[*Umukoro* et al., 6(12): December, 2019*] ISSN: 2349-5197
Impact Factor: 3.765

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH SCIENCE & MANAGEMENT

FLEXIBLE WELLBEING AND SMART-HEAD

Jones E. Umukoro*[1] & Johnson A. Egwakhe[2]
Department of Business Administration and Marketing, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3596345

Abstract
The study argued that flexible wellbeing determines the depth of smart-head among academic staff of any university. The workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical, technological, and psychological work environment appeared to have affected Nigeria universities teaching staff creativity and patents. It is against this background that three private universities were purposively selected and eighty-five copies of a validated questionnaire was distributed and retrieved after establishing reliability. The results from multiple regression analysis conducted found that flexible wellbeing variables had combined positive significant effect on smart-head [$R = 0.756$, $F_{(6, 78)} = 17.303$, $p < 0.05$]. However, based on the individual predictors, life-satisfaction, physical and, technological work environment had a positive and significant individual effect among other predictors. The recommended was pillared on improved flexible wellbeing to stimulate smart-head among academic staff of universities

Keywords: Flexible wellbeing, life satisfaction, mental health, physical work environment, psychological work environment, smart head, technological work environment, workload.

Introduction
The debate as to what drives academics smart-head is universal and extensive as scholars and commentators work seek solutions. Context observation has shown that researchers, policy-makers, Human Resource specialists, and business owners had tackled and conceptualized smart-head from different perspectives (Ballface, 2004; Hassan, 2016). However, what stimulates smart-head has to be, conceptualized from creativity and transformative thinking since creative person connotes possession of great intellectual capacity, critical thinking, and novelty. The aforementioned is argued to be a probable derivative of wellbeing. A report by Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] (2009, 2018) established creativity as one of the most critical skills for the future, and the future requires people who are problem-solvers and adapt to workplaces and environment that are increasingly complex.

More so, to achieve creativity, people are required to be expressive, energetic, imaginative, and unconventional (OECD, 2009). Interestingly, the literature on creativity (Amabile & Pratt, 2016; Batey, 2013; Gupta & Banerjee, 2016; Sadi, 2019; Usoro, 2018) have often interchangeably used the concepts of individual creativity, performance, effectiveness, and output, with the assumption that a high-performing individual should be more creative. Nevertheless, a growing concern is the fact that Nigeria ranked 134 of 140 countries on critical thinking in teaching and research skills, and 117 of 137 countries in levels of research and development and patents per capita (World Economic Forum, 2017, 2018). Compounding the low creativity ranking, Nigeria ranked 152 of 157 countries on the human capital index based on the knowledge, skills, and health that people accumulate to enable them to realize their potential as productive members of society (World Economic Forum, 2018). Thus human capital index report could be linked to creativity (Sipa, 2018).

Flexible wellbeing is multifaceted and is a growing area of research (Gareth & Wilson, 2017; Guest, 2017); and the perspective encompasses how people experience and evaluate their lives positively (Tov, 2018). This flexible wellbeing drives a creative person in ideas creation, reflective and critical thinking and the ability to translate ideas into action **(**Kenetta, Levy, Kenett, Stanley, Faust, & Havlin, 2017; Paek & Sumners, 2017). As such, individual creativity is the driver of organizational creativity (Gupta & Banerjee, 2016) which probably is derived from flexible wellbeing. Hence the strength of every organization lies primarily on smart-head (Usoro & Etuk, 2016) as stimulated by workers' wellbeing. Scholars have claimed that the product in creativity is almost

always the focal point of smart-head/creativity (Gajda, Karwowski, & Beghetto, 2017; Kanematsu & Barry, 2016). However, Corazza (2016) contended that no matter the sector, to achieve creativity, it is important not to carry out the study on only the product but, on the person who produces the product, the process involved, the resources available, and the pressure and support in the environment to perform on the job.

Thus, Rubenstein, Ridgley, Callan, Karami, and Ehlinger (2018) advanced that, without reference to the person who utilizes cognitive processes, a product cannot be produced within an environment. Therefore, Abubakar, Hilman, and Kaliappen (2018) affirmed that employees are responsible for most of the great ideas for achieving profile ranking, corporate growth, and profits. Hence, 'when people are happier, they tend to be more open-minded and creative in their thinking. In contrast, unhappy people, stressed, or dissatisfied tend to exhibit 'tunnel vision' and rigid thinking' (Lambert, Elechi, & Out, 2018, p. 32).

Studies have substantiated reports that worldwide, in tertiary institutions, one factor affecting academic staff output is flexible wellbeing (Gareth & Wilson, 2017; Mudrak, Zabrodska, Kveton, Jelinek, Blatny, Solcova, & Machovcova, 2017; Steenkamp & Roberts, 2018), however the extent of wellbeing experienced by academics in Nigerian universities is abysmal and has remained a growing concern (Omole, 2018; Usoro, 2018). These concerns are not only peculiar to the public universities but private universities since they operate within the same economic climate, are an offshoot from the same weakened education industry and constitute 48% of the total number of universities in Nigeria. Hence, private universities are not insusceptible (Olukoju, 2019; Rasheed, 2018). It is on this premise that this article investigated the effect of flexible wellbeing on smart-head in selected private universities in South-West Nigeria. The work is structured into a literature review after the introduction, methodology, the results presentation, conclusion, and recommendation.

Literature Review

Conceptually, smart-head is used to refer to a person possessing intellectual capacity (Ballface, 2004). It is characterized as new ways of working, ability to adapt new intellectual ideas (Stanford, 2012). Also, it connotes a phenomenon that involves a desire to grow and a capability to be puzzled, spontaneous, a divergent thinker, open to new experiences, persistent, and a smart and hard worker (Kanematsu & Barry, 2016; Runco, 2004). The perception of previous scholars aligns with creative person as, Barron and Harrington (1981) had earlier opined that a creative person has a high valuation of aesthetic qualities in experience, broad interests, and attraction to complexity, high energy, independence of judgment, autonomy, intuition, self-confidence, and a firm sense of self as creative. Therefore, based on previous definitions, Kanematsu and Barry (2016) postulated that the concept of creative person which is consistent with smart-head refers to originality, flexibility, fluency, and elaboration of ideas.

Interestingly, while fluency refers to the total number of meaningful ideas generated, originality relates to the rarity of the concept. On the other hand, elaboration is the amount of detail and flexibility of ideas and the ability to break apart from mental fascinations (Kanematsu & Barry, 2016; Kenetta et al., 2017). This perspective aligns with the education environment as, lecturers, educators, or academic staff are referred to as, the creative class (Florida, 2002; Zhou & Shalley, 2018). Thus this work referred to a creative person as the quality of faculty in terms of originality, flexibility, fluency, and elaboration in ideas depicting smart-head in academics' output.

A report by Mercer (2015) proposed that wellbeing captures the essence of what drives success both inside and outside the workplace; encompassing physical, emotional, and financial health, but not limited to wellness and health management. Ahmed, Kamil, and Ishak (2018) added that wellbeing is achieved when there is a match between the equilibrium level of the workers' resource pool and the demands. In congruence with these submissions, Amabile (2012) emphasized the inclusion of time and money (in the form of wages) as creative facilitating resources, while Jovanović and Joshanloo (2019) advanced that life satisfaction, is a predictor of wellbeing. Therefore, flexible wellbeing promotes the mental and physical health (Bücker, Nuraydin, Simonsmeier, Schneider, & Luhmann, 2018), and supports creativity in terms of novelty, fluency, flexibility, and originality of ideas and solutions to problems (Dahie, Mohamed (Aligees), & Khalif, 2017; Suh, 2019).

Thus, the causes, consequences, and correlates of flexible wellbeing may depend on the context, and theoretical perspective adopted.

Scholars have perceived wellbeing as the result of a dynamic process of constant interaction between individual factors and environmental, cultural and social factors (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002; Mininni, Manuti, Scardigno, & Rubino, 2010). Taylor (2015) added that flexible wellbeing at work presents a valuable opportunity to benefit societies by helping working individuals to feel happy, competent, and satisfied in their roles. Also, people who achieve the standard of flexible wellbeing at work are likely to be more creative, more loyal, more productive, and deliver better services than individuals with suboptimal standards at work. Therefore, understanding flexible wellbeing as holistic life experience is much broader than physical wellness (Lovell & Beckstrand, 2015). As such, O'Brien and O'Shea (2016) supported previous scholars' submission that although there are many definitions of wellbeing, any definition of flexible wellbeing should communicate its multi-dimensional nature and draws on the insights of psychology, philosophy, and sociology. Consequently, rather than attempting to formulate a complete definition, establishing clear working outlines for each separate discussion or study is recommended. Thus flexible wellbeing involves both mental, psychological, physical, and financial wholeness (Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2018; Jovanović & Joshanloo, 2019; Mercer, 2015; WHO, 2014). Hence flexible wellbeing in this work was measured by workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical, technological, and psychological work environment.

Workload

Duze (2011) referred to the workload as the amount of work assigned or expected to be carried out within a specific time or period. Usoro and Etuk (2016) defined workload as the amount of work an individual has to do. Osaat and Ekechukwu (2017) added that workloads are the duties and or the tasks carried out by workers in the course of their activities in their workplace. However, Perry-Smith and Mannucci (2017) argued that workload could lead to pressure if not adequately managed and if the required resources are not provided. Gorondutse and John (2018) concurred that workload pressure is a common situation which occurs in any job environment. However, the response to workload varies based on individuals. Scholars have claimed that the workload perception will be different for every individual as the way it is perceived is subjective (Bakker, 2015; Fakir, 2010). Usoro and Etuk (2016) agreed that the actual amount of work and the worker's perception of the workload are two different things. Hence different individuals in varied sectors perceive workload differently.

Mental Health

Mental health refers to a state of mind in which an individual can effectively utilize his or her capacities by displaying psychological resilience in making personal and social adjustments to fit the dynamic environment within which the individual coexists with other persons (Devdutt & Mehrotra, 2018; WHO, 2016). Mental health further represents an individual's ability to adapt to internal and external environmental stressors. However, mental health problems may be associated with genetics, environmental stressors, psychological factors, amongst other factors (Ahmed et al., 2015; Schmidt, 2007). According to Steel, Marnane, Iranpour, Chey, Jackson, Patel, and Silove (2014), mental health, like physical health, is not confined to geo-polities or social strata. It is an issue that has the potential to affect anyone. Devdutt and Mehrotra (2018) reported that the workplace itself is an environment that poses significant impact on mental health because the workplace is a platform for different psychological experiences in terms of, providing a sense of time structure, developing social contact, fostering a sense of collective purpose, forging social identity outside the family, and maintaining a level of consistent activity. Thus wellbeing promotes mental health (laIsho, 2017).

Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction relates to the outcome or condition which occurs as a result of a comparison between what a person wants to have and what the person has. It also involves people's explicit and conscious evaluations of their lives, often based on factors that the individual deems relevant including financial concerns which have a place in the concept of wellbeing (Diener et al., 2018; Dodge, Daly, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012; Mercer, 2015). This perspective aligns with literature that life satisfaction as a construct, measures the overall wellbeing based on an evaluation of life in general (Mustafayeva & Bayraktaroğlu, 2014). Szczygieł and Mikolajczak (2017)

broaden the concept of life satisfaction to include judgmental and cognitive process, which shows a subjective and worldwide evaluation of a person's life quality.

Physical Work Environment

The physical work environment is referred to as the tangibles at the setting where the job at work is performed and as crucial to employees' productivity, satisfaction, social relations, creative skills and health (Mohammed & Faruq, 2017; Oludeyi, Momoh & Akinsanya, 2018). The physical work environment does not only involve facilities and layout but comprises employees' fit or misfit to the workplace (Iqbal, Nisar, & Ali, 2018). It is also known as the ergonomic workplace, a process of designing or arranging workplaces, products, and systems to ensure the fit between the people for efficiency and comfort in the working environment. According to Visagie (2010) employee behave in different ways and the essence to organizational behavior is to influence such conduct in a way that it will be both beneficial and productive to the employee and organization as a whole. Implying that the physical working environment an organization provides shape employees attitude on the job and impact on productivity and creative skills (Mohammed & Faruq, 2017; Iqbal et al., 2018; Oludeyi et al., 2018).

Psychological Work Environment

Psychological work environment refers to elements of the workplace which are pertinent to worker conduct including, a pattern of reactions to the situation(s) where job demands are not compatible with employees' competence, abilities or aptitudes, and which challenge workers coping mechanism (Salau, 2017).Mbazor, Ajayi, and Ige (2018) supported previous submissions that, demands at work and employees' possibilities for influencing the performance of tasks, as well as predictability and clarity of roles, are some of the factors that play a part when evaluating the psychological work environment. However, the individual's personality could determine the level to which the work environment influences psychological wellbeing. Iqbal et al. (2018) advanced that stress and wellbeing are themes within the psychological work environment; hence, it is imperative to ensuring wellbeing in the workplace.

Technological Work Environment

Technological work environment refers to a workplace that has a strategic mechanism that improves cooperation, communication, and exchange of information and knowledge through the presence and proper use of tools or assets that encourage information sharing more rapidly throughout the organization (Akusoba, 2015; Alabi, Murlala, & Lawal, 2017; García-Sánchez et al., 2018; Nwachukwu & Asom, 2015). Scholars opined that, in today's high, tech multi-sensory approach to learning, education, information and recreation, the use of technological concepts in the workplace becomes inevitable as it improves performance, reduces stress and excess workload due to restrictions in manually carrying out most jobs and promotes innovativeness and creativity (Olofin & Aniede, 2016; Watson, 2005).Researchers have argued that as technology advances at an unprecedented rate, creative problem solving will be needed to cope with its challenges as they arise hence the provision of technological facilities only will not promote performance if the users are not skilled and or willing to adapt (Abdulbaqi et al., 2018; Masum, Azad,& Beh, 2015).

Flexible Wellbeing and Smart-head

Empirically, evidence on the various forms of smart-head revealed that, providing employees with flexibility is associated with positive outcomes in terms of health and well-being, as well as positive institutional outcomes such as increased productivity. Conversely, denying workers resources results in some negative outcomes (Tucker & Folkard, 2011). Thus Nyarko, Akenten, and Abdul-Nasiru (2013) found that appropriate environment and resources fostered a person's creativity. Consistent with this finding, a study by the University and College Union [UCU] (2013) revealed that academics experience higher stress than other professionals in the wider population. Also, results showed that the demands for increased product and productivity, resulting in increased workloads on higher education, is to blame for rising levels of mental health problems among academics. In line with previous findings, studies have highlighted the determinants of employee wellbeing that influence creativity to include, health and happiness (Muhammad & Nasreen, 2015), pleasant emotions (Ogenyi, Onuoha, & Nwede, 2018), accumulating effects of academic success or failure combined with other factors (Bücker et al., 2018), and job stress from excess workload and life satisfaction (Lambert et al., 2018; Naseem, 2018). Thus

Lovell and Beckstrand (2015) found that improved wellbeing has a significant impact on employees, their work output, and ultimately on the organization's bottom-line.

Further, studies in academia revealed that lecturers' experienced excess workload in academic activities (Alabi et al., 2017; Osaat & Ekechukwu, 2017). Adiele (2017) reiterates that, if teachers are overstretched, it will result from working pressure, boredom, stress, and underachievement. Gorondutse and John (2018) study result supports Adiele's findings that there is a significant effect of workload pressure on creativity among educators. Also, other study findings have shown that excess workload is linked with mental health issues (Dahie et al., 2017; Eluka & Nwonu, 2015). Hence, Guest (2017) submits that high wellbeing is replicated in better health and low wellbeing harms performance. Conversely, other study findings contended that individual creativity might be influenced positively by the presence of higher workload (Hon & Kim, 2007; Joo, McLean & Yang, 2013). However, there are certain factors which will suppress creativity in the creative person such as unrealistic expectations, extreme datelines, environment distraction, which induces workload pressure (Ramli et al., 2018), and diminishes problem solving, reflective and critical thinking skills (Amasuomo, 2015; Faboyede, Faboyede, & Fakile, 2017).

Osaat and Ekechukwu (2017) suggested that much work in quantity and quality, that demand thinking could lead to restlessness and sleeplessness in the bid to accomplish the tasks. Also it might lead to role conflict, frustration, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and poor personal accomplishment. In line with these findings, Ekechukwu and Isiguzo (2016) postulated that stress and excess workload leads to inefficiency, increased plagiarism and death. Despite, these findings, Furnham (2016) stressed that the relationship between wellbeing and creativity is a much-debated topic; as studies have found links between creativity and vulnerability to mental health issues (Carson, 2013; Dietrich, 2014; Hassard & Cox, 2013). Likewise, while it is undoubtedly true that some eminent artists have had difficulty with their psychological wellbeing, many successful creative people do not experience mental health issues, and the vast majority of people who experience serious mental health issues are not successfully creative and productive (Ramey & Chrysikou, 2014).

Theoretically, the Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Theory by Kaplan (1950) and reviewed by French, Rodgers, and Cobb (1974) assumes that the degree to which individual and environmental characteristics match and is integrated influences performance and creativity. Hence, the person-environment fit presents a match between the individual and the environment and is beneficial to the individual's mental, and physical wellbeing, while a mismatch implies stress and results in mental, psychological and physical tension. According to van Vianen and Stoelhorst (2007), people have a fundamental need to fit the environments of work and the degree of fit between people and work environment is positively related to individual outcomes which could culminate into organizational products. Other scholars postulated that the fit between personal and contextual factors influences the occurrence of creative performance (Joo et al., 2013; van Vianen, 2018).

Methodology

This cross-sectional survey research design was adopted. The justification for applying this is to understand a specific population at a particular time and to focus on facts and information about people such as people's beliefs, opinions, motivations, and behavioral patterns (Zikmund, Babin, Carr & Griffin, 2012). The justification for the choice to use cross-sectional survey is consistent with the study of Salau, Worlu, Osibanjo, Adeniji, Oludayo and Falola (2018) in a research on work environments and productivity of academic staff and, Gorondutse and John (2018) work on the effect of workload pressure on creativity in private higher education institutions. Similarly, Steenkamp and Roberts (2018) worked on workload and institutional pressure on accounting educators at Australian universities applying a similar research design. The study was conducted in South-West Nigeria since the zone has, the highest number of private universities in Nigeria (NUC, 2019).

Three (3) private universities were selected based on year of establishment (accredited universities from 5 years and above - 1999 to 2011), ownership (partnership, individual and faith-based) and ranking on JAMB's 2017 statistics, which considered academic stability, popularity, affordability, available facilities and quality of academic staff in determining applicants' choice of preferred universities as gathered by the Economic Confidential, 2017. The selected private universities were

Pan-Atlantic University, Lagos State, Wesley University of Science and Technology, Ondo State and Adeleke University in Osun State, Nigeria.

These private universities were ranked 16th, 12th, and 36th correspondingly. The target population consisted of full-time academic staff categorized between Senior Lecturer and above. A sample size of one hundred and five (103) constituted the sample size determined by utilizing the formula developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) for sample determination for a finite population. The study adopted the multiple stage stratified sampling technique. A well-structured questionnaire administered on full-time academic staff to obtain data on their opinion, and perception in a short period, and add to empirics was used to conducted the study. Items in the questionnaire were adopted, adapted, and self-developed based on conceptual review since the questions have been used in other counties and

The pilot test conducted was on the questionnaire along with validity and the reliability test. Content, criterion, and construct validity were established (Griffee, 2012) to determine the reliability of the instrument. Whereas the face content or face validity (scale's validity) was used to measure how well the content of the research measurement instrument measures what it is designed to measure. The construct validity was addressed through the review of literature; adapting instruments used in previous research that has been critically reviewed and validated (Smart-head (α) = 0.96, Workload (α) = 0.79, Mental Health (α) = 0.78, Life Satisfaction (α) = 0.85, Physical Work Environment (α) = 0.97, Technological Work Environment (α) = 0.82, Psychological Work Environment (α) = 0.71) (Amabile, Burnside & Gryskiewicz, 1995; Rotich & Tugumisirize, 2017; Zhou & George, 2001).

The content validity was implemented through the review of literature; adapting instruments used in previous research that has been critically reviewed and validated, and self-developed through conceptual review. The criterion validity was used to measure the ability of the research instrument to predict future results. Cronbach's alpha coefficient from the internal consistency test determined the reliability result. The result revealed (α) = 0.875 (with the lowest being 0.738; and the highest 0.953. The structured questionnaire was considered reliable since the results of the pre-test result as depicted by the Cronbach's alpha was greater than (>) 0.70 and closer to 1.0 (Livingston, 2018). The study analyzed the data using inferential statistics through Statistical Package for Service Solutions SPSS 21.0.

Therefore, the multiple regression equation was established based on the features of flexible wellbeing. Hence the model was formulated about the research objective as stated below:

$Y = f(X)$

Where:
Y = Smart-head (STH)
X = Flexible Well-Being (FWB)

Where: x_1= Workload (WL)
x_2= Mental Health (MH)
x_3= Life Satisfaction (LS)
x_4= Technological Work Environment (TEHWE)
x_5= Physical Work Environment (PHWE)
x_6= Psychological Work Environment (PSYWE)

The functional relationship of the model is presented as:

$\sum WL + MH + LS + TEHWE + PHWE + PSYWE = FWB$ _____ Hence

$$STH = a_0 + \beta_1 WL_i + \beta_2 MH_i + \beta_3 LS_i + \beta_4 IEHWE_i + \beta_5 PHWE_i + \beta_6 PSYWE_i + \mu i$$

Where: β_0 = Constant term
β_1 = Coefficient of workload
β_2 = Coefficient of mental health
β_3 = Coefficient of life satisfaction
β_4= Coefficient of technological work environment
β_5= Coefficient of physical work environment
β_6 = Coefficient of psychological work environment

μ = Error term (Stochastic variable).

The multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis at 95% confidence interval.

Results and Discussions

The inferential statistics was conducted based on the eighty-five (85) copies of questionnaire retrieved which represented a response rate of 81%. The study assumption was that flexible wellbeing (workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical work environment, technological work environment, psychological work environment) have no significant effect on smart-head. Therefore, to test the formulated hypothesis, a multiple regression analysis was implemented as presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Summary of evaluation statistics of multiple regression analysis between Flexible Wellbeing and Smart-head

Variable	Correlation Coefficient (R)	Coefficient of Determination (R^2)	P – value	Constant	Parameter estimate (B)	T-value	F-value
Joint Results (FWB & STH)	0.756[a]	0.571	0.000	-0.904		-3.572	17.30
Individual Results	**Beta**						
WL	-0.033		0.704		-0.022	-.382	
MH	-0.096		0.387		-0.095	-.870	
LS	0.269		0.033		0.220	2.174	
PHWE	0.280		0.008		0.293	2.726	
TEHWE	0.386		0.001		0.256	3.594	
PSYWE	-0.022		0.797		-0.022	-0.258	

a. Dependent Variable: Smart Head
b. Predictors: (Constant), FWB (WL, MH, LS, PHWE, TEHWE, PSYWE)
Source: Field Survey, 2019
Source: Results extracted from Regression tables (see appendix II)
Number of companies: 85
Level of significance 0.05 (5%)
Significant at $p< 0.05$

Interpretation

The multiple regression combined results in Table 4.1revealed that, the relationship between flexible wellbeing (workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical work environment, technological work environment, psychological work environment) and smart-head was significant, strong, and positive [R = 0.756, $F_{(6, 78)}$ =17.303, $p< 0.05$]. Moreover, the goodness, robustness, and fitness of the model presented in Table 4.1 show that Adjusted R^2= 0.571, denotes that about 57.1% variation in smart-head is explained by variations in flexible wellbeing. The association is attributed to the fact that flexible wellbeing yielded some equivalent results in terms of smart-head, implying that there are other factors associated with smart-head not fitted in the model. Accordingly, the study assumption that flexible wellbeing has no significant effect on smart-head is hereby rejected.

Additional, Table 4.1result of individual multiple regression analysis revealed that out of the six flexible wellbeing measures; life satisfaction [β = 0.118, t = 2.174, p = 0.033], physical work environment [β = 0.293, t = 2.726, p = 0.008] and technological work environment [β = 0.256, t = 3.594, p = 0.001] have positive and statistically significant effect on smart head; workload [β = -0.022, t = -0.382, and p = 0.704],mental health [β = -0.095, t = -0.870, and p = 0.387], and psychological work environment [β = -0.022, t = -0.258, and p = 0.797]have negative and no significant effect on smart head.The model equation parameter estimate depicting good fit for Flexible wellbeing (workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical work environment, technological work environment, psychological work environment) and Smart-head is therefore;

STH = -0.904 + 0.220LS + 0.293PHWE + 0.256TEHWE

Where:

STH = Smart-head
LS = Life Satisfaction
PHWE = Physical Work Environment
TEHWE = Technological Work Environment

The regression model equation indicates thatβ_0 is -0.904when X = 0. The value -0.904 indicates that statistically without flexible wellbeing there seems to be a negative effect on smart-head. Further, the coefficient (parameter estimate) results indicate that regarding flexible wellbeing, for one-unit increase in life satisfaction, physical work environment, and technological work environment; smart-head increases by 0.220, 0.293, 0.256 units respectively (implying that, statistically, smart-head in terms of intellectual capacity in originality of ideas and novelty in research from academic staff will increase by 22%, 29.3%, and 25.6% respectively). Indicting that statistically, based on data retrieved for this work and analyzed, of the six measures for flexible wellbeing, only life satisfaction, physical work environment, and technological work environment has positive effect on smart-head. Nevertheless, the combined result from the multiple regression analysis as previously stated [R = 0.756, $F_{(6, 78)}$ =17.303, p< 0.05] implies that flexible wellbeing has a significant effect on smart-head.

Discussion of Findings

The finding reveals that based on the combined result flexible wellbeing (workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical work environment, technological work environment, psychological work environment) have a significant effect on smart-head. Thereby provided an argument for flexible wellbeing and smart-head (creative person). The result affirms the position of Tucker and Folkard (2011) that, providing employees with flexibility is associated with positive outcomes in terms of health and wellbeing, as well as positive institutional outcomes such as increased productivity. Conversely, denying workers control over their work schedules and the required resources results in some negative outcomes. Nyarko et al. (2013) concurred that when appropriate environment and resources are present, a person's creativity is fostered.

Lovell and Beckstrand (2015) confirmed that improved flexible wellbeing has impact on employees, their work output, and ultimately on the organization's bottom-line. The finding is also consistent with the submissions of a number of scholars that wellbeing of an employee supports, self-perceived health, longevity, social connectedness, productivity and creativity in terms of novelty, fluency, flexibility, and originality (Bücker et al., 2018; Dahie et al., 2017; Lovell & Beckstrand, 2015; Mudrak et al., 2016). Despite these findings, Furnham (2016) argued that the relationship between wellbeing and creativity is a much-debated topic. Scholars have argued that not every person is affected by wellbeing (Dietrich, 2014; Hassard & Cox, 2013; Ramey & Chrysikou, 2014). Nevertheless, Guest (2017) submitted that high wellbeing is replicated in quality health and low wellbeing harms performance and critical thinking.

On the other hand, based on the individual coefficient results, since workload, mental health, and psychological work environment have a negative effect on smart-head, could infer adverse consequences on smart-head. Consistent with these findings, Osaat and Ekechukwu (2017) opined that much work in quantity and quality, that demand much critical thinking could result in restlessness and sleeplessness in the bid to accomplish the tasks. Also, it might lead to role conflict, frustration, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and lack of personal

accomplishment. Thus Ekechukwu and Isiguzo (2016) hypothesized that stress and excess workload leads to inefficiency, increased plagiarism, and death. Further, the non-significant effect of workload, mental health, and psychological work environment could support the position of pervious scholars' argument that individual creativity may be influenced positively by the presence of a higher workload (Hon& Kim, 2007; Joo et al., 2013). Bakker (2015) affirmed that the effect on smart-head could be positive and or negative contingent on the level of demands and resources daily. Hence, the effect of workload, mental health, and psychological work environment, to an extent, is dependent on the individual involved.

Conversely, Blomberg, Kallio, and Pohjanpää (2017) postulated that the main barriers to creativity were high work pressure, fear of risk-taking, and time pressure. In addition, a number of scholars found that there are certain factors which could suppress creativity in achieving smart-head such as unrealistic expectations, extreme datelines, and environment distraction, which induces workload pressure (Ramli et al., 2018;Sadi, 2019), and diminishes problem solving skills, reflective and critical thinking skills (Amasuomo, 2015; Faboyede et al., 2017).Thus, Gorondutse and John (2018) affirmed that there is a significant effect of workload pressure on creativity among educators. Previous studies support the findings that life satisfaction, physical work environment, the technological work environment has a positive and significant effect on smart-head; since the provision of these flexible wellbeing measures shape employees' attitude on the job and impact their productivity and creative skills (Iqbal et al., 2018; Oludeyi et al. 2018).

Similarly, the provision and proper use of tools or assets that encourage information sharing more rapidly and spread more throughout the organization affects the creative person (García-Sánchez et al., 2018; Nwachukwu & Asom, 2015). However, only the provision of technology facilities will not promote creativity if the users are not skilled and or willing to adapt (Abdulbaqi et al., 2018; Masum et al., 2015). Thus, when people are happier as a result of the quality of life (Szczygieł & Mikolajczak, 2017), they tend to be more open-minded and creative in their thinking. In contrast, unhappy, stressed, or dissatisfied people tend to exhibit tunnel vision and rigid thinking as previously identified by Lambert et al (2018). Consequently, previous works have highlighted key determinants of flexible wellbeing that influence creativity to include, health and happiness (Muhammad & Nasreen, 2015), pleasant emotions (Ogenyi et al., 2018), time and money (in the form of wages) (Diener et al., 2018; Jovanović & Joshanloo, 2019), and a match between the equilibrium level of the workers' resource pool and the demands (Ahmed et al., 2018).

Summarily, the study findings are substantiated by the Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Theory (French, Rodgers, & Cobb, 1974; Kaplan, 1950) that the individual, the personality and the work environment and resources provided influences the wellbeing and results in either or not creative outcomes. Therefore, a link exists between the need for domain-relevant skills, creativity-relevant processes, task-motivation and, the intrinsic motivation to enable the individual engage in creative activities out of interest, enjoyment, or a personal sense of challenge to yield novelty (Ostroff & Schulte, 2007; Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017; van Vianen, 2018; Woodman et al., 1993; Zhou & Shalley, 2015).

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the data analyzed and findings established, the study multiple regression combined results revealed that flexible wellbeing (workload, mental health, life satisfaction, physical work environment, technological work environment, psychological work environment) have a significant effect on smart-head**.** However, the individual coefficient results revealed that while, some flexible wellbeing features such as life satisfaction, physical work environment, and technological work environment have a positive and significant effect on smart-head, other features like, workload, mental health, and psychological work environment have a negative and non-significant effect. Thus the recommended is pillared on improved flexible wellbeing to stimulate smart-head among academic staff. As factors such as, unrealistic expectations, extreme datelines, environment distraction, and incommensurate remuneration which could derail creativity in the creative person should not be glossed over in any organisation much more in the education environment, as creativity is the pillar for a knowledge-based economy and, smart-head (creative person) is a derivative of flexible wellbeing. Also, future researchers should extend this concept of smart-head to public universities to broaden the insight on flexible wellbeing.

Acknowledgement

The author's first appreciation is to God Almighty for life, health, renewed mercies, wisdom and providence. Appreciation goes to Prof J. Egwakhe for his tutelage and inspiration behind this article write-up and critique. He is indeed an exceptional writer, a dynamic administrator, an editor and a mentor. The author also appreciates the Bond family (Umukoros) for the immerse support and constant encouragement

References

[1] Abdulbaqi, S. Z., Tejideen, T. O., Raji, K. O., Balogun O. S., & Isiaq, A. A. (2018). Technology and worker's alienation in two contrasting work environment in Ilorin, Kwara State Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews, 8*(1), 124–132.
[2] Abubakar, A., Hilman, H., & Kaliappen, N. (2018). New tools for measuring global academic performance. *SAGE Open*, 1-10.https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018790787
[3] Adiele, E. E. (2017). Planning teachers' workload for effective service delivery in the school system. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education, 10*(3), 272-277.
[4] Ahmed, O. M., Kamil, B. A. M., & Ishak, A. K. (2018). Influence of perceived stress and organisational justice on employee wellbeing amongst academia: A conceptual paper. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8*(8), 396–409. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i8/4477
[5] Ahmed, S., Sun, Z., & Nazar, H. (2015). Employees' health: Work behaviour and organisational performance. *International Journal of Education Research, 3*(1), 475-484.
[6] Akusoba, C. C. (2015). Understanding brain drain in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(15), 5-29.
[7] Alabi, A. T., Murlala, A. T., & Lawal, A. A. (2017). Lecturers' work stress and job performance in Kwara State Colleges of Education, Nigeria. *Journal of Vocational Technology, 4*(1), 1-7.
[8] Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organisational culture*. London: Sage.
[9] Amabile, T. N. (2012). *Componential theory of creativity*. Harvard Business School.
[10] Amabile, T. M., Burnside, R., & Gryskiewicz, S. S. (1995). *User's guide for KEYS: Assessing the climate for creativity*. Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
[11] Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organisations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organisational Behavior, 36*, 157-183.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001
[12] Amasuomo, J. O. (2015). Academic performance of students during transition period before choice of disciplines in Nigeria certificate in education (Technical) programme. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(3), 192-204.https://oai:doaj.org/article:e5ee39fa8af640eca20029d04879feab
[13] Bakker, A. B. (2015). A job demands–resources approach to public service motivation. *Public Administration Review, 75*(5), 723–732.https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12388
[14] Ballface (2004, September 2). *Smart head.* Retrieved from https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=smarthead
[15] Barron, F. B., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). Creativity, intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 32*, 439–476.https://doi.org/10.3200/MONO.132.4.355-430
[16] Batey, M. (2013). The measurement of creativity: From definitional consensus to the introduction of a new heuristic framework. *Creativity Research Journal, 24*(1), 55–65.https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.649181.
[17] Blomberg, A., Kallio, T., & Pohjanpää, H. (2017). Antecedents of organisational creativity: Drivers, barriers or both? *Journal of Innovation Management, 5*, 78-104. https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-0606_005.001_0007.
[18] Bücker, S., Nuraydin, S., Simonsmeier, B. A., Schneider, M., & Luhmann, M. (2018). Subjective well-being and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 5*(5), 1-11.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.02.007
[19] Carson, S. (2013). Creativity and psychopathology: Shared neurocognitive vulnerabilities. *Neuroscience of Creativity*, 175-204.https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262019583.003.0009.
[20] Corazza, G. (2016). Potential originality and effectiveness: The dynamic definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal. 28*, 258-267.https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2016.1195627.

[21] Dahie, A. M., Mohamed (Aligees), A. A., & Khalif, H. B. (2017). Examining factors affecting the quality of work life of lecturers: Case study from university of Somalia in Mogadishu, Somalia. *International Journal of Advance Engineering and Research Development, 4*(4), 1117-1124.
[22] Devdutt, J., & Mehrotra, S. (2018). Emotions at work and mental health: Emerging directions. *International Journal of Community Medicine & Public Health, 5*(4), 1233-1238.
[23] Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2018). Advances and open questions in the science of subjective wellbeing. Collabra: *Psychology, 4*(1), 1-15.http://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.115
[24] Dietrich, A. (2014). The Myth-conception of the mad genius. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 79.http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00079.
[25] Dodge, R., Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 2*(3), 222-235. http://doi.org/doi:10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4.
[26] Duze, C. (2011). Job stress, workload, academic freedom and quality research in Nigerian universities. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal, 9*(2), 1-10.
[27] Economic Confidential. (2017, August 29). *Universities rankings-2017.* Retrieved from http://www.Economicconfidential.com
[28] Ekechukwu, R. O., & Isiguzo, B. C. (2016). Stress and its associated health problems among nonacademic staff in Nigerian universities: A case study of university of Port Harcourt. *European Journal of Psychological Research, 3*(1), 16-27.
[29] Eluka, J. C., & Nwonu, C. O. (2015). A critical review of the effect of working conditions on employee performance: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 5*(5), 1-11.
[30] Faboyede, S. O., Faboyede, A. O., & Fakile, S. A. (2017). Funding of university education in Nigeria: challenges and prospects. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies,2*(8), 21-38.
[31] Fakir, Z. (2010). *Examination of the instantaneous relationship between perceptions of workload on emotions in the context of a longitudinal study*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South African.
[32] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variable and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39-50.http://doi.org/10.2307/3151312
[33] French, J. R. P., Jr., Rodgers, W. L., & Cobb, S. (1974). Adjustment as person-environment fit. In G. Coelho, D. Hamburg, & J. Adams (Eds.), *Coping and adaptation* (pp. 316-333). New York: Basic Books.
[34] Furnham, A. (2016). The relationship between cognitive ability, emotional intelligence and creativity. *Psychology, 7*. 193-197.http://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2016.72021
[35] Gajda, A., Karwowski, M., & Beghetto, R. A. (2017). Creativity and academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 109*, 269-299. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/edu0000133
[36] García-Sánchez, E., García-Morales, V. J., & Martín-Rojas, R. (2018). Influence of technological assets on organisational performance through absorptive capacity, organisational innovation and internal labour flexibility. *Sustainability, 10*, 1-25.http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su10030770
[37] Gareth, H., & Wilson, C. (2017). From transcendence to general maintenance: Exploring the creativity and wellbeing dynamic in higher education. In F. Reisman (Ed.), *Creativity, innovation and wellbeing*. London: KIE Conference Publications.
[38] Gorondutse, A. H., & John, J. A. (2018). *The effect of workload pressure on creativity in private higher education institutions (PHEIs).* Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
[39] Griffee, D. T. (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods*: Design and data. 1st ed. CA: TESL-EJ Publications. 213.
[40] Guest, D. E. (2017). Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Human Resource Management Journal, 27*(1), 22–38.https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12139
[41] Gupta, R., & Banerjee, P. (2016). Antecedents of organisational creativity: A multi-level approach. *Verslas Teorija ir Praktika, 17,* 167-177.https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2016.624
[42] Hassan, S. A. G. (2016). *Smart working conditions and efficiency at the workplace: A comparative study between the American University in Cairo, and the University of California, Berkeley* (Master's

thesis). Department of Public Policy and Administration. The American University in Cairo, School of Global Affairs and Public Policy, Egypt.
[43] Hassard, J., & Cox, T. (2013). The physical work environment and work-related stress: mechanisms and consequences. *Environment and Behaviour, 30,* 739-762.
[44] Hon, A. H., & Kim, T. Y. (2007). Work overload and employee creativity: The roles of goal commitment, task feedback from supervisor, and reward for competence. *Current Topics in Management, 12*, 193-211.
[45] Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist introductory statistics using generalized linear models.* Sage Publication, Thousand Oaks, CA.
[46] [46] laIsho, A. A. (2017). Workplace safety management as correlates of wellbeing among factory workers in Oluyole industrial estate, Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management, 3*(11), 78-84.https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1211017
[47] Iqbal, F., Nisar, A., & Ali, A. (2018). The moderating effect of job aid on the relationship between work environment and employees' productivity in oil and gas development company limited (OGDCL) of Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8*(6), 630-651. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i6/4261
[48] Joo, B-k. B., McLean, G. N, & Yang, B. (2013). Creativity and human resource development: An integrative literature review and a conceptual framework for future research. *Human Resource Development Review, 12*(4), 390-421.https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484313481462
[49] Jovanović, V., & Joshanloo, M. (2019). The determinants of life satisfaction in Serbia: Findings from the Gallup World Poll. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 9*(1), 43-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v9i1.751
[50] Kanematsu, H., & Barry, D. M. (2016). The importance of STEM for modern education. In: *STEM and ICT Education in Intelligent Environments.* Intelligent Systems Reference Library, Springer, Cham.
[51] Kasule, G. W. (2015). Impact of work environment on academic staff job performance: Case of a Uganda University. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics, 4*(4), 95-103.
[52] Kenetta, Y. N., Levy, O. L., Kenett, D. Y., Stanley, H. E., Faust, M., & Havlin, S. (2017). Flexibility of thought in high creative individuals represented by percolation analysis. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement, 115*(5), 867-872. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717362115
[53] Kim, K., & Choi, S. B. (2017). Influences of creative personality and working environment on the research productivity of Business School Faculty. *Creativity Research Journal, 29*(1), 10-20.https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2016.1239900
[54] Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001316447003000308
[55] Krippner, S., & Arons, M. (1973). Creativity: Person, product, or process? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 17,* 116-123.https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001698627301700207
[56] Lambert, E. G., Elechi, O. O., & Otu, S. (2018). Living the good life: The effects of job variables on Nigerian prison staff life satisfaction. *International Criminal Justice Review, 20*(20), 1-17.https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1057567718763252
[57] Lovell, A., & Beckstrand, G. (2015). *The impact of excellent employee wellbeing.* O.C. Tanner Institute Global Health and Wellbeing Survey Report USA
[58] Masum, A. K., Azad, A. K., & Beh, L. S. (2015). Determinants of academics' job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from private universities in Bangladesh. *PLoS ONE, 10*(2), e0117834.https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117834
[59] Mbazor, D. N., Ajayi, M. A., & Ige, V. O. (2018). Staff satisfaction with workplace facilities in the school of environmental technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigerian. *Journal of Environmental Sciences and Technology (NIJEST), 2*(1), 69–77.
[60] Mercer Annual Report (2015 March 4). *2015 Quality of living survey*. Mercer's national survey of employer-sponsored health plans.
[61] Mininni, G., Manuti, A., Scardigno, R., & Rubino, R. (2010). Work experience as a discursive resource for subjective well-being. In M. Cortin, E. Morin, & G. Tanucci (Eds), *Boundaryless Careers and Occupational Wellbeing* (pp. 141-157). Palgrave Macmillan: London

[62] Mohammed, I., & Faruq, M. A. (2017). The moderating effect of physical working environment on job attitude and employee performance. *International Sciences of Management Journal,3*(3), 1-14.
[63] Mudrak, J., Zabrodska, K., Kveton, P., Jelinek, M., Blatny, M., Solcova, I., & Machovcova, K. (2017). Occupational well-being among university faculty: A job demands-resources model. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(3), 325-348.https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9467-x
[64] Muhammad, N. Q., & Nasreen, T. M. (2015). Determinants of employee health and happiness: A perceptive of well-being from Islamic and general point of view at public sector organisations in Islamic Republic of Pakistan. *Al-Idah ,31,* 84-103.
[65] Mustafayeva, L., & Bayraktaroğlu, S. (2014). The relatıonship between work-family conflict and life satisfaction: Comparative study between the UK and Turkey. *İşletme Bilimi Dergisi, 2*(1), 127-145.
[66] Naseem, K. (2018). Job stress, happiness and life satisfaction: The moderating role of emotional intelligence empirical study in telecommunication sector Pakistan. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies, 4*(1), 7-14.
[67] Nigerian University System Statistical Digest. (2018). *Lecturer-student ratio.* National Universities Commission. Abuja.
[68] Nwachukwu, V. N., & Asom, F. (2015). Utilization of computer technology for academic work by lecturers of University of Jos – Nigeria. *International Journal of Library and Information Science Studies, 1*(2), 14-22.
[69] Nyarko, K., Akenten, W., & Abdul-Nasiru I. (2013). Teachers‟ promotion of creativity in basic schools. *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences,4*(2), 63-70.https://doi.org/10.5251/ajsms.2013.4.2.63.70
[70] O'Brien, M., & O'Shea, A. (2016). *A human development framework for orienting education and schools in the space of wellbeing*. Dublin: NCCA.
[71] Ogenyi, R. F., Onuoha, B. C., & Nwede, I. G. (2018). Employees emotions and creativity in advertising agencies in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research, Social & Management Sciences, 4*(4), 118-143.
[72] Olofin, B. B., & Aniede, P. I. (2016). Problem and prospect e-learning in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Technology and Inclusive Education (IJTIE), 3(*2), 320-327.https://doi.org/10.20533/ijtie.2047.0533.2014.0041
[73] Oludeyi, O. S., Momoh, A. M., & Akinsanya, A. O. (2018). Campus environmental factors and job commitment of staff in State universities in Ogun South-West Nigeria.*Human Social Sciences, 7*(1), 42-61.https://doi.org/10.2478/hssr-2018-0004
[74] Olukoju, A. (2019, April 27). Knocks over NUC's alleged poor supervision of private varsities. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://guardian.ng/news/knocks-over-nucs-alleged-poor-supervision-of-private-varsities
[75] Omole, D. (2018, August 26). Excess workload killing lecturers, ASUU cries out. *P.M. News* Retrieved from https://www.pmnewsnigeria.com/2018/08/26/excess-workload-killing-lecturers-asuu
[76] Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] (2009). *21st century skills and competences for new millennium leaners in OECD countries. Education Working paper 41.* OECD Publishing. Paris. Retrieved from https://oced.org/edu/workingpapers
[77] Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] (2018). *Education at a glance 2018. OECD indicators.* OECD Publishing. Paris. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en
[78] Osaat, D. S., & Ekechukwu, R. (2017). Managing workload of academic staff for job effectiveness in Nigerian universities: A study of University of Port Harcourt in South-South geopolitical zone of Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 4*(12), 102-108.http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0412013
[79] Paek, S. H., & Sumners, S. E. (2017). The indirect effect of teachers' creative mindsets on teaching creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 70*(100), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.180
[80] Perry-Smith, Jill., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *The Academy of Management Review, 42,* 53-79.https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0462

[81] Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.* SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks.
[82] Ramey, H. C., & Chrysikou, E. (2014). Not in their right mind: The relation of psychopathology to the quantity and quality of creative thought. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5,* 835.https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00835
[83] Ramli, N. H. H., Alavi, M., Mehrinezhad, S. A., & Ahmadi, A. (2018). Academic stress and self-regulation among university students in Malaysia: Mediator role of mindfulness. *Behavioral Sciences, 8*(12), 1-9.https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8010012
[84] Rasheed, A. (2018, January 26). Reforming Nigeria's university system. *Punch Newspaper*. Retrieved from https://punchng.com/reforming-nigerias-university-system
[85] Rotich, O., & Tugumisirize, J. (2017). Mental health in developing countries emphasis on Africa. *Journal of Mental Health, 23*(1), 25-30.
[86] Rubenstein, L. D., Ridgley, L. M., Callan, G. L., Karami, S., & Ehlinger, J. (2018). How teachers perceive factors that influence creativity development: Applying a social cognitive theory perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 70,* 100-110.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.012
[87] Runco, M. A. (2004). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 657–687. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141502
[88] Sadi, M. (2019). Barriers to organizational creativity: A perspective of national and expatriate academics in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Management Development, 27*(6), 574-599.
[89] Salau, O., Worlu, R., Osibanjo, A., Adeniji, A., Oludayo, O., & Falola, H. (2018). Survey data on work environments and productivity of academic staff of selected public universities in Nigeria. *Data in Brief, 19*(10), 1912-1917.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2018.06.074
[90] Schmidt, C. W. (2007). Environment connects: A deeper look into mental illness. *Environmental Health Perspectives, 115*(8), 404-410.https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.115-a404
[91] Sipa, M. (2018). The factors determining the creativity of the human capital in the conditions of sustainable development. *European Journal of Sustainable Development, 7*(2), 1-13.http://dx.doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2018.v7n2p1
[92] Stanford, N., (2012). *Smart working: Revolutionary or evolutionary?* Retrieved from http://www.flexibility.co.uk/flexwork/general/Naomi-Stanford-smart-working.htm
[93] Steel, Z., Marnane, C., Iranpour, C., Chey, T., Jackson, J. W., Patel, V., & Silove, D. (2014). The global prevalence of common mental disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis 1980-2013. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 43*(2), 476-493.https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyu038
[94] Steenkamp, N., & Roberts, R. (2018). Does workload and institutional pressure on accounting educators affect academia at Australian universities? *Accounting and Finance, 10,* 1-36.https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.12340.
[95] Suh, H. (2019). Motivational orientations to mindfulness and wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 9*(1), 1-19.http://dx.doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v9i1.725
[96] Szczygiel, D., & Mikolajczak, M. (2017). Why are people high in emotional intelligence happier? They make the most of their positive emotions. *Personality and Individual Differences. 117.* 177-181.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.05.051
[97] Taylor, T. E. (2015). The markers of wellbeing: A basis for a theory-neutral approach to well-being". *International Journal of wellbeing, 5*(2), 75-90. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v5i2.5
[98] Thawabieh, F. A., Saleem, M., & Hashim, M. W. (2016). Organisational creativity and competitive advantage: A GCC perspective. *International Journal of Economic Management, 5*, 355-383. https://doi.org/10.4172/2162-6359.1000355
[99] Tov, W. (2018). *Well-being concepts and components*. In E. Diener, S. Oishi, & L. Tay (Eds.), Handbook of well-being. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF Publishers.
[100] Tucker, P., & Folkard, S. (2011), Working time, health, and safety: A research synthesis paper. *Conditions of Work and Employment Series*, 31, 1-59.
[101] University and College Union (UCU). (2013). *Workload and academics experience in higher education.* Retrieved from https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2013/feb/university-and-college-union-ucu

[102] Usoro, A. A. (2018). Occupational stress and the job effectiveness of Federal university lecturers in Akwa Ibom and Cross River States, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management, 18*(3), 23-28.

[103] Usoro, A. A., & Etuk, G. R. (2016). Workload related stress and job effectiveness of university lecturers in cross River and Akwa Ibom States, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies, 3*(1), 34-41.https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.500/2016.3.1/500.1.34.41

[104] van der Heijden, H. R. M. A., Geldens, J. J. M., Beijaard, D., & Popeijus, H. L. (2015). Characteristics of teachers as change agents. *Teachers and Teaching, 21*(6), 681-699.https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044328

[105] van Vianen, A. (2018). Person–environment fit: A review of its basic tenets. *Annual Review of Organisational Psychology and Organisational Behavior, 5*, 75-101.https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104702

[106] Van Vianen, A. E. M., & Stoelhorst, J. W. (2007). *Homogeneity of personalities generating organisational culture: Bottom-up rather than top-down fit*. Keynote paper presented at the 1st Global e-Conference on Fit. Holland.

[107] Visagie, C. M. (2010). *The relationship between employee attitudes towards planned organisational change and organisational commitment: an investigation of a selected case within the South African telecommunications industry* (Doctoral dissertation). Cape Peninsula University of Technology.

[108] Watson, E. F. (2005). Access to audio visual and multimedia materials: What are the challenges for developing countries? *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(5), 1102–1119.https://doi.org/10.5897/IJLIS2013.0384

[109] Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organisational creativity. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(2), 293–321.https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1993.3997517

[110] World Economic Forum. (2017, 2018). *The Global Competitiveness Report.* The framework of the Global Competitiveness and Risks Team. https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report

[111] World Health Organisation. (2016). *World Health Statistics 2016: Monitoring health for the Sustainable Development Goals SDGs*. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/gho/publications/world_health_statistics/2016/en/

[112] Zikmund, W., Quinlan, C., Babbin, B., Carr, J., & Griffin, M. (2015). *Business research methods*. South-Western College Publisher.

Appendix I

Multiple Regression Analysis Results for Flexible Wellbeing and Smart-head

(a) Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.756[a]	.571	.538	.54854

a. Predictors: (Constant), FWB (WL, MH, LS, PHWE, TEHWE, PSYWE)
Source: Field Survey, 2019

(b) ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.238	6	5.206	17.303	.000[b]
	Residual	23.470	78	.301		
	Total	54.707	84			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Smart Head
b. Predictors: (Constant), FWB (WL, MH, LS, PHWE, TEHWE, PSYWE)
Source: Field Survey, 2019

(c) Coefficients[a]

Model		Standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-0.904	.449		-3.572	.001
	WL	-.022	.058	-.033	-.382	.704
	MH	-.095	.109	-.096	-.870	.387
	LS	.220	.101	.269	2.174	.033
	PHWE	.293	.108	.280	2.726	.008
	TEHWE	.256	.071	.386	3.594	.001
	PSYWE	-.022	.085	-.022	-.258	.797

a. Dependent Variable: Smart-head

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Number of respondents: 85
Level of significance 0.05 (5%)
Significant at $p < 0.05$