Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. P. (2003). Self-Leadership and Super Leadership: The Heart and Art Facilitating Shared Leadership. In *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership* (pp. 123-140) <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452229539.n6>
- Mumford, M. D., Gaddis, B. H., and Connelly, S. (2003). How creative leaders think: Experimental findings and cases. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4), 411-432. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-09618-002>
- Mustafa, W. S. A. M., J. Anderson, N., and Sayer, B. (2007). Innovative work behaviour and personality traits Examining the moderating effects of organisational tenure, *J. Manag. Psychol.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 29–42, (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-01-2017-0016>

- Oldham, G.R & Cummings A. (1996). Employee creativity: personal and contextual factors at work, *Acad. Manag. J.* 39(3) 607–634. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-01923-003>
- Paul, H., & Kenneth H. B. (1988). *Management of Organization Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Management_of_Organizational_Behavior.html?id=xBVZAAAAYAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Pieterse, A. N., Van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M., and Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behaviour: the moderating role of psychological empowerment. *J. Organ. Behav.* 31, 609–623. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.650>
- Prieto, I. & P´erez-Santana, M. (2014). Managing innovative work behaviour: the role of human resource practices, *Person. Rev.* 43(2) 184–208, <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-11-2012-0199>.
- Scott, S., & Bruce, R. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace, *Acad. Manag. J.*, vol. 37, no. 580–607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256701>
- Stewart, G. L., Courtright, S. H., & Manz, C. C. (2011). Self-leadership: A multilevel Review. *Journal of Management*, 37, 185-222. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206310383911>
- Storey, C., Cankurtaran, P., Papastathopoulos, P., & Hultink, E. J. (2016). Success factors for service innovation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 33(5), 527–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12307>
- Kim, W., & Park, J. (2017). Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organisational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behaviour for sustainable organisations. *Sustainability*, 9(2), 205. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9020205>
- Saxton, T., C. L. Wesley and M. K. Saxton (2016). Venture advocate behaviours and the emerging enterprise, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10, pp. 107–125. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1212>
- Scott, S. G., and Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: a path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Acad. Manage. J.* 37, 580–607. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/256701>
- Shafarila, Asri Wahyuni & Supardi, Endang (2016). Organisational Climate and Work Motivation as a Result of Employee Performance. *Journal of Office Management Education*, 1(1).
- Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Van Der Heijden, B., and Farrell, M. (2017). Organisational climate for innovation and organisational performance: the mediating effect of innovative work behaviour. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 100, 67–77. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2017-22284-007>

- Sugiarto, I. (2018). Organisational Climate, Organisational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance. *Diponegoro International Journal of Business*. 1(2), 112-120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14710/dijb.1.2.2018.112-120>
- Sumaedi, S., Bakti, I. G. M. Y., Astrini, N. J., Rakhmawati, T., Widiarti, T., & Yarmen, M. (2014). *Public Transport Passengers' Behavioural Intentions: Paratransit in Jabodetabek-Indonesia*. Springer Singapore. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-4585-24-8>
- Sunarsih, Nenah & Helmiatin (2017). Influence of Organisational Climate, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, 6, Supplementary Issue 1. Retrieved from http://sibresearch.org/uploads/3/4/0/9/34097180/riber_6-s1_sp_s17-034_262-276.pdf
- Tett, R. P., & Burnett, D. D. (2003). A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 500-517. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2003-00755-013>
- Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.)*. Harper and Row. Retrieved from https://books.google.ro/books/about/Statistics.html?id=W7rAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Yuan, F., & Woodman, R. M. (2010). Innovative behaviour in the workplace: the role of performance and image outcome expectations, *Acad. Manag. J.* 53(2) (2010) 323–342. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-10207-005>
- Woods, S. Lievens, F. De Fruyt, F., & B. Wille, B. (2013). Personality across working life: the longitudinal and reciprocal influences of personality on work, *J. Organ. Behav.*, vol. 34, pp. 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1863>

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain copyright to their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Management and Marketing Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).