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ABSTRACT
This study investigated the relationship between social awareness and organizational innovativeness. The study adopted the cross sectional research design. A total of ninety seven (97) management staff from twenty (20) functional manufacturing firms in Rivers State constituted the population of the study. Census sampling method was adopted because the sample size is small. The main data collection instrument for the study was structured questionnaire. A total of ninety-seven (97) copies of the questionnaire were distributed and ninety one (91) were retrieved. Descriptive statistics, Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation Coefficients and Statistical Package for Social Science version 23 were used for data analysis and hypotheses testing to determine the relationship between social awareness and organizational innovativeness. The study revealed positive and significant relationship between social awareness and organizational innovativeness. The study concluded that social relationships and understanding of the trend in the environment could assist organizations to produce goods and services that meet customers’ satisfaction at profit. The study recommended that top managers should drive innovativeness however; there should be a process and structure that solicits and accommodates the ideas and suggestions of subordinates in the innovativeness initiative. This will engender collaborativeness, team work and sense of belonging in its organizational wide implementation of innovation programmes.
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INTRODUCTION
Organizations operate in a dynamic environment necessitated by the advancement in technology and cultural changes. Technologies have facilitated the removal of barriers in business transactions due to geographical locations and encourage the linkages and quick exchanges of goods and services among organizations across the globe. Competitions are stiff in the 21st century and to stay afloat and competitive, organizations need to innovate and provide goods and services at affordable prices. Social awareness would facilitate innovativeness through purposive interpersonal relationships from managers and among employees. Social awareness derived success by harnessing the talents, skills, and understanding emotions and feelings the employees bring to their jobs. According to Goleman (2006), our brains’ very design makes man sociable by nature. Human beings cannot afford to function effectively in an environment devoid of social interaction with other members of the environment and be innovative naturally. It is interesting to note that technology has made this social interaction both virtual and physical simple and easy. The invention of social media platforms and other simple communication devices have increased tremendously social interactions among workers and managers with the environment irrespective of location, thereby increasing the prospects of innovativeness among managers and employees. Many scholars such as Goleman and Boyatzis (2008), Frankovsky and Birknerova (2014) and Al-Jarreh and Asleh (2016) have stressed the importance of effective social interactions to enable managers achieve organizational goals. Social awareness encompasses the ability
to understand the trends in the environment, needs of human beings and the role of effective network of relationships in the workplace to harness skills and talents for production of quality goods to meet customers’ satisfaction at profit.

The dynamic nature of business environment and social expectations of customers have prompted and necessitated the exigency for organizations to be innovative in order to stay competitive while satisfying the needs of their customers. Organizations can innovate by way of improving existing products or by developing new products or improving its processes of manufacturing and administration. Mcfadzean and Shaw (2005) defined innovativeness as a process that provides added value and novelty to the organization through the development of new procedures, solution and product. According to Dam (2017) technology is changing the way human beings ordinarily live their lives and goods and services produce and distributed. Dam further noted that, we are in a period characterized by the advent of cyber-physical systems which involves entirely new capabilities for people and machines. He classify this period as the fourth industrial revolution and is driven by robotic systems, drones, 3-D printing devices, smart phones, smaller and powerful sensors, mobile internet, machine learning capabilities, artificial machines and robots doing jobs human beings could do. There are disruptions in the workplace as a result of technological advancement. To this end, managers should be acquainted with the development in the society, its impact in the production and distribution of goods and services and the social needs of customers.

The purpose of this study was to empirically examine the relationship between social-awareness and organizational innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers State.

The specific objectives of this study included.

1. To examine the relationship between social-awareness and product innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers state.
2. To investigate the relationship between social-awareness and process innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers state.
3. To determine the relationship between social-awareness and management innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers state.

The research questions are as follows

1. What is the relationship between social-awareness and product innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers State?
2. What is the relationship between social awareness and process innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers State?
3. What is the relationship between social-awareness and management innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers State?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Foundation

Social Network Theory

The baseline theory for this study is the Social network theory. Social network theory is a baseline theory for explaining social awareness which has been described as competencies that place one in a scale of balanced feeling towards others and utilizing peoples’ skills to achieve innovativeness initiatives. These competencies direct one’s ability to organize and direct his skills and that of others in social context to innovate and be productive, (Atuma, 2010). The Social network is a theoretical construct that is used in management to study relationships between individuals, groups and organizations. It is also a social structure made up of a set of social actors, sets of dyadic ties and other social interactions between actors. According to Ahiauzu and Asawo (2016) the underlying assumption of the social network theory is the social man concept. This concept holds that man exists within a web of relationships and it is this view that gave rise to the human relations movement in organizational studies. Social networks and its analysis is an inherent interdisciplinary academic field which emerged from disciplines such as psychology, sociology, Anthropology, statistics, etc. According to Malinowski (2000), social network theory came into being as a result of several research carried out from sociology, anthropology, psychology, organizational management and political science specifically to explain the importance of interactions and human relationship to achieving organizational goals.
This theory explains that employees work better in a network of productive and purposeful relationships in order to achieve the goals of the organization. Human organisms are incapable of functioning optimally except in conjunction with other human organisms (Sapru, 2013). Working in an organization requires social interactions so as to learn from others, exchange ideas and share views that will help in keeping the organization afloat and innovative (Jaja, 2012).

**Concept of social awareness**

This is the ability to sense, understand and react to others' emotions while comprehending on social networks (Goleman 1998). Social awareness which encompasses the competency of empathy is the ability to read non-verbal cues for negative emotions, particularly anger and fear and to judge the trustworthiness of others. It is about understanding others' feelings, not experiencing them (Garner, 2009). Social awareness accentuates on an individual's ability to identify, perceive and react to other's emotions while being a part of the social network circuitry. Social-awareness is the ability to understand and be compassionate to the feelings, views, opinions and challenges of other people. Social-awareness cannot only be equated with understanding people's need but as well as caring for them (Goleman, 2006). It also entails understanding social circumstances that influence people's behaviours and performance. A boss that is socially aware can envisage office politics and its related connecting dots and impacts in the organization. The components of social-awareness competence are primal empathy, service orientation and organization awareness (Goleman, 2001). However, Goleman (2006) added more components to social awareness which are social cognition and Attunement. They are important factors that enhance performance in the organization. Below is a brief explanation of the aforementioned words as part of social awareness:

**Primal Empathy**: Feeling with others and sensing non-verbal emotional signals. Primal empathy is the ability to put oneself in another person's situation, which is crucial as people are becoming more self-centered, interest-seeking, accumulating wealth at the expense of people's feeling and reactions within the organization and society at large. Goleman (2001) argues that closing your ears and pretending not to notice people's feeling can bring social embarrassment; either by misinterpreting people's feeling through careless talk or not being interested in someone's problem, it can destroys relationship and impedes creativity. According to Goleman (2001), at the peak of any situation, one with empathy ability knows the issues and can sense the force behind another's actions. Goleman (1995) noted that the ability to understand others' feelings and thereby react to them on the basis of understanding is the first and foremost requirement for building productive relationships in the organization. Goleman (2006) argued that, even though we can stop talking our feelings, we cannot stop sending signals of our feelings (tone of voice, fleeting expressions and eye position). Critical aspect of social awareness is communication. Communication forms the basis of any relationship and it can be in the form of verbal, nonverbal, body language, eye moment which leads to a relationship. Relationship will entails being sensitive towards others feelings.

**Service orientation**: This is the ability to understand the customer's needs. This competence will aid in knowing what the customers want and to harmonize with the service offered or the product delivered. Service orientation will make you think like the customer and to give them needed assistance that will make the customer trust, be satisfied and pay their loyalty to your product or organization.

Organizational awareness: Organizational awareness opens an employee's eyes to understand the social and political flow of emotions within the organization. Understanding the power tussle within an organization is important because it makes you notice when people are collaborating and forming alliance that make one lose savior and exert control no matter your capability (Atuma, 2010). There are other factors in organization other than skills such as office politics, leadership styles and corporate practices that are capable of enhancing innovativeness initiatives in the organization that should be taken cognizance.

**Attunement**: This refers to the attention that goes beyond momentary empathy to a full, sustained presence that one give to understand others rather than just a little observation moment. Attunement entails deep intentional concentration given to listening and understanding of other people's feelings. Goleman (2006) noted that, intentionally paying more attention to someone may be the best way to encourage the emergence of good relationships. Social cognition: This is the ability to understand how the social world works. Knowing
what is expected per time socially and adapting to social situations are crucial requirements for social cognition.

**Concept of Innovativeness**

The word innovativeness is derived from the Latin word ‘innovare’ which means to make something new in a complex construct. Innovativeness literature has emanated from different fields of knowledge including management, psychology, economics, sociology and science. Within these and other disciplines, researchers tend to conceptualized innovativeness in different ways (Gopalakrishnan & Damanpour 1997; Tang 1998). Innovativeness is the key to competitive advantage in a highly dynamic and turbulent business environment. The ability to innovate has direct consequences for the ability to compete as an organization. The values created by innovativeness are often manifested in new ways of doing things (processes) or new products and management structures that contribute to increase profitability of organizations (Chen & Sawhney, 2010).

The concept of innovativeness was first introduced by the great economist, Schumpeter in (1949). Innovativeness gives competitive advantage to organizations that possess it. Schumpeter (1949), defined innovativeness as encompassing the entire process that begins with an idea and continue through all steps to reach a marketable product that change the economy. Innovativeness doesn’t only entails introduction of new or improved products but it encompasses holistic steps beginning from technical to commercial success of such products. OECD (1981) defined innovativeness as consisting all those scientific, technical, commercial and financial steps necessary for the successful development and marketing of new or improved manufactured products, the commercial use of new or improved processes or equipment or the introduction of a new approach to social service.

Common to all definitions of innovativeness is that, it is something new or novel. Beyond newness, definitions vary with academic perspective and application (Burgelman & Sales 1996). Mcfadzean and Shaw (2005) defined innovativeness as a process that provides added value and novelty to the organization through the development of new procedures, solution and product. The dynamic nature of business environment has prompted and necessitated the exigency for organizations to be innovative in order to stay competitive. According to Bitar (2003), organizations should constantly create additional variation of their goods and services by innovating to meet up with current demands and expectations of end users. Organizations that are not innovative could find it extremely difficult to be competitive and stay afloat in this technology-driven dynamic business environment. Innovativeness is described in terms of corporate and individuals’ abilities in what they do differently and uniquely that support the realization of their business object distinguished from similar organizations in the same industry. Christensen (2011) argued that innovativeness is embedded in the entrepreneurial process that resulted in new market of goods and services. Furthermore, this innovativeness is described in terms of individuals’ creative ability that strongly in what they do and promote through different layers of the organization. The search for competitive advantage has led to the recognition of innovativeness as a vital ingredient for survival and profitability in the Information Age. Organizational innovativeness focuses on a dynamic and interactive process of creating or modifying an idea and developing it to produce products, services, processes, structures, or policies that are new to the organization (Zhuang 1995, Nohria & Gulati, 1996). The innovativeness process is usually conceptualized as a sequential process, including recognition of problem/opportunity, development, production, commercialization, adoption, and implementation (Rogers, 1995; Van de Ven & Angle, 2009). Gopalakrishnan and Damanpour (1997) identified three measures of innovativeness which are product innovativeness, process innovativeness and administrative or management innovativeness

**Measures of Organizational Innovativeness**

**Product innovativeness**

Product innovativeness entails production of quality goods or products (the outputs of the organization), that satisfy the needs of customers. This products or goods could be physical goods or services that satisfy consumers’ need. Kotler (2013) argued that product Innovativeness start with knowing what consumers want and initiating the process to satisfying those needs at affordable prices. Read (2014) noted that products are basically created to satisfy specific demands of costumers at a profit per time. There are different kinds of products competing for customers’ attention. Some of these products may not be quality all due to changes in
customers taste and preference and changes in the society. Product innovativeness in organizations represents a crucial point for maintaining a sustainable competitive advantage and survival in any industry. In a world of continuous change, where customers are more demanding than ever, expecting better products at a lower price it become imperative for organizations to improve their products. Kotler and Armstrong (2013) define a product as anything that can be offered to a market for attention, acquisition, use or consumption that might satisfy a want or need. Product has different varieties that could satisfy consumers. These varieties according to Kotler and Armstrong (2013) are consumer products, convenient products, shopping products and specialty products. Kotler (2013) noted that, product innovativeness could take two dimensions: improvement on existing products and creating new products. Over time due to changes in taste and expectations of customers’ existing products may need to be improved upon. Dean (2009) noted that no product has ever remains forever from its origin to everlasting without modification to meet the demand of its time. New products, this entails the process of engaging in designed to generate and implement new ideas after market surveys to enable organization create new products that will satisfy customers. According to Biner (2015) product innovativeness process are tied to the behaviors, actions and personalities of the individuals, or actors, engaged in the initial, creative steps as well as the latter steps of exploitation. Innovativeness is a cognitive process that involves the thoughts, associated feelings and ways of thinking of the innovator that are express in their innovative behavior to produce goods and service

**Process innovativeness**

Process innovativeness facilitates methods, procedures, designs and techniques to produce quality goods (output) from inputs resources. Norman (2012) noted that there is no product that is produce that will not follow an established standard. This standard could be the method, design or specification that the raw materials will go through before it finally comes out as products. It is important to noted that the outcome of any product is determined by the process adopted in order to ensure it conform to quality expectations. Kotler (2013) argued, the process that brings a product should be robust enough to ensure quality products at the final production stage. In between the raw materials and final products is the process which requires diligent planning and control. The ability of the organizations to produce goods that will appeal to customers remains a very fundamental challenge. Organizations can thrive or fail at this point should there be uncontrollable failure in the production process (Gabriel, 2017). A typical production process involves three elements of inputs, transformation and output. The inputs may comprise men, machine, materials, money and information. The transportation may comprise conversion methods, techniques and factory configuration and packaging (Gabriel, 2017). Finally the outputs may include quality goods of different shapes. Process innovativeness begins with planning, facility layout, instructions and controlling to ensure standards are comply with. Many scholars have argued that if organization has a robust process of production, then its products will be of high quality (Ajibola & Otti, 2013)

**Management innovativeness**

There is a distinction between technological innovativeness and management innovativeness (Damanpour 1991, Damanpour & Evan 1984, Kimberly & Evanisko 1981). According to Damanpour and Aravind (2012), for long research were limited to technological innovativeness and its impact on the organization. This trend and line of research continue till the mid-50s when Peter Drucker and other management scholars popularized and modernized management practices while laying more emphasis on the organization. Drucker (1954) had proven that management innovativeness is as important as technological innovativeness. Management innovativeness relates to administrative oriented processes such as structure, human resources management and accounting systems. According to Sola (2014) management innovativeness refers to innovativeness in management principles, corporate practices and processes that will eventually influence the practice of what managers do and how they do it. This kind of innovativeness entails fundamental shift in management philosophy and goals that could be subsumed into market-driven and customers-friendly approach to both product development and distribution (Udhas, 2013). Similarly, Damanpour (2014) explained that management innovativeness can be conceptualized simply as how managers do what they do and the processes adopted to achieve organizational set goals. According to Hamel (2016) noted that, this innovativeness includes new ideas for recruitment of people, the allocation of resources, sourcing of suppliers, structuring tasks, communication lines, authority and rewards. It is also includes changes in organizational
structures, modification of workers attitudes and behavioural pattern and belief system regard work. Damanpour, Walker and Avethaneda (2009) sees management innovativeness as novel changes in the organization’ structure, processes, administrative systems and knowledge utilized in performing the work of management, skills that enable an organization to function effectively and efficiently. This kind of innovativeness entails both bottom-top and top-bottom approach to innovativeness. Hollen, Vanden-Bosch and Volberda (2013) noted that management innovativeness refer to firm-specific, new-to-the-firm management activities associated with setting objectives, motivating employees, coordinating activities and making decisions which arises due to new inter-organizational relations and organizational expanded goals.

It is believe that this kind of innovativeness empowers the employees to be innovative by integrating organizational structures, policies and human resources systems to foster and induce innovativeness. Udhas (2013) noted that empowerment of workers is the centerpiece of a human resources management system that foster continuous improvement of existing structures and innovativeness. Management can adopt a three-pronged strategy for innovativeness: initiatives that will impact in the long term, quick wins and continuous incremental improvement on existing products (Damanpour, 1991). Modern organizations have realized the importance of leveraging on technology to improve organization’s processes and systems. Competition is now a function of your ability to utilize technology for the production of goods, services and improvement of processes. Many successful multi-national organizations are making great impact all over the world because they have adopted modern management practices driven by technology while their counterparts in third world countries are still embroiled in crude bureaucratic tendencies. Management innovativeness is key survival in this technology age.

**Social-Awareness and Organizational innovativeness**

Process innovativeness entails initiating steps to the ways of manufacturing products. There are three kinds of initiatives: generation of innovative insights, driving disruptive process improvements, and creation of new products (Mark, 2014). Process innovativeness is crucial for product innovativeness, and it facilitates management innovativeness, especially with the changes in the business environment. Process is an amalgamation of skill, technologies, and facilities required to produce, deliver, and support a service or product. Process begins with planning and ends with control. In between methods, techniques and standards are crucial because it determine the final outcome (Kotler & Armstrong, 2013). Social awareness has to do with the ability to understand and be compassionate to the feelings, views, opinions and challenges of other people. People feel better when they realized that their needs, feelings and work are accorded the attention it deserves in the organization (Clegg et al, 2015). Every manager who understands the peculiar needs of employees in the organization, it will enhance the building of social and purposive relationships that could bring out the best from the workforce. According to Goleman (2006), social awareness has to do with understanding employees’ feelings and one’s socials needs to enable it build effective relationship and utilize employees’ skills to improve production. Knowing the happenings within the employee psychological state and the environment may influence the methods, structures and techniques adopted by an organization to produce goods and services (Dam, 2017).

In view of the foregoing argument, the following hypotheses were drawn

**Ho**: There is no significant relationship between social-awareness and product innovativeness in the manufacturing firms

**Ho**: There is no relationship between social-awareness and process innovativeness in the manufacturing firms

**Ho**: There is no significant relationship between social-awareness and management innovativeness in the manufacturing firm
Fig. 1: Operational framework for the hypothesized relationship between social-awareness and organizational innovativeness

Source: (Goleman, 2006 & Damanpour, 1991)

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of investigating the relationship between social-awareness and organizational innovativeness, the study adopted the cross-sectional research design. A total of ninety-seven (97) management staff from twenty (20) functional manufacturing firms in Rivers State constituted the population of the study. Census sampling method was adopted because the sample size is small. The main data collection instrument for the study was a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was structured into two sections: A and B. Section A collected data regarding the demographic characteristics of respondents while section B collected data regarding the variables under review. A total of ninety-seven (97) copies of the questionnaire were distributed and ninety-one (91) were retrieved. Descriptive statistics, Spearman’s Rank Order Correlation Coefficients, and Statistical Package for Social Science version 23 were used for data analysis and hypotheses testing to determine the relationship between social-awareness and organizational innovativeness.
Table 1: Reliability Coefficients of variable measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>Dimensions/Measures of the study variable</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Product innovativeness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process innovativeness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Management innovativeness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research data, 2019

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Bivariate Analysis

We used the spearman’s rank order correlation coefficient tool at 95% confident level for data analysis. The tests cover hypotheses Ho1, Ho2 and Ho3 which are bivariate and all stated in the null form. To this end, we based on the Spearman’s Rank (rho) statistics to carried out the analysis. The 0.005 significance level was adopted as the basis for accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses at (p<0.005).

Relationship between social awareness and measures of organizational innovativeness

Table 2: Correlation matrix for social awareness and measures of organizational innovativeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Awareness</th>
<th>Product Innovativeness</th>
<th>Process Innovativeness</th>
<th>Management Innovativeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman's rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Awareness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.756**</td>
<td>.408**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Innovativeness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.756**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.855**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Innovativeness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.408**</td>
<td>.855**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Innovativeness</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>.822**</td>
<td>.959**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between social awareness and product innovativeness in manufacturing firms

From the result on the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a positive relationship between social awareness and product innovativeness. The correlation coefficient 0.756 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is statistically significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation
coefficient represents a high correlation between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate accepted. Thus, there is a significant relationship between social awareness and product innovativeness in manufacturing firms.

**Ho2:** There is no significant relationship between social awareness and process innovativeness in manufacturing firms

From the result on the table above, the correlation coefficient (rho) shows that there is a positive relationship between social awareness and product innovativeness. The correlation coefficient 0.408 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is statistically significant at P0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a moderate correlation between the variables. Therefore, based on the empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate accepted. Thus, there is a significant relationship between social awareness and product innovativeness in manufacturing firms.

**Ho3:** There is no significant relationship between social awareness and process innovativeness in manufacturing firms

From the result on the table above, the correlation coefficient shows that there is a positive relationship between social awareness and process innovativeness. The correlation coefficient 0.628 confirms the magnitude and strength of this relationship and it is statistically significant at p 0.000<0.05. The correlation coefficient represents a high correlation between the variables. Therefore, based on empirical findings the null hypothesis earlier stated is hereby rejected and the alternate accepted. Thus, there is a significant relationship between social awareness and process innovativeness in manufacturing firms.

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

The study show that there is a strong, significant and positive relationship between social awareness and organizational innovativeness of manufacturing firms in Rivers State, using Spearman’s order correlation tool and at 95% confident interval. The finding of this study confirmed that social awareness have a positive impact on organizational innovativeness. The results of the tests hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 on table 1 shows that there a strong, significant and positive relationship between social awareness and measures of organizational innovativeness (0.756, 0.408 and 0.628 respectively). Furthermore, the findings however, corroborates the views that social awareness has to do with the ability to understand and be compassionate to the feelings, views, opinions and challenges of other people. People feel better and become creative when they realized that their needs, feelings and work are accorded the attention it deserves in the organization (Clegg et al, 2015). The feelings employees bring to work it as important as their skills to performing their job. Goleman (2006) opined that, social awareness has to do with understanding employees’ feelings and one’s socials needs to enable it build effective relationship. The dynamics in the environment and the psychological state of employees are crucial factors that could influence innovativeness in the organization. This supports the views of Dam (2017), knowing the happenings within the employee psychological state and the environment may influence the methods, structures and techniques to be adopted by an organization to produce goods and services. This confirmed a similar study carry out by Rima (2017) noting that social awareness help managers understand their environmental social movement, preferences and changes that influence business activities.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

We will say that, robust social relationships in the workplace most times determine human success from the personal to professional levels and organizational innovativeness. Purposeful relationships in the workplace bring out the best in employee and in turn cause organization to be effective. When managers understand the environment, social spectrum of human needs and their skill set, and then build purposive relationships, it will be easier for innovativeness to thrive seamlessly in the organization. The connection between social awareness and innovativeness is very strong and positive.

From the findings, we make the following recommendations

i. Managers in manufacturing firms should be social conscious taking cognizance of trends in the environment and then build social relationships in the workplace that support innovative initiatives in the organization.
ii. Managers in manufacturing firms need to inculcate the competency of social awareness, it will help them to understand the psychology customers bring to buying and their consumption behavior at all times. This will help them be on the know of their preferences, tastes and when there is change of loyalty.

iii. For organizations to gain competitive advantage in this 21st century among other factors, managers should understand the dynamics and inter-play of the social environment and the expectation of end users of their goods and services and then leverage on technology to produce quality products that could satisfy customers’ needs.

iv. Top managers should drive innovativeness however; there should be a process and structure that solicits and accommodates the ideas and suggestions of subordinates in the innovativeness initiative. This will engender collaborativeness, team work and sense of belonging in its organizational wide implementation of innovation programmes.
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