CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter consists of four sections. In the first section, we begin with a brief overview of the hospitality industry and the recent changes and development leading to the significance of employee engagement (EE) and employee creativity (EC) among hotel organizations. In the second section, we discuss the concept of employee engagement and employee creativity in sufficient detail and depth through a review of relevant literature. In the third section, we introduce each of our antecedents that have been identified as the most important drivers to engagement and creativity in the workplace. The fourth and final section outlines the research gaps that we have identified from our literature study that will help us build hypotheses and propose a conceptual model.

2.2. Hospitality Industry

Back in the day a huge number of travelers, both business and leisure, considered the "location of a hotel" as a significant factor in choosing hotels to stay as compared to the "hotel brand" (Yesawich, Pepperdine , Brown , & Russell, 2004). However, this trend has shifted over time. Nowadays, location is not an important factor in choosing a hotel due to the constant rise in the number of prominent hotel brands at primary sites. Even though slowly, but the brand is surely an emerging factor influencing consumer's choice of a hotel, now and probably also in the long run (Deloitte, 2010).

Guests and visitors nowadays are expecting hospitality services and products that are not restricted to only catering to their boarding and lodging needs. Hotel customers are looking for

"quality hospitality experiences" that are customized prudently to suit individual tastes and preferences (Bhushan & Bharwani, 2011). Therefore, hotel services are becoming more and more customer-focused and experience-centric to satisfy the needs of the evolving modern day traveler (Knutson, Beck, & Kim, 2007). A major determinant of a quality customer experience is an engaged and creative workforce.

Ever since the economic barriers between countries have been dissolved, organizations have stepped outside the narrow boundaries to build international brands. Lashley (1995) proposes that a hotel organization's capability to create a competitive edge over others, rests in intangible services, such as the quality of service requirements. This lays more emphasis on delivery of service as a crucial distinguisher in order to maintain an organization's competitive advantage. Research suggests that globalization has led to the emergence of human resources' ability to deliver quality services and products as a fundamental provider of competitive edge in the industry all over the globe (Baum, Amoah, & Spivack, 1997; Bharwani & Jauhari, 2013). Thus an engaged and creative workforce could be a source of competitive advantage and hence the importance, strategically, for organizations to understand what factors lead to the creation of such a workforce as well as the interdependence between these two attributes.

2.2.1. Overview of the Industry

Over the past 25 years, countries all over the world bear witness to the wave of globalization due to the constant improvement in connectivity and consistent growth in the interdependence of markets and economies across the globe. The services sector has perpetually benefited from this global transformation in the economies and the hospitality industry has however, progressed significantly. But, this change has brought in numerous obstacles to be confronted by the

hospitality industry with regard to its serviceable areas, such as HRM, cross cultural communications and marketing (Bharwani & Butt, 2012).

The hospitality and tourism industry accounts for roughly 30% of total services transactions internationally resulting in its rapid growth (ILO, 2010). This industry has substantial potential in India owing to tourism because of the historical heritage and rich cultural, diversity in terrains, ecology and places of natural beauty all around the country. The consumption behavior in the industry has evolved considerably ever since the importance ascribed to leisure time hobbies has increased (Williams, 2006). This is evident by the fact that, foreign tourist arrivals are increasing at a rate of 6.20% in India, every year. This industry contributes approximately 6-7% to employment pertaining to the overall number of both indirect and direct jobs worldwide. The hospitality & tourism industry in India accounted for 12.38% of the total job opportunities created in 2017-18, employing around 81.1 million people (IBEF, 2019).

2.2.2. The Context of Employee Engagement in the Hospitality Organizations

An organization's success depends on its capability to deliver consistently on the promise made by the brand, by way of optimally merging experience with value when attending to customers' needs and requirements. A vital component of customers' experience with a brand is its customer service and how customers perceive the brand, depends on the interaction quality with employees associated with customer service (for e.g. a hotel's front office or banquet manager). Therefore, employees play a central part in stimulating a wholesome experience for hotel guests because it is them, who truly deliver the promises made by a brand. *"The ability of employees to demonstrate sincere respect and concern for customers at every touch point goes a long way in building an organization's brand equity"* (Bharwani & Butt, 2012, p. 157). Thus, in the context

of hospitality organizations, brands get recognized by virtue of quality of their delivery of service and other "intangibles" inside the organization (Lashley, 1995). Committed and engaged employees who apprehend and acknowledge features of the brand can be the brand's "evangelists". They consistently deliver on the promises made by the brand irrespective of their designations or job profiles (Bharwani & Butt, 2012).

Engagement refers to the levels of commitment and involvement employees have towards the value system of their organization that leads to the complete deployment of employees' abilities and talents in order to attain individual and organizational objectives (Schneider, Macey, Barbera, & Martin, 2009). According to Hewitt Associates (Looi, Marusarz, & Baumruk, 2004), engagement is: *"a measure of the energy and passion that employees have for their organizations"*. Engaged employees are those *"say positive things about their workplace, stay committed to the organization, and strive to deliver extraordinary work"*.

Further, Harris & De Chernatony (2001) propose that consumers' perception of an organization is strongly impacted by the employees of that organization which, in turn, have a profound effect on the organization's success in the long run and overall performance. King (2010) argues that using internal brand management techniques such as developing brand commitment, providing role clarity and promoting brand supportive behavior among employees will certainly improve their engagement with the brand. King & Grace (2005, 2008) strongly recommend that other than providing just the job-related and technical information, organizations must also disseminate brand knowledge to employees since it is fundamental to augmenting employees' commitment to the brand and providing them with proper direction.

Research suggests that employee engagement positively correlates with many of the desirable organizational outcomes (for e.g. better return on assets, improved levels of customer loyalty,

higher customer satisfaction, reduced employee turnover, and increased profits). Engagement has played a contributing and essential part in top hospitality brands such as Intercontinental Hotels Group (IHG), Marriott International, etc. by assisting them to maintain higher consistency in service delivery of their brand globally and lower levels of turnover among employees (Deloitte, 2010). Therefore, an engaged workforce is an emerging talent management concern that requires due attention of hospitality organizations which are becoming more and more brand-centric in the current economic setting (Bharwani & Butt, 2012).

2.2.3. The Context of Employee Creativity in the Hospitality Organizations

The hospitality industry (inclusive of hotel, airlines and tourism) has begun to focus increasingly on innovation as organizations in this sector are intensively involved in an extremely competitive and dynamic environment that demands an innovative and creative workforce to offer customers with high-quality services (Hon, 2012, 2013; Hon, Chan, & Lu, 2013; Hyun & Han, 2012; Stierand & Dörfler, 2012). For instance, hotel industry organizations are dependent on innovative and differentiable services to fill vacant rooms in their hotels during the off period and to maintain a healthy customer relationship. Likewise, in the tourism industry, amusement parks need to be creative to introduce different themes and wild-rides in order to attract national and foreign tourists. Similarly, in the airline industry, it is necessary for airlines to develop innovative fare program and also open new routes that attracts more and more travelers.. Even though the significance of innovation in the field of hospitality, empirical tests and systematic investigations on innovation and creativity are scarce (Brooker, Joppe, Davidson, & Marles, 2012; Enz, 2012; Hjalager, 2010).

Hjalager (2010) postulated that analysts of hospitality sector delay in transferring concepts, theories and methodologies that are implied and functional in other industries for several years already. In recent times, a large number of researchers in hospitality have begun to broaden the methodological scope of their research across different levels laying emphasis on creativity and innovation in the industry (Hon & Chan, 2013; Hon et al., 2013; Hon & Lui, 2016). For instance, Hon (2012) argued (based on the concept of intrinsic motivation) that a feeling of self-directed motivation among individuals played a substantial part in fostering employee creativity, whereas an intimidating or controlling work environment seemed to have an adverse effect on creativity. Wong (2016) too asserts the statement that new opportunities for multilevel research methods may possibly reflect a step forward in the advancement of extensive research in hospitality. These techniques might also help in bridging the gap between practice and research. Undertaking such investigations would exemplify valuable and meaningful ways of understanding the changing atmosphere of the hotel industry. Methodological and theoretical arguments would help managers and decision makers endorse creativity and innovation in their organizations (Hon & Lui, 2016).

However, previous research on innovation and creativity in hospitality mostly depended on exploratory and qualitative research and analysis, or student samples (Horng & Lee, 2009; Johnson, 2009; Khan & Khan, 2009). There have been other methods that were used to explain and investigate innovation and creativity in hospitality but, they are either fragmented or less organized. The chances of successful innovation or creativity in hospitality is comparatively very low (Ottenbacher, 2007), since it requires for employees to change, act or think differently and be deviant from the norm. Griffin (1997) indicated that 40% innovation projects in the marketplace often fail. This is most likely a result of inadequate information or lack of

sophisticated and comprehensive experiential research, absence of appropriate techniques to handle innovation related problems, like uncertainty barrier, or a possibility of failure at the individual and/or group level in the organization. Therefore, managers might be dependent on their own incomplete understanding and limited experience to promote innovation (Ottenbacher, 2007), which mostly leads to letdown.

Even though there is potential risk of failure associated with creativity and innovation, scholars have postulated that attributes of the workplace could diminish the unfavorable impact of uncertainty on innovation (Hon, Bloom, & Crant, 2014; Hon & Lu, 2015; Hon & Lui, 2016). These studies lay emphasis on organizational aspects that play a pivotal role in nurturing or hindering creativity and innovation. These studies also pointed out that addressing the organizational factors at each level such as, individual, group, work unit and organizational is required (Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014; Hon et al., 2014; Hon & Lui, 2016; Wong, 2016).

2.3. The Context of Employee Engagement in the Literature

Employee engagement has germinated a lot of interest since its origin in the field of organizational behavior by Kahn (1990). He was one of the first to theorize about work related engagement in his qualitative work on personal engagement and disengagement. He conceptualized engagement as *"harnessing of organizational members' selves to their work roles; in engagement people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances"* (1990, p. 694). Thus, engaged employees are highly likely to apply significant effort into their work when they strongly identify with their work roles. He suggests that a *"dynamic and dialectical relationship"* exists between the individual and their work role. The individual brings their personal self to work role performance and

13

simultaneously expresses and employs themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally in that role. According to his theory, personally engaged individuals are *"physically involved, cognitively vigilant and empathetically connected in the service of the work they are doing in ways that display their creativity, their values and their personal connections to others"*. He proposed that people work under three basic psychological conditions namely, safety, meaningfulness and availability. These conditions are those momentary circumstances of people's experience that shapes their behaviors. Here, psychological meaningfulness is affiliated to those work elements that create "incentives" to be engaged. When employees feel they are "worthwhile, useful and valued" they are able to provide their best to others and to the job and receive aptly. People experience psychological safety when they are free of fear linked to the "negative consequences to self-image, status or career". Psychological availability measures the extent to which people are ready to engage, despite the distractions from the society. He conducted the qualitative study at an architecture firm, where he recorded the moments when a senior designer felt the moments of high engagement. For example, the designer mentioned how she was flying around the office (physical involvement), working out design and construction interfaces (cognitive availability), and refusing to criticize people publically and also empathizing with other's feelings (emotional attachment). His definition of personal role engagement has been operationalized by May *et al.* (2004), Rich *et al.* (2010), Reio & Sanders-Reio (2011) and Soane *et al.* (2012). Rothbard (2001) also defines engagement as psychological presence but with a slightly different angle. She defines engagement as a twin-componential motivational construct that includes: absorption and attention. Attention is *"cognitive availability and the amount of time one spends thinking about a role"* while absorption *"means being engrossed in a role and refers to the intensity of one's focus on a role"* (2001, p. 656).

In a review, Macey & Schneider (2008) documented different definitions of engagement, most of them being "old wine in new bottles". Employee engagement is a collective umbrella term that comprises of different forms of engagement, each of them is related to different conceptualizations: viz. trait engagement (proactive personality), state engagement (satisfaction) and behavioral engagement (extra-role behavior), and also work related environments that promote state and behavioral engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008) Work related engagement has also been categorized as two separate entities, namely, job engagement and organization engagement. Saks (2006, p. 602) defines engagement as *"a distinct and unique construct consisting of cognitive, emotional and behavioral components that are associated with individual role performance"*, differentiating between job engagement and organizational engagement. The study further postulates that employee engagement is distinct from several closely related constructs such as, organizational commitment, job involvement and organizational citizenship behavior. Similarly, Selmer *et al.* (2013) suggested that work related engagement can be observed at the team level and also suggested a measure of workplace teams' engagement.

The most popular and predominant field of psychology views engagement as a "positive state of mind" focused in the direction of their work. This is established on the conception of engagement as the contradictory aspect of burnout (Shuck, 2011). Burnout researchers define engagement a "positive antithesis of burnout" (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). According to Maslach and colleagues, (2001), engagement is *"characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy"*, exact contrary to the burnout dimensions of "exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy". Previous studies on burnout and engagement have identified that "exhaustion and cynicism" dimensions of burnout and "vigor and dedication" dimensions of engagement, are exactly contrary to each other (González-Romá, Schaufeli, Bakker, & Lloret, 2006). Based on this

finding, the "Utrecht Group" defined engagement as "*a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind* and proposed that an engaged employee has a strong sense of vigor towards, dedication to, and absorption in work activities" (Schaufeli et al., 2002, p. 74). They then postulate that engagement is not a limited or temporary state, but instead, it is "a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior" (2002, p. 74). "The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale" (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2002) is the most widely adopted measure of employee engagement and has been validated for use in several languages (Bailey, Madden, Alfes, & Fletcher, 2017).

Engagement is a multi-faceted motivational construct of the underlying type with components serving as indicators of high level engagement concepts. Although there are various concepts linked to engagement, three dimensions have gained significant popularity in research; *Vigor* means "high levels of energy and mental resilience at work" (Maslach & Leiter, 2008), *dedication* refers to "strong involvement in work" and *absorption* when an individual is "being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work". When employees feel energetic, involved and content at the workplace (or engaged) they perceive their work role and characteristics positively.

Employee engagement is the medium by which an organization seeks to associate itself with its employees who are healthier, more productive and less likely to turnover (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002), profitable, safer, avoid absenteeism and willing to engage in discretionary efforts (Shuck & Wollard, 2010) in a way that employees fully understand and are dedicated to achieve organizational goals and the organization also gives due regard to the personal aspiration and ambition of its employees. It is also majorly the organization's responsibility to provide a culture and environment conducive to this association. High engagement levels amongst the employees

16

leads to high productivity. Engaged employees are consciously aware of the business context of their organization and, work among or with the other associates to enhance job performance for the organization's benefit. They generally carry a positive attitude towards the organization and its values. A two- way relationship is required between the employer and each employee in order to cultivate and grow employee engagement in the organization. Therefore, employee engagement is an indicator that governs the relationship of an individual with the organization. Engagement is often referred to as a psychological state of mind (e.g. attachment, commitment, involvement, mood, etc.), as a performance construct (e.g. pro-social or organizational citizenship behavior), or as a disposition (e.g. positive affect) (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

The importance of employee engagement is among both practitioners and among academic researchers (Macey & Schneider, 2008). It has been widely popular as a practical measure of the "psychological well-being" of employees in services oriented industries (Chen & Chen, 2012). Such as, aviation (Chen & Chen, 2012; Ilkhanizadeh & Karatepe, 2017), hospitality organizations (Hughes & Rog, 2008; Karatepe & Olugbade, 2016; Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016), healthcare (Gupta, Agarwal, & Khatri, 2016), IT firms (Bhatnagar, 2012), banking (Koyuncu, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2006), schools and colleges (Chen, 2016), R&D organizations (Bhatnagar, 2012; Chughtai & Buckley, 2011). It has gained popularity across major countries, viz a viz; U.S.A. (Chen, 2016; Lu et al., 2016), Europe (Demerouti, Bakker, & Gevers, 2015; Ilkhanizadeh & Karatepe, 2017; Slåtten, & Mehmetoglu, 2011), Asia (Agarwal & Gupta, 2018; Chen & Chen, 2012; Gupta, Agarwal, & Khatri, 2016; Anitha, 2014; Zhong, Wayne, & Liden, 2016).

With reference to the work environment, the term "engagement" has been used interchangeably as employee engagement (Hughes & Rog, 2008; Saks, 2006; Wollard & Shuck, 2011), or job

engagement (Rich et al., 2010; Vogel, Rodell, & Lynch, 2016; Zhong et al., 2016), or work engagement (Demerouti et al., 2015; Karatepe & Olugbade, 2016; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Even though it is questionable whether researchers will reach a unanimous agreement on a single definition and a measure of employee engagement pertaining to that definition, it is important that measures of engagement reflect what is conceptually at the core of the construct. Definitions of employee engagement might usefully recognize that employee engagement is a "positive work- related psychological state" characterized by a sincere enthusiasm to contribute to organizational success.

Antecedents of Employee Engagement

Table 2.1. below lists relevant studies identified from the literature that link each of the antecedents included in this study with employee engagement.

Table 2.1. Antecedents of Employee Engagement

Antecedents	Studies that link to Employee Engagement
Task Characteristics	Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2008; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Sulea et al., 2012; Wollard & Shuck, 2011
Perceived Organization Support	Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2008; Rich et al., 2010; Saks, 2006; Wollard & Shuck, 2011
Perceived Supervisor Support	Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2008; Saks, 2006
Perceived Value Congruence	Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Rich et al., 2010; Wollard & Shuck, 2011
Intrinsic Motivation	Rich et al., 2010; Wollard & Shuck, 2011
Creative Self-Efficacy	Ballout, 2009; Bandura, 1994; Consiglio, Borgogni, Di Tecco, & Schaufeli, 2016; Liu, Cho, & Putra, 2017

2.4. The Context of Employee Creativity in the Literature

The Oxford Dictionary describes "Creativity as the use of imagination or original ideas in order to create something" (Oxford Online, 2006). The term 'creativity' is difficult to define, and to explore the subject of creativity is even harder. For a conceptual clarity, many experts have tried to define and explain creativity by mentioning its various aspects. Therefore, for the purpose of our study we strictly refer to previous studies and research work on creativity in the context of workplace and more specifically the concept of individual or employee creativity.

Creativity is having the ability of making unique combination of ideas or unusual association between them (Amabile, 1996). It is the ability to produce innovative and useful ideas. The outcome of these unusual associations between ideas turned into useful products or work methods is known as innovation. According to the literature, the first theory based framework of creativity was proposed by Amabile in (1983, 1985, 1988), to understand the personal and environmental factors that influence employee creativity. There have been others who have demonstrated the differential effects of these two factors having considerable effects for creativity in the workplace (Shalley, 1991; Woodman, Sawyer, & Griffin, 1993). There are two influential models investigating creativity in the workplace, namely, the componential model of creativity by Amabile and, an interactionist approach to organizational creativity by Woodman and colleagues. Both of these models talk about individual characteristics and effects of contextual influencers that have an impact on employee creativity.

Amabile's model suggests that there are three main "components" of creative performance, namely, domain relevant skills (depends on the individual's education, perception and cognitive abilities), creativity relevant skills (strategic knowledge about generating creative ideas) and

ntrinsic task motivation (individual's attitudes and perception of self-motivation). This model makes two significant inferences: firstly, individuals with high domain relevant skills may not be creative unless they are eager to engage in creative activities intensely and persistently and, secondly, researchers can identify the contextual factors that influence creativity in promoting or diminishing intrinsic motivation.

Woodman and colleagues (1993) proposed an "interactionist" model, that incorporate five subcategories related to social environment, namely, "creative process, creative product, creative person, creative situation and the way in which each of these dimensions interact with the other". On the contrary, Simonton (1984) suggested that social psychology of creativity prospers when the creative people work within a network of their social relationships. Chen, Chang & Hung (2008) determined that creativity is positively affected by individual's network ties and social interactions. Therefore, it is believed that the notions of creativity are dynamic and multifaceted. It is also often observed that one's domain knowledge, experiences and socio-cultural environments stimulate change in the conceptions of creativity.

The literature on creativity has pointed out a number of variables impacting employee creativity, either directly or indirectly. These variables include "personality related components" (Costa & McCrae, 1992, "intrinsic motivation" (Amabile, 1996), "knowledge" (Ford, 1996), "cognitive abilities and traits" (Woodman et al., 1993), "self-efficacy" (Redmond, Mumford, & Teach, 1993), "complexity of jobs" (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), "leader–member exchange" (Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999), "leadership support" (Deci & Ryan, 1985), "supervisors' support" (Oldham & Cummings, 1996), "support from colleagues" (Zhou & George, 2001), "interpersonal relationships" (Perry-Smith & Shalley, 2003), "leader–member exchange"

20

(Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999), "transformational leadership" (Shin & Zhou, 2003) and "work environment" (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996).

One of the oldest factors related to creativity (from the 1920s) is intelligence(Spearman, 1923). It was although referred to as a necessary condition for creativity, but not sufficient (Terman, 1926). However, a review of intelligence and creativity studied by Sternberg & O'Hara (2000) found that academic intelligence is not strongly associated with creativity. Furthermore, the study suggested that higher level of creativity is not influenced by higher levels of IQ, and therefore showing limited impact of IQ on creativity (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). Quite often intelligence is strongly associated with divergent thinking, a cognitive approach where a person spawns a number of uncommon, creative solutions to a particular problem. On the contrary to divergent thinking style is convergent thinking, a cognitive process characterized of an organized approach to find an accurate, right answer to a given question (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). The association between divergent thinking and creative problem solving is very popular and has been extensively researched upon (Tierney et al., 1999). Nonetheless, the most relevant technique to be used for problem solving entirely depends on the type of problem at hand (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). Other creativity related cognitive characteristics of individuals determining cognitive thinking are being fluent, flexible, imaginative (Woodman et al., 1993), original, methodical and conformist (Kirton, 1976). Apart from the above mentioned cognitive characteristics, relevant expertise and domain knowledge have a strong, positive impact on creativity (Redmond et al., 1993; Woodman et al., 1993). Creativity has also been studied extensively in the social psychology domain of research (Klijn & Tomic, 2010). Wherein, from a social viewpoint, affect (inclusive of both emotion and mood) has been identified as a determinant of creativity, moreover positive affect was found to have a constructive impact on

creativity (Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, & Staw, 2005; Hirt, McDonald, Melton, & Harackiewicz, 1996; Isen, Johnson, Mertz, & Robinson, 1985; Vosburg, 1998). On the contrary, some studies (although less consistent) suggest that the association between affect and creativity may be negative (George & Zhou, 2002), whereas, others concluded the relationship between affect and creativity to be curvilinear (James, Brodersen, & Eisenberg, 2004). This suggests lack of clarity in the relationship between affect and creativity.

Another important topic of research in the creativity literature is motivation. Motivation includes two categories, namely, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In the following sections, we will mostly focus on intrinsic motivation and its relationship with creativity rather than extrinsic. Because our study focuses on positively affecting antecedents, and creativity literature suggests that extrinsic motivation is mostly detrimental and not conducive to creativity (Amabile, 1983). Intrinsic motivation is a state of mind in which an individual is engrossed in a task mostly for their own sake rather than for procuring an external reward or escaping punishment. It is pivotal to creativity (Zhou, 2003). Intrinsic motivation is a pre-requisite to creativity also impacting other factors related to creativity such as, persistence, risk taking, cognitive flexibility, and positive effect, (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). Munoz-Doyague, Gonzalez-Alvarez and Nieto (2008) suggested that "intrinsic motivation positively and significantly influenced the individual's creativity" (2008, p. 29). A review study by DiLiello & Houghton (2008), identified a large number of essential influencers of intrinsic motivation relevant to fostering creativity, like self-determination, competence, autonomy, challenge, task involvement, interest, informational evaluation and creative self-efficacy. Therefore, the relationship between intrinsic motivation and creativity is well established.

Apart from identifying the social and psychological factors affecting creativity in individuals, researchers have also examined creativity in light of the physiological aspects of the human body and brain. For instance. clinical and neurological studies suggest that on the basis of genes, individuals with different enzymes and neurotransmitters (ultimately related to DNA chains) have varying levels of creativity accordingly (Eysenck, 1993). Another neurological study used EEG (used for measuring brain wave patterns) measures. and tested them as creativity influencers (Bekhtereva, Dan'ko. Starchenko. Pakhomov. & Medvedev, 2001). The EEG study assigned a fundamental task to the frontal lobes in the brain. However, not much is known about the elements that fostered individual creativity in this case. Additionally, the clinical research is mostly conducted on clinical patients and therefore the results may or may not be applicable to healthy individuals.

In the field of creativity, there is a lot of controversy on how to measure creativity. Previous research suggests two perspectives in order to measure creativity: "dimension component" and "unit of analysis". With regard to the "unit of analysis", some researchers lay emphasis on either process or person, whereas others focus on products (Simonton, 2013). From the "dimensionality component" prospect, researchers have settled for two widely relevant dimensions of creativity. To judge something as creative, it has to be both "novel and useful" (Piffer, 2012). Some researchers have also suggested a third dimension, effect or the element of surprise, as a mandatory to judge something on the aspect of being creative (Simonton, 2013). Even the operationalization of creativity is under the controversial limelight since different studies have utilized different methods to evaluate an individual's creativity. For example, producing an advertising, marketing or business plan, performing tasks that involve convergent or divergent

thinking, supervisors' rating of employee creativity and evaluating employee creativity using self-report measures (Puente-Diaz, 2015).

Furthermore, to add up to this disagreement on the operationalization and conceptualization of creativity, few researchers have interchanged the terms, creativity and innovation, even though there is an evident difference between the two (Ford, 1996). For example, creativity is used frequently in the psychology literature, and innovation is more relevant to the sociological and management literature (Ford, 1996). Amabile (1988) too proposed that individual creativity is a stepping stone or facilitator for organizational innovativeness. There is a conceptual difference between creativity and innovation, proposed in the organizational psychology and innovation management literature, where creativity is *"the generation of useful and novel ideas"* and innovation is *"the successful implementation of those ideas"* (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988).

Antecedents of Employee Creativity

Table 2.2. below lists relevant studies identified from the literature, that link each of the antecedents included in this study with employee creativity.

Table 2.2. Antecedents of Employee Creativity

Antecedents	Studies that link to Employee Creativity
Task Characteristics	(Baer, Oldham, & Cummings, 2003; Jaskyte & Kisieliene, 2006; Greg. R. Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley et al., 2004; West, 2002)
Perceived Organization Support	(Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000; Zhou & George, 2001)
Perceived Supervisor Support	(Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004; Shalley et al., 2004)
Perceived Value Congruence	(Dollinger, Burke, & Gump, 2007; Kasof, Chen, Himsel, & Greenberger, 2007; Sousa & Coelho, 2011)
Intrinsic Motivation	(Amabile, 1983; 1988; Jaskyte & Kisieliene, 2006; Shalley et al.,

24

2.5. Antecedents in the Literature

The antecedents included in this research are characterized as job resources and personal resources. According to the theorists of the Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R Model), job resources are the *"physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job"* (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004, p. 296) Job resources are essential for achieving work related goals and they also induce learning and development, and personal growth among individuals. The antecedents pertaining to job resources are task characteristics, perceived organization support and perceived supervisor support. Personal resources, however, are, *"aspects of the self that are linked to resiliency and refer to individual's sense of their ability to control and impact their environment"* (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007, pp. 123–124). The antecedents pertaining to personal resources are perceived value congruence, intrinsic motivation and creative self-efficacy.

2.5.1. Task Characteristics (TC)

Job complexity and multi-tasking have become very common with organizations facing a lot of challenges due to the dynamic business environment. The characteristics of the task at hand have been given significant value when investigating motivational work design (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). Task characteristics are not just related to how a particular task is accomplished, but also related with the variety and nature of all tasks to be performed during a particular job. The type of work or duties that employees do in their jobs significantly influences their decision to stay with the organization or leave (Ferreira, Martinez, Lamelas, & Rodrigues,

2017). The theory by Hackman & Oldham, in the year 1976, on Job Characteristics posits that contribution to personal and job-related outcomes requires five core elements in a job (viz. *"task identity, task significance, skill variety, feedback and autonomy"*). These elements enhance an individual's psychological states with respect to meaningfulness, responsibility and know-how towards the job.

As offered by Morgeson & Campion (2003), three main categories best describe task characteristics. First is motivational, concerned with how they associate with employee responses to work. Second, socio-technical related to how individuals at the workplace interact and communicate with one another, what techniques they use in the production of services and products and in what way are these two aspects interrelated. Third, situational components to which they are susceptible and how likely are they to manipulate employees' needs and behaviours. Even though there are different conceptualizations, researchers agreed that significant employee and organizational outcomes are predominantly influenced by employee perceptions of task characteristics (Sabella, El-Far, & Eid, 2016). For instance, job characteristics and job satisfaction are interrelated (Häusser, Mojzisch, Niesel, & Schulz-Hardt, 2010) and job characteristics and organizational commitment are correlated (Park & Rainey, 2007). Job characteristics is inclusive of all the major aspects of the job, such as task-significance, skill variety, role clarity, degree of autonomy, role overload, role conflict and scope of the job (Suman & Srivastava, 2012).

Task characteristics plays a vital role to engage employees at work because when employees strongly identify with their job, they contribute with efforts to perform their tasks. In fact, the above mentioned task characteristics is included among the most relevant work related factors to predict employee engagement (Rai, Ghosh, Chauhan, & Mehta, 2017; Ram & Prabhakar, 2011;

ks. 2006) and also predicts individually, every component (i.e., vigour, dedication and sorption) of work engagement (Kittredge, 2010). Job characteristics hold relevance in the pular theories that conceptualize job engagement (such as, Bakker & Demerouti 2007; Kahn 90). All the five task characteristics have shown strong relationships with job satisfaction, trinsic motivation and growth satisfaction (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Humphrey, Nahrgang, & orgeson, 2007). Such findings suggest that job characteristics is significantly important to prove employee engagement, as these job related consequences are strongly associated with gagement of employees. May et al. (2004) and Saks (2006) have also determined similar idings. Others have posited that autonomy is positively linked to employee engagement akker & Bal, 2010; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). The study by iristian et al. (2011) found that employee engagement is strongly driven by job characteristics at include, autonomy, task significance, skill variety and feedback. The Job Demands-sources (JD-R) model offers itself as a theoretical background for research that attempts to vestigate the effect of some of the task characteristics on employee engagement, viz a viz edback (Salanova & Schaufeli, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Van Den Broeck, ansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008), task variety (Salanova & Schaufeli 2008) and ttonomy (Slåtten & Mehmetoglu, 2011; Van Den Broeck et al., 2008), all of which were found increase the levels of engagement among employees.

esearchers have found that monotony entices psychological distress among workers (Melamed, en-Avi, Luz, & Green, 1995). Such suffering might lead to disengaging employees tellectually from their job or even the workplace. When employees believe that they are volved in a variety of tasks they perceive their job as motivational (Ryan & Deci, 2000) and iteresting (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006). This positively links employee engagement with

27

task variety. Similarly, job autonomy strongly promotes psychological ownership of work. Hence a work role that provides autonomy may willingly put in hard work and survive despite of hindrances, that are snitching signs of work engagement (Shantz, Alfes, Truss, & Soane, 2013).

Kahn (1990) suggested that employees are highly likely to be more engaged when they are more willing and able to give and take from their job tasks. Shantz et al. (2013) postulated that employees could highly associate with work role if they were to be accountable for the entire task of meaningful work. A study conducted by Hackman & Oldham (1980) posits that significance in tasks is associated with evident effect, from performing those tasks, on other individuals. Grant's (2008) conceptualizes that when employees are conscious of how their work affects other individuals prompts them to apply more efforts and perseveringly complete their work (Rai et al., 2017).

It is anticipated that employees are highly likely to be engaged in their job when information regarding their successful efforts is available to them from time to time. This information when received from the work itself tends to increase their enthusiasm and pride in their work (Hackman & Oldham 1980). As employee engagement is already associated with feelings of pride and identification with one's job, feedback offers knowledge about job performance so that individuals are aware of their progress and the goals they have achieved from the tasks they perform (Shantz et al. 2013). Feedback has also been identified as a motivating drive (Locke & Latham, 1990) that influences employees to be more enthusiastic and persevere during challenging circumstances.

2.5.2. Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

It is clearly evident that organizations' performance depends entirely on the amalgamation of its resources with the human resources. This suggests that employees are the most valued assets of any business institution (Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015). These employees when commit themselves to their organizations, they expect to receive that commitment in return from the organization. Exchange theories consider that such support from the organization work as a catalyst for positive outcomes associated with individual's attitude, behavior, or performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Bearing to the exchange relationship between employee and organization establishment of support from one party (either employee or organization) facilitates the other to reciprocate, which eventually benefits the other party too (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Employees working in an environment where the organization provides enough support to them with reference to approval, care and respect can be driven to achieve job related expectations and goals (Karatepe & Aga, 2016). Promoting such feelings of care and organizational support among employees is regarded as an indebtedness by employees towards the organization (Sharma & Dhar, 2016). This may persuade them to initiate and contribute towards the enhancement of overall organizational performance (Jaiswal & Dhar, 2016). Perceived organizational support (POS) refers to *"the degree to which employees believe that their organizations value their contributions and care about their well-being and hence fulfill their socio-emotional needs"* (Allen, Armstrong, Reid, & Riemenschneider, 2008; Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001).

Results from a meta-analysis study conducted by Ahmed & Nawaz (2015) indicate strong association of perceived organization support with employee engagement (Caesens,

29

Stinglhamber, & Ohana, 2016), organizational citizenship behavior (Wen, Li, & Hou, 2016), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Garg & Dhar, 2016; Jaiswal & Dhar, 2016; Muse & Stamper, 2007; Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009). Therefore it could be determined that when individuals feel that their organization supports them they tend to respond constructively by displaying their positive attitude and behavior towards the organization. Such as job satisfaction, psychological alignment with the values and goals of the organization, and emotional attachment with the organization. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009). The effect of POS was strongly associated towards employee engagement, as compared to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The literature also suggests that results vary across previous studies due to the difference in demographics of the respondents, e.g., age, gender, education qualification, job description, type of organization.

POS moderately affects both organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intentions (e.g. Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen., 2009). Such findings emphasize on the significance of organizational support that encourages individuals to perform beyond of what is expected of them at work (high OCB), and to continue to work in the organization for a long period of time (low turnover intentions). Hence, employees' perception of organization support works as a significant tool by way of which employees' behaviors and attitudes can be modified and used to achieve organizational objectives (Ahmed & Nawaz, 2015. This explains the need for a supportive environment in the organizations. Additionally, the significant predecessors of POS across many organizational settings are support from colleagues, support from supervisors, procedural justice and distributive justice. Therefore, it can be inferred that in order to generate a

committed and engaged workforce, organizations are expected to provide a supportive work environment and at the same time offer justice at the workplace.

For employees, POS is the level of commitment that the organization has towards them (Paillé, 2015). However, as indicated by support theory, the feeling of being valued and cared for by the organization entails that supportive behavior must be displayed willingly and not forced by a bureaucratic decision or as an outcome of negotiations (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). For instance, when the behavior or actions of top management are actually an outcome from a series of negotiations with a union, employees usually do not associate easily with their work environment as supportive (Paillé, 2015). Whereas, if the organizations voluntarily introduce a program that benefits their employees in some way, such as, learning and development opportunities or fitness programs, etc., then employees feel that their organization genuinely cares for their well-being and consider it as supportive

2.5.3. Perceived Supervisory Support (PSS)

Employees' expectation of commitment from their organizations is very crucial to them to perform better at their jobs. Likewise, employees look for care, support and commitment from their immediate supervisor. Research studies in the past have, time and again, proven strong relationships between an employee's job performance and his leader/supervisor. Considered from different lenses, good leadership (as perceived by subordinates) has had a very strong impact on improving employees' job performance outcomes. Research studies from western culture provide support to the claim that perceived support from organizations highly influences behavioral outcomes like commitment and intentions to be with the organization (Eisenberger,

Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Tuzun & Kalemci, 2012).

Perceived supervisor support (PSS) is defined as *"the beliefs employees hold regarding the extent to which supervisors provide emotional and instrumental (work-related) assistance"* (Jin, McDonald, & Park, 2016a, p. 222). Even though the advantages of PSS are widely acknowledged (Ng & Sorensen, 2008), a majority of the existing research studies were based on leadership approach (Hollander, 1992; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985). Previous studies indicate that PSS creates "enabling relationships with others that make it easier for employees to learn" (Mink, Owen, & Mink, 1993), and are therefore known to assist employees' learning and development (Ellinger, Ellinger, & Keller, 2003). Previous research suggests that employees tend to develop common opinions regarding the extent to which their supervisors value their contributions towards the organization and their concern about the employees' well-being is known as perceived supervisor support or PSS (Maertz et al., 2007). Researchers have given a great deal of importance to PSS in previous studies. The results from these studies suggest that PSS is significantly related to important organizational and job performance outcomes (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Maertz et al., 2007).

Present literature prodigiously indicates that the relationship between POS and PSS is highly significant and positively related (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001; Yoon & Lim, 1999; Yoon & Thye, 2000). Levinson (1965) advocates that supervisors should offer incentivized treatment to enhance POS towards employees, in such a way that their actions are ascribable to the organization. From employees' perceptive, supervisors are the representatives of an organization since it is part of their job to direct and evaluate their subordinates' job performance. Therefore, employees often perceive their supervisor's behavior and predisposition

towards them as synonymous to that of the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Individuals strongly affiliate PSS and POS with each other because of the fact that their performance evaluation by the supervisor is always communicated to senior managers of the organization and which in turn, impacts these managers' opinion towards the individuals (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

At the same time, there is contradiction in the literature regarding the stance of the relationship between PSS and POS. Some studies indicate that the impact of PSS on work related outcomes, such as intentions to leave and affective commitment, are completely intervened by the presence of POS (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001). Findings from the study conducted by Rhoades et al. (2001) confirm their argument that the influence of PSS on affective commitment was completely mediated by POS. Whereas, the other line of research indicates that, apart from being mediated by other variables, employees' perception of supervisor support could have a direct impact on work related outcomes such as intentions to stay with the organization or leave (Maertz et al., 2007). Analysts of organizational psychology discuss that individuals can differentiate their associations with the immediate supervisor from that of the organization. Likewise, other studies support the argument that supervisor or leadership related variables provide more significant associations with work related positive outcomes and behavior as compared to those at the organizational level variables (Maertz et al., 2007).

However, for employees who are internally driven to work are not much affected by supervisor support (Yukl, 2010). Moreover, when individuals perceive close supervision and direction to be a pointless obligation of leader control, this negatively impacts their behavioral outcomes causing a decline in their performance (Yukl, 2010).

2.5.4. Perceived Value Congruence (PVC)

Values are "enduring beliefs regarding the modes of conduct and end states transcending specific objects and situations and that are personally and socially preferable to opposite modes of conduct and end states" (Rokeach, 1973). In the work setting, the perception that one's values are congruent to their organizations, has been shown to have positive influence on the tendency to have attitudes and to act in line with the organization's values (Edwards & Cable, 2009; Lajoie, Boudrias, Rousseau, & Brunelle, 2017).

According to Kahn (1990, 1992), the congruence between the expected behaviours of an organization and those that employees value as a fragment of their own self-images are influenced by one's psychological meaningfulness. Hence, when individuals perceive that their jobs involve behaviours congruent with how they wish to portray themselves, they are more likely to find their roles encouraging, worthwhile, and meaningful and voluntarily fully engage themselves (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Kahn, 1990; Rich et al., 2010). When individuals' perception of their role calls for behaviours that they feel are inappropriate for their desired self-image, they feel unworthy, taken for granted, and discouraged to get engrossed in performing job tasks (Kahn, 1990, 1992). Values that organizations hold important are conveyed to its employees by way of defining the acceptable and desired behaviours in their job profile (Chatman, 1989; Ravlin & Meglino, 1987). Whereas, personal values partly advocate an individual's behavioural standards and expectations included in their own self-image (Cable & Edwards, 2004). This justifies the role of perceived value congruence in the context of workplace environments. In other words, employees will perceive the congruency between their job role expectations and their desired self-image when they are certain that the organization's values are congruent with their own (Chatman, 1989; Kahn, 1990, 1992; Kristof, 1996; Ostroff, Shin, &

34

Kinicki. 2005). Such a correspondence makes one certain that the work they do is meaningful and adds value to their personal self, which further results in them being highly engaged in their work. Previous studies have reported that when employees perceive their values to be congruent with the job roles they perform or, even with those of the organization's they work for, they experience psychological meaning out of their work which prompts them to invest themselves in their work such that there performance benefits both, the organization as well as themselves (Brown & Leigh. 1996; May et al., 2004; Rich et al., 2010)

Indeed, researchers have found that perceived value congruence strongly effects employees' organizational outcomes, either attitudinal, behavioral or related to individual performance (Hoffman & Woehr. 2006; Kristof-Brown. Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Ren & Hamann, 2015; Schneider, 1987). Literature provides strong support to the claim that value congruence positively impacts individual's job related outcomes For example, job satisfaction, commitment, extra-role behavior and career success (Brez & Judge, 1994; Chatman, 1991; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999; Meglino, Ravlin, & Adkins, 1989; O'reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991). However, value congruence is believed to lower job related stress in employees (Posner, Kouzes, & Schmidt, 1985), and negatively effects turnover intentions (Vancouver & Schmitt, 1991).

Table 2.3. Schwartz's (1992) Values Circumflex Model Mapped Onto the Work Values Survey (source: Cable & Edwards, 2004)

Schwartz's conceptual dimensions	Schwartz's universal values	Work values dimensions
Self-transcendence	Universalism Benevolence	Altruism Relationship with others
Self-enhancement	Achievement/hedonism Power	Pay Prestige
Conservation	Security Conformity/tradition	Security Authority

Openness to change	Stimulation	Variety
	Self-direction	Autonomy

2.5.5. Intrinsic Motivation (IM)

Motivation has two basic categories, namely, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, that have been and continue to be relevant, even today, to a number of studies across various domains (Amabile, 1993; Lin, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The basic difference between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation is based on the presence of the driving force. Individuals who are motivated to work or perform because of driving forces external to them (e.g. income, social status, etc.) are known to be extrinsically motivated. Whereas, individuals who are motivated to work due to the driving forces internal to or within them (e.g. sense of achievement, self-satisfaction, etc.) are known to be intrinsically motivated (Giancola, 2014). Next, extrinsic motivation is defined as mainly "focusing on factors that are goal driven", such as the benefits and rewards received from completing a certain job task, contrarily intrinsic motivation is usually referred to as meaningfulness an individual gets after accomplishing a task (Lin, 2007). Intrinsic motivation, generally, has a positive influence on employee's attitudes and behaviors to perform in their job and at the workplace (Lin, 2007). Intrinsic motivation is defined as "the performance of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable outcome, reflecting the natural disposition in humans to assimilate and learn" (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Employees are intrinsically motivated when they get involved in activities and tasks out of their own interest, and for the pleasure they get from the experience of being involved in the task (Lin, 2007). Intrinsic motivation in employees leads them to be more engaged at work, not for the sake of any outcome, but for their own sake (Cerasoli et al., 2014).

Previous research suggests that increased intrinsic motivation can be associated with willingness in employees to generate positive surroundings, which leads to an environment conducive to learning and information sharing (Lin, 2007). However, it has been noted that not every employee is motivated to do similar tasks (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Some employees may be intrinsically motivated for different reason or even different activities than others. To motivate employees, many theories advocate that intrinsic motivators are more impactful than extrinsic ones (Giancola, 2014). Some researchers proposed that intrinsic rewards could be perceived superior as compared to extrinsic ones since intrinsic rewards are a more positive consequence of doing a task in comparison to extrinsic rewards (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012). Intrinsic motivation evidently prevails in the relationship between an individual and their work, thus, some theorists have defined it as the "task that is performed by the employee", on the other hand, others, have defined it as the "satisfaction an employee gains from performing the task" (Ryan & Deci, 2000). For instance, when people feels accomplished after performing a task well (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012), they are known to be intrinsically motivated. According to Renko et al. (2012), when individuals, because of their work itself, are interested in their personal growth and development as they continue to perform their job tasks, they are known to be intrinsically motivated. Cerasoli et al. (2014) concluded that in the absence of extrinsic rewards, intrinsically driven motivation becomes the singularly operational force to encourage employees to perform (Lin, 2007).

2.5.6. Creative Self-Efficacy (CSE)

Bandura (2001) suggests that the construct of creative self-efficacy is germinated from the social cognitive theory of human agency. However, it is the general construct of self-efficacy that has a more vital role to play when explaining creative self-efficacy (Puente-Díaz, 2015). Subsequently,

to comprehend the meaning of creative self-efficacy completely, we first need to recognize and attain profound knowledge and understanding of the detailed scope in the earlier construct of self-efficacy.

Initially the concept of self-efficacy was deduced from social cognitive theory, a framework of theory proposing the *"triadic reciprocal causation model in which behavior, cognition and the environment all influence each other in a dynamic faction"* (Gist & Mitchell, 1992, p. 184; Slåtten, 2014, p. 328). Self-efficacy has been defined by Wood & Bandura (1989) as something that *"refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands"*. With reference to cognitive theory and Wood & Bandura's (1989) definition, there are three important elements describing the self-efficacy construct: judgement (assessment of self-abilities); dynamics (responsiveness to change); and mobilization (utilization of resources). The first element explaining an individual's perception of their own efficiency is their judgement as to how they assess their abilities in entirety. Bandura (1997) claims that this facet of self-efficacy points out an individual's belief about his or her own capabilities to succeed in tasks they perform in a given environment. The second aspect of the construct of self-efficacy is dynamic, suggesting that an individual's abilities change with time as he or she learns and grows by gaining knowledge and experience from performing a particular job task (Gist & Mitchell, 1992).The final element functional to the context of self-efficacy is mobilization, wherein, people regulate the selection of tasks along with the perseverance; the hard work; and, finally, the achievement of the set goals and target (Beghetto, 2006). Bandura (1986) conceptualization of the self-efficacy construct suggests that *"self-efficacy is concerned not with the skills one has but with the judgements of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses"*.

Self-efficacy lies amid two extremes, namely, "general" and "specific". Nevertheless, according to Bandura (1994), it can be categorized as either one of the two, and at the same time ranging across the continuum (Bandura, 1994). General self-efficacy is characterized as an individual's "assessment of how well one believes one can perform in a range of situations" (Smith, 1989). It signifies an individual's entire traits of self, such as self-esteem and neuroticism (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). Whereas, specific self-efficacy portrays an individual's "judgement of being efficient in a given context of their task capability". On this basis of the fact that self-efficacy is a self-regulating intellectual tool (Gist, 1987), Bandura's theory concludes that individuals who have higher self-efficacy frequently seek brainstorming assignments and activities as their targets to accomplish rather than something to escape (Bandura, 1994). Thus, it can be inferred that self-efficacy is how, cognitively, individuals weigh themselves with respect to specified work roles (Sousa, Coelho, & Guillamon-Saorin, 2012). Creative self-efficacy, however, characterizes an amplified situation related to and qualities relevant for a specific category of self-efficacy. Subsequently, creative self-efficacy is domain-relevant and is based on an individual's assessment of resources and limitations in that specific context.

The self-efficacy theory in the organizational context (Gist & Mitchell, 1992) and the theoretical framework of individual creativity (Ford, 1996) lay the foundation for conceptualizing creative self-efficacy as "the belief one has the ability to produce creative outcomes" (Tierney & Farmer, 2002, p. 1138). It is vital to observe that this conceptualization restricts its attention on self-efficacy relevant only to creativity, to jobs associated with a particular work role and therefore, theoretically varying from general self-efficacy, that indicates to an individual's belief of himself or herself in entirety, across various domains (Slåtten, 2014). One of the propositions, about creative self-efficacy, is that individuals are going to first identify the problem. Upon defining

problem in a proper manner, individuals need to set their objectives and/or identify motivating factors in order to invest themselves completely and delve deep into problem solving. Defining the problem accurately and identifying the motivating factors aptly, will collectively impact the belief about one's own capabilities to generate creative solutions Now, once the individual possesses accurate information relevant to the domain, suitable and relevant capabilities, and divergently thinking abilities, creative self-efficacy assists in acting creatively to solve the given problem. Creative self-efficacy, as hypothesized by the theory of individual creativity, is a motivational concept with sense-making where objectives are the precursors and, creativity and habit as the two highly likely outcomes (Puente-Diaz, 2015).

.6. Research Gaps

Based on the extensive review of literature discussed above, some gaps that were identified are s follows:

The six antecedents mentioned above viz a viz; task characteristics, perceived organization support, perceived supervisor support, perceived value congruence, intrinsic motivation and creative self-efficacy have been recognized as the most relevant and important variables affecting both employee engagement and employee creativity. Previous researchers have studied these variables under various contexts empirically and qualitatively but to our best knowledge no research has been attempted to understand the combined impact of these variables together on employee engagement and employee creativity simultaneously in the same study. Further, there are previous researches that have attempted to understand employee engagement and employee creativity with respect to employees working in the hospitality industry but none so far have been conducted in the Indian context.

The previous studies have shown relationships between employee engagement and employee creativity where engaged leaders have been successful in promoting creativity among employees (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2013). There are various studies that have identified common grounds or antecedents resulting in employee engagement and employee creativity. These studies have been conducted separately by different researchers, at different timeframes, in different types of work settings. However, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that attempts to understand the relationship between these antecedents, employee engagement and employee creativity in the same context.

Various studies on culture differences by Hofstede (1980; 2001) have described how people, across the globe, differ in terms of their values and how they behave differently in their different working environments (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). Therefore, testing our model in the Indian context in order to investigate to what extent the outcomes would differ from the findings from other cultures/settings would be a valid research gap that we would attempt to fill through our study.

There is also a broad theoretical gap that we will attempt to answer through our research. According to the JD-R model, proposed by Bakker and colleagues (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2008; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), there exists a relationship between work engagement and creativity, where creativity has been considered as a job performance measure. The model suggests that an engaged employee would deliver creative outcomes. Whereas, this study posits that being engaged may or may not be a necessary requirement for creativity. It is clearly evident from the theory of JD-R model as well as from empirical investigations (Bakker & Xanthopoulou, 2013) that employees who are physically, cognitively and emotionally attached to their work are highly likely to be creative at their work. But how about those employees who

may have the requisite ability for the job but aren't really engaged in their work? These employees may have the ability to perform creatively at work but they don't play by the rules and regulations of their organization. Individuals who are creative but deviant may or may not be engaged in their work as is expected of them. We need to find ways to identify what would it take for these creative but deviant employees to become more engaged.