

INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOURS AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE OF MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN RIVERS STATE

KALIO, Okosimiema Florence¹, Prof. B. Chima Onuoha²

¹*Doctoral Candidate, University of Port Harcourt Business School, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.*

²*Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.*

ABSTRACT

The study is an empirical investigation on the relationship between innovative work behaviour and employee performance of manufacturing companies in Rivers State. This study measured employee performance through work engagement and work design, while the dimensions of innovative work behaviour were given as initiation and implementation. A cross sectional survey which is a form of quasi experimental design was employed with a population of 158 drawn from the association of water producers in Rivers State. The taro yamen formula was applied to arrive at a sample size of 113 employees. Primary data was collected for this work, the spearman rank correlation coefficient with the help of SPSS was used for the hypotheses. The study findings revealed a significant and positive relationship between Initiation and the measures of employee performance. It concluded that table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State that engage and strictly nurture initiation improves and enhances the employee's performance, and that innovative work behaviour is key for every business and if businesses must compete favourably, enhance their productivity and performance, and or even survive in the consistently turbulent business environment.

KEYWORDS: *Innovative Work Behaviour, Employee Performance, Initiation, Implementation, Work Empowerment, Work Design.*

INTRODUCTION

The performance of every organization depends on the skilled labour force which are ready to turn the fortune of the organization into success. Employees are often responsible for the great bulk of necessary work to be done as well as customer satisfaction and the quality of products and events (Elnaga & Imran, 2013). Having employees that are competent helps to increase the success level of the organization especially as they can reduce wastage and improve efficiency (Macey, 2006; Branham, 2005).

Organization that wants to increase their productivity will concentrate on their efficiency. It also means that the employees must improve their innovative ways of working by being creative with the use of tacit knowledge (Kanter, 1988, Rogers, 2003). According to Amabile (1988) organizations can gain advantage competitively by striving to ensure that her workers are willing and able to engage in innovative work behaviour. The interaction between organizational innovation and employee creativity will influence performance. Consequently, innovative work behaviour will enhance the creation and application of ideas for the processes, methods, and usage for work roles for the success of the business (West & Farr, 1989, 1990; Janssen, 2000).

Innovative work behaviour is important for both the individual and the organization because in an innovation-oriented jobs (Axtell et al., 2000; Mumford, 2003; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Some employees see employee innovativeness as voluntary and discretionary behaviour that is not describe in the organizations rules and regulation (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Janssen, 2000, 2001).

Innovative behavior has been studied from the perspective of the individual (Krause, 2004; Janssen, 2000; Scott & Bruce, 1994) as well as in working groups (Messman & Mulder, 2012; Post, 2012). There is empirical evidence that has focused on identifying factors that promote this type of behavior (Scott, & Bruce, 1994; Yuan & Woodman, 2010; Romero & Martinez-Roman, 2012). Bawuro (2018) pointed out that previous studies on innovative work behaviour have been carried out on service, manufacturing, and industrial sectors. There are however scanty studies on innovative work behaviour and employee performance at the manufacturing sector in Rivers State.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The bulk of the work in the organizations is the responsibility of employees. Most of the problems that often showcase in the organization are as a result of the organization having employees that lacks the capabilities to shoulder the duties or work roles that are assigned to the employee. This shows that most organization does not have competent employees, or they do not match check the competence of the employee suitable for the work roles. This has continuously posed a problem for the organization.

Many organizations do not pay attention to the learning habits of their employees and see how they can pass down the learning memory which the organization has in storage. This weakness according to Abraham et al., (2001) accounts for the inability to pass down the organizational dreams to her employees. When organization do not pay due concern to failures of the employees to follow or improve it results then there will enough incompetence expressed through untimely completion of tasks, low output among employees, great wastage of allocated resources and poor wage rates.

1.3. Conceptual Framework of the Study

Ndunguru (2007) posits that the conceptual framework logical collection of constructs as they relate with the concepts and are often represented in different forms as diagrams, charts, graphs, pictographs, flow-charts, or graphs mathematical equations. This study will use the various concepts and construct in principle as would be applied through diagram depicted as figure 1.1.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between innovative work behaviour and employee performance of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State of Nigeria.

The objectives of the study are to:

- i. Examine the relationship between initiation and task performance
- ii. Determine the relationship between initiation and job satisfaction
- iii. Assess the relationship between implementation and task performance
- iv. Identify the relationship between implementation and job satisfaction

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Review

The AMO framework is the theory upon which this research philosophy is drawn from. The AMO framework was initially proposed by Bailey (1993), who suggested that ensuring the employee's discretionary effort needed three components: employees had to have the necessary skills, they needed appropriate motivation and employers had to offer them the opportunity to participate (Appelbaum et al., 2000). Based on this model, and drawing on the concept of high performance work systems (HPWS), the model was later developed by Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg and Kalleberg (Appelbaum et al., 2000), and its acronym stands for the three elements that enhance together employee performance: individual ability (A), motivation (M), and the opportunity to participate (O) (Bayo-Moriones & Galdon-Sanchez, 2010; Boselie, 2010; Claudia, 2015; Knies & Leisink, 2014; Kroon, Van De Voorde & Timmers, 2013; Munteanu, 2014).

Ability dimension is usually defined by the acronym KSA (knowledge, skills and abilities) (Fu, Flood, Bosak, Morris & O'Regan, 2013). Thus, Ability- enhancing practices aim to improve those three components. Examples of these practices are employee recruitment techniques or formal training (Kroon et al., 2013; Raidén et al., 2006). Motivation deals with an employee desire to perform, which can be enhanced by extrinsic or intrinsic

motivation. Examples of motivation-enhancing practices are incentives or career opportunities (Munteanu, 2014; Raidén et al., 2006). The AMO model introduces the opportunity dimension as well, on the basis of job design theories (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Kroon et al., 2013), or empowerment literature (Gerhart, 2005; Kroon et al., 2013). Hence, opportunity takes into consideration not only individual characteristics but also the work environment. Practices contributing to the opportunity dimension are, for instance, quality circles or team working.

2.1. Innovative Work Behaviour

Innovative work behaviour has no globally accepted definition. Innovative work behaviour has often been interchanged with innovative competence. This was confirmed by Yams (2017) that the term innovative work behaviour has commonly been used than innovative competence. Innovative work behaviour and individual innovative competence refers to the same thing that is the reason for its usage is interchangeable. The core of the concept is the behaviour of the individual with innovations in identifying opportunities, generating ideas, finding support for ideas, and implementing them (Kanter, 1988; Janssen, 2001; Abbas & Raja, 2015).

Most scholars have defined the concept of innovative work behaviour by making reference to West and Farr (1990: 9) that innovative work behaviour is the “the intentional introduction and application, within a role, group or organisation of ideas, processes, products or procedures, new to the relevant unit of adoption, designed to significantly benefit the individual, the group, organisation or wider society”. In summary, West and Farr (1989) opined that innovative work behaviour is an individual action that is geared towards the organization of methods for the processing of organizational work.

Similarly, other scholars have aligned and agreed with the definition of innovative work behaviour by West and Farr (1990). For instance, De Spiegelaere et al., (2014: 126) defined innovative work behaviour as “all employee behavior directed at the generation, introduction and/or application (within a role, group or organization) of ideas, processes, products or procedures, new to the relevant unit of adoption” (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2008). It is necessary to state that innovative work behaviour is about generating an idea and applying such idea in a work role.

Shanker et al., (2017) argued that innovative work behaviour are those behaviours which the individual indulges at during work roles so that the work may not be difficult to execute for the individual. Succinctly put, innovative work behaviours are intentional and discretionary of the individual. Innovative competence is an extra-role behaviour which are intrinsically motivated and go beyond the formal job requirements but are used willingly by the employee to have a good performance (Wolfe, 1994; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005).

Innovative working behaviour is the manifestation of initiatives by an individual under any prevailing working condition to improve the work as expected through the creation of ideas on the work pattern that is good enough to be used by others in a similar work process. The intriguing thing is that the idea might be improved by the individual or by another person that has innovative characteristic (Crant, 2000). Such characteristic may be by impulse or as a function of lifestyle.

The innovative work behaviour of an individual is that propensity to conceive behaviours that can generate new ideas with the aim of meeting organizational goals in a novel way (Kanter, 1988; Scott & Bruce, 1994). The propensity might be as a result of stimulation from another individual. At the work place an employee may see the innovative way and manner that another employee deployed to do and borrow the style but in the long run the employee that borrowed the process will try to improvise by creating something new around the existing innovation.

Under working conditions, an individual with an innovative behave is always ready to find a way to turn a stressful work with a simplified method to satisfaction. Aryee, Walumbwa & Zhou (2012) argued that when individuals are fully engrossed with what they are doing, their psychological capacity becomes activated they develop and improve on their work by looking at simpler and faster ways to accomplish task. The fact is that innovative work behaviour is that type of behaviour that occurs when individual tries to do something different (Van Rijnsoever et al., 2012).

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between initiation and task performance of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State of Nigeria.

2.1.1. Initiation

The initiation stage is vital in the explanation of innovation especially as it has to do with innovative behaviour. Zaltman et al., (1973) defines initiation as an occurrence which happens when a performance gap (occurrence of divergence between desired and actual performance) has been discovered. The underlined concept in the definition is divergent which means differing behaviours occurs at this level. In lieu of the above, considering the desired behaviour and the actual performance this researcher looks at the convergence which is the point where the two relationship is not sequential but a continuous process of innovation which contains exploring opportunities, idea generation and followed by evaluating the extent to which the idea is appropriate.

Leong and Rasli (2014) contends that innovative work behaviour is generally outlined in the context of how individuals could facilitate the achievement of initiation and intentionally introduce new and useful ideas, processes, products or procedures. Initiation is any an easy fit as there are rigors that the individual will have to pass through before bringing that thought into reality. It has to pass through the processing of the idea up to the checking of the idea if it met the purpose for which it was thought for. Mumford et al., (1997) concludes that moving from idea exploration to idea generation is a skill that has to do with combining and reorganizing concepts in a creative arrangement.

In this study, initiation component of innovative work behaviour consists of two intertwined behaviors namely opportunity exploration and idea generation. This assumption is backed up with the postulation of De Jong et al., (2003) that opportunity exploration and idea generation may not be necessarily sequential but are part of initiation.

Opportunity exploration is that stage of innovation when innovative employees are looking for ways to improve an existing product or service or it can be described as a situation where employees are looking for solution to a problem (Farr & Ford, 1990; Kanter, 1988). Krueger (2000) emphasized that it is the process of innovation when knowledge employees start identifying new opportunities. More so, opportunity exploration according to Messmann et al. (2017) is the process of innovation which begins with the creation of awareness of opportunities to strive for something new from an existence of problems.

Exploration process is a phase where idea starts when an employee tries to look for an opportunity in the organization to generate the idea in order to solve existing or arising problem. The exploration phase consisted of observing and looking for ways to improve current processes, products, services or work relationship or trying to find a better-preferred solution in alternative ways (Basadur, 2004).

2.1.2. Implementation

Implementation is execution of an idea which has been accepted or decided upon to be used. De Jong et al., (2003) posits that innovative work behavior at the implementation stage is otherwise referred to as convergent innovative work behavior. According to King and Anderson (2002) the implementation stage phase of innovation is called a convergent behavior because it is directed towards the development and launch of innovation in in order to acquire their benefits. By convergent it means that the new idea can be converted into an actual result with a prior test before launching (De Jong et al., 2003).

Implementation can be explained as improving existing product, process, and method by using the ideas that were proposed to the organization as developing innovative ideas into work practices. These includes activities such as making innovation part of regular work process, and new behaviours to be adapted in daily working activities (Kleysen & Street, 2001). Thus, given new idea, it has to be developed, tested and commercialized by the knowledge workers.

The knowledge worker has to be conversant with the results in the process of idea development because it is the employee that will establish the new idea to others. Kanter (1988) contends that when new idea or service has been developed and established as a status quo, the individual has carried out the innovation process. In this study, implementation is discussed as championing (idea promotion) and application (idea implementation) efforts.

Idea championing (promotion) is expressed here by Kleysen and Street (2001) as someone who puts in efforts to develop a creative idea and has the capacity to move forward a new service by overcoming all the possible organizational barriers (Shane, 1994). So, idea championing is the influencing of other innovation users to use or understand the new idea (Kanter, 1983; Kanter, 1988; Anderson & King, 1993) while it is also seen to contain elements of pushing and negotiating (Maute & Locander, 1994).

Idea championing is expressed here as championing (Idea promotion). Ideas comes from those individuals who were truly committed and believe that their ideas will be accepted by others as well

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between implementation and task performance of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State of Nigeria

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

Mathias and Jackson (2009) stated that employee performance is the successful completion of tasks by a selected individual or individuals, as set and measured by a supervisor or organization, to pre-defined acceptable standard while efficiently and effectively utilizing available resource within a changing environment. Thus, employee performance is seen from the perspective of what the individual worker achieved at work after exerting required effort on the job.

Ahmad and Khurram (2011) also argue that employee performance symbolizes the broad belief of the personnel about their behaviour and contributions towards the achievement of the organization. This definition has shifted direction of employee performance from the perspective of meeting sets standard to employee behaviour and their contribution to the organization objectives. Apparently, Ahmad and Shahzad (2011) defined employee performance as the embodiment of the whole belief of the employee about their conduct and contributions to the accomplishment of the organization and further stated that compensation practices, performance evaluation and promotional practices are determinant of employee performance. Perceived employee performance represents the general belief of the employee about his behavior and contributions in the success of organization.

According to Andersen and Fagerhaug (2002) performance measurement system can become the instrument panel. This instrument panel is used for strategic maneuvering, day to day running of the organization and planning, implementing improvements and changes. Since it is an instrument panel that is used on daily basis performance measurement could be accepted as the regular measurement of the outcome and efficiency of services. When performance is not measured or is measured incorrectly, those using the information will be misinformed and bad verdict will be likely followed, therefore, the adage “garbage in garbage out” provides more credence.

2.1.3. Work Engagement

Khan (1990: 694) defined work engagement as “the harnessing of organizational members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. The concept centers on the way and manner organizational members put their psychological state of mind in performing organizations work. It is the opinion of Kahn (1990) that engaged employees are those who are physically involved in their work and are cognitively alert and emotionally connected to others at the time of doing the work. May et al., (2004) empirically supported the proposition of Kahn (1990) that work engagement is a positive relationship between psychological meaningfulness, psychological safety and psychological availability.

Kahn (1990) further posit that the physical aspect of work engagement refers to the physical presence of the employee to do the work. The cognitive aspects are the employee beliefs about the organization, the working condition and the leadership of the organization while the emotional aspect of work engagement is the employee attitude towards the other two aspects of work engagement organization (Shanmugam & Krishnaveni, 2012). According to Khan (1990) an employee could be engaged in any of the aspects and no the other but the other two could contribute to the overall engagement of the employee.

According to Saks (2006) work engagement is associated with an individual’s attitudes, intentions and behaviours which make the engaged employee to be more likely attached to their organisation. Engaged employees are willing to take initiative on what is necessary to add value to them as they do their work. However, their values are aligned to that of the organization where they work. They have the capacity to generate their own positive feedback that will encourage them not to be fatigue even though most times they become fatigue and burnout they are able to extricate themselves from the situation; they are not enslaved to their job, and they tend to also pursue outside interests (Van den Berg et al., 2008).

Ho₃: There is no significant relationship between initiation and job satisfaction of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State of Nigeria.

2.3.3. Job Design

Job design as defined by Durai (2010) is a combination of job content and the work method which has been adopted in the performance of the job. By content of the job design, it means those aspect of the job which must be done, while work method is the procedure with which the work is done. Hence, job design basically is arrangement of work and rearranging the work so that it will be satisfactory with the employee.

Armstrong (2003: 494) defined job design as “the specification of the contents, methods, and relationships of jobs in order to satisfy technological and organizational requirements as well as the social and personal requirements of the job holder”. This definition is more encompassing as it recognizes that job design is about job content and the methods implored to carry out work function. The definition also captures another point which is that job design meets certain requirements which may be either the way and manner at which the organization structured the work and a consideration to innovation which is necessary in performing a work.

According to Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), job design is a fundamental process of altering how work is done and the work roles the employee functions. First the scholars defined job design as a process, they also defined it as a way of altering work process using the individual functionality. This view of job design being the process that has to do with various elements that form a job by putting into consideration the individual and organizational requirements (Moeed et al., 2013).

Parvin (2011) stated that the purpose of job design is to increase the level of job satisfaction which shall ultimately cause the good performance of the employee. The satisfaction of employee is important and paramount because an organization that has a properly designed work will enjoy the benefit of having a workforce that is target oriented due to the feeling of the employee that the work is simplified, a good understanding of the job routines and also has the skill varieties (Hodgetts & Hegar, 2005).

However, the above propositions of job design have dwelt more on the rearrangement of work and did not concentrate on the techniques. Armstrong (2003) pinpointed job rotation, job enlargement, job enrichment, self-managing teams (autonomous work groups) and high performance as work design. Durai (2010) also added other work methods of job design as: job reengineering, participative management, and peer performance review. According to Ali and Aroosiya (2012) job rotation and job enlargement were developed to benefit from specialization and job engineering approach, thus this study will follow suit to precisely examine job rotation and job enlargement as techniques of job design.

Ho₄: There is no significant relationship between implementation and job satisfaction of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State of Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted the quasi-experimental designs using the cross-sectional survey technique to collect data once, over a continuous period, as against the longitudinal survey that requires data to be collected at different intervals, and time, but same environment (Ahiauzu & Asawo, 2016). The study is correlational in nature and is carried out in the natural environment where work proceeds normally (non-contrived setting). Besides, correlational studies identify the relationship between important factors (independent variables) and the problem-variable (dependent variables) (Baridam, 2009).

In this study, the target population was purposively drawn from table water manufacturing association known as Association of Water Producers in Rivers State. The total population of the study is one hundred and fifty-eight (158) operators and supervisors from the various table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State.

Thus, in order to determine the sample size, the researcher adopts the standard error factor also called the Taro Yamane formula, which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where n = Sample Size

N = The study population (158)

1 = Constant

e = Degree of error expected (0.05)

The sample size from the population of 158 employees is 113 employees, which will be issued the study instrument (questionnaire). This sample size conforms to the figure in the Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) sample size

determination table. Primary data was used for this study, the questionnaire was the main instrument for data collection, the questionnaire was subjected to construct and content validity. The Cronbach Alpha test was used to check the reliability of the instrument. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to test our hypotheses.

Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion of Findings

In this section we present how data for this study were collected through the questionnaire including responses from the study targets. Table 4.1 showed how data for this study were collected through the questionnaire.

Table 4: Number of questionnaires produced, distributed, retrieved, and used

S/N	Questionnaire	Quantity	Percentage (%)
1	Numbers of copies produced	113	100
2	Numbers of copies distributed	113	100
3	Numbers of copies retrieved	113	100
4	Numbers of copies used	113	100

Source: Field Survey, 2021

From the statistics on table 4.1, it is shown that a total of one hundred and thirteen (113) copies (100%) of the questionnaire were produced and distributed by the researcher to the target respondents and the 113 copies were successfully retrieved and used by the researcher.

Bivariate Analyses

In this section bivariate statistics was used to carry out the analyses. Spearman's Rank Order Correlation was the bivariate statistic adopted to test ten null hypotheses which were stated in the study, while Partial Correlation was the multivariate statistic employed to determine the moderating influence of corporate culture on the relationship between intrapreneurial spirit and corporate productivity performance. Dunn (2001) categorization scheme was adopted to guide in establishing the relationships between the variables. In the decision rule, 0.05 is the critical value. Thus, if the probability value is less than the critical value we reject the null hypothesis, otherwise we accept it.

TEST OF HYPOTHESES

Ten null hypotheses were tested in this study using a non-parametric statistic of Spearman Rank Order Correlation.

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between initiation and work engagement

Table 6. Correlations Matrix for Initiation and Work Engagement

			Initiation	Work Engagement
Spearman's rho	Initiation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.600**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	Work Engagement	N	113	113
		Correlation Coefficient	.600*	1.000
Engagement	Work	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	113	113
	Engagement	N		

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS output version 23.0

As shown from the data analysis using a sample size of 113 on table 6 the relationship between initiation and work engagement is strong, positive and significant evident in the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient is .600** and the probability value less than the critical value (i.e. $r_s = .600$, $p = .000 < 0.05$). In other words, initiation significantly predicts work engagement. This means, if table water manufacturing companies strengthen their level of initiation, employees will be able to be engaged with their job. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis which

states that there is no significant relationship between initiation and work engagement and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between initiation and work engagement.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between initiation and job design

Table 7. Correlations Matrix for Initiation and Job Design

		Initiation	Job Design
Initiation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.697**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	113	113
Spearman's rho	Correlation Coefficient	.697*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	113	113

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS output version 23.0

As shown from the data analysis using a sample size of 113 on table 7 the relationship between initiation and job design is strong, positive and significant evident in the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient is .697** and the probability value less than the critical value (i.e. $r_s = .697$, $p = .000 < 0.05$). In other words, initiation significantly predicts job design. This means, if table water manufacturing companies strengthen their level of initiation, employees will be able perform well with the job design. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between initiation and job design and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between initiation and job design.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between implementation and work engagement

Table 8. Correlations Matrix for Implementation and Work Engagement

		Implementation	Work Engagement
Implementation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.533**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	113	113
Spearman's rho	Correlation Coefficient	.533*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	113	113

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS output version 23.0

As shown from the data analysis using a sample size of 113 on table 8 the relationship between implementation and work engagement is moderate, positive and significant evident in the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient is .533** and the probability value less than the critical value (i.e. $r_s = .533$, $p = .000 < 0.05$). In other words, implementation significantly predicts work engagement. This means, if table water manufacturing companies strengthen their level of implementation, employees will be able to be engaged with their job. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between implementation and work engagement and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between implementation and work engagement.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between implementation and job design

Table 9. Correlations Matrix for Implementation and Job Design

		Implementation	Job Design
Implementation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.545**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	113	113
Spearman's rho	Correlation Coefficient	.545*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	113	113
Job Design	Correlation Coefficient	.545*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	113	113

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS output version 23.0

As shown from the data analysis using a sample size of 113 on table 9 the relationship between implementation and job design is moderate, positive and significant evident in the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient is .545** and the probability value less than the critical value (i.e. $r_s = .545$, $p = .000 < 0.05$). In other words, implementation significantly predicts job design. This means, if table water manufacturing companies strengthen their level of implementation, employees will be able perform well with the job design. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between implementation and job design and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that there is a significant relationship between implementation and job design.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

After a thorough field work for collection of data and their testing using appropriate statistical tools

Table 10: Summary of Findings

Hypotheses	Decision	Basis for Decision
Ho ₁ : there is no significant relationship between initiation and work engagement	The null hypothesis stated was rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.	Relationship was not significant based on rho and p-value where $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. There is a strong relationship
Ho ₂ : there is no significant relationship between initiation and job design	The null hypothesis stated was rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted.	Relationship was not significant based on rho and p-value where $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. There is a strong relationship
Ho ₃ : there is no significant relationship between implementation and work engagement	The null hypothesis stated was rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted	Relationship was not significant based on rho and p-value where $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. There is a moderate relationship
Ho ₄ : there is no significant relationship between implementation and job design	The null hypothesis stated was rejected and alternate hypothesis accepted	Relationship was not significant based on rho and p-value where $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. There is a moderate relationship

Source: Research Desk, 2021

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The test of hypotheses one and two in this study revealed that initiation positively relates with employee performance of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State. This finding implies that table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State that engage and nurture strictly initiation improves and enhances the employee performance of the company. Innovation improves business products, processes, and practices, thereby

making and keeping firms relevant in the market and industry, and by so doing enhancing their performance (Ottih, 2016). Also, it was revealed in the literature that innovative organizations enshrine creative activities in their corporate culture in order to enhance performance and productivity (Han *et al.*, 1998). The implication of this literature and the finding of this study is that firms that are more creative and innovative enhance their productivity through consistent involvement of employees in improving the ways things are done in the organization.

The test of hypothesis three and four revealed that implementation positively relates with employee performance of table water manufacturing companies in Rivers State. This implies that a deliberate and consistent application of implementation such as idea championing and idea implementation by employees will help to improve the innovation. This result is in agreement with the findings of Skillicorn (2015) that intrapreneurs are people who innovate in the organization, and the purpose for intrapreneurship is to achieve and accomplish pre-determined goals as organizational and socio-economic survival depends deeply on their achievement motivation.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering the elaborate empirical attention given to this research, its conclusion is based on the facts drawn from the literature reviewed, summary of findings culled from the data analyzed and discussion of findings. This research concludes that innovative work behaviour is very important in every business organization, if they must compete favourably, enhance their productivity performance, and or even survive in the consistently turbulent business environment.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M. & Raja, U. (2015). *Impact of psychological capital on innovative performance and job stress*. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/ Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*, 32(2), 128-138.
2. Abraham, S. E., Kams, L. A., Shaw, K. & Mena, M. A. (2001). *Managerial competencies and the managerial performance appraisal process*. *Journal of Management Development*, 20(10), 842-852.
3. Abstein, A. & Spieth, P. (2014). *Exploring HRM meta-features that foster employees' innovative work behavior in times of increasing work-life conflict*. *Journal of Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(2), 211-225.
4. Ahmad, S. & Shahzad, K. (2011). *Human resource management and employee performance: a case of university teachers of Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) in Pakistan*. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), 5249-5253.
5. Akram, T., Haider, M. J. & Feng, Y. X. (2015). *The effects of organizational justice on the innovative work behavior of employees: An empirical study from China*. *Journal of Creativity and Business Innovation*, 2, 114-126.
6. Amabile, T. M. (1988). *A model of creativity and innovation in organizations*. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 123-167.
7. Amabile, T. M. & Rigolizzo, M. (2015). *Entrepreneurial creativity: The role of learning processes and work environment supports*. In *The Oxford Handbook of Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship*. Ch.4:61, *Oxford Library of Psychology*.
8. Andersen, B. & Fagerhaug, T. (2002). *Performance measurement explained: Designing and implementing your state of the art system*. Published by America society for quality, Inc
9. Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., Zhou, Q. & Hartnell, C. A. (2012). *Transformational leadership, innovative behavior, and task performance: Test of mediation and moderation processes*. *Human Performance*, 25(1), 1-25. [https://doi: 0.1080/08959285.2011.631648](https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2011.631648).
10. Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E. (2000). *Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas*. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(3), 265-285. doi:10.1348/096317900167029
11. Balau, G., Faems, D. & van der Bij, H. (2012). *Individual characteristics and their influence on innovation: A literature review*. *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Innovation and Management, Eindhoven, 14-16 November*, 887-901.
12. Barron, F. & Harrington, D. M. (1981). *Creativity, intelligence and personality*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 439-476.
13. Basadur, M. (2004). *Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 103-121.
14. Bawuro, 2018
15. Binnewies, C., Ohly, S. & Sonnentag, S. (2007). *Taking personal initiative and communicating about ideas: What is important for the creative process and for idea*

- creativity? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16, 432-455.
16. Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave: How to recognize the subtle signs and act before it's too late*. Amacom.
 17. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.), 1, 687-732. Consulting Psychologists Press.
 18. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H. & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In E. Schmitt, W. C. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 35-70
 19. Collins, M. A. & Amabile, T. M. (1999). Motivation and creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 297-312). Cambridge University Press.
 20. Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435-462.
 21. De Jong, J. P. (2007). Individual innovation. The connection between leadership and employees' innovative work behavior. University of Amsterdam. ISBN: 978-90-371-0725-8
 22. De Jong, J., Den Hartog, D. & Zoetermeer. (2003). Leadership as determinant of innovative behavior: A conceptual framework. Research Report H200303, 1-95.
 23. De Jong, J. P. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behavior. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41-64.
 24. De Jong, J. P. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Innovative work behavior: Measurement and validation. *EIM Business and Policy Research*, 1-27.
 25. De Jong, J. P. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x>
 26. De Jong, J. P. & Kerste, R. A. J. (2002). De kracht van het idee: betere resultaten door innovatief gedrag van medewerkers. Academic Service.
 27. De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., De Witte, H., Niesen, W., & Van Hootegem, G. (2014). On the relation of job insecurity, job autonomy, innovative work behaviour and the mediating effect of work engagement. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 23(3), 318-330. <https://doi: 10.1111/caim.12079>.
 28. Dorenbosch, L. W., Van Engen, M. L. & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and innovation management*, 14(2), 129-141. <https://doi: 10.1111/j.1476-8691.2005.00333.x> 32
 29. Dörner, N. (2012). *Innovative work behavior: The roles of employee expectations and effects on job performance*.
 30. Drucker, P. F. (2014). *Innovation and entrepreneurship*. Routledge.
 31. Elnaga, A. & Imran, I. (2013). The effect of training on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4).
 32. Farr, J. L. & Ford, C. (1990). Individual innovation. In West, M. & Farr, J. (Ed.), *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies* (pp. 63-80). Wiley
 33. Ford, C. M. (2000). Creative development in creativity theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 284-289.
 34. Ghani, N. A. A., Hussin, T. A. B. S. R. & Jusoff, K. (2009). The impact of psychological empowerment on lecturers' innovative behaviour in Malaysian Private Higher Education Institutions. *Canadian Social Science*, 5(4), 54-62.
 35. Howell, J. M., Shea, C. M. & Higgins, C. A. (2005). Champions of product innovations: defining, developing, and validating a measure of champion behavior. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(5), 641-661.
 36. Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
 37. Janssen, O. (2001). Fairness perceptions as a moderator in the curvilinear relationships between job demands, and job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 1039-1050.
 38. Kanter, R. M. (1983). *The change masters: Innovations for productivity in the American corporation*. Simon and Schuster.
 39. Kanter, R. M. (1988). When a thousand flowers bloom: Structural, collective, and social conditions for innovation in organizations. In B. M., Staw and L. L., Cummings (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, (169-211)
 40. Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. John Wiley and Sons.
 41. Kaur & Gupta, 2016
 42. Kleysen, R. F & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 284-296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eum000000005660>

43. Krause, D. E. (2004). Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors: An empirical investigation. *The leadership quarterly*, 15(1), 79-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.006>
44. Krueger, N. F. (2000). The cognitive infrastructure of opportunity emergence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Spring, 5-23.
45. Leong, C. T. & Rasli, A. (2014). The Relationship between innovative work behavior on work role performance: An empirical study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 129, 592-600.
46. Macey, O. (2006). Toward a definition of engagement. Paper presented at the society for Industrial and Organization Psychology 21st Annual conference, May, Dallas, TX.
47. Maute, M., & Locander, W. (1994). Innovations as a socio-political process: an empirical analysis of influence behavior among new product managers. *Journal of Business Research*, 30, 161-74.
48. Messmann, G. & Mulder, R. H. (2012). Development of a measurement instrument for innovative work behaviour as a dynamic and context-bound construct. *Human Resource Development International*, 15(1), 43-59. <https://doi:10.1080/13678868.2011.646894>
49. Messmann et al. (2017)
50. Mumford, M. D. (2000). Managing creative people: strategies and tactics for innovation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(3), 313-351.
51. Mumford, M. D., Baughman, W. A., Suppinski, E. P. & Maher, M. A. (1996). Process based measures of creative problem-solving skills: Information encoding. *Creativity Research Journal*, 9, 77-88.
52. Mumford, M. D., Baughman, W. A. & Palmon, R. R. (1997). Thinking creativity at work: Organizational influence on creative problem solving. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 31, 7-17.
53. Ndunguru, P. C. (2007). Lectures on research methodology for social sciences. Mzumbe University: Research and Information Publication Department.
54. Post, C. (2012). Deep-level team composition and innovation: The mediating roles of psychological safety and cooperative learning. *Group & Organization Management*, 37(5), 555-588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601112456289>
55. Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T. & Sardesai, R. (2005). Determinants of innovative work behaviour: Development and test of an integrated model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 142-150. <https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-8691.2005.00334.x>
56. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Simon and Schuster.
57. Romero, I. & Martínez-Román, J. A. (2012). Self-employment and innovation: Exploring the determinants of innovative behavior in small businesses. *Research Policy*, 41(1), 178-189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2011.07.005>
58. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V. & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>.
59. Scott, S. G. & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
60. Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L. & Crant, J. M. (2001). What do proactive people do: A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success? *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 845-874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00234.x>
61. Shalley, C. E. & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 33-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.004>
62. Shane, S. A. (1994). Are champions different from non-champions? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(5), 397-421.
63. Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Van der Heijden, B. I. & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 67-77.
64. Taggar, S. (2002). Individual creativity and group ability to utilize individual creative resources: A multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 315-331.
65. Van Rijnsoever, F. J., Meeus, M. T. & Donders, A. R. T. (2012). The effects of economic status and recent experience on innovative behavior under environmental variability: An experimental approach. *Research Policy*, 41(5), 833-847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.02.005>
66. Vincent, A. S., Decker, B. P. & Mumford, M. D. (2002). Divergent thinking, intelligence, and expertise: A test of alternative models. *Creativity Research Journal*, 14 (2), 163-178.
67. West, M. A. & Farr, J. L. (1989). Innovation at work: Psychological perspectives. *Social Behavior*, 4, 15-30.
68. West, M. A. & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation at work. In West, M.A. and Farr, J.L. (Eds), *Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies* (pp.3-13). John Wiley & Sons.

69. Wolfe, R. (1994) *Organizational innovation: review, critique and suggested research directions. Journal of Management Studies*, 31(3), 405-431
70. Woods, Mustafa, Anderson, Sayer, et al., 2018
71. Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E. & Griffin, R. W. (1993). *Toward a theory of organizational creativity. Academy of management review*, 18(2), 293-321.
72. Yams, N. B. (2017). *Integrated model of innovative competence. Journal of Creativity and Business Innovation*, 3, 140-169.
73. Yuan, F. & Woodman, R. W. (2010). *Innovative behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome expectations. Academy of Management Journal*, 53(2), 323-342. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dlo.2010.08124fad.010>
74. Zaltman, G., Duncan, R. & Holbek, J. (1973). *Innovations and organizations*. Wiley.