Journal of Capital Development in Behavioural Sciences Vol. 7 Issue 2 (September, 2019)
Faculty of Arts & Education, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria
***ISSN Online:** 2449-0679 **ISSN Print:** 2354-3981*

Self-Efficacy, Academic Buoyancy and Attitude towards Research among University of Ibadan Graduating Education Students

Sabina N. **OBI**

sabinaobi27@gmail.com
Lead City University, Ibadan

Abstract
The study focused on the relationship among self-efficacy, academic buoyancy and attitude towards research among University of Ibadan graduating education students. The study employed a descriptive research design of correlational type. A sample of ninety seven male and female final year students was selected using the purposive sampling technique. Data were collected with the use of a questionnaire containing the General Self-efficacy scale by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995), the Academic buoyancy scale by Martin and Marsh (2008) and the Attitude Towards Research Scale by Papanastasiou (2005). The three scales yield internal consistency Cronbach alpha coefficients of 0.78, 0.84 and 0.73 respectively. The findings reveal that attitude towards research among graduating university students is positively related to their levels of self-efficacy ($r = 0.154$, $p<.05$) and academic buoyancy($r = 0.084$, $p<.05$). Also, there is no significant difference in the attitude towards research of male and female graduating university students ($0.407>0.05$). It is recommended that self-efficacy and academic buoyancy among university students should be fostered through therapeutic interventions so that their attitude towards research can be improved on.

***Keywords:** Self-efficacy; Academic buoyancy, Attitude towards research, University of Ibadan graduating education students*

Introduction
Attitude towards research in this study is conceptualised as graduating students' dispositions to statistics, research method courses and research projects execution as compulsory courses in their professional training. From earlier empirical studies and observations of final year students in the Faculty of Education, students do not view research methods

courses, statistics and project writing in a favourable way. Their attitude towards these areas of their training is rather poor, and does not show interest even in future endeavours. The implication of this is that if and when these students become teachers and lecturers, they will not impart the right knowledge and attitude on their students. For the graduates of education who will work in research institutes, and other spheres of life, the pattern of attitudinal disposition that they had as foundation may be displayed at their jobs. Attitude towards research, whether positive or negative might not be found to exist on its own in most cases, it might co-exist with other personal, psychological and contextual factors resident in or around individual university student. Attitude towards research can be described as an effective feeling and reply towards research (Hussain, Qayyum, Akhter, Abid & Sabir, 2016). The reported negative attitude of students towards research may affect academic confidence and the learning/achievement of other courses in the university. Attitude towards research among final year students may have links with their self-efficacy levels or levels of academic buoyancy. Fear of failure, negativity, stress, feeling ineffectively prepared or unable to do, and disinterest are described in the various studies concerning attitude towards research among university students (Hussain, et. al., 2016). Fraser (2009) distinguishes that students who juggle numerous aspects of living are particularly susceptible to deteriorating interest and lower confidence in undertaking study efforts. Life experiences of graduating university students may pose different challenges in their education and schooling, creating varied levels of confidence, beliefs and resilience in them. In the Faculty of Education, carrying out researches at the final year is an imperative facet of all prospective educators' professional training. The fundamental rationale of research project course in education curricula is to widen the expertise and capabilities of prospective educators, and to sustain focus and optimistic attitude towards research both on the university campus and in the larger communities.

This assertion nevertheless, does not neglect the fact that some psychological constructs might have some build up in the development and sustenance of traits of attitude towards research among university students. Negative/poor attitude towards research may spell doom for

students' academic engagement, confidence, lecturer-student relationship, academic outcomes, sense of independence, belief in one's ability and general feeling of worth and identity. Therefore, strengthening these variables in students generally could add to the level of positive attitude towards research especially. As viable as research methods, statistics and research efficacy are, sense of self-efficacy and level of academic buoyancy resident in final year students could go a long way in influencing positive or negative attitude towards research. Emphasising the importance of research, encouraging students, and providing a research friendly and supportive environment have been identified as increasing the research interest of students (Kirk & Rosenblatt, 1981; Pan & Tang, 2005; Secret et al., 2003). Research friendly and supportive environment could also be about supportive faculty members and research project supervisors who guide students and enhance the quality of their research works. Good research works and their outcome/ reports and recommendations when put to use generally facilitate capacity building ventures which drive sustainable development in any society. Researches could drive the overall development and growth of any nation that keys into genuine researches. Ground-breaking researches are not done without keying into information and communication technology which are pivotal aspects of the fourth industrial revolution globally.

Many studies (Bandele & Adebule, 2013; Papanastasiou, 2013; Munir, Bolderston, & Fcamrt, 2009; Ojo, 2007) have explored the attitude towards research and research methods courses among both undergraduates and post graduate students in universities and have found out that most students have negative attitudes towards research. This is probably because research has both theory and practice aspects, and it is laden with some detailed tasks like reading, comparing and contrasting literature, going out for field works getting data (primary and or secondary), analyses and interpretation and rigorous aspects of discussion and logical thinking. Learning ordinarily is a task, while research project writing, research methodology courses/training, and statistics add to the already tasking nature of learning especially at the final year. Research project execution may carry a message of fear appeal sometime, when advisors and supervisors do not handle students well and expect extra-

ordinary results from students whom they may not have engaged consistently in research education. This could induce a negative attitude towards research among graduating students, also considering time cost, money cost, and other sacrifices students make in research projects writing and execution. At the final year, many graduating students are agitated, anxious and uncertain about many issues. Two out of these issues are: grades and classes of degree issues, and facing the future after graduation. The fear of facing a future which many final year undergraduates consider uncertain might make them develop a negative attitude towards research and any other tasking course at the final year. There are gaps in literature in this line of research enquiry which might be responsible for the waning of research competences among university students. There is at present, contract project writing businesses, more of religious/denominational groups formations all over university campuses in Nigeria instead of formations of research groups, there are more ethnic/tribal groups than having students investigative journalism groups, little or no students pressure groups insisting on sustainable development from research/training. Generally nowadays, young people (including university students) are comfortable with the status quo instead of being interested in a new research-driven world order. From observation, the Nigerian society in general is not really a research-oriented one; research policies are not well put in place, and scientific methodology is not well-adapted to daily life. No society can develop if researches are not well carried out in terms of quality and quantity, and recommendations put to use by concerned stakeholders. There are possible psychological correlates of attitude towards research among university students (undergraduates). Two of them are self-efficacy and academic buoyancy. There is a dearth of empirical researches in the area of confirmation of significant relationships among self-efficacy, academic buoyancy and attitude towards research. This present study therefore, aims to examine the relationships among the variables of interest in this study.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as an individual's judgment or beliefs about his/her capability to successfully carry out a specific task or perform certain

behaviours. Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara and Pastorelli (1996) contend that self-efficacy can influence a person's life in diverse ways. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy is defined as self-judgment about his/her capacity to manage successfully by organising required activities in order to display his/her performance. Zimmerman (2000) opines that students with high self-efficacy are eager to learn and are persevering and show more resilience to tackle problems. Bandura (1997) states that self-efficacy is the main construct in social learning theory and described it as the disposition of an individual that impels his/her to be successful in specific ventures (Bandura, 1997; Zimmerman, 1995). According to Bandura, self-efficacy affects the way people think, feel and motivate (Bandura, et. al., 1996). Erdem (2015) contends that self-efficacy is determinative of the levels of endeavouring and being persistent of a student under conditions.

The four sources of self-efficacy are experience, like being successful or unsuccessful; emotional and physical conditions, like fear, excitement, observing others; experiencing, and witnessing success; and verbal conviction of family, friends and colleagues (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy beliefs are fed from these sources and affect the performance, exertion of power and the individual's struggles to succeed (Kuchkyilmaz, & Duban, 2006).

Students who are confident about their research skills and competences expect high grades after project execution and defence, and look forward to a future which is achievements-filled. Bandura (1977) emphasises that success is not only related to the required skills of a student to do the work, but also to the need of self-compliance along with the skills. Research is methodological, it is not done haphazardly, and so students must follow the sequence of research steps in order to arrive at a logical conclusion and contribute to knowledge. To successfully do researches as a graduating student, there must be strong belief in one's capability and rising above challenges and setbacks that present themselves in the course of doing a research work.

Academic Buoyancy

Academic buoyancy is the ability to withstand and respond successfully to the types of challenges and setbacks associated with routine school

life, such as competing deadlines, examination pressure and poor grades (Martin & Marsh, 2008a). For graduating students, deadlines would also include research proposals and research projects submission and defence deadlines. Academic buoyancy is distinct from academic resilience, which can be defined as "a student's capacity to overcome acute or chronic adversities that are seen as major assaults on educational processes." (Martin & Marsh, 2009, p.353). Academic resilience has to do with means to an end in the educational pursuit, while academic buoyancy talks about specific routine activities within the educational endeavours such as formative assessments (assessment for learning or continuous assessment tests), summative assessment (assessment of learning or examinations), projects, field trips, practicum, seminar presentations and turning in of term papers. Academic buoyancy is relevant to the majority of students and is relevant to everyday academic challenges such as examination pressures, whereas academic resilience is relevant to a minority of students (e.g. school refusers) and is relevant to more extreme, adverse experiences such as being bullied (Martin & Marsh, 2009). According to Martin, Ginns, Brackett, Malmberg and Hall (2013), the distinction between the two concepts has been demonstrated empirically. For example, buoyancy correlates more strongly with low-level negative outcomes such as academic anxiety, uncertain control and failure avoidance, whereas resilience correlates more strongly with more severe negative outcomes such as disengagement from schooling (Martin et. al., 2013).

Academic buoyancy is positively related to a range of adaptive educational outcomes including enjoyment of school, class participation, academic self-efficacy, planning, persistence, control and low academic and test anxiety (Martin et. al., 2013; Martin & Marsh, 2008a; Martin, Colmar, Davey & Hall, 2010; Putwain, Connors, Symes & Douglas-Osborn, 2012; Putwain & Daly, 2013). Adaptive educational outcomes such as attitude to statistics and research methods as a course and as a project work could be related to academic buoyancy because, when students are academically buoyant, they are more likely to weather any academic storm and develop positive attitude towards any specific aspects of their schooling, including research.

Attitude towards Research

Attitude connotes a behavioural predisposition towards an object, a situation, a person, or an event, either to like or dislike such. Attitude can be developed from experience or natural preferences or learnt from social intercourses in the environment. According to Bandele and Adebule (2013), some researchers like Aborisade (2008), Adebule (2002), and Idu (1988) indicate many but similar patterns of attitude formation, that the main sources of attitude include assimilation from the environment, emotional effects of certain kinds of experiences and direct intellectual processes. Research drives creativity, innovation and sustainable development, it also points to areas of needs of a society in the nearest future. Research work demands clear understanding of what is to be done, it methodical, it needs structured effort and skills from final year students. It builds on existing data, which require adequate use of textbooks, journals and library facilities (Bandele & Adebule, 2013). Educational research is conducted to increase human knowledge, solve contemporary problems, create basis for decision making, make new discoveries, enhance contemporary status evidence, aid educational innovations and improve educational services (Bandele, 2004). However, Ojo (2007) observes that there are symptoms of downward trend in research performance and that the gold standards of excellence that were explicitly sought by elitist universities have gradually been compromised. Studies have shown that attitude has strong influence upon behaviour, kinds of satisfaction and value which individuals choose (Idu, 1988).

Reynolds and Walberg (1992) acknowledge that attitude had a significant force on educational attainment of students. Though, contradictory to this argument, there were other researchers disagreeing that attitude of students might not be consistent to educational attainment (Hung, 2005). Research showed that students typically tend to view research-related courses with negative attitudes and feelings (Munir et al. 2009; Papanastasiou, 2005).

One of the main problems of these negative attitudes is that they have been found to serve as obstacles to learning (Papanastasiou, 2005). Rezaei and Zamani-Miandashti (2013) submit that students' attitude influences how they mentally approach research including all the work

related to that research. According to the authors, a positive attitude enables students to solve the problem quickly whereas; a negative attitude hampers the efforts in research. A research inquiry into correlates of attitude towards research, especially self-efficacy beliefs and levels of academic buoyancy could assist in knowing how to improve students' attitude towards research when these psychological correlates are strengthened. The strength and direction of psychological correlates of attitude towards research when explored and studied could point future empirical researches to the areas of need in terms of interventions, so that positive attitude towards research could be fostered among undergraduates. Research skills and competencies among undergraduates would rub off on other courses they take in the university and even on endeavours outside education and schooling. This study, therefore aimed at exploring the possible links attitude towards research might have with self-efficacy and academic buoyancy.

Statement of the Problem

There is a dearth of empirical researches in educational psychology and related fields on the relationship among the three constructs. This has hampered necessary recommendations needed to be made and utilized in order to boost research skills, knowledge and competences among university students. Even, research efficacy which is a domain specific self-efficacy construct could be fostered among university students when studies like the present one are conducted on our university campuses. When undergraduates are not self-efficacious, there are so many consequences for their academics and general life functioning ranging from low academic confidence, low quality of school life, wrong choice of career, low level of learning effectiveness, to lack of self-development. Students who are not academically buoyant might record low academic outcome, poor social competence and low motivations in life. Poor attitude to research might result in general negative attitude towards overcoming challenges in life because aptitude in the school system could connote high functioning in the future endeavours in the society. It is in view of these that this study seeks to examine the relationship among self-efficacy, academic buoyancy and attitude towards research among University of Ibadan graduating education students.

Hypotheses

The following directional null hypotheses were formulated and tested in this study at 5% level of significance:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between the independent variables (self-efficacy and academic buoyancy) and attitude towards research among graduating university students.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in attitude towards research between male and female graduating university students.

Methodology

Design and Participants

This study adopted the descriptive research design of correlational type. The researcher did not manipulate any of the variables in the study. The relationship among variables, and significant difference between participants were studied as they existed in the participants as at the time of the study. The participants comprised of final year (graduating) university students in the University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria, specifically in the Faculty of Education.

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample for the study consisted of ninety seven male and female final year students (graduating) from the population of two hundred and eighty-one. The participants were drawn from the Faculty of Education, University of Ibadan. One hundred questionnaires were administered in total, but only ninety-seven questionnaires were correctly filled and found suitable for analyses. The sample was drawn using the purposive sampling technique to select only final year students from the Faculty of Education, excluding special students from the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation Sciences. The participants were captured during a general (Faculty) lecture, involving students in all the seven departments: Teacher Education (Arts and Social Sciences Education, Science and Technology Education and Early Childhood Education), Guidance and Counselling, Special Education and Rehabilitation Sciences, Library, Archival and Information Studies, Adult Education, Educational Management and Human Kinetics and Health Education. The consent

of the participants was sought before giving them the questionnaires to fill. Questionnaires were given to students who were willing and patient enough to fill the questionnaire on the spot after their lecture.

Instrumentation

Data were collected with the use of a Questionnaire titled Self-efficacy, Academic buoyancy and Attitude towards Research Questionnaire, and it contained three sections. Section A consisted of Demographic information only about the respondent's Gender. Section B contained: the General self-efficacy scale by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). The scale is a self-report measure of self-efficacy, with 10 items. Internal reliability for GSE = Cronbach's alpha between .76 and .90., in the present study the scale yields an internal consistency of .78; the Academic buoyancy scale by Martin and Marsh (2008) comprising of four items, with response rates ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 7- Strongly Agree, the scale yields an internal consistency of 0.84 in the present study; the Attitude Towards Research Scale by Papanastasiou (2005), it contains 28 items which are divided into five factors: research usefulness, research anxiety, positive attitudes, relevance to life, and research difficulties, with five-point Likert style response categories. The scale yields an internal consistency reliability coefficient of 0.73 in the present study. All the scales used in the study were adopted.

Method of Data Analysis

Data collected for this study were analysed using the Pearson's product moment correlation and T-test analyses at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Ho1: There is no relationship among self-efficacy, academic buoyancy and attitude towards research among graduating university students

Table Descriptive statistics and correlations among variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3
Attitude towards research	1.11	27.43	1.000		
Self-efficacy	24.26	3.02	.154*	1.000	
Academic buoyancy	13.31	.93	.084*	-.138	1.000

The table showed the correlation matrix of the relationship among the independent variables (self-efficacy and academic buoyancy) and attitude towards research. It was observed that self-efficacy ($r = 0.154$, $p<.05$); and academic buoyancy ($r = 0.084$, $p<.05$) had positive significant relationship with attitude towards research.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in attitude towards research between male and female graduating university students

T-test summary table showing significant difference in attitude towards research between male and female graduating university students

	N	**Mean**	**Std**	**Df**	**T**	**P**
Male	45	7.08	1.27	95	0.407	>0.05
Female	52	8.10	2.15			

The table showed that there was no significant difference in attitude to research between male and female undergraduates (0.407> 0.05).

Discussion

The first hypothesis stated that there is no significant relationship between the independent variables (self-efficacy and academic buoyancy) and attitude towards research among graduating university students. This hypothesis was rejected because results revealed that self-efficacy ($r = 0.154$, $p<.05$) and academic buoyancy ($r = 0.084$, $p<.05$) had positive significant relationship with attitude towards research. This indicates that the higher the self-efficacy beliefs and academic buoyancy of graduating university students, the more positive their attitude towards research is. The probable justification for this result is that as tasking and challenging as research is, self-confidence, high spirit, efficacy and beliefs in one's

ability could make a final year student face any academic work and record good outcomes. Graduating students have come a long way in their academic journey, so they must have achieved some feats in their endeavours, they could draw that efficacy belief in the past experiences and have faith that they can do it again when it comes to research and research-related tasks. Again, when students are academically buoyant, they tend to face any challenges with optimism, and courage, surmounting those challenges. Academic buoyancy of final year students must range between fairly good and excellent for them to advance up to the final year, thus they would be able to tackle any further challenging tasks as they had been tackling academic challenges and overcoming them.

This finding is in line with that of Davari, Danesh Kazemi, Aghili, and Mozafari (2015) who confirms that there was a significant and positive relationship between the overall scale of self-efficacy and research performance of college Dental students. Regarding the association of self-efficacy in research with research performance of dental students, it can be stated that awareness of the level of self-efficacy in research can lead to better planning for improving the research performance (Davari, *et. al*., 2015). Also, Shirbagi (2011) confirms that university postgraduate students' attitudes to research had a positive relationship with their research self-efficacy. Shirbagi (2015) also confirms that in term of self-efficacy, male students were more efficacious than the female students, while female postgraduate students are less concerned about the difficulties of research than their male counterparts.

Hypothesis two stated that there is no significant difference in attitude towards research between male and female graduating university students. The results showed that there was no significant difference in attitude towards research between male and female undergraduates ($0.407 > 0.05$). Thus this hypothesis was accepted. This finding connotes that male and female graduating university students do not differ in their attitudes towards research. This further means that being a male or a female student does not matter in the development and sustenance of either positive or negative attitude towards research in the university. The probable reason for this finding is that attitude as a psychological trait does not have gender preferences for universal issues like statistics,

research methodology and research among students. All students face the rigours of research equally, have the normal students' dispositions towards academic tasks, even though they may have different coping mechanisms.

The finding of this study corroborates the finding of Bandele and Adebule (2015) which confirms that the patterns of graduating students' attitude towards research work irrespective of the gender are very similar. Also, the findings support that of Ojo (2007) who submits that there was no significant difference in the mean dispositional scores of male and female graduating students to research. The finding of this study also corroborates that of Davari, *et. al*. (2015) which confirms that there was no statistical significant difference between the overall mean score and the score of seven parts of self-efficacy in research and research performance, in terms of sex (gender).

Conclusion

It is concluded from this study that, the higher the levels of self-efficacy and academic buoyancy resident in University of Ibadan graduating education students, the more positive their attitude towards research. Also, being a male or female graduating student does not influence attitude towards research. There is no gender difference in attitude towards research among graduating university students.

Limitation of the Study

Although the sample used in this study is small somewhat, only ninety seven University of Ibadan graduating education students out of the population (two hundred and eighty-one). Nevertheless, the finding of this study is still adjudged to be valid.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. University students need psychotherapeutic interventions in the area of self-efficacy training (including research efficacy) and ego bolstering. That 'can do' spirit needs to be geared up in undergraduates in the area of research and in other aspects of their professional training.

Faculty members who are counselling psychologists should assist in this area.

2. Resilience and academic buoyancy should be encouraged and fostered among university students, so they can rise above limiting challenges and excel no matter the setbacks encountered in the course of their educational pursuits.
3. Research fora, workshops, symposia, conferences and seminars should be organised by the Faculty (lecturers) to inspire university students' interests in research projects and increase positive attitude towards research.

References

Aborisade, O.J. (2008). Construction and Validation of Mathematics Attitudinal Scale for Secondary School Students. *An Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*.

Adebule, S.O. (2002). Development and Validation of an Anxiety Rating Scale in Mathematics for Nigerian Secondary Schools. *An unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*.

Bandele, S.O. (2004). *Educational Research in Perspective*. Ibadan: Niyi Commercial Ventures.

Bandele S.O., & Adebule S.O. (2013). Patterns of University Graduating Students' Attitude to Research work. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology (IJERT), 4*(3), 98-103.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review,* 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G.V, & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaced impact of self-efficacy beliefs on academic functioning. *Child Development,* 67, 1206-1222.

Davari A, Danesh Kazemi A, Aghili H., & Mozafari F. (2015). The Evaluation of Relationship between Self-efficacy in Research and Research Performance of Dental Student, of Yazd Dental College in 2014. *The Journal of Medical Education and Development (JMED), 10*(2), 129–137.

Erdem, E. (2015). The relationship between self-efficacy and attitude of Chemistry Teachers Candidates. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century,* 63, 62-70.

Fraser, H. (2009). Trying to complete socially just, politically sensitive social work research. *Journal of Social Work, 9*(1), 87–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.582459

Hung, H. L. (2005). Factors associated with the attitudes of nondisabled secondary school students toward the inclusion of peers who are deaf or hard of hearing in their general education classes. *Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University*, US.

Hussain, T., Qayyum, A., Akhter, M., Abid, N., & Sanir, S. (2016). A Study on Attitude towards Research among Technology Education Students in Pakistan. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 38* (2), 113-122.

Idu E.U. (1988). Development and Preliminary Validation of an Instrument for Measuring Attitudes towards Mathematics of Senior Secondary School. *An Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*.

Kirk, S. A., & Rosenblatt, A. (1981). Research knowledge and orientation among social work students. In S. Briar, H. Weissman & A. Rubin (Eds.), *Research utilization in social work education* (pp. 29–39). New York, NY: Council on Social Work Education.

Kuchkyilmaz, A., & Duban, N. (2006). Smif ogretmeni adaylarinm fen ogretimi oz-yeterlik inanclarinm artiri labilmesi icin almacak onlemlere iliskin gorusleri Yuzuncu Yil University. *Journal of Education, 3*(2), 1-23.

Martin, A.J., & Marsh, H.W. (2008). Academic buoyancy: Towards an understanding of students' everyday academic resilience. *Journal of School Psychology,* 46, 53-83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2007.01.002

Martin, A.J., & Marsh, H.W. (2009). Academic resilience and academic buoyancy: Multidimensional and hierarchical conceptual framing of causes, correlates and cognate constructs. *Oxford Review of Education, 35*(3), 353-370. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934639

Martin, A.J., Colmar, S.H., Davey, L.A., & Marsh, H.W. (2010). Longitudinal modelling of academic buoyancy and motivation: Do the 5Cs hold up over time? *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(3), 473-496. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709910X486376

Martin, A.J., Ginns, P., Brackett, M.A., Malmberg, L., & Hall, J. (2013). Academic buoyancy and psychological risk: Exploring reciprocal relationships. *Learning andIndividual Differences,* 27, 128-133. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.06.006

Munir, N., Bolderston, A., & Fcamrt, M. (2009). Perceptions and attitudes toward conducting research: A nuclear medicine student perspective. *Journal of Medical I. and Radiation Sciences,* 40, 183-189.

Ojo O.O. (2007). Attitude of University graduating Students to Research; Implications for Counselling. *Journal of Educational Foundations and Management, 5*(1), 1-8.

Pan, W., & Tang, M. (2005). Students' perceptions on factors of statistics anxiety and instructional strategies. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32*(3), 205–214.

Papanastasiou, E. C. (2005). Factor Structure of the Attitude Towards Research Scale. *Statistics Education Research Journal*, *4*(1), 16-26. http://www.stat.auckland.ac.nz/serj

Papanastasiou, E.C. (2013). Factor Structure of the Attitudes toward Research Scale. Online www.stat.auckland.ac.nz Assessed on 24/5/2013 www.academic.edu.

Putwain, D.W., & Daly, A.L. (2013). Do clusters of test anxiety and academic buoyancy differentially predict academic performance? *Learning and Individual Differences,* 27, 157-162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.07.010

Putwain, D.W., Connors, L., Symes, W., & Douglas-Osborn, E. (2012). Is academic buoyancy anything more than adaptive coping? *Anxiety, Stress & Coping: An International Journal, 25*(3), 349-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.582459

Reynolds, A.J., & Walberg, H.J. (1992). A structural model of science achievement and attitude: An extension to high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3), 371-382. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.371

Rezaei, M. and Zamani-Miandashti, N. (2013). The Relationship between Research Self-efficacy, Research anxiety and Attitude toward Research: A Study of Agricultural Graduate Students. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World, 3* (4), 69-78. ISSN: 2146-7463.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.

Secret, M., Rompf, E.L., & Ford, J. (2003). Undergraduate research courses: A closer look reveals complex social work student attitudes. *Journal of Social Work Education,* 39: 411–422.

Shirbagi N. (2011). A Survey of Kurdistan University Postgraduate Students' Attitudes to Research and Its Relationship with their Research Self-Efficacy. *Training & Learning Researches*, *2*(1), 67–80.

Zimmerman, B.J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), Self-efficacy in changing societies (pp. 46-68). New York: *Cambridge University Press.*

Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Self-Efficacy: An Essential Motive to Learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 82-91. ISSN:1999.1016.

Journal of Capital Development in Behavioural Sciences Vol. 7 Issue 2 (September, 2019)
Faculty of Arts & Education, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria
***ISSN Online:** 2449-0679 **ISSN Print:** 2354-3981*

Managers as Innovation Champions in Modern Organizations

Tolulope E. **ADENEKAN**
lizzadenekan@yahoo.com
+234 909 339 2575

Department of Office Information Management
Faculty of Environment, Management & Social Sciences
Lead City University, Ibadan
Oyo State

Abstract

People are the most important organizational assets and Managers remain at the forefront of leading or influencing the people towards achieving the organizational goals. Managers are so important to business success to the extent that organizations might not succeed without a competent manager. Modern organizations that wish to succeed must constantly practice innovation which a manager must champion, emphasizing knowledge management. This is necessary in Nigeria, a developing country struggling to meet up with the demand of globalization and advancement in information technology. This paper describes the role of Managers in Organizations: it compares the characteristics of the past managers with the present/future-oriented 21st Century managers of modern organizations. Existing literature was reviewed in the area under examination. The paper revealed that the attributes noted for innovation champions are just perfectly adequate for all managers of modern organizations. Thus, managers need to update their knowledge in this regard, strive to increase their capabilities and skills to align with this evolving professional trend and to meet up with new demands of globalization, information technology and knowledge management. The paper emphasizes the importance of Managers championing innovation management for competitive advantage and organizational success. It concluded by highlighting the basic skills needed by managers of modern organizations to champion innovation successfully. This will therefore drive optimal level of success in the organizations and society at large.

Keywords: Innovation, innovation champions, knowledge management, managers and modern organization

Introduction

Every business organization, schools, hospitals and government agencies require systematic management. Thus, whether we like it or not, managers touch lives in many ways. In today's world, managers are contending with changing roles, changing workplaces, changing technology, ethical issues, global economic uncertainties, political instability and security threats. All these, creates a mandate for a new kind of manager in the 21st century who is ready and willing to champion innovation i.e. leading implementation of new ideas in their various organizations.

Innovation is the key to continually achieve success to secure the future (Robbins & Coutler 2013). Innovation is a process of implementing new ideas introduced by creative persons to achieve a new or better products and services. Managing innovations in an organization requires the identification of employees that have the tendency to engage in creative and innovative behavior. It further involves understanding of how the organizational context influences their behavior while contributing to the hassle-free adoption and implementation of innovation (Jain, 2016). Hence, the importance of knowledge management as a concept of organizational knowledge, aimed at effective application of knowledge to make quality decisions which will eventually nurture innovation in the organization (Jelenic, 2011). Effective knowledge management is required to be able to identify those employees who are creative and innovative to be able to manage their innovation successfully. Managers have important roles to play in stimulating and nurturing innovation in business organizations. They are to act as innovation champions in the business organizations.

Innovation champions identify, recognize, and encourage people to come forward with their novel ideas, make sure that idea generators receive timely recognition and support. Thus, managers need to act as innovation champions, improve their skills and capabilities to effectively and efficiently manage all the resources that are available in the modern organizations towards achieving the set goals. Management is a universal concept and process but managers are faced with different working environment influenced by political, economic, social and technological factors. Employees in the work place are also from different tribal or

ethnic background and possess attitudes; traits, perceptions and thinking depending on the country where the work place exist. (Osunde, Ashima, Anup, Shankar 2015).

In a developing nation like Nigeria, managers of modern organizations tend to have more responsibilities in an unbalanced societal environment. It is perceived that employees of modern organizations in Nigeria may still be struggling to move from Douglas McGregor Theory X point of view; a negative and pessimistic view of employees' motivation and behavior that they dislike work, they are not ambitious, they are self-centered, they avoid responsibility and dislike change. Thus, managers of organizations in Nigeria are confronted with lots of challenges from the societal environment, economic, socio-cultural, political, legal and technological which directly affects their strategies and decision-making. To appropriately discuss the focus of the study, the paper is divided into six segments. The first segment is the introduction. The second segment concisely describes managers and the competencies required of them in organizations. The third segment discusses the evolving roles of Manager: comparing the characteristics of the past managers with the future-oriented 21st Century managers of modern organizations. The fourth segment talks about successful innovation management; emphasizing effective knowledge management, innovation processes cum innovation drivers. The fifth look critically into the specific focus of the paper – managers as innovation champions. The 21st century skills needed for managers to succeed in championing innovation in the workplace was detailed in the conclusion and last segment of the paper.

Managers and their Competencies

Management is the process of working with and through others to achieve organizational objectives in an efficient and ethical manner (Kreitner, Kinicki, & Buelens 2002). Management is also defined as a way of achieving goals that add the most value (Magretta, 2003). A manager is someone who coordinates and oversees the work of other people so that organizational goals can be accomplished. A manager's job is not about personal achievement; it's about helping others do their work. The dominant view in management theory and society in general is that managers are directly responsible for an organizations success or

failure. Managers need to creatively and actively sell bold new directions in an ethical and sensitive manner. Effective managers are team players, empowered by willing and active support of others who are driven by conflicting self-interests (Robbins & Coutler 2013). Good managers anticipate change, exploit opportunities, correct poor performance and lead their organizations (Kreitner, Kinicki, & Buelens 2002). A manager must be able to take charge of a business and overcome any obstacle in seeing that the organization achieves its goals. To be able to achieve this huge stake, a manager needs to possess the following personal key traits as highlighted by Robbins, Bergman and Stagg (2014):

1) Drive: Managers have a relatively high desire for achievement, they are ambitious, they have lot of energy, they are tirelessly persistent in their activities, and they show initiative
2) Desire to lead: Managers demonstrate the willingness to take responsibility.
3) Honesty and integrity: Building trusting relationships with workers by being truthful or non-deceitful and by showing high consistency between word and deed.
4) Self-confidence: Managers need to show self-confidence in order to convince workers of their rightness of their goals and decisions.
5) Intelligence: Managers need to be intelligent enough to gather, synthesize and interpret large amounts of information and they need to be able to create visions, solve problems and make correct decisions.
6) Job-relevant knowledge: Effective managers must have a high degree of knowledge about the company, industry and technical matters. In-depth knowledge allows leaders make well-informed decisions and to understand the implications of those decisions.
7) Extraversion: Managers are energetic and lively people.

Stream of research over the past 20years, by Clark Wilson and others cited in Kreitner, Kinicki, and Buelens (2002), has given us a practical and statistically validated profile of managerial skills that are very much in tune with today's emphasis on managerial competency. They are stated as follows:

1. Clarifies goals and objectives for everyone involved.
2. Encourages participation, upward communication and suggestions.

3. Plans and organizes for an orderly work flow.
4. Has technical and administrative expertise to answer organization-related questions.
5. Facilitates work through team building, training, coaching and support.
6. Provides feedback honestly and constructively.
7. Keep things moving by relying on schedules, deadlines and helpful reminders.
8. Controls details without being overbearing.
9. Applies reasonable pressure of goal accomplishment.
10. Empowers and delegates key duties to others while maintaining goal clarity and commitment.
11. Recognizes good performance with rewards and positive reinforcement.

Evolving Roles of Managers

The managerial shift of past managers to future managers is a necessity in the modern organization. Managers are recognizing that delivering consistent high-quality customer service is essential for survival and success in today's competitive environment and that employees are an important part of that equation (Dougherty & Murthy 2009). The implication is clear – managers must create a customer-responsive organization where employees are friendly and courteous, accessible, knowledgeable, prompt in responding to customer needs, and willing to do what's necessary to please the customer (Mayer, Ehrhart, Schneider 2009). Evolution of the 21st Century managers has made it possible for researchers to compare the characteristics of the past managers with the future managers. The table below is adapted from Kreitner, Kinicki, and Buelens (2002) in their World of Organizational behaviour.

	Past Managers	***Present Managers (futuristic)***
Primary role	Order giver, privileged elite, manipulator, controller	Facilitator, team member, teacher, advocate, sponsor, coach
Learning and knowledge	Periodic learning narrow specialist	Continuous life-long learning, generalist with multiple specialties
Compensation criteria	Time, effort, rank	Skills, results
Cultural orientation	Monocultural, monolingual	Multicultural, multilingual
Primary source of influence	Formal authority	Knowledge (Technical and interpersonal)
View of People	Potential Problem	Primary resource
Primary communication pattern	Vertical	Multidirectional
Decision-making style	Limited input for individual decisions	Broad-based input for joint decisions
Ethical considerations	Afterthought	Forethought
Nature of interpersonal relationships	Competitive (win-lose)	Co-operative (win-win)
Handling of power and key information	Hoard and restrict access	Share and broaden access
Approach to change	Resist	Facilitate

In view of the above and the content analysis of the literature, the characteristics of 21st century managers have been highlighted as follows:

- Team players relying on joint-decision making than formal authority.
- Engage in life-long learning
- Facilitate rather than resist change
- Share rather than hoard power and key information
- Multidirectional communicators

- Ethics will be a forethought rather than afterthought
- Generalists with multiple specialties

And the evolving role of managers as follows:

- Strategist: Strategist helps to define the company's goals and objectives by identifying opportunities.
- Change Agent: Change agent introduces new tools and techniques and organizational designs that will help achieve stated goals and objectives.
- Staff Professional: Staff professional is one who oversees the management of special projects and develops one time solutions that help pull the firm through a changing stretch.
- Politician: A politician is someone who is sensitive to the corporate culture and knows how to get the job done by working with the system.
- Integrator: Integrator is someone who melds existing application systems and technologies into solid platforms from which to run the business.

Innovation Management

Robbins and Coutler (2013) define creativity as the ability to combine ideas in a unique way or to make unusual associations between ideas while innovation is taking creative ideas and turning them into useful products or work methods. Creativity is concerned with the production of new ideas while innovation is concerned with the process that transforms those forward-looking new ideas into real world (commercial) products, services, or processes of enhanced value. Innovation would relate to human ability to intentionally change to meet new opportunities. Thus, innovation describes an intended change including having a common direction or vision, recognizing and deciding opportunities related to the vision, intentionally and effectively moving in a direction to achieve the objective (Akinboye, 2016). Innovation is important because it is a necessity to survive in a global competitive environment. Organizations must constantly innovate to be in front of and respond to market opportunities, competitive threats and changes in the business environment (Robbins & Coutler, 2013).

In order to win over their competitors, organizations require increasing innovation management competence at the level of entire organization and the employees across the cadres (Jain, 2016). An existence of all the innovation capabilities in an organization enhances effective innovative performance (Lawson & Samson, 2001). Innovativeness is an attribute that organizations must demonstrate over time. Globalization of world's economies and the resultant competition in markets requires managements of various organizations to set their contextual environment to motivate employees' innovation (Jain, 2016).

> *"Innovation should be embedded as a part of organizational culture and organizational people should be encouraged to contribute to generate novel ideas directly or indirectly as well as to involve in the process of adoption/implementation of such pool of novel ideas (innovation) to some or greater extent. While facing the challenge of implementation of innovation, organizations are dependent on the tacit and explicit knowledge, creative abilities, and engagement of the employees in such a process".* (Jain, 2016: 210)

Thus, implementation of innovation requires effective knowledge management. The organizations are forced to innovate and develop new techniques for improving the quality and functionality of products, reduce costs and, of course, the answer to the increasingly sophisticated customers' demands in order to survive in the market (Jelenic, 2011). Knowledge Management as defined by Holsapple and Joshi (2004) is an entity's systematic and deliberate efforts to expand, cultivate, and apply available knowledge in ways that add value to the entity in the sense of positive results in accomplishing its objectives. The entity's scope may be individual, organizational, trans-organizational, national, and so forth. Alavi and Leidner (2001) concluded that KM involves distinct but interdependent processes of knowledge creation, knowledge storage and retrieval, knowledge transfer, and knowledge application. The ultimate result of well-created process of knowledge management is that every employee in the company fulfill its mission, which reaches the corporate objectives and strategies, and identifies the most valuable knowledge from the "sea of information". It is not an easy task because it involves the management structure at the highest levels of management

(Jelenic, 2011). They are responsible for the processes of finding, selecting, organizing and presentation of information in a manner that promotes understanding of employees in a particular area of interests. Managers need to have a greater sense of invisible and intangible assets of people, featured in the minds and experiences of employees. Without these assets, organizations are unequipped with vision and ability to predict the future. The using of knowledge management process increases the effectiveness of decision-making processes, as well as the level of operational efficiency, flexibility, commitment and involvement of employees (Jelenic, 2011). The knowledge management process aims to support innovation and encourage the free flow of ideas through the company.

Jain (2016) has identified five sets of process/capabilities to influence adoption and implementation of innovation in organizations. They are employees' creativity & innovative behavior, innovation championing, organization's absorptive capacity, organization's capability for team working and Human Resources Management practices. In the context of this paper, emphasis will be on innovation championing which the researcher infers to be a compulsory attribute for managers of modern organization.

Innovation Drivers

Innovation drivers are those elements that make innovation work in organizations. Dooley and O'Sullivan (2000) differentiated between tangible and intangible elements that influence, direct, facilitate or hinder innovation. According to the authors, intangible elements like culture, personal schemas, resistance to change, politics, and fears, are normally underestimated in innovation management systems in comparison to more tangible elements such as the resource infrastructure and the information systems that support the innovation process itself.

The most common innovation driver in the literature reviewed is Innovation Strategy. Strategy includes the company's medium to long term vision regarding innovation, including the foresight about market and technological developments and an action plan to develop innovative capabilities to explore opportunities and defend against threats. An innovation oriented strategy is essential to the establishment of long

term directions for the innovative efforts (Kramer, Person, Wolpert, Craumer, Peebles, Drucker, Brown, & Levitt, 2003). At the same time, it tries to guarantee top management commitment to a path that can be perilous, dangerous, and risky, while setting adequate reward mechanisms that favour non conformity to current business practices. This driver also includes directives for resource management mechanisms that recognize the specificities of innovation projects (Damanpour, 1991; Wan, Chin & Lee, 2003).

Another very common innovation driver identified is the organizational culture. To Kocher, Kaudela Baum, and Wolf (2011), the organizational culture represents a guideline that orients stakeholders' expectations. Cormican and O'Sullivan (2004) describe organizational culture to be an orientation towards knowledge sharing. However, the authors mention that the organizational culture is not always an innovation driver per se, as it can also be a barrier to effective knowledge sharing and interpersonal information flows, with obvious negative consequences on innovation performance.

The third most commonly mentioned innovation driver was the organizational structure. Organizational structure is an all encompassing driver that includes mechanisms of structural complexity, decision making, formalization and distribution of power and assignment of roles to all involved. Similarly, this driver includes organizational procedures to regulate conflict resolution inherent to the innovative activity. Organizational structure must be flexible to encourage innovation champions and idea generators to relate with top management who are capable of implementing creative ideas.

Another key driver for innovation is management leadership. The leader influences, directly or indirectly, the individual behavior and commitment of all involved with innovation efforts. Effective innovation leaders combine personality traits, abilities, and attitudes that allow him or her to be recognized as visionary, sensitive to even the slimmest change in the business environment, and inspiring (Kramer et al., 2003; Mumford & Licuanan, 2004; Sun, Wong, Zhao, & Yam, 2012). Engaged and committed leaders are also essential in setting and maintaining innovation oriented organizational culture, structure, and strategy. This also buttresses

the researcher's view of a manager, as all top-level managers are leaders in their various organizations.

Knowledge Management can also be highlighted as a key innovation driver. Successful innovation requires a blend of market, consumer, and technical knowledge. The knowledge management function is responsible for fostering idea generation and the transformation of these ideas in a visible, positive result for the company. Effective knowledge management practices include knowledge development and acquisition, which allows internal knowledge development and external knowledge acquisition, as well as knowledge dissemination and accumulation, which leads to organizational learning, improved communication, and the creation and exploitation of intellectual capital (Wong and Chin, 2007). Indeed, an innovation driver identified in the literature reviewed that is closely related to knowledge management is Communication.

To Cormican and O'Sullivan (2004), innovation could be described as a process of information transformation and application in the right context, as appropriate information is reunited, processed, and transferred all over the company in support of idea generation, evaluation, and transformation into innovation projects. Effective communication management is essential to innovation.

Human Resources were also widely recognized as a key innovation driver. Successful management of innovation requires the management of people. Thus, the assembly and development of work teams that take into account the individuals' personalities, inclinations, attitudes and competences is critical to the innovative company. In particular, capabilities related to problem solving, communication, creativity, conflict resolution, experimentation and collaborative work are essential individual abilities in the context of innovation (Alpkan, Bulut, Gunday, Ulusoy & Kilic, 2010). Complementary to the human resources, Physical Resources were also mentioned in the literature reviewed. Combined with human resources, resources such as equipment and machinery allow to aggregate physicality to the ideas and concepts generated in the first stages of the innovation process. Moreover, technology can be interpreted as the embodiment of innovation, thus being essential to the latter phases of the innovation process. Dervitsiotis (2010) define physical resources for innovation as all the available resources that complete the organizational

knowledge and competences that drive the innovation process. In some innovation management system proposals, the interaction with regional and national innovation systems is considered a key driver (Galanakis, 2006; Llamas Sanchez, Munoz Fernandez & Maraver Tarifa, 2011; Ichimura, Ishii, Tuominen, & Piipo, 2003).

To Galanakis (2006), the national innovation system is composed by elements like the regulatory system, the national economic system, basic infrastructure (transport, energy, communications, etc.), demand conditions, and physical and human resources available. To interact with the national innovation system is a pre requisite for effective innovation in a changing context like Nigeria, where open innovation practices become more and more critical. Meanwhile, the innovation drivers permeate the whole innovation process in its various stages. The specific relationship between the drivers and the process stages will vary depending on the particularities of the company and the business sector it operates on. This is an important aspect that has to be investigated and customized wherever the system is actually implemented.

Managers as Innovation Champions

Business organizations today are in dire need for managers who not only can achieve efficient productivity, but also who possess technical, human and conceptual skills that make them sensitive toward not only market needs for goods and services, but also speedily respond to other environmental factors that are continuously changing (Moghrabi, Sharabati & Khader 2014).

Champions of innovation are individuals who take a lead in bringing forth and implementing creative ideas of themselves or others. They show conscientiousness and enthusiasms while pursuing new product ideas, evolving the ideas into innovations and eventually bringing them to market (Mansfeld, Holzle, &Gemunden, 2010).

Innovation champions also serve as role models to the organizational people to provide inspiration, support their ideas, and the facilitation required to excel. Champions of innovation question the status quo, voice contrary views, and push enterprise leaders to think and do things differently (Howell, 2005). Team work is also very important in influencing overall ability of the organization to innovate (Muthusamy,

Wheeler & Simmon, 2005). People that work within teams seldom function better that those working by themselves (Whetten & Cameron, 2011).

Mansfeld, Hozle and Gemunden (2010) found that innovation champions are characterized by a need for autonomy and an intrinsic form of motivation and they show significantly higher level of altruism than others. Innovation champions are willing to take risks and confront the organization's resistance and political pressures to realize their objectives. Idea champion, sponsor or mentor, orchestrator or facilitator, and rule breaker.

Innovation champions pro-actively manage and maintain a free flow of information exchange among team members and the stakeholders. They actively attempt to influence the attitude of senior and top executives toward the initiation and implementation of innovation in an effective manner. They develop a coalition of all concerned in order to ensure effective implementation of innovation. They inspire the internal public by sharing their vision regarding the potential for innovation. The findings of the study of Howell & Shea, (2001) suggest that in scanning the environment for new ideas, the most effective source of information is the champion's personal network of people inside and outside the organization.

In a nutshell, innovation champions, who have intrinsic motivation, considerable degree of autonomy, tendency of taking personal initiative, focus on exploratory learning, positive attitude of empowering organizational people, high level of altruism, supportive relationship with organizational people, social network and coalition of supporters, and also ability to promote sharing creative ideas among team members, are in better position to promote innovation in organization. Empowering others (e.g., idea champions) by the innovation champions enhances creativity, initiative, and resourcefulness of the organizational people and increases their motivation and commitment to innovation endeavors.

Critically looking at all the salient points made on innovation championing, the attributes of innovation champions and their contributions to implementing innovation in modern organizations which eventually predicts the success, profitability and competitive advantage of the organization, it is obvious that all 21st century managers should be

innovation champions. Damanpour and Schneider (2006) found that managers' attitude toward innovations, competition and entrepreneurship positively affect all phases of innovation adoption. However, managers need to motivate their subordinates to be innovative.

Conclusion

In conclusion, innovation has been found to be directly related to the competencies of managers. It is the responsibility of a manager to set the context, guide the process, clearly communicate reasons, shield creative teams, appreciate distinctiveness in people and their thinking, and welcome change. The managers are encouraged to strive to continually manage the knowledge of employees, provide a work environment of openness built on trust where every member of the team at all levels feels free to express their views/opinions without fear of ridicule or reprisal.

Way Forward

In view of the above, it is pertinent to give specific clues on how managers can become a better professional in the 21st century as highlighted in Adenekan, Chilaka, Fadeyi, George & Ige (2018) which are:

1. Sharpen your communication skills - Multidirectional communicators
2. Work on your people management skills - Team players relying on joint-decision making than formal authority
3. Be an innovative thinker - Generalists with multiple specialties
4. Develop your business acumen.
5. Continue your education and professional development - Engage in life-long learning
6. Facilitate rather than resist change
7. Ethics should be a forethought rather than afterthought
8. Improve on your digital literacy skills – information literacy, ICT literacy and media literacy.

References

Adenekan T.E., Chilaka U.C., Fadeyi O.O., George P.A. & Ige N.A (2018). Education in the 21st Century: Acquisition and Application of Knowledge versus Certificate. *American Journal of Educational Research*. 6(3), 210-213. Available http://www.sciepub.com/education/content/6/3)

Akinboye, J.O. (2016). Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Revised edition, CYFO Behaviour Services Ltd., Ibadan

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 107-136.

Alpkan, L.,Bulut, C.,Gunday, G. Ulusoy, G.,Kilic, K. (2010). Organisational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management Decision* 48(5): 732 755.

Bass, B.M. & Avolio, B.J. (1994). Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Beatti, R. (1999). The Creative Entrepreneur: A Study of the Entrepreneurs' Creative Process (Thesis), Dundee (UK): Abertay University.

Cormican, K.; O'sullivan, D. (2004). Auditing best practice for effective product innovation management. *Technovation*, 24, 819 829.

Damanpour, F. (1991).Organisational innovation: a meta analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 555 590.

Damanpour, F. & Schneider, M. (2006). Phases of the Adoption of Innovation in Organizations: Effects of Environment, Organization and Top Managers", *British Journal of Management,* 17(3): 215-36.

Davenport, T.H., & Prusak, L. (1998). Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Dervitsiotis, K.N. (2010). A framework for the assessment of an organization's innovation excellence. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 21(9), 903 918.

Dooley, L., O'sullivan, D. (2000). Systems innovation: Managing manufacturing systems redesign. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 13(5), 410 421.

Dougherty, D. & Murthy, A. (2009). What Service Customers Really Want, *Harvard Business Review* 87 (9), pp. 22-23.

Frost, P. J. & Egri, C. P. (1991), "The Political Process of Innovation", in B. M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, Greenwich, CT: Jai Press.

Galanakis, K. (2006). Innovation process. Make sense using systems thinking. *Technovation*, 26, 1222 1232.

Holsapple, C.W., & Joshi, K.D. (2004). A formal knowledge management ontology: Conduct, activities, resources, and influences. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *55*(7), 593-612.

Howell, J.M. (2005). The Right Stuff: Identifying and Developing Effective Champions of Innovation, *Academy of Management Executive,* 19(2): 108-19.

Howell, J.M., & Shea, C.M. (2001). Individual Differences, Environmental Scanning, Innovation Framing and Champion Behavior: Key Predictors of Project Performance, *The Journal of Product Innovation Management,* 18(1): 15-27.

Ichimura, T., Ishii, K., Tuominen, M. & Piipo, P. (2003). Comparative study of product innovation systems. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 25(6/7), 560 567.

Jain, R. (2016). Innovation Management: Conceptualization for Practice and Research. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 52(2): 203 - 216

Jelenic, D. (2011) The Importance of Knowledge Management in Organizations – With Emphasis on the Balanced Scorecard Learning and Growth Perspective. *Management, Learning and Conference*

Kramer, S.J., Person, A.E., Wolpert, J.D., Craumer, M., Peebles, E., Drucker, P.F., Brown, J.S. & Levitt, T. (2003): *Harvard Business Review on the Innovative Enterprise*, HBS Publishing Corporation, Boston, MA

Kocher, P.Y., Kaudela Baum, S. & Wolf, P. (2011). Enhancing Organisational Innovation Capability through Systemic Action Research: A Case of a Swiss SME in the Food Company. Systemic Practice and Action Research, 24, 17 44.

Kreitner, Kinicki, & Buelens (2002). Organizational behaviour, Second European edition, McGraw-Hill Education, Berkshire Pg. 8 – 12.

Lawson, B. & Samson, D. (2001). Developing Innovation Capability in Organizations:A Dynamic Capabilities Approach, *International Journal of Innovation Management,* 5(3): 377-400.

Llamas Sanchez, R., Munoz Fernandez, A. &Maraver Tarifa, G. (2011). The local agenda 21 in Andalusia, Spain A model for sustainable innovation. African Journal of Business Management, 5(32), 12653 12663.

Magretta, J. (2003). What management is, Profile Books.

Mansfeld, M.N., Holzle, K. &Gemunden, H.G. (2010). Personal Characteristicsof Innovators - An Empirical Study of Roles in Innovation Management, *International Journal of Innovation Management,* 14(6): 1129-47.

Markham, S.K. (1998), A Longitudinal Examination of How Champions Influence Others to Support their Projects, *Journal of Product Innovation Management,* 15(6): 490-504

Mayer, D.M., Ehrhart, M.G., & Schneider B. (2009). Service attribute boundary conditions of the service climate-customer satisfaction link. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.52, No.5 Pg. 1034 – 1050.

Moghrabi, K.M., Sharabati, A.A. & Khader M.K. (2014). Impact of Managers Skills Profile on His Managerial Behavior: A Case Study of Jordan Kuwait Bank, *International Review of Management and Business Research* Vol. 3 (2).

Mumford, M.D., Licuanan, B. (2004). Leading for innovation: conclusions, issues, and directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 163 171.

Muthusamy, S.K., Wheeler, J.V. & Simmon, B.L. (2005). Self-managing Work Teams: Enhancing Organizational Innovativeness. *Organization Development Journal,* 23 (3):53-67.

Nam, C.H. & Tatum, C.B. (1997), Leaders and Champions for Construction Innovation, *Construction Management and Economics,* 15(3): 259-70.

Noke, H. & Radnor, Z.J. (2004). Navigating Innovation: A Diagnostic Tool Supporting the Process, *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management,* 15(2): 172-83.

Osunde, C., Ashima, J., Anup, V., & Shankar, G. (2015). Management Problems and Practices: India and Nigeria.*Advances in Management*, *8*(1), 9.

Read, A. (2000). Determinants of Successful Organizational Innovation: A Review of Current Research, *Journal of Management Practice,* 3(1): 95-119.

Robbins, S.P. & Coutler, M. (2013). Management, Pearson Horizon edition, Pearson Education Limited, England

Robbins, S.P., Bergman E. & Stagg I. (2014). Management, Business and Economics Vol 7 Pg. 653. Available at https://books.google. com.ng/books?

Sun, H., Wong, S.Y., Zhao, Y., Yam, R. (2012). A systematic model for assessing innovation competence of Hong Kong/China manufacturing organizations: A case study. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 29(4), 546 565.

Wan, D., Chin, H.O. & Lee, F. (2003). Determinants of manufacturing company innovation in Singapore. *Technovation*, 25(3), 261 268.

Whetten, D.A. & Cameron, K.A. (2011). Developing Management Skills. (8th Edition),New Delhi (India): PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd. Pg. 205.

Witte, E. (1977). Power and Innovation: A Two Center Theory, *International Studies of Management and Organization,* 7(1): 47- 70.

Wilson, C. (1980).Identify Needs with Costs in Mind, Training and Development Journal, pp58 – 62

Wong, S.Y. & Chin, K.S. (2007). Company wide perspective. *Organisational Innovation Management*, 109(9), 1290 1315.