

The Predictive Power Of Leadership Behaviour, Organisational Culture And Work Engagement On Knowledge Management In Academia

Nwannah, Ngozi Caroline¹, Adebuseyi, Jane Roli², Ayodele, Kolawole Olanrewaju³, Ezeokoli, Rita Nkiruka⁴, Morka, Emmanuel⁵, Eregare, Emmanuel Orihentare⁶

¹Department of Education, Babcock University Ilishan, Ogun State, Nigeria. uwannagn@babcock.edu.ng

²Dept. of Sociology Psych. & Criminology, Lead City University. janrona78@yahoo.com

³Research, Innovation and International Cooperation (RIIC), Babcock University Ilishan, Ogun State, Nigeria. ayodelek@babcock.edu.ng, (Corresponding author), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4674-3523>

⁴Social Work Department, Babcock University Ilishan, Ogun State, Nigeria. ezeokolir@babcock.edu.ng

⁵Department of Mass Communication, Babcock University. nenait3@gmail.com

⁶History Dept., Babcock University, eregar@babcock.edu.ng

Abstract

Just like every other formal organisation, academic institutions grapple with many challenges to remain relevant in the educational sector, seek ways of ensuring optimum efficiency and effectiveness of their academic staff. This study therefore examined how leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement could predicts academic staff's knowledge management. This study used a descriptive survey design while 2,252 respondents selected through a multi-stage sampling participated in the study. Data were collected using five adopted instruments, two research questions guided the study while data were analyzed using regression analysis. It was found that the predictor variables jointly predicted academic staff's knowledge management ($R = .466$; $R^2 = .217$; Adj. $R^2 = .216$; $F_{(3, 2248)} = 207.912$; $p = .000 < .05$); while the most potent predictor of academic staff's knowledge management was leadership behaviour. The next predictor variable was work engagement while organisational culture was the least. It was concluded that leaders must use knowledge management, enhanced work environment and staff engagement to support the organisation's strategy. It was recommended, amongst others that universities should adopt leadership styles that will stir up good work environment, knowledge sharing and adequate involvement of academic staff in decision making process.

Key words: knowledge management, leadership behaviour, organisational culture, work engagement.

I. Introduction

The importance of education to the development of every nation cannot be jettisoned as it will always remain the goose that lay the golden egg for the nation's economy and helps in the development of infrastructure and other industries. In the contemporary world, education industry, like every other organizations, grapple

with many challenges to remain relevant in the competitive world of work; they seek ways of ensuring optimum knowledge sharing and management by their employees, especially the academic staff. Academic staff's knowledge management is an important aspect of study in view of the competitiveness in the educational sector occasioned by globalization. Knowledge management in this respect needs an important

consideration as it contributes to the success of any organisation because it is a strong factor that could give an organisation an edge over others in terms of performance and success (Ologbo & Sofian, 2013; Oguntimehin & Nwosu 2017)).

The extent at which employees get committed and passionately get involved about their jobs, as well as putting unrestricted and flexible effort into their work for the betterment of the organization could be linked to management of knowledge and information within the organization (Ayodele, Aladenusi & Bello, 2015). However, various scholars have defined knowledge management differently but in the same manner. For instance, the British Standards Institution (2003) define knowledge management as the “formation and consequent management of a surrounding which gives confidence for knowledge to be created, transferred, learned, advanced, planned and utilized for the welfare of the firm and its consumers”. Whittington and Galpin (2010) stated that an institution with higher level of painstaking efforts in knowledge sharing will experience a directly greater link to global competitiveness and outstanding benefits - customer satisfaction, better productivity, improved efficiency, profitability and employee retention.

2. The Problem Statement

In recent years, research has shown that organisations are highly concerned with issues related to knowledge management. Many organisations strive to increase knowledge management among employees because performance seemed to have been below expectations of the actual capacity of the workers. In contrast, high level of employees' knowledge management within the organisation is believed to increase the employees' performance which in turn can have a positive impact on an organisation's performance. In line with this, educational institutions are constantly faced with

the challenge of academic staff knowledge management with so many roles and responsibilities. This implies that academic staff knowledge management is also a common current challenge in the system.

Within the Nigeria context, there are several studies that have been carried out that cut across different sectors of the economy. As important as this is, and in view of the growing need for education in the nation, there is a paucity of research especially as it affects tertiary educational institutions in Nigeria. This is more crucial because it is very important for the institutions to have a workforce that adequately and efficiently share and manage knowledge not just for the betterment of selves but the organization as well if they are to survive.

3 Hypotheses

1. There is no significant combined effects of leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement, leadership behaviour on academic staff's knowledge management.
2. There is no significant relative contribution of leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement, leadership behaviour to academic staff's knowledge management?

4 Literature Review

a. Work Engagement

Bakker, Demerouti and Sanz-Vergel (2014) conceptualized work engagement to be veritable tool that can propel contemporary public and private organizations to enhance organization creativity, citizenship behaviour, task performance, and client satisfaction. Ayodele, Adebuseyi and Aladenusi (2021) affirm that work engagement promotes employees' emotional commitment to the organization and their work, involvement and commitment level. Work engagement is not the same as job satisfaction. For any organization to successfully

be at the competitive advantage, have increase in performance and enhance the potentials of her workforce, the work engagement level of such organization must be ensured (Margaretha & Saragih, 2008).

Employee work engagement could be influence by so many factors which can be pruned down into two as engagement with the Organization and with the leaders. When an employee is said to be engaged with his or her organization, it shows the degree to which the employee is emotionally and affectionately attached to the organization's vision and mission. By extension, how they feel about the leadership - trust, fairness, values, respect and confidence in organizational leadership as well as interpersonal relationship with all the stake holders. On the other hand, engagement with the leaders reflect how employees relate to their direct boss or supervisors. At this level of engagement, the employees the focus is on fair treatment, mutual respect/understanding, being valued, interpersonal relationship and getting timely feedback on work performance and appraisal.

Organisations are constantly faced with the challenge of workers' poor engagement with roles. The challenge most organizations are facing in the last 2 decades is on how to have the best hands at work and make them more committed to their career, work and organization (Aninkan & Oyewole, 2014). There are factors that have been studied as antecedents or predictors of work engagement. Such factors include, but not limited to: organisational culture, job satisfaction, employee commitment, emotional intelligence, personality, and organisational citizenship behaviour (Akindele-Oscar, Adesoye & Ayodele, 2019; Sabi'u & Umar, 2016; Shuck, 2010; Ram & Prabhakar, 2011). Until proper approach is taken to address the needs and every areas of human resources, employees will never see the need to get themselves fully engaged in the overall development of the organization, sharing her

vision and promoting the organizational image through their productivity and efficiency (Ayodele, Aladenusi, & Bello, 2015; Markos & Sri devi, 2010). According to McBain (2007), work engagement drives organisational culture.

b. Organizational Culture

Organizational culture play a major role in the development of superior business performance. The role of organizational culture in encouraging organizational competitiveness, multiplicity, mergers, acquisitions, internal cohesiveness and different workforce improvements have made it a crucial requirement for advancing corporate survival, development and advancement (Szymańska, 2016). Employee's work life at times depend on the work environment they find themselves. This environment showcase shared ideals, viewpoint, ways of life, which dictates how everyone in the organization operates (Nwonyi, 2014; Schein, 2011). It is the 'thread that holds and the norm that binds the elements of an organisation' (Agwu, 2014).

Generally speaking, organisations do not exist in a vacuum but in a specific culture or socio-cultural environment that influence the way their employees think, feel and behave. This implies that organisations have beliefs, which are used to establish norms of behaviour, the way to interact with colleagues in particular and the public in general (Oguntimehin, 2016). Also, organisational culture provides a powerful mechanism for controlling behaviour by influencing how the world is viewed (Agwu, 2014).

c. Knowledge Management (KM)

All over the world today, information sharing and management is key to the overall development of a viable organization for the knowledge-based economy, which help to ensure that existing organization talents are not wasted but enhanced to help every employee develop their potentials to the fullest. As a social process, KM is a means

by which employees willingly share their talents with significant others for the betterment of everyone. As noted by Pinho (2016). "knowledge management relates to sharing resources that are non-substitutable, inimitable, rare and valuable opening up new opportunities to individuals and organisations alike".

Knowledge management is another factor that enhance work engagement. It is that systemic and organisationally specified process for acquiring, organizing and communicating both tacit and explicit knowledge of employees so that other employees may make use of it to be more effective and productive in their work (Olaniyan & Ojo, 2008; Sokhanvar, Matthews and Yarlagadda, 2014). Consideration the fact that the work environment is changing daily with a shift from a mere industrial economy, which sales of product is order of the day to a knowledge based economy, that is concerned with the overall development of the nation (Epetimehin & Ekundayo, 2011). There is a need to leverage on the existing company intellectual assets in order to produce, capture, systematize and sort for knowledge that is relevant to organization's vision and mission (Mulyaningsih, Yudoko & Rudito, 2014).

d. Leadership Behaviour

In considering other antecedents of work engagement, Leadership behaviour plays a very important role (Leithwood & Harris, 2010). This is because, in the context of organisation, leadership influences individual and group efforts toward the optimum achievement of organisational objectives (Oguntimehin & Nwosu, 2017). A better force to bring about a positive and sporadic change in the advancement of any organization is good leadership behaviour, which play a major role on organization productivity and efficiency (Adebayo & Ogunsina, 2011).

In higher institutions, leadership is one of the most important determinant of a leader's

success and an effective learning environment for academics. This normally happens because good leaders often time tap into the future, envisage the need, and make provision for the future needs by making the followers share in vision to implementation (Kelley, Thornton & Daugherty, 2005).

In the same vein, higher institution that desires to create conditions that ensure work engagement must be able to determine the extent their leadership styles or behaviour is creating work engagement. Believing so much in leaders, getting lead from them, and having emotional support from their attitudes for creating a work environment that is engrossed with psychological safety and fertile ground could get employees more engaged in their work and committed to the vision of the leaders (Bedarkar & Pandita, 2014).

5 Methods

Research Design: A descriptive survey design was adopted for this study as the researchers examined the influence of the independent variables (leadership behaviour organisational culture and work engagement) on the dependent variable (knowledge management).

Subjects: The population of this study comprised all academic staff in six selected universities (3 public and 3 private) in Ogun State, Nigeria. Simple random sampling was used to select 2252 academic staff of the institutions (1496 males and 756 females). Their academic cadre ranged from Graduate Assistant to Professor.

Sample and Sampling Techniques: The sample for this study consisted of 2252 academic staff. A multi-stage sampling method was used. At the first stage, six (6) universities were selected from the sixteen (16) fully accredited ones. These include the only federal university, 2 out of the 3 state owned university and 3 out of 12 universities owned by the private or religious

institutions. The selection involve the use of purposive sampling and random sampling methods. At the second stage, 60% of the academic staff were selected through the proportional sampling techniques. This give all the universities opportunity of equal representation. And lastly, simple random sampling technique was used in the selection of all the participants of this study.

Instrumentation

Four instruments were utilized in this study.

Knowledge Management Scale (Becerra-Fernandez & Sabherwal, 2001). The has 17 items, which was based on four classifications: Externalisation, internalisation, socialisation and combination. It is a 17 item questionnaire and has 4 point Likert rating scales ranges from Never (1) to Always (4). The reliability ranges from 0.74 to 0.89 (Oke, Ogunsemi & Adeeko, 2013; Oluchi, Okere & Olorunfemi, 2018).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) - Short Form (Avolio & Bass, 1995). It is a 45 item questionnaire. The items assessed the respondents satisfaction with leadership behaviour, extra effort, and effectiveness. It has a four-point rating scale ranges from Never (1) to Always (4). The reliability of the MLQ for each leadership factor scale ranges from 0.75 to 0.93 (Ugwu, 2016; Uzonwanne, 2017).

Dension Organisational Culture Survey (Denison, 1990). The scale contained 60 items which measures respondents' perception of

organisational culture. 36 items were adapted from the study. The items capture the general properties of organisational culture which are: Involvement, Consistency, Adaptability and Mission. It is a four (4) point Likert rating scale ranging from 1(Strongly Disagree) to 4 (Strongly Agree). The Cronbach Alpha coefficient ranges from 0.67 to 0.89.

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002). It's a 17 item scale on a 4-point rating scale ranging from Never (1) to Always (5). In Nigeria, Adekola (2010) used UWES to study how work engagement of English teachers affects their students' performance and a reliability of 0.91 was reported for the instrument.

Method of Data Analysis: The two research questions raised in this study were tested using Multiple Regression analysis at 0.05 level of significance.

6 Results

This result addressed two major concerns. The first issue was to know the degree to which leadership behaviour, work engagement and organisational culture could predict knowledge management among the university academic staff. The second issue of concern was to find out the variable that made the greater contribution to the prediction of knowledge management of university academic staff.

Table 1: Model Summary of the composite contribution of leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement to the prediction of academic staff's knowledge management

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
	.466 ^a	.217	.216	5.56492	.217	207.912	3	2248	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational culture, Leadership, Work engagement

The results in Table 1 revealed the composite contribution of work engagement, organisational culture and leadership behaviour to the prediction of university staff knowledge management. When all the predictor variables (work engagement, organisational culture and leadership behaviour) entered into the regression

model at once, they jointly predicted university staff knowledge management ($R = .466$; $R^2 = .217$; Adj. $R^2 = .216$; $F_{(3, 2248)} = 207.912$; $p = .000 < .05$). It could be said that the 21.6% of the variance observed in the university staff knowledge management was accounted for by work engagement, organisational culture and leadership behaviour.

Table 2: Model Summary of the step-wise regression of the composite contribution of work engagement, organisational culture and leadership behaviour to the prediction of university staff knowledge management

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
Leadership behaviour	.382 ^a	.146	.146	5.810	.146	384.415	1	2250	.000
Leadership, Work Eng.	.439 ^b	.193	.192	5.650	.047	130.477	1	2249	.000
Leadership, Work Eng., Org. culture	.466 ^c	.217	.216	5.565	.024	70.198	1	2248	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership

b. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership, Work engagement

c. Predictors: (Constant), Leadership, Work engagement, Organizational culture

d. Dependent Variable: KMP

The results in Table 2 indicated that leadership behaviour enter into the regression model due to its strength of relationship with knowledge management, there was a significant prediction ($R = .382$; $R^2 = .146$; Adj. $R^2 = .146$; $F_{(1,2250)} = 383.415$; $p = .000$). This implies that leadership behaviour alone accounted for about 15% (14.6) of the variance in the university staff's knowledge management. Also, when work engagement enter into the model as the second predictor variable, a significant prediction was found ($R = .439$; $R^2 = .193$; Adj. $R^2 = .192$; $F_{(1,2249)} = 130.477$; $p = .000$). This shows that work engagement along with leadership behaviour accounted for 19.2% variance in the university staff's knowledge management. Thus, work engagement accounted for an additional 4.6% of the variance in the

university staff's knowledge management. Again, when organizational culture enter into the model as the third predictor variable, there was a significant prediction knowledge management among the university staff ($R = .466$; $R^2 = .217$; Adj. $R^2 = .216$; $F_{(1,2248)} = 70.198$; $p = .000$). This shows that organizational culture, work engagement and leadership behaviour accounted for 21.6% variance in the university staff's knowledge management. Therefore, organizational culture alone accounted for an additional 2.4% of the variance observed in the university staff's knowledge management. It could be deduced that all the three predictor variables are important in predicting the university staff's knowledge management.

Table 3: Coefficients of relative contributions of leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement to the prediction of knowledge management in academia

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	14.035	1.723		8.145	.000
Work engagement	.211	.020	.214	10.438	.000
Leadership Behaviour	.176	.012	.294	14.454	.000
Organizational culture	.096	.012	.158	8.378	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Knowledge management

The results in Table 3 revealed that out of leadership behaviour, organisational culture and work engagement, leadership behaviour ($\beta = .294$; $t = 14.454$; $p = .000$) is the most compelling predictor of knowledge management in academia. This is followed by work engagement ($\beta = .214$; $t = 10.438$; $p = .000$) and lastly by organisational culture ($\beta = .158$; $t = 8.378$; $p = .000$) in the prediction of knowledge management in academia. The question of no relative contribution of organisational culture, knowledge management, and leadership behaviour to work engagement of university staff was answered. This shows a significant relative contribution of leadership behaviour, work engagement and organisational culture to knowledge management of university staff.

7 Discussion

The outcome of this study has revealed a significant composite and relative contribution of organisational culture, leadership behaviour and work engagement on academic staff's knowledge management. Result showed that leadership behaviour, work engagement and organisational culture combined to predict knowledge management of university staff. The implication of this result is that the role played by knowledge management, organisational culture, work engagement, and leadership behaviour cannot be downplayed in the overall success of the organization. Thus, academic staff's knowledge

management will promote the extent at which employees passionately get involved about their jobs, as well as putting unrestricted and flexible effort into their work for the betterment of the organization

One plausible reason for this finding may be adduced to the fact that leadership behaviour play a very important role in employees work engagement. This is because leadership behaviour influences individual and group efforts toward the optimum achievement of organisational objectives. The result is in tandem with the findings of Adebayo and Ogunsina (2011) Oguntimehin and Nwosu (2017) that development and growth of any formal organization will be facilitated by the leadership skills, which in turn promotes the efficiency and effectiveness of all the employees.

Work engagement is another factor that combined with organizational culture and leadership behaviour to enhance academic staff knowledge management. As noted by Mulyaningsih, Yudoko and Rudito (2014) there is a need to leverage on the existing company intellectual assets in order to produce, capture, systematize and sort for knowledge that is relevant to organization's vision and mission. This corroborates the report of Ayodele, Adebusi and Aladenusi (2021) that work engagement promotes employees' emotional commitment to the organization and their work, involvement and commitment level. Also, the

findings of Margaretha and Saragih (2008) lend credence to this study. They reported that for any organization to successfully be at the competitive advantage, have increase in performance and enhance the potentials of her workforce, the work engagement level of such organization must be ensured.

Organisational culture is the third potent variable in the prediction of knowledge management in academia. This implies that organisations have culture and beliefs which are used to establish norms of behaviour, the way to interact with colleagues in particular and the public in general (Oguntimehin, 2016), and seen as the 'thread that holds and the norm that binds the elements of an organisation (Agwu, 2014).

The general benefit of this result is that it provides a guide in improving academic staff work effectiveness through proper knowledge management. The positive knowledge management of academic staff is fundamental to the sustainability and achievement of the long term goals and objectives of university education. A high quality academic staff is the corner stone of successful educational system. Knowledge management should be of utmost important for the implementation of a successful, innovative, and vibrant educational system. It is through positive knowledge management that provision of service and product qualities could be ensured and thus enhance the competitive advantage of the university.

The results equally revealed the extent to which organisational culture, leadership behaviour and work engagement predicts academic staff's knowledge management. The most potent predictor of knowledge management was leadership behaviour followed by work engagement and organisational culture. It can be deduced therefore that the role leadership behaviour and its impact on the quality of the organizational climate is clear. Organizational leadership has direct bearing on the totality of the organization. The importance of knowledge

management is tied to positive organizational results due to leadership behaviour. This study therefore corroborates that of Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2015), Carnegie (2012), and Wiley (2010) to a greater extent tie organizational success to leaders and leadership traits.

8 Conclusion

This study established the predictive power of leadership behaviour, organizational culture and employee engagement on knowledge management to attain ultimate organization objectives. Therefore, education industry to remain relevant in the competitive world of work; they must ensure employees' optimum knowledge sharing and management. Academic staff's knowledge management will always remain an important factor in view of the competitiveness in the educational sector occasioned by globalization. Hence, all the factors studied will play a central role in organizations and employees performance. Leaders must therefore use knowledge management, enhanced work environment and staff engagement to support the organisation's strategic goals.

9 Acknowledgements

Our deepest gratitude goes to all the participating schools and their teaching staff for their support during the study.

10 Funding: Self-funded

11 Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests or whatsoever.

12 Availability of data and material: This on request will be made available

13 References

1. Adebayo, S. O. & Ogunsina, S. O. (2011). Influence of supervisory behaviour and job stress on job satisfaction and turnover intention of police personnel in Ekiti State. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 2(3), 13-19
2. Agwu, M. O. (2014). Organisational culture and employees' performance in the national agency for food and drugs administration and control (NAFDAC) Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 14 (2): 1-11.
3. Akindele-Oscar, A. Adesoye, E. O. & Ayodele, K. O. (2019). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal skills training programmes as strategies for enhancing teachers' teamwork behaviour in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Kampala International University (KIU) Journal of Humanities*, 4(3): 155–161.
4. Aninkan, D.O. & Oyewole, A. A. (2014). The influence of individual and organisational factors on employee engagement. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*. 3(6), 1381-1392
5. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire. Retrieved from: www.mindgarden.com.
6. Ayodele, K. O., Aladenusi, O. & Bello, A. (2015). The Mediation Effect of Personality Characteristics and University's Psycho-Social Climate on Academic Research Engagement Components. *Emerging Discourses on the future of Higher Education in Africa*, Edited by Michael A, Omolewa, Mobolanle E. Sotunsa, and Philemon, O. Amanze. Pgs. 401-415.
7. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Lieke, L. (2012). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 555-564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.08.008>
8. Bakker, A. B. & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Weekly work engagement and flourishing: The role of hindrance and challenge job demands. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83(3), 397-409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.008>
9. Becerra-Fernandez, I., & Sabherwal, R. (2001). Organisational knowledge management: A contingency perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 23-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2001.11045676>
10. Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A study on the drivers of employee engagement impacting employee performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 106-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174>
11. Bhuvanaiah, T. & Raya, R. (2015) Predicting employee work engagement levels, determinants and performance outcome: Empirical validation in the context of an information technology organization. *Global Business Review*, 17(4), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0972150916645696>
12. British Standard Institution (2013). *Introduction to Knowledge Management in Construction*. BSI, Committee Reference KMS/I. ISBN 0-580-33343-4.
13. Denison Consulting (2010). *Organisational culture and employee engagement: What's the Relationship?* Denison, 4(3) 1-4.
14. Denison, D. R. (1990). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. *Human Resource Management*, 28(4), 557-561.

15. Epetimehin, F. M., & Ekundayo, O. (2011). Organisational knowledge management: survival strategy for Nigeria insurance industry. *Interdisciplinary Review of Economics and Management*, 1(2), 9-15.
16. Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126 (1), 17–25.
17. Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Strauss, T. (2010). *Leading school turnaround How successful leaders transform low-performing schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
18. Margaretha, M., & Saragih, S. (2008). Employee engagement: Upaya peningkatan kinerja organisasi. *Proceedings of the 2nd National Conference*, Widya Mandala University, Surabaya.
19. Markos, S. K., & Sridevi, M. S. (2010). Employee engagement: The key to improving performance. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 89-96. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v5n12p89>
20. McBain, R. (2007). The practice of engagement: research into current employee engagement practice. *Strategic HR review*, 6(6):124-136. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14754390780001011>
21. Mulyaningsih, H. D., Yudoko, G., & Rudito, B. (2014). Initial conceptual model of knowledge-based social innovation. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 30 (30A), 256-262. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2014.30.icmrp.33>
22. Nwonyi, P. E. (2014) Agency culture, training, and technological application predictors of the effectiveness of commercial crime investigators in Nigeria. A thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.d) in Applied Psychology of Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria.
23. Oguntimehin, A. (2016). Promoting organizational culture in schools. *Babcock Journal of Education (BUJED)*, 2(1), 94-107.
24. Oguntimehin, A., & Nwosu, J. (2017). *The administrative process: Educational management series1*. Ijebu-Ode: Lucky Odoni (Nig.) Enterprises.
25. Oke, A. E., Ogunsemi D. R. & Adeeko O. C. (2013). Assessment of Knowledge Management Practices among Construction Professionals in Nigeria. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 2(3): 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijcem.20130203.06>
26. Olaniyan, D. A. & Ojo, L. B. (2008). Staff training and development: A vital tool for organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 24(3), 326-331.
27. Ologbo, AC, and Sofian, S. (2013). Individual and Organizational Factors of Employee Engagement on Employee Work Outcomes. *International Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, 3(3), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.222>
28. Oluchi O. Okere, O. O. & Olorunfemi, M. (2018). Academic Library Leadership in South West Nigeria and Recession: An Exploratory Study. *International Information & Library Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2017.1378047>

29. Ram, P., & Prabhakar, G. (2011). The role of employee engagement in work-related outcomes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*, 1(3): 47-61.
<https://doi.org/10.13189/aeb.2015.030602>
30. Sabi'u, S. M & Umar, A. A. (2016). Human resource management, employee engagement and employee performance in Nigerian public sector: A Proposed Model. *Sokoto Journal of Management Studies*, 11 (2), 272-297.
31. 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: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, 3(1), 71-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
32. Schein, E. H. (2011). *Leadership and organisational culture*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
33. Shuck, M. B. (2010). *Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables*. An unpublished PhD thesis, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, FIU Electronic Theses and Dissertations.
34. Sokhanvar, S., Matthews, J. & Yarlagadda, P. (2014). Importance of knowledge management processes in a project-based organization: A case study of research enterprise. *Procedia Engineering* 97, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.proeng.2014.12.336>
35. Organisational culture as a part in the development of open innovation - the perspective of small and medium-sized enterprises, *Management* 20(1), 142-150.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/manment-2015-0030>
36. Ugwu, C. C. (2016). Adaptation of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Mlq Form-5x) In Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*. 6(4)4, 10-21
37. Uzonwanne, C.F. (2017). Transformational and transactional leadership styles among leaders of administrative ministries in Lagos, Nigeria, *IFE Psychologia*, 25(2), 151-164.
38. Whittington, L. J., & Galpin, T. J. (2010). The engagement factor: Building a high-commitment organization in a low-commitment world. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 31(5), 14-24.