

# Satisfaction of academics with leadership, creativity, innovation and organisational performance at a university 5.0 work environment

Thobekani Lose and Luthando Jack  
Nelson Mandela University, South Africa

## Keywords

University 5.0, innovation, creativity, technology revolution, competitiveness

## Abstract

*Just like in industries, university and other higher educational institutions are facing novel working contexts arising from their present technological transitions. As a result, known factors that influence organisational success require new assessments to establish how they have been affected by the disruptions. The objectives of this study were to: (1) explore the satisfaction of academics with leadership, creativity, innovation and organisational performance at university 5.0 work environments (2) assess the relationship between transformational leadership and organisational performance within the university 5.0 context and (3) assess the relationship between innovation and organisational performance within the university 5.0 context. To attain the stated objectives, 200 academics from a university that is a leader in the adoption of education 5.0 transitions completed a questionnaire and the data was analysed. The study found that the academics were satisfied with the leadership, creativity, innovation and organisational performance associated with the university 5.0 contexts. It appears that the adoption of university 5.0 practices was favourable for creativity, innovation and performance. Future studies may have to follow comparative designs that factor in the relevance of sector specific mediators in the realisation of innovativeness, creativity and productivity of university 5.0.*

## Introduction

At present the business environment is being transformed by technological systems (Icela, Soledad & Antonio, 2023; Hirschi, 2018) thereby calling for studies in worker satisfaction with the new work context. Such studies allow for better appreciation of the new transformations and how to ensure organisational competitiveness remain optimal. Traditional work patterns have been disrupted and business models transformed. Consequently, previously established knowledge systems are being challenged (Mukhuty, Upadhyay & Rothwell, 2022). Of interest to this study is how leadership, employee creativity, innovation and organisational performance are relating to each other given the shift to education 5.0 in South Africa. Higher education is witnessing increased digitalisation, automation, information load, analytics, connectivity, and transparency (Sudibjo, Idawati & Harsanti, 2019). The dependent variables of interest were employee creativity, innovation and transformational leadership behaviours and organisational performance while the independent variable was the work environment associated with higher education 5.0. It was important in this study to determine the strength of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables so as to inform higher educational institutions on how they can better take the technological environment to solve problems in society 5.0

## Literature review

As reported by the Presidential Commission on the Fourth Industrial Revolution (2020) and also explained in Schwab (2016), digitalization as a result of the 4IR has created smart industries which are to be managed through smart management practices involving interconnected systems. At a time when most organizations were working on ensuring that they adapt to the new management models, the Covid-19 pandemic resulted in lock downs and closure of businesses resulting in forced need to digitalise.

Higher education (and education in general) has evolved from education 1.0 (9<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> century) which was teacher centered to education 2.0 (15<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> century) which was knowledge and exam centered through education 3.0 (18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century) which was student centered up to education 4.0 (20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>th</sup> century) which was outcome or action based (Nikum, 2022). In the view of Nikum (2022), education 5.0 is more

about people and the realisation of their creativity in the use of technological systems. Usmaedi (2021) support this view and explains that education 5.0 seeks to ensure that humans are at the centre of innovation based on the use of technology to improve the quality of life, social status, and general welfare of people. In their study of higher education 5.0, Aviva, Adiputra, Wibowo, Anshori and Safrizal (2023), averred that society 5.0 and education 5.0 is haunted by the challenge of creating educationist and academics who digitally competent, innovate and creative to meet new demands. Additionally, higher education has to respond to the progression to society 5.0 and this responsiveness require appropriate transformational leadership, innovativeness, and creativity (Susanto, Pritikana & Utama, 2024).

Earlier studies like that of Alharbi (2023) have explored the implementation of education 5.0 in developing and developed countries and recommended further studies to understand the challenges and opportunities of implementation of education 5.0. The present study focuses on satisfaction with leadership, creativity, innovation, and organisational performance at university 5.0 environments. Previous studies (Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009) have established that there is a positive relationship between leadership and employee creativity and innovation, and this finally leads to better performance. This study will consider this relationship at a university 5.0 environment which is characterized by widespread automation and digitalization given the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR). There is no adequate knowledge on how the restructuring, disruption of previously established management models and adoption of smart digital management practices affect project goal attainment (Mminele, 2018). Dhanpat, Buthelezi, Joe, Maphela & Shongwe (2020) asserted that some sectors have found this as a positive development in improving management effectiveness, specific studies on the influence of digital management practices on construction projects undertaken by the Cape Construction are still little. As a result, the effective ways in which digital management practices influence project goal attainment is still lacking (Gastrow, 2020).

### Methodology

The study was quantitative and based on the collection of questionnaire data from one two hundred (200) academics at a selected university in South Africa and enquiring on their satisfaction with leadership, innovation, organisational performance and creativity. The university was purposively selected because of its status as a recognised leader in the implementation of higher education 5.0. Purposive sampling involves selecting a case based on its suitability for a certain purpose of a study (Christensen, Johnson & Turner, 2015; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Academics were approached to seek their willingness to participate. The majority (53.5%) of the 200 respondents were males while 46,5% of them were females. It can, however, be argued that the sample was quite gender representative given that there was a small difference between numbers of males and female respondents in the study. Participants with working experience less than 5 years were 58 which is 29% , those with 5 -10 years of experience were 117 which is 58.5% and those with 10-15 years were 25 which is 12.5%. The education level of the respondents showed that 22 had diploma which is 11%, 58 had degrees which is 29% , 51 had master's which is 25.5%, 62 respondents had PhDs which is 31% and others were 7 which is 3.5% . The questionnaire was based on Likert scale items which were coded as follows: Strongly Disagree (SD) =1, Disagree (D)=2, Neutral (N)=3, Agree (A)=4 and Strongly Agree (SA)=5

### Findings

For the analysis presented in this section, data was coded as follows - TL:Transformational leadership, OP: organisational performance, EC= Employee creativity , OI=Organisational Performance. Mean less than 2.4 indicates a lower level of agreement and a mean of 2,5 and above indicates a high level of agreement. To achieve the objectives that have been stated for this study, a normality test was performed to the data set so as to establish whether the data was normally distributed. The Tests for normality yielded the results displayed in the next section

**Table 1: Normality test**

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
TL	.172	200	.000	.937	200	.000
PS	.124	200	.000	.974	200	.001
IM	.217	200	.000	.777	200	.000
EM	.184	200	.000	.913	200	.000
IS	.228	200	.000	.891	200	.000
EC	.218	200	.000	.919	200	.000
OI	.228	200	.000	.898	200	.000
OP	.184	200	.000	.936	200	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

(TL - Transformational Leadership, PS - Perception of support, IM - intrinsic motivation, EM- Empowerment assertions, IS -Intellectual Stimulation, EC - Employee Creativity, OI-Organisational Innovation, OP- Organisational Performance).

As shown in Table 4 All variables did not follow a normal distribution (for TL,  $p=0.000<0.005$ , for PS= $0.001<0.005$ , for IM = $0.000<0.001$ , for EM= $0.000<0.005$ , for IS= $0.000<0.005$ , for EC= $0.000<0.005$ , for OI= $0.000<0.005$ , for OP= $0.000<0.005$ ).

Since the variables did not follow a normal distribution, the appropriate analysis that were adopted were spearman’s rho as were as ordinal regression analysis analysis it was appropriate to perform correlation analysis to establish how the variables related to one another and to attain the study objectives. Table 2 provides a summary of the Results of Spearman’s rho correlation analysis correlations of all the variables considered in the analysis, individual based analysis for each variable is treated in the next section.

**Table 2: Summary of correlations between the variables**

		OP	TL	PS	IM	EM	IS	EC	OI	
Spearman's rho	OP	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.766**	.676**	.140*	.293**	.800**	.689**	.866**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.048	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	TL	Correlation Coefficient	.766**	1.000	.754**	.209**	.240**	.816**	.659**	.771**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.003	.001	.000	.000	.000
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	PS	Correlation Coefficient	.676**	.754**	1.000	.228**	.300**	.731**	.576**	.662**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	IM	Correlation Coefficient	.140*	.209**	.228**	1.000	.366**	.160*	.271**	.161*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.003	.001	.	.000	.023	.000	.023
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	EM	Correlation Coefficient	.293**	.240**	.300**	.366**	1.000	.281**	.425**	.286**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	IS	Correlation Coefficient	.800**	.816**	.731**	.160*	.281**	1.000	.668**	.817**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.023	.000	.	.000	.000
		N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	EC	Correlation Coefficient	.689**	.659**	.576**	.271**	.425**	.668**	1.000	.660**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	
OI	Correlation Coefficient	.866**	.771**	.662**	.161*	.286**	.817**	.660**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.023	.000	.000	.000	.	

N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

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

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

TL: **Transformational** leadership, OP: organisational performance, EC= Employee creativity ,  
 OI=Organisational Performance,IS= Intellectual stimulation ,EM= Empowerment, IM= Intrinsic  
 motivation, PS= Perception for support

**Employee creativity**

Table 3 provides views provided by respondents in respect of employee creativity in the organisation

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Employee creativity**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I am encouraged to suggest new ways to achieve goals	200	1	5	2.48	.987
2. I am motivated to come up with new or practical ideas to improve performance	200	1	5	2.42	.989
3. Constructive criticisms are accepted and encouraged	200	1	5	2.77	1.142
4. My suggestions are sometimes taken into account	200	1	5	2.61	1.031
Valid N (listwise)	200				

In interpreting the means above: the highest agreement was that constructive criticisms are accepted and encouraged (mean=2.77,;Sd=1.142); my suggestions are sometimes taken into account (Mean=2.61, SD=1.031): 1. I am encouraged to suggest new ways to achieve goals (Mean=2.48,;SD=.989 ) and I am motivated to come up with new or practical ideas to improve performance (Mean=2.42,; SD=.989)

The strength and direction of the correlation between employee creativity and organisational performance is shown in Table 4

**Table 4: correlation coefficient for assessing the relationship between organisational performance and employee creativity**

		OP	EC
Spearman's rho	OP	1.000	.689**
			.000
		200	200
	EC	.689**	1.000
		.000	.
		200	200

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

Table 4 shows a strong positive correlation (r=0.689) for the relationship between organisational performance and employee creativity. This correlation was significant (p=0.0001<0.005). Implication of this result is that improvement in employee creativity can result in improvement in organisational performance. This is evidence that the organisation need to boost the creativity of employees as this has a positive effect on organisational performance.

The relationship between Transformational Leadership and organisational performance.

Table 5 provides views provided by respondents in respect of transformational leadership in the organisation

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for transformational**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. There is an instilled sense of fulfilment in employees in this organisation	200	1	5	2.65	1.151
2. Leadership goes beyond self-interest for the good of the employees	200	1	5	2.68	1.244

3. In this organisation, people are enthusiastic about what needs to be accomplished	200	1	5	2.60	1.116
4. Leadership articulates compelling vision in this organisation	200	1	5	2.48	1.032
5. Leadership considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	200	1	5	2.62	1.163
Valid N (listwise)	200				

In interpreting the means above: the highest agreement was that leadership in the organisation goes beyond self-interest for the good of the employees (Mean =2.68: SD=), Other statements with a better tendency for agreement were there is an instilled sense of fulfilment in employees in this organisation (Mean=2.65,SD=1.151). Followed by Leadership considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions (Mean =2.62,SD =1.163). In this organisation, people are enthusiastic about what needs to be accomplished (Mean=2.60,SD=1.116).The lowest agreement was Leadership articulates compelling vision in this organisation with a (Mean=2.48,SD=1.032). Correlation analysis was then performed to establish how the statements on transformational leadership were related to organisational performance. The results of the spearman's correlation analysis were as presented in Table 6

**Table 6: Correlation coefficient for assessing the relationship between organisational performance and transformational leadership**

			OP	TL
Spearman's rho	OP	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.766**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	200	200
	TL	Correlation Coefficient	.766**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	200	200

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

Table 6 shows a strong positive correlation ( $r=0.766$ ) for the relationship between organisational performance and transformational leadership. This correlation was significant ( $p=0.0001<0.005$ ). Implication of this result is that improvement in transformational leadership can result in improvement in organisational performance. This is evidence that the organisation need to boost the transformational leadership as this has a positive effect on organisational performance.

The relationship between organisational innovation and organisational performance

The relationship between organisational innovation and organisational performance was as as presented in Table 7

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics for organisational innovation					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
The rate of introduction of new services into the organisation has grown rapidly	200	1	5	2.83	1.063
The rate of introduction of new methods of delivery of services into the organisation has grown rapidly.	200	1	5	2.80	1.062
The rate of introduction of new markets services into the organisation has grown rapidly	200	1	5	2.81	1.050

The rate of introduction of new systems for strategic planning and control into the organisation has grown	200	1	5	2.82	.991
The rate of introduction of new systems for training and development or promoting managers into the organisation has grown rapidly	200	1	5	2.96	1.088
6.The organisation develop new competencies supporting innovation in the organisation	200	1	5	2.87	1.062
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results provided by respondents on organisational innovation were characterized by a high-level agreement to the statements that: The rate of introduction of new systems for training and development or promoting managers into the organisation has grown rapidly (Mean=2.96,;SD=1.088): The organisation develop new competencies supporting innovation in the organisation with a ( Mean=2.87,; SD=1.062): The rate of introduction of new services into the organisation has grown rapidly (Mean=2.83,;SD=1.063). Followed by the statement: The rate of introduction of new systems for strategic planning and control into the organisation has grown with (Mean=2.82,;SD=.991) : The rate of introduction of new markets services into the organisation has grown rapidly with a(Mean=2.81,;SD=1.050) and the lower response was: The rate of introduction of new methods of delivery of services into the organisation has grown rapidly with a (Mean =2.80,;SD=1.062

**Table 8 shows correlation coefficient for assessing the relationship between organisational performance and organisational innovation**

#### Correlations

			OP	OI
Spearman's rho	P	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.866**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	I	Correlation Coefficient	.866**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
N			200	200

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

Table 8 shows a strong positive correlation ( $r=0.866$ ) for the relationship between organisational performance and organisational innovation. This correlation was significant ( $p=0.0001<0.005$ ). Implication of this result is that improvement in organisational innovation can result in improvement in organisational performance. This is evidence that the organisation need to boost organisational innovation as this has a positive effect on organisational performance.

#### Regression analysis

Given that this data was not consistency with the normal distribution the test for regression that was appropriate was either ordinal logistic regression or multinomial logistic regression.

Ordinal logistic regression was first attempted, and the parallel test was as shown in Table 9

**Table 9: Test of Parallel Lines<sup>a</sup>**

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	881.306			
General	.000 <sup>b</sup>	881.306	87	.000

The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.

a. Link function: Logit.

b. The log-likelihood value is practically zero. There may be a complete separation in the data. The maximum likelihood estimates do not exist.

The Test of parallel lines in Table 9 was violated ( $p=0.0001 < 0.005$ ) thereby making the ordinal logistics model inappropriate for the analysis. In order to use the ordinal logistics model, the test of parallel should provide a p value that is more than 0.05. Given this violation, the multinomial logistic regression model became appropriate for the study

A multinomial logistic regression was performed to assess the relationship between, employee creativity, transformational leadership and organisational performance. The traditional of 0.05 criteria of statistically significant was employed for all tests. The result was as follows  $\chi^2(90, N=200) = 434.319$ , Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .888$ ,  $p < .001$ . The Tables below provides the model fitting information

**Table 10: Model Fitting Information**

Model	Model Fitting Criteria		Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood		Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	1152.913				
Final	718.594		434.319	90	.000

Since the p value was less than 0.05 the model fits the data significantly than a dull model

**Table 11: Goodness-of-Fit**

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	2296.730	4200	1.000
Deviance	699.071	4200	1.000

**Table 12: Pseudo R-Square**

Cox and Snell	.886
Nagelkerke	.888
McFadden	.365

Given that the P value for Pearson was 1.000 ( $P > 0.05$ ) the model adopted is not statistically significant meaning that it the model fits the data set well and also the value of p value for Deviance is  $p = 1.000$  which is greater than 0.05 means that it is not statistically significant, so the model fits the data set very well. Table 13 provides the likelihood Ratio Tests

**Table 13: Likelihood Ratio Tests**

Effect	Model Fitting Criteria		Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model		Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept	993.307		274.713	30	.000
OI	872.611		154.017	30	.000
TL	778.512		59.918	30	.001
EC	776.348 <sup>a</sup>		57.754	30	.002

The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.

a. unexpected singularities in the Hessian matrix are encountered. This indicates that either some predictor variables should be excluded, or some categories should be merged.

The results of the likelihood ratio test presented above shows organisational innovation (OI) significantly has an effect on organisational performance ( $p=0.0001<0.05$ ), transformational leadership significantly has an effect on organisational performance ( $p=0.001<0.05$ ), employee creativity significantly has an effect on organisational performance ( $p=0.002<0.05$ )

#### *Other variables influencing organisational performance*

The independent variable for this study was organisational performance (OP). Given that OP is affected by many variables, some of them were analysed in this study, it was important to consider descriptive statistics for OP from the data. The other variables that are described in this section were not specifically mentioned in the objectives but may directly affect OP or they may mediate the relation between OP and the other variables which were of interest in this study. Findings in relation to OP for this study are shown in Table 14

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. The quality of our products and services has been improved	200	1	6	2.66	.944
This organisation Employee education and training has increased	200	1	5	2.91	1.124
. The employees' satisfaction has increased in this organization	200	1	5	3.09	1.120
Customer satisfaction has increased in this organisation	200	1	5	2.82	1.011
. We continuously try to strengthen innovation skills in key areas where we have no prior experiences	200	1	6	2.71	1.045
The organisation is constantly exploring new/different ways to understand the expectations and requirements of key stakeholders	200	1	5	2.60	.972
The business processes are flexible allowing us to achieve high levels of responsiveness towards key stakeholder needs and demands	200	1	6	2.85	1.080
Customer complaints has decreased in this organisation	200	1	5	2.82	1.061
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results for organisational performance indicate strong agreement on the statement that: . The employees' satisfaction has increased in this organization with a (Mean =3.09,SD=1.120). Followed by the statement that: This organisation Employee education and training has increased with (Mean =2.91,SD=1.124), The business processes are flexible allowing us to achieve high levels of responsiveness towards key stakeholder needs and demands had (Mean=2.85,SD=1.080). Customer satisfaction has increased in this organisation (Mean =2.82,SD=1.011) the statement that: Customer complaints has decreased in this organisation had a (Mean=2.82,SD=1.061) The statement that: We continuously try to strengthen innovation skills in key areas where we have no prior experiences had a (Mean =2.71,SD=1.045). The statement with low agreement were : The quality of our products and services has been improved with (Mean =2.60,SD=.972) and the statement : The organisation is constantly exploring new/different ways to understand the expectations and requirements of key stakeholders with a (Mean =2.60,SD=.972)



**Perception for support**

Statements for employee support in the organisation resulted in the described statistics shown on the table 15

**Table 15: Descriptive Statistics on Perception for support**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Leadership always encourages people to come up innovative ideas	200	1	5	2.28	1.032
2. In my organisation, people are encouraged to solve the same problems using different ways	200	1	5	2.48	.935
3. This organisation is flexible and continually adapting to change	200	1	6	2.69	1.167
4. This organisation seems to be more concerned with the status quo than with change	200	1	5	2.94	1.279
5. This organisation publicly recognises those who are creative and innovative	200	1	5	2.88	1.230
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results for perception for support indicates the high agreement on the statement that: This organisation seems to be more concerned with the status quo than with change with a (Mean =2.94,SD=1,279) This organisation publicly recognises those who are creative and innovative with a (Mean =2.88,SD=1.230) .Followed by the statement that : This organisation is flexible and continually adapting to change with a (Mean =2.69,SD=1.167) The statement with a lower agreement rate were In my organisation, people are encouraged to solve the same problems using different ways with a (Mean=2.48,SD=.935) and .Leadership always encourages people to come up innovative ideas with a (Mean=2.28,SD=1.032)

**Table 16: provides views provided by respondents in respect of intrinsic motivation**

**Descriptive Statistics for intrinsic motivation**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I enjoy finding solutions to complex problems	200	1	6	1.70	.745
2. I enjoy engaging in analytical thinking	200	1	5	1.68	.648
3. I enjoy creating new procedures for work tasks	200	1	5	1.68	.665
4. I enjoy improving existing processes or products	200	1	5	1.67	.675
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results provided by the respondents indicates a lower agreement with the statement that : . I enjoy finding solutions to complex problems with a (Mean=1.70,SD=.745). Followed by the statement that . I enjoy engaging in analytical thinking with a (Mean=1.68,SD=.648) and I enjoy creating new procedures for work tasks with a (Mean=1.68,SD=.665).

**Table 17: Provides views provided by respondents in respect of empowerment**

**Empowerment**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my tasks	200	1	5	2.21	1.010
2. I have considerable freedom on how I carry out my tasks	200	1	5	2.21	1.014
3. The work I do is very important to me	200	1	5	1.61	.701
4. My job activities are meaningful to me	200	1	5	1.78	.798

5. I am confident about my ability to do my tasks	200	1	5	1.50	.665
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results show low agreement that autonomy determines how tasks are done (Mean =2.21,SD=1.010). Respondents that considerable freedom on how I carry out my tasks (Mean=2.21, SD=1.014), The statement that: My job activities are meaningful to me had a (Mean=1.78,SD=.798) and the lowest agreement were as follows : The work I do is very important to me with a (Mean=1.61,SD.701) : I am confident about my ability to do my tasks with a (Mean=1.50,SD=.665)

*Table 18 provides views provided by respondents in respect of intrinsic motivation Intellectual stimulation*

Descriptive Statistics for intellectual stimulation					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. Leadership spends time mentoring and coaching	200	1	5	3.01	1.188
2. Leadership considers each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations.	200	1	5	2.89	1.181
3. Leadership inspires employees to look at problems from different angles	200	1	5	2.85	1.117
4. Leadership solicits differing perspectives when solving problems	200	1	5	2.87	1.106
5. Leadership helps employees to develop their capabilities	200	1	5	2.86	1.207
Valid N (listwise)	200				

The results provided by the respondents indicates a high agreement starting with the statement that: Leadership spends time mentoring and coaching with a (Mean=3,01,SD=1.188).The second high agreement is: Leadership considers each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations with (Mean =2.89,SD=1.181). The third highest response is: Leadership solicits differing perspectives when solving problems with a (Mean=2.87,SD=1.106) . Followed by the statement that : . Leadership helps employees to develop their capabilities (Mean=2.86,SD=1.207) and the last statement :Leadership solicits differing perspectives when solving problems with a (Mean=2.85,SD=1.106)

## Conclusion

In conclusion the respondents indicate high satisfaction with employment creativity with a (mean=3.4312, sd=.89314), transformational leadership had a mean of (mean=3.3980, sd= .99768). Satisfaction that organisational performance has improved was also high (mean =3.2031, sd=.89522) and Organisational innovation had a (mean=3.1542, mean=.97182). The findings of the study suggest that there is strong positive correlation ( $r=0.689$ ) for the relationship between organisational performance and employee creativity. This correlation was significant ( $p=0.0001<0.005$ ). Implication of this result is that improvement in employee creativity can result in improvement in organisational performance. This is evidence that the organisation needs to boost the creativity of employees as this has a positive effect on organisational performance. There also shows a strong positive correlation ( $r=0.766$ ) for the relationship between organisational performance and transformational leadership. This correlation was significant ( $p=0.0001<0.005$ ). Implication of this result is that improvement in transformational leadership can result in improvement in organisational performance. This is evidence that the organisation needs to boost the transformational leadership as this has a positive effect on organisational performance. The results also show a strong positive correlation ( $r=0.866$ ) for the relationship between organisational performance and organisational innovation. This correlation was significant ( $p=0.0001<0.005$ ). Implication of this result is that improvement in organisational innovation can result in improvement in organisational performance.

This is evidence that the organisation needs to boost the organisational innovation as this has a positive effect on organisational performance.

### References

- Sudibjo, N. Idawati, L. & Harsanti, H.G.R. 2019. Characteristics of Learning in the Era of Industry 4.0 and Society 5.0. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 372: 276-278
- Nikum, K. 2022. Answers to the Societal Demands with Education 5.0: Indian Higher Education System. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 36:115-127
- Usmaedi, C. 2021. Education curriculum for society 5.0 in the next decade. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Setia Budhi*, 4(2):63-79
- Aviva, N., Adiputra, W., Wibowo, F. A., Anshori, M.I. & Safrizal, H.B.A. 2023. Challenges of Higher Education in Facing the Society 5.0 Era: Systematic Literature Review (SLR). *EDUMASPUL*, 7(2):5305-5307
- Susanto., A.M., Epriliyana, N.N., Utama H.H. (2024). Implementation of Learning Innovations in Society 5.0 to Stimulate Creative Thinking Skills in Higher Education. *Jurnal Dimensi Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo*, 12(1):25-36.
- Gumusluoglu, L. & Ilsev, A. 2009. Transformational leadership, creativity, and organizational innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62: 461-473
- Icela, G-P.L., Soledad, R-M.M. & Enciso-Gonzalez Juan Antonio, E-G.J. 2023. Education 4.0 Maturity Models for Society 5.0: Systematic literature review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(3):1-27
- Hirschi, A. 2018. The fourth industrial revolution: Issues and implications for career research and practice. *The career Development Quarterly*, 66. 192-204
- Mukhuty, S., Upadhyay, A., & Rothwell, H. 2022. Strategic sustainable development of Industry 4.0 through the lens of social responsibility: The role of human resource practices. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 1-14. South Africa. 2020. *Presidential Commission on The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Pretoria: Government printers.
- Mminele, D. 2018. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution and the future of work: some implications for central banking*. Speech at University of Zululand, MBALI International conference
- Gastrow, M. 2020. *Policy options for the Fourth Industrial Revolution in South Africa*. Human Sciences Research Council. [www.hsrc.ac.za](http://www.hsrc.ac.za) [20/03/2023]
- Creswell, J.W. & Creswell, J.D. 2018. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New Delphi: Sage publications.
- Christensen, L.B., Johnson, R.B. & Turner, L.A. 2015. *Research methods, design, and analysis*. 12<sup>th</sup> Global edition. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Schwab, K. 2016. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. New York: Crown Business.