

# The Influence of Transformational Leadership on the Employees Innovative Work Behavior

Sayed Sami Muzafary<sup>1</sup>, Zhixia Chen<sup>1</sup>, Zalmay Wafayar<sup>2</sup> & Mohammad Naim Wahdat<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Public Administration, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

<sup>2</sup>College of Psychology and Educational sciences, Kabul University, Kabul, Afghanistan

<sup>3</sup>College of Psychology and Educational sciences, Kabul University, Kabul, Afghanistan

Correspondence: Sayed Sami Muzafary, College of Public Administration, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, P. R. China. Tel: 86-130-0639-8947.

**Abstract:** Innovative work behavior is progressively vital for organizations' survival. Transformational leadership has been contended to be especially viable in inciting follower innovative work behavior. Psychological empowerment as an enhancer of transformational leadership influences and found that transformational leadership acts via empowerment to affect an individual's work outcome. This study recognized that transformational leadership completely influences innovation work behavior, which comprises idea generation in addition to idea implementation.

**Keywords:** Transformational leadership, Innovative work behavior

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the present profoundly competitive and technologically progressive world, development assumes an essential role (Smith & Tushman, 2005). Innovation by employees is a standout amongst the ideal approaches to encourage Innovation and organizational achievement (Mytelka & Smith, 2002; Ven, Science, & May, 2010). To encourage employees to innovate in extreme knowledge-based work settings, the role of supervisors as leaders has gotten consideration of scholars and specialists. Therefore, scholars have discovered expanding concern for finding approaches to convince employees at individual dimensions to show creative behaviors through transformational leadership (Piccolo, 2006; Morgan, Walker, Wang, & Aven, 2012). Nevertheless, how transformational leaders influence innovative work behaviors of employees has not been enough looked into (Gong, Kim, & Lee, 2013; Yoon, Sung, & Choi, 2015). While scholars have explored the linkage between the individual view of transformational leadership and employees' creativity behavior, which is the first phase of innovation (Hyypiä & Parjanen, 2013; Malloch, 2014), negligible consideration has been given with the impact of the transformational initiative on employees innovative work behaviors.

Exiting empirical researches in leadership-innovation uncovers two issues. To start with, the absence of systematic regard for the effect of transformational leadership on employee's work innovation behavior is particularly amazing given that thoughts are pointless except if utilized (Whittington, Goodwin, & Murray, 2004), and that employee's innovation, especially in knowledge-intensive settings, is generally perceived as being basic to the development and effectiveness of the organization (Majumdar & Ray, 2018; Shipton et al., 2006). An

individual's impression of supervisors' transformational leadership is firmly identified with his/her anticipated results (for example Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, & Frey, 2013; Chen & Campbell-bush, 2013; Eisenbeiss & Boerner, 2009). Second, it is extremely important to comprehend the follower's psychological procedures that make an interpretation of leader behavior into followers' activity (Knippenberg, Knippenberg, Cremer, & Hogg, 2004).

This research will comprehend the role of follower psychological empowerment and self-idea and personality on the linkage between transformational leadership and innovation work behavior. Employees' innovation work behavior alludes to the advancement and initiation of novel and helpful thoughts and executing these thoughts into better than ever items, administrations or methods for getting things done (Baer, 2012; Wang & Holahan, 2017; Ven et al., 2010). This is in accordance with past research, which separated between thought generation and thought implementation stage and consolidated these two stages in a single develop named innovation behavior (Baer, 2012; Baer, Oldham, & Cummings, 2003; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002; Somech, 2013).

Obviously, there is a need to comprehend the mechanisms and procedures via which transformational leaders' impact creativity behavior of their subordinates (Bass, 1999). A few researchers believe that previous research has not explored the effect of the powerful procedures of employee's psychological mechanisms and self-ideas on the transformational leadership-creativity relationship (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004; Shin & Zhou, 2007). We employ self-determination theory as a main driver; we increase an integrative structure for the effects of transformational leadership on employees' innovation work behavior via psychological empowerment. Since SDT accepts that psychological empowerment, play an important

role in specifying employees' innovative work behavior. Thus, one specifically encouraging psychological mechanism that may intercede the linkage between transformational leadership and creativity is psychological empowerment – an employee's personal state portrayed by expanded intrinsic task motivation, the impression of competence and self-determination to start and perform work behaviors (Deci, Connell, & Ryan, 1989).

Psychological empowerment is the perception of the autonomy and power of an individual who can affect novel and inventive constructive changes (Ramamoorthy, Flood, Slattery, & Sardesai, 2005). Psychological empowerment enhances the creative procedure commitment of intrinsic and motivation (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Xiaomeng Zhang and Kathryn Bartol, 2010). Since creativity is a basic component of innovation work behavior, consequently we suggest that psychological empowerment is going to affect transformational leadership - psychological empowerment relationship. Thus, in the present research, we analyze the influence of transformational leadership on employees' innovative work behavior.

## **2. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND INNOVATION WORK BEHAVIOR**

There is a scarcity of research on the particular linkage between transformational leadership and innovation work behavior (Majumdar & Ray, 2018). Various reasons are proposed to support the belief that transformational leadership definitely affects innovation work behavior. Majumdar & Ray, (2018), Bass, (1911a) and Kahai, Sosik, & Avolio, (2003), recommend that transformational leadership is permeated with moving inspiration, the aggregate feeling of mission, fearlessness, uplifted attention to objectives, energizing vision, and yearning. These parts of transformational leadership stimulate intellectual inspiration, intrinsic motivation, bolster for innovation and creativity of employees (Eisenbeiss & Boerner, 2009; Elkins & Keller, 2003; Pieterse & Knippenberg, 2010; Ryan, Awais, & Tipu, 2012; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009); which nearly coordinate with predecessors invigorating innovative behavior between employees. Research demonstrates that transformational leaders increment organizational innovation (Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009; Gumusluoglu & Ilsev, 2009; Jung, Wu, and Chow, 2008; Joo & Lim, 2013) and enterprising goals of employees (Pieterse & Knippenberg, 2010), because of elite desires from employees.

As indicated by (Eisenbeiss & Boerner, (2009), transformational leaders guarantee that individuals challenge the norm and are animated mentally by rising above their very own self-gain for a higher aggregate gain. Transformational leaders create stimulating objectives, vision, and values; rouse followers to seek after innovative aims to affect their creative behaviors. In accordance with the social exchange point of view (Rubin, 2007), the leader's individualized thought urges employees to respond with more prominent creativity and innovativeness. By giving

uplifting inspiration to employees to change existing systems and plan better approaches to deliver issues causes them to show practices focused on creating better approaches for getting things done. A transformational leader with idealized impact shows positivity and fervor about novel viewpoints and this "championing role" increases organizational innovation via intellectual incitement (Elkins & Keller, 2003). This elevated dimension of intellectual incitement is probably going to increment exploratory reasoning and innovation work behavior. Innovation work behavior expects employees to have a high requirement for accomplishment and low requirement for conformance that is encouraged by transformational leaders. Transformational leaders go out on a limb to attempt better approaches for working, change existing procedures and systems for long haul advantages, and help followers to consider abusing openings effectively (Pearce & Ensley, 2004).

Kahai et al., (2003) contended that transformational leaders rouse employees to show creative undertakings and increment their critical thinking and explanatory capacities. Transformational leaders aid followers with striving for progressively troublesome and challenging objectives by changing follower's inclination for creative points of view (Whittington et al., 2004). They give individual just as an aggregate esteem system, access to assets and information, compelling correspondence, self-assurance, and inward sequence. At the point when followers' individual needs and desires are considered, they will, in general respond by investigating new open doors with a superior spotlight on critical organizational issues and procedures.

Transformational leaders help to offset momentary objectives with circumstance misuse and rouse employees to go out on a limb related with experimenting with new procedures. They cultivate innovation work behavior by encouraging employees to make progress toward aggregate objectives (Basadur, 2004; Majumdar & Ray, 2018; Krause, 2004), and empower individual's learning and aid them to mingle more to discover bolster for their thoughts' application (Huang & Farh, 2009; Kahai et al., 2003; Ramamoorthy et al., 2005). Therefore, transformational leadership influences employees' thought advancement and thought implementation by urging them to thoroughly consider of the box solutions by giving intellectual incitement, reassuring solid social ties among collaborators, including them increasingly more into their employment and organizations, taking into account their intrinsic motivation and thinking about their requirements for improvement and recognition (Tierney & Farmer, 2002; Walumbwa, Lawler, Walumbwa, & Lawler, 2011).

## **3. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

As indicated by Braun et al., (2013), transformational leaders move followers through articulating a stimulating vision and challenging objectives, leaders and followers make each other to progress to a more elevated amount of profound quality and inspiration. Bass, (1911) broadened

crafted by Avolio & Bass, (1995) by clarifying the leaders' impact on making an important and positive change in the followers and presented four dimensions of transformational leadership.

The idealized impact is characterized as the capacity to act as a role model whereby the leader winds up appreciated, regarded and trusted. Intellectual inspiration is the leaders' capacity to stir inside followers to address decisions and handle challenging works. Individualized thought is tied in with giving individual consideration regarding follower's differences and self-improvement, and connecting needs of followers to the organizational mission through nonstop instructing and input. Stimulating motivation includes encouraging followers to trust in their capacity to accomplish energizing vision by moving and inspiring them.

#### **4. INNOVATION WORK BEHAVIOR**

Innovation work behavior is a recognition of issues and beginning and deliberate demonstration of new and valuable thoughts, include a set of behaviors expected to create, dispatch and execute thoughts with a plan to improve individual as well performance (Hartog, 2007; Yang & Rui, 2009). Innovation work behavior varies from employee creativity that focusses on the revelation and generation of thoughts (Hage, 1999). Malik, Butt, & Choi, (2015), Yoon et al., (2015), Chen & Zhang, (2018) and Mumford et al., (2002) define creativity as the way toward starting a novel, new and valuable thoughts; while innovation work behavior incorporates, set of exercises aimed at recognition, advancement, adjustment, adoption, and implementation of thoughts (Yoon & Choi, 2010; Fidan & Oztürk, 2015; Ven et al., 2010).

In contrast to creativity, innovation work behavior has a clearer connected segment and is required to create some sort of inventive yield an advantage. However, to dive into creativity literature is pertinent as it is a part of the first phase of innovative behavior, where employees identify potential issues or performance holes and start thoughts in light of an apparent requirement for innovation (West, 2002). Innovation work behavior has additionally been discovered more extensive than proactiveness develops, for example, proactive work behavior (Strauss & Parker, 2014) and individual initiative (Somech, 2013), which center on person's tendency to implement thoughts proactively, however, cannot catch thought generation part of the innovation procedure.

#### **5. SELF-DETERMINATION THEORY (SDT)**

Employing self-determination theory (Gagne' and Deci, 2005) as a primary driver, we advance an integrative structure for influences of transformational leadership on employees' innovation work behavior through psychological empowerment. Because SDT accepts that psychological empowerment, which includes competence, autonomy, meaning, and impact play an important role in identifying employees' innovation work behavior (Thomas &

Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1995). Competence is the sentiments of self-efficacy or endeavors-performance hope, which drive one to accept his/her capacity to perform activities with expertise (Bandura, 1998). Autonomy is an independence in starting of work behaviors and taking decisions about work (Deci et al., 1989). Meaning is the esteem an individual place on a work role dependent on his/her goals or norms (Bateman & Crant, 1993). The impact is the degree, how much an individual can affect organizational results (Ashforth, Mael, & Consulting, 1989).

These four perceptive dimensions include the fundamental essence of psychological empowerment in the work environment (Houghton & Yoho, 2005). Self-determination is a basic concept that suggests each individual's ability to settle on decisions and apply for order over their own one of a kind life (Andrews, 2016). This limit accepts an imperative occupation in psychological wellbeing and flourishing. Self-determination empowers individuals to feel that they have control over their decisions and lives (Andrews, 2016). Depending upon the idea of relations to be studied, a few scholars saw empowerment from basic and social point of view, which focused after enhancing basic individual decision-making power, while others accentuated on the cognitive or psychological perceptions of empowerment, which are identified with individual discernments about power in the organization and the psychological states (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000). This study emphasis on employee's cognitive or psychological views of empowerment.

#### **6. DISCUSSION**

It is reliable that the organization, which is innovative, has a greater possibility of survival in any geographic or industrial area at any given time. Innovation work behavior is critical for organizations if they wish to build more benefit and continuing extending effectively. Transformational leadership has significant and positive linkage with the psychological empowerment and innovation work behavior. Transformational leaders regularly underline on cooperation, aggregate task achievement, learning by sharing experiences, control, and independence in making a decision, and delegating authority to perform thoughts, which cultivates employee's cooperation in the thought generation and implementation (Pieterse & Knippenberg, 2010). Hence, transformational leadership constructs a workplace in which, employees feel motivated, able and self-guided to encounter inward empowerment (Binyamin & Brender-ilan, 2017; Xiaomeng Zhang and Kathryn M. Bartol, 2010). It emphases on little power separation and requirements and abilities premise of individuals (Zohar & Tenne-gazit, 2008). Transformation leaders delegate authority and support participatory decision-making, making employees committed to completing tasks with a high level of aggregate and cohesion (Jung, Wu, and Chow, 2008; Kahai et al., 2003). They regularly change organizational procedures and systems to accomplish energizing future; delegate authority



to employees to approach and accept responsibility and look for them to a more elevated amount of duty by giving adaptability to settle on making decisions about their work settings.

In the other side, while employees are engaged in organizations, they show creative behaviors, as they discover value in their job roles (Jung, Wu, and Chow, 2008). Transformational leaders make an environment without direct supervision or mediation, which is helpful for innovation work behavior (Wat & Shaffer, 2006; Houghton & Yoho, 2005). Employees who are psychologically empowered sense better about the tasks they are doing and observe them be significant and challenging. Therefore, a psychologically empowered employee shows creative behaviors by adjusting individual objectives to organizational objectives (Jha & Engineering, 2014). When employees sense that they have individual decision-making control, the capacity to affect others, autonomy, adaptability, which means of the work, motivation to accomplish an intended appealing future, they will, in general, deliver more creative efforts to improve work implementation (Kendall et al., 1999). Employees who sense empowered and discover importance in their work, are assured to be motivated intrinsically to affect the organization, which thus advances innovation work behavior and task achievement (Berg & Hallberg, 1999; Amutan, 2018; Kahai et al., 2003; Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk, 2004).

Conger, Kanungo, & Kanungo, (2019) proposed that psychological empowerment energizes change, and innovation works behaviors are change arranged by definition. Most commonly, psychological empowerment increments intrinsic task motivation, individual adaptability and self-determination over work performance making individuals less compelled about guideline bound angles and enable them to add to innovative behaviors (Guay, Vallerand, & Blanchard, 2000).

## 7. CONCLUSION

By concluding, transformational leadership acts via empowerment to affect an individual's work result. Psychological empowerment clarifies the linkages between transformational leadership and employee work-related behaviors by giving complete motivational component.

Employees encouraged by transformational leader's sense psychologically empowered since they comprehend the organization's desires from them and are better prepared to coordinate their abilities and behaviors to these requests, execution results, and desires. They have a higher feeling of authority and self-efficacy over their errands and workplaces. Giving employees more independence and decision-making control outcomes in employees who are bound to respond with larger amounts of creative process commitment.

Transformational leaders empower learning dispersion, relegate challenging tasks, and excite intellectual incitement, which is all related definitely to creativity and innovation

work behavior. This leadership style prepares employees to take on more responsibility and increase convictions about their ability to perform activities and achieve tasks with novelty and creativity.

Such types of leaders consider their employees' feeling of achievement, which is relied upon to increase employees' innovativeness. Employees demonstrate creativity and innovation by working in a high-load independence working condition with incessant consultations, self-management and control, and delegation.

## REFERENCES

1. Amutan, K. I. (2018). A Review of B. F. Skinner's Reinforcement Theory of Motivation. *International Journal of Research in Education Methodology*, 5(3), 680–688.
2. Andrews, C. (2016). Integrating public service motivation and self-determination theory: A framework. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 29(3), 238–254.
3. Ashforth, B. E., Mael, F. A., & Consulting, M. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20–39.
4. Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual Consideration Viewed At Multiple Levels of Analysis: A Multi-Level Framework for Examining the Diffusion of Leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 199–218.
5. Baer, M. (2012). Putting Creativity To Work: the Implementation of Creative Ideas in Organizations. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1102–1120.
6. Baer, M., Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (2003). Rewarding creativity: When does it really matter? *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4–5), 569–586.
7. Bandura, A. (1998). *Self-Efficacy* (Vol. 4).
8. Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 103–121.
9. Bass, B. M. (1911a). *From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision*.
10. Bass, B. M. (1911b). *Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision*, 19–31.
11. Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118.
12. Berg, A., & Hallberg, I. R. (1999). Effects of systematic clinical supervision on psychiatric nurses' sense of coherence, creativity, work-related strain, job satisfaction and view of the effects from clinical supervision: a pre-post test design. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 6(1), 371–381.
13. Binyamin, G., & Brender-ilan, Y. (2017). Leaders' language and employee proactivity: Enhancing psychological meaningfulness and vitality. *European Management Journal*, 3(1), 1–11.
14. Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013).

- Transformational leadership , job satisfaction , and team performance : A multilevel mediation model of trust ☆. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 2012–2014.
15. Chen, G., & Campbell-bush, E. M. (2013). Teams as Innovative Systems : Multilevel Motivational Antecedents of Innovation in R & D Teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(6), 1018–1027.
  16. Chen, Y., & Zhang, L. (2018). Be creative as proactive? The impact of creative self-efficacy on employee creativity : A proactive perspective. *Curr Psychol*, 23(7), 72–82.
  17. Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Kanungo, R. N. (2019). The Empowerment Process : Integrating Theory and Practice Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : The Empowerment Process : Integrating Theory and Practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471–482.
  18. Deci, E. L., Connell, J. E., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-Determination in a Work Organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580–590.
  19. Eisenbeiss, S. A., & Boerner, S. (2009). Transformational Leadership and Team Innovation : Integrating Team Climate Principles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2008), 1438–1446.
  20. Elkins, T., & Keller, R. T. (2003). Leadership in research and development organizations : A literature review and conceptual framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 587–606.
  21. Fidan, T., & Oztürk, I. (2015). The Relationship of the Creativity of Public and Private School Teachers to their Intrinsic Motivation and the School Climate for Innovation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195(4), 905–914.
  22. Gagne' and Deci. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior J. Organiz. Behav*, 26(4), 331–362.
  23. Gong, Y., Kim, T., & Lee, D. (2013). A Multilevel Model of Team Goal Orientation, Information Exchange, and Creativity the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 56(3), 827–851.
  24. Guay, F., Vallerand, R. J., & Blanchard, C. (2000). On the Assessment of Situational Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS). *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3), 175–213.
  25. Gumusluoglu, L., & Ilsev, A. (2009). Transformational leadership , creativity , and organizational innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(4), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.07.032>
  26. Hage, J. T. (1999). Organizational Innovation and Organizational Change. *Annual Reviews*, 25(1), 597–622.
  27. Hartog, D. N. Den. (2007). How Leaders Influence Employees ' Innovative Behaviour How leaders influence employees ' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41–64.
  28. Houghton, J. D., & Yoho, S. K. (2005). Toward a Contingency Model of Leadership and Psychological Empowerment : When Should Self-Leadership Be Encouraged?, 11(4).
  29. Huang, J., & Farh, J. (2009). Employee Learning Orientation, Transformational Leadership, and Employee Creativity: The Mediating Role of Employee Creative Self-Efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765–778.
  30. Hyypiä, M., & Parjanen, S. (2013). Boosting Creativity with Transformational Leadership in Fuzzy Front-end Innovation Processes Creativity in Fuzzy Front-end Innovation Processes. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 8(1), 21–41.
  31. Jha, S., & Engineering, I. (2014). Transformational leadership and psychological empowerment : Determinants of ... *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 3(1), 18–35.
  32. Joo, B. B., & Lim, T. (2013). Transformational Leadership and Career Satisfaction : The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(3), 316–326.
  33. Jung, D.D., Wu, A. and Chow, C. W. (2008). Towards Understanding the Direct and Indirect Effects of Transformational Leadership on Firm Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 19(5), 582–594.
  34. Kahai, S. S., Sosik, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Effects of leadership style , anonymity , and rewards on creativity-relevant processes and outcomes in an electronic meeting system context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 499–501.
  35. Knippenberg, D. Van, Knippenberg, B. Van, Cremer, D. De, & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership , self , and identity : A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 825–856.
  36. Krause, D. E. (2004). Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors An empirical investigation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 79–102.
  37. Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J. E., Shamian, J., & Wilk, P. (2004). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on work satisfaction, 545(December 2003), 527–545.
  38. Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T. (2000). An Examination of the Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment on the Relations Between the Job , Interpersonal Relationships , and Work Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 4016.
  39. Majumdar, B., & Ray, A. (2018). Transformational Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour Transformational Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied*

- Psychology*, 37(1), 140–148.
40. Malik, M. A. R., Butt, A. N., & Choi, J. N. (2015). Rewards and employee creative performance: Moderating effects of creative self-efficacy, reward importance, and locus of control. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(1), 59–74.
  41. Malloch, K. (2014). Beyond Transformational Leadership to Greater Engagement: *Nurse Leader*, 12(2), 60–63.
  42. Morgan, W. B., Walker, S. S., Wang, Y., & Aven, F. F. (2012). Proactive and Committed: Characteristics for Retention. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 12(1993), 97–108.
  43. Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships, 13, 705–750.
  44. Mytelka, L. K., & Smith, K. (2002). Policy learning and innovation theory: an interactive and co-evolving process, 31, 1467–1479.
  45. Pearce, C. L., & Ensley, M. D. (2004). A Reciprocal and Longitudinal Investigation of the Innovation Process: The Central Role of Shared Vision in Product and Process Innovation Teams ( PPITs ) Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article: A reciprocal and longitudinal investiga. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(2), 259–278.
  46. Piccolo, R. F. (2006). Transformational Leadership and Job Behaviors: The Mediating role of core job characteristics University of Central Florida. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 327–340.
  47. Pieterse, A. N., & Knippenberg, D. V. A. N. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 623(1), 609–623.
  48. Ramamoorthy, N., Flood, P. C., Slattery, T., & Sardesai, R. (2005). Determinants of Innovative Work Behaviour: Development and Test of an Integrated Model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 180–199.
  49. Rubin, B. A. (2007). For Love or Money? Extrinsic Rewards, Intrinsic Rewards, Work–Life Issues, and Hour Mismatches. *Workplace Temporalities*, 17(1), 285–311.
  50. Ryan, J. C., Awais, S., & Tipu, A. (2012). Transformational Leadership in Pakistan: An Examination of the Relationship of Transformational Leadership to Organizational Culture and Innovation Propensity. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 10(2), 1–29.
  51. Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? *Journal of Management*, 30(6), 933–958.
  52. Shin, S. J., & Zhou, J. (2007). When Is Educational Specialization Heterogeneity Related to Creativity in Research and Development Teams? Transformational Leadership as a Moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1709–1721.
  53. Shipton, H., West, M. A., Dawson, J., Birdi, K., Patterson, M., & Group, O. P. (2006). HRM as a predictor of innovation. *Aston Business School*, 16(1), 3–37.
  54. Smith, W. K., & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing Strategic Contradictions: A Top Management Model for Managing Innovation Streams. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 522–536.
  55. Somech, A. (2013). Translating Team Creativity to Innovation Implementation: The Role of Team Composition and Climate for Innovation. *Journal of Management*, 39(3), 684–708.
  56. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465.
  57. Strauss, K., & Parker, S. K. (2014). Effective and Sustained Proactivity in the Workplace: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 66(6), 158–185.
  58. Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive Elements of Empowerment: An " Interpretive " Model of Intrinsic Task Motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666–681.
  59. Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative Self-Efficacy: Its Potential Antecedents and Relationship to. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 45(6), 1137–1148.
  60. Ven, A. H. Van De, Science, S. M., & May, O. D. (2010). Central Problems in the Management of Innovation. *Management Science*, 32(5), 590–607.
  61. Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2011). Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies Fred. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(7), 1083–1101.
  62. Wang, K., & Holahan, P. J. (2017). The Effect of Monetary Reward on Creativity: The Role of Motivational Orientation. *Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 50(1), 224–233.
  63. Wat, D., & Shaffer, M. A. (2006). Equity and relationship quality influences on organizational citizenship behaviors The mediating role of trust in the supervisor. *Personnel Review*, 34(4), 406–422.
  64. West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling Fountains or Stagnant Ponds: An Integrative Model of Creativity and Innovation Implementation in Work Groups. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(3), 355–387.
  65. Whittington, J. L., Goodwin, V. L., & Murray, B. (2004). Transformational leadership , goal difficulty , and job design : Independent and interactive effects on

- employee outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 1997–1999.
66. Xiaomeng Zhang and Kathryn M. Bartol. (2010). Linking Empowering Leadership and Employee Creativity: The Influence of Psychological Empowerment, Intrinsic Motivation, and Creative Process Engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 67–89.
67. Yang, J., & Rui, M. (2009). Turning knowledge into new product creativity: An empirical study. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 109(9), 1197–1210.
68. Yoon, H. J., & Choi, J. N. (2010). Extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and creativity in the workplace: Reward importance as a moderator. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting*, 5(3), 68–88.
69. Yoon, H. J., Sung, S. Y., & Choi, J. N. (2015). Mechanisms Underlying Creative Performance: Employee Perceptions of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards for Creativity. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 43(7), 1161–1179.
70. Zohar, D., & Tenne-gazit, O. (2008). Transformational Leadership and Group Interaction as Climate Antecedents : Transformational Leadership and Group Interaction as Climate Antecedents : A Social Network Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4), 744–457.