

REWARDS AND EMPLOYEE CREATIVE PERFORMANCE: MODERATING EFFECTS OF CREATIVE SELF EFFICIENCY, AND REWARD IMPORTANCE

Jowhar Massoudie

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics, Kardan University, Kabul
jowhar.massoudie@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The main aim of this paper is to investigate the effect of rewards on employee creative performance with moderating role of creative self-efficient, and reward importance. This study is carried on telecommunication sector in Nangarhar – Afghanistan. The simple random sampling technique is adopted to collect the data from the corresponding population and the sample size is 150 employees working in different telecommunication sector. The estimation technique that is employee in the study is ordinary least square. The result of the study indicate there is a significant positive effect of reward on employee creative performance. Beside this, the result reveal that moderating variables such as creative self-efficiency, and reward importance have a strong effect on rewards that enhance the relation between rewards and employee creative performance.

KEYWORDS: Rewards, Employee Creative Performance, Creative Self Efficiency, Afghanistan

1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to visualize and implement creative solutions, the flexibility to adapt to changing situations, and the full use of the human imagination has not only transformed organizations into competitive advantage benefits but also predicts their survival and success. (Cooper and Jayatilaka, 2006).

As a result, much attention has been paid to research to identify different predictors of creative behavior. Creativity research has attracted a great deal of research focus and generated over 9,000 studies over the past four decades (Prabhu, Sutton, & Saucer, 2008), however, questions and issues remain unanswered by creativity researchers. One of these issues is the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards on employees' creative behavior (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1998). Another area that needs further research is to classify different types of creative behaviors and identify their predictors (Gillson & Madjar, 2011; Unsworth, 2001). The purpose of this study is to address both issues and to attempt to answer some unresolved questions. In the next section, these two avenues of research are summarized and research questions are formulated for this study.

In economics, efficiency is defined as the optimal ratio between outputs and inputs of products and services. The optimal ratio corresponds to the best possible distribution of the resources available (Cvilikas, & Jurkonyte-Dumbliauskiene, 2016). Efficiency of commercial banks has been cited as one of the key factors contributing to their successes or failures (Barr, Seiford, and Siems, 1994).

Additionally, an efficient banking sector leads to economic growth and sustainable development (Huang & Tang, 2012; De Jongh, De Jongh, Jongh, & Gary, 2013). The necessity to have an efficient banking industry to sustain economic growth is well known.

The debate about the impact of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards on creative behavior is quite old (Cummings, 1965).

There are two research streams that have attempted to explain the impact of rewards on creative behavior. It is a shared cognitive perspective that is the main predictor of intrinsic motivation and high intrinsic creative behavior.

Motivation leads to a higher level of creative behavior (Amabile, Hill, Hennessey, & Tighe, 1994). The stream of cognitive research holds that extrinsic rewards undermine intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1985) and suggest that the impact of extrinsic rewards on creative behavior is generally negative. Several empirical studies have supported this view and have shown that external awards decrease intrinsic motivation as well as creative behavior (Amabile, 1979; Amabile, 1985). On the other hand, behavioral research shows that repetitive training and positive outcomes can reinforce human behaviors such as power, frequency, and novelty (Skinner, 1938). This view suggests that since creativity is a behavioral dimension, appropriate intrinsic and extrinsic rewards can enhance creative behavior (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1998). Therefore, behavioral attitudes support the use of extrinsic rewards and are considered as a means of enhancing creative behavior (Eisenberger, Armley, & Pretz, 1998). Some empirical studies have confirmed this view and have shown that extrinsic rewards can enhance intrinsic motivation as well as creative behavior (Eisenberger et al., 1998; Eisenberger & Shanock, 2003). Thus, although the general consensus has emerged about the positive effects of intrinsic rewards on creative behavior, the impact of extrinsic rewards on creative behaviors remains controversial.

The contradictory findings of cognitive and behavioral research flows are confusing to researchers and managers. On the one hand, research clearly demonstrates the value of creative behavior for organizational and personal success. However, on the other hand, it has not been able to predict the impact of different rewards on employees' creative behavior - for sure. Therefore, the top research priority should be to examine the impact of these rewards on creative behavior and to identify the factors that influence this relationship.

One of the main goals of this study was to clarify the ambiguous relationship between reward and creative behavior. One step that can gain greater clarity in creativity talk about rewards is to study the underlying processes through which rewards affect employees' creative behavior. A better understanding of these processes can not only add to the body of knowledge in reward - the creativity research paradigm, but can also help researchers understand and hypothesize the particular

direction in which different types of rewards may influence creative behavior.

Despite the importance of studying these underlying processes, previous research has considered the reward-creative behavior relationship as a black box, and little effort has been directed toward studying the underlying processes that link rewards to creative behavior. The list of all such factors that can mediate the relationship between reward and creativity is indescribable. So the first research question of this study is to identify some of the underlying processes through which reward affects creative behavior. In other words, the first aim of this study is to identify some of the mediators of the reward-creative behavior relationship.

Creative Behavior (Dessie, Costner & Ryan, 2001), most researchers are likely to expect similar rewards between extrinsic rewards and creative behaviors. Another similarity between cognitive and behavioral research is that it is expected to affect individuals' extrinsic rewards regardless of the local features and contextual settings of individuals in a similar way. Only about reward are very few studies - creativity research that has examined the possibility of changing the effects of reward on individuals based on their individual differences.

The discussion of the comparative power of personal and contextual factors as predictors of human behavior (ie, Davis-Blake & Pfeiffer, 1989) is almost settled. It is now generally accepted that human behavior is better predicted by the interaction between personality traits and contextual factors (Sternberg, 2006). This approach suggests that the interaction between personality and context can explain human behavior more effectively than either (House, Shane, & Herold, 1996). Since creativity is a behavioral dimension, it can be believed that it is also stimulated by the interaction of personal and textual factors. However, to date, research on the interaction between rewards and personal (or contextual) factors is scarce. Creativity research has shown that in certain situations, the reward-creative behavior relationship becomes positive and meaningful (ie, Eisenberger, Pierce, & Cameron, 1999), whereas in others, the relationship is negative and meaningful (ie, Dessie, Kostner, and Ryan). , 1999). This situation refers to the presence of moderators, which moderates the relationship between reward and creative behavior. Although rewards - creative behavior research has generally attracted much research, research to identify moderators of the rewards - creative behavior is scarce. Research to identify observers of this relationship is limited

Objectives of the study are: First, to investigate the effects of rewards on employee creative performances. Second, to examine the moderating role of locus of control in enhancing the relationship of rewards on employee creative performance. Third, to test the moderating role of self efficiency in enhancing the relationship of rewards on employee creative performance. Finally, to scrutinized the moderating role of rewards importance in enhancing the relationship of rewards on employee creative performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

a. Defining and Measuring Creativity

For psychometric work, each variable needs a clear and valid definition (Batey & Furnham, 2006).

This is precisely where the problem for creativity researchers begins. Defining creativity is a complex task, because creativity can be defined in terms of thought process (such as divergent thinking), behavior (such as finding new ways to do repetitive tasks) as well as in terms of the end product (such as inventing a new device). Considers four different approaches that can be defined as creativity. The four approaches are:

1- The environment in which it is created or the creative environment, 2- the production of creativity or creative product, The creative process, or the creative process, and the person who is creative, or the creative personality. Based on these four approaches, Taylor (1988) identified 50 different definitions of creativity presented in the past five decades. "These definitions are so different that a very creative person by one definition may not be considered creative by another," he said. Betty and Furham (2006) stated that creativity has been defined in a variety of ways that has almost ceased its meaning. The researchers identified eight different methods used in research to operationalize individual creativity. These eight methods included divergent thinking tests, attitudes and interest inventory, personality inventories, biographical inventories, product judgments, prominent ratings, creative activities, and self-reports by peers, teachers, and supervisors (Batey & Furnham, 2006). It can be easily appreciated that some methods regard creativity as a cognitive process, others regard it as a behavior or attitude, and others regard it as a personality trait and an individual difference. Focusing on these issues, Simonton (1999) points out that a single definition of creativity that can meet all different approaches is difficult to achieve, and Sternberg (1999) stated that "the essence of creativity cannot be found in a single variable. Be captured "(p. 84).

Despite the controversy surrounding the definition of creativity, there are definitions that are widely accepted and accepted. I use the definition of creativity that defines creativity as a result - in the form of a product, service, procedure, or process - that is both new and useful (Amabile, 1983; Amabile 1996a). This definition is relatively broader than many other definitions because it encompasses several aspects of creativity

Results (whether a product or service) as well as the process of achieving that result (such as displaying creative behavior) in the field of creativity. This makes this definition equally valid in diverse contexts as the result of creativity is apparently different from one another, and hence, this definition is often used by creativity researchers (ie, Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron , 1996; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley, Gilson & Blum, 2000; Fong, 2006; Gilson & Madjar, 2011).

b. Creativity Classification

Creativity is categorized by the nature of the outcome of creativity (ie incremental versus radical creativity) in several ways, including by level of analysis (ie, team vs. individual creativity) (Gillson & Muder, 2011) and by relevance to the existing model. (i.e, replication, orientation, and restart) (Sternberg, 2006). I will briefly talk about one of these classifications that relates to the current framework, incremental and radical creativity.

c. Incremental and Radical Creativity

Creativity is generally defined as the production of an idea, process or product, and new and useful (Amabile, 1996a). One of the criteria used to classify creativity is the extent to which an idea, product, or process is propagated (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). 'Innovation' may be a partial adaptation of 'explicit discoveries and fundamental developments' (Gillson & Madar, 2011). There is a similar difference in the innovation literature that defines "exploration" and "exploitation" differently.

The so-called refers to new approaches and ideas, something completely new and different from the past, while exploiting to describe the progress of current practices, poor productivity gains and performance, and improvements in existing products. (March 1991). Banner & Tucson (2003) noted that these are different types of creative partnerships and are not superior to one another. Both are crucial to organizational success and are key drivers of performance.

Research on anti-interactionist mentality (ie, Kerry, Galinsky, & Wong, 2006) also supports the distinction between incremental and radical creative behavior. People with an anti-violent mindset are defined as people who frequently compare reality with what might have been, and frequently ask "what if" types of questions (such as "if I marry that person I was like, what happens "). In a study to investigate the impact of cross-mind sets on cognitive processes and creative behavior, Carey et al. (2006) found that individuals with the opposite mind set perform better in "creative community" tasks (creative tasks that require "in-box thinking"), whereas they perform better in "creative generation" tasks (creative tasks that Need "thinking outside the box") to perform better. The distinction between creative association and creative generation is similar to the distinction between incremental and radical creative behavior. Creative production and radical creative behavior correspond to the creation of new things, quite different from existing products and processes, while both creative communication and incremental creative behavior refer to partial adaptation and creation of existing products and processes (March 1991).

Radical and incremental creativity can be seen as two ends of a single continuum, with several points in between. This idea is reinforced by the Creative Propulsion Model (Sternberg, 2006), which classified creative partnerships into eight different types and divided them into three categories. On the one hand, partnerships that accept the current paradigm, such as "duplication" and "redefinition" are. This type of creative partnership was quite close to what was termed incremental creativity by Gilson and Madjar (2011). On the other hand, the Sternberg classification is creative contributions

such as redirection, reconstruction, and restart that reject the current pattern. They are close to what is defined as fundamental creativity or achievement.

Radical and incremental creative behaviors are useful at different stages of the problem solving process and are generated by different sets of predictors. In one of the few empirical studies to distinguish between radical and incremental creative behavior, Gillson and Mader (2011) have shown that radical creative behavior is useful at the beginning of problem solving such as problem identification and construction, whereas, incremental creative behavior. The next part of the problem solving process, such as identifying and implementing the solution, is more useful. In an empirical study to identify predictors of incremental and radical creative behavior, Muder et al. (2011) found that willingness to take risk and job commitment are strongly correlated with radical creative behavior, whereas the presence of creative colleagues and organizational identification is more strongly associated with incremental creative behavior.

d. The Relationship Between Reward and Creative Behavior

In this rapidly changing world, the flexibility to adapt to new environments and provide innovative solutions to customers is becoming a key competitive advantage and the most important predictor of organizational success and survival (Cooper & Jayatilaka, 2006; Hunter, Bailey & Mumford, 2007; Mumford & Gustafson, 1988). This has led to great interest in research into the study of different predictors of creative behavior. An area in which the research paradigm has attracted a great deal of research interest is the impact of external rewards (such as verbal encouragement, tangible rewards, and cognition) compared to intrinsic rewards (such as the feeling of involvement and play in activity and entertainment, and Entertainment). Intrinsic rewards induce intrinsic motivation, which is the desire to perform an activity as an end in itself, to enjoy the activity without any expectation or desire for extrinsic reward (Lepper et al., 1973; Amabile (et al., 1994), on the other hand, extrinsic awards induce extrinsic motivation, indicating the tendency for an activity to achieve a result other than the activity itself. Dekey and Ryan (1985) argue that external motivation comes from understanding the instrumental relationship between behavior and some external rewards, whereas there is no relationship when it comes to intrinsic motivation.

Rewards are not psychological constructs; at the theoretical level there is only a relationship between motivation and individual behavior, not between specific rewards and behaviors. There is a relationship between reward and behavior at the observable / empirical level (Deci et al., 1999).

The debate over the impact of reward on creative behavior is probably as much as his research on old creativity (Cummings, 1965). There are two distinct research streams that link extrinsic rewards to creative behavior, albeit in a contradictory way. The first is a cognitive perspective that is sometimes referred to as "romanticism" (Eisenberger & Shanock, 2003). It is a common view that the basic prerequisite and predictor of creative behavior is intrinsic motivation and that a high level of intrinsic motivation leads to a higher level of creativity. Most researchers converge on this point, meaning

that the intrinsic motivation for an activity leads to creative behavior, but the role of extrinsic motivation (and the rewards that this motivates) is the starting point of two research streams. The stream of cognitive research shows that extrinsic rewards undermine intrinsic motivation, which is

the key to creative behaviors (Amabile, 1985), and therefore the role of extrinsic rewards is perceived as detrimental to creative behavior. This view involves a situation where extrinsic rewards, with a few exceptions (ie, verbal and unexpected rewards), are generally detrimental to creative behavior (Desi et al., 1999). On the other hand, research is a course of behavior that assumes that all functional dimensions such as speed, power, and novelty can be reinforced by intrinsic and extrinsic rewards (Skinner, 1938). This view holds that repeated training and reinforcement can control human behavior, and since creativity is a behavioral dimension, it can be controlled and reinforced by appropriate use.

This stream of research shows that with the help of external rewards, it is well managed, that creative behavior can be improved and that the negative effects of external rewards on creative behavior cannot be generalized to any situation (Eisenberger & Cameron, 1998). The behavioral perspective encourages the use of extrinsic rewards and uses these rewards as a tool to foster creative behavior (Eisenberger et al., 1998).

Relationship between Reward and Classification of Creative Behavior

In the above sections, I have summarized the seemingly contradictory findings of cognitive and behavioral researchers. One possible reason for the contradictory research findings has been reported by Unsworth (2001). He stated that the creative outcome can be different because of the creative behavior and because of the different starting points of the creative process. Gillson and Madar (2011) also suggested that a proven view of creativity as a one-dimensional construct without regard to the different types of creative behavior can be a source of potential error and that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards can be created. Creative behavior - but of different types.

The human behavior that results from an innate interest in an activity is greater than the behavior that begins with the external rewards (Amabile 1996a). This shows that intrinsic rewards create the kind of creative behavior that requires higher engagement. In contrast, extrinsic rewards cannot cause much involvement in the activity and thus can produce the kind of creative behavior less dependent on it. High level of conflict in one

The activity promotes new ideas and the kind of creative behavior resulting from such cognitive processes is generally fundamental in nature (Gillson & Mader, 2011). In contrast, incremental creative behavior occurs when there is less participation in the activity and the ideas generated are based on the repetition and redefinition of current practices. For these reasons, Gillson and Madjar (2011) stated that the relationship between intrinsic rewards and radical creative behavior is much

stronger than the relationship between extrinsic rewards and creative radical behavior.

Similarly, the relationship between extrinsic rewards and incremental creative behavior is stronger than extrinsic rewards and radical creative behaviors. Gillson, Lim, D'Innocenzo, and Moy (2012) also stated that the persistence and attraction that radical creative behavior requires may be due to an intrinsic interest in activity rather than extrinsic rewards. The presence of high intrinsic rewards leads to increased risk behaviors, increased endurance in the face of adverse evaluations, and thus facilitates the exhibition of radical creative behavior (Gillson et al., 2012). So it seems that the profound amount of conflict that comes from the intrinsic rewards of an activity

Although creativity motivation and literature - in general - show a significant relationship between extrinsic rewards and incremental creative behavior and between intrinsic rewards and radical creative behaviors, some real life examples do. The careers of many great scientists and mathematicians have shown that anticipated rewards increase creative behavior to the extent that it can lead to substantial success.

Eisenberger and Shanock (2003) cited an example of a famous scientist, James Watson, who discovered the molecular mechanism of human inheritance transfer, for whom the desire to obtain a noble prize was effective in his return to work from long periods. Diversion In this case, the tendency to receive external rewards leads to radical behaviors. So, although I assume that the relationship between intrinsic rewards and radical creative behavior is stronger than the relationship between extrinsic rewards and radical creative behaviors, I do not rule out the possibility of extrinsic rewards that lead to radical creative behaviors.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design

This study examine the effect of rewards on employee creative performance with moderating role of self efficiency, rewards importance and locus of control. The study adopt the primary data for the analysis which is collected via five likert scale questionnaire. The questionnaire adopted from different authors for the data collection. The sample size of the study is 150 out of 340 number of employees in the telecommunication sector in Nangarhar province of Afghanistan. The data was entered into excel spreadsheet for further analysis. The data was analyzed through Eview. The descriptive statistics, its correlation matrix and regression analysis has been presented in this chapter.

2. Population and Sampling

The statistical population of the study consisted of employees working full time in the telecommunication sector in Nangarhar. Two methods were used to collect the data. Data were first collected from staff participating in various telecommunicatin networks. Secondly, the survey questionnaire was administered to selected organizations. In both forms of data collection,

participants were first informed about the purpose of the research. Adopted questionnaire was utilized to collect the data from corresponding respondents.

It was also informed about the confidentiality protocol. Data were collected from two sources, namely employees and their supervisors. The dependent variables (Employee creative performance) are operationalized through the observer report, while all other constructs are operationalized through the self-report.

For administration, the self-reported questionnaire and the pre-administered questionnaire were numbered equally. Three questions, namely self-report questionnaire, observer questionnaire and blank identification form were handed over to employees. Employees were asked to return the self-made questionnaire directly to the researchers and to hand over the supervisor's questionnaire with the identification form (questionnaire) to the supervisors. A questionnaire to be completed by the supervisors also included instructions for the supervisors. Supervisors filled out the questionnaire and removed the ID. The completed questionnaires were collected directly from supervisors at the next visit.

The sample size was calculated using the number of cases and the structure of the questionnaire. Researchers have proposed different rules for calculating sample size based on the number of items and structures. An approximate method for calculating sample size is to have two (or more) datasets for each item in the questionnaire (Kline, 2000) or to have fifteen (or more) datasets for each structure (Pedhazur, 1997). The sample size was between 150 and 255. To be on the safer side, the higher of the two was chosen as the sample size. The following is the size of population in telecommunication sector in Nanagarhar.

Table 1. Population of Telecommunication Sector in Nanagarhar

S.No	Telecommunication Network	Number of Employees
01	Etisalat Telecommunication Network	120
02	MTN Telecommunication Network	80
03	AWCC Telecommunication Network	90
04	Salam Telecommunication Network	50
	Total	340

The following table would represents the sample size for the current study. The total number of employees would recommended to fulfill the questionnaire which are following.

Table 2. Sample Size of Telecommunication Sector in Nanagarhar

S.No	Telecommunication Network	Number of Employees
01	Etisalat Telecommunication Network	45
02	MTN Telecommunication Network	35
03	AWCC Telecommunication Network	40
04	Salam Telecommunication Network	30
	Total	150

3. Model Specification

The following model has been constructed to examine the effect of rewards on employee creative performance with moderating role of self-efficiency, reward importance and locus of control.

$$ECP = \beta_0 + \beta_1 R + \beta_2 SE + \beta_3 LOC + \beta_4 RI + \beta_4 R * SE + \beta_4 R * LOC + \beta_4 R * RI + \epsilon$$

where,

ECP = Employee Creative Performance

R = Rewards

SE = Self Efficiency

LOC = Locus of Control

RI = Reward Importance

ϵ = Error Term

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

a. Descriptive Statistics

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the Study

Variables	Mean	St.Devaiton	Max	Min
ECP	2.56	0.03	3.56	1.45
SE	1.98	0.08	2.98	0.45
LC	1.24	0.78	2.98	1.12
R	3.21	0.32	4.21	2.11
RI	2.53	0.45	3.24	1.32

The above Table represents the descriptive or summary statistics of the variables undertaken for the study. The mean value of employee creative performance is 2.56, while its standard deviation is 0.03 with the number of observation is 150. The maximum value of 3.56 and its minimum value is 1.45.

The mean value of self efficiency is 1.98, while its standard deviation is 0.08 with the number of observation is 150. The maximum value of 2.98 and its minimum value is 0.45. The mean value of locus of control is 1.24, while its standard deviation is 0.78 with the number of observation is 150. The maximum value of 2.98 and its minimum value is 1.12. The mean value of rewards is 3.21, while its standard deviation is 0.32 with the number of observation is 150. The maximum value of 4.21 and its minimum value is 2.11. The mean value of rewards importance is 2.53, while its standard deviation is 0.45 with the number of observation is 150. The maximum value of 3.24 and its minimum value is 1.38.

b. Correlation Matrix

The correlation matrix indicates the co movement of the variables that how two variables are moving together. The correlation matrix shows that rewards was significantly correlated with employees creative performance ($r = 0.38$). This indicates that rewards and employee creative performance is positively correlated with each other. As rewards rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performances and its vice versa. The correlation matrix shows that locus of control was significantly correlated with employees creative performance ($r = 0.63$). This indicates that locus of control and employee creative performance is positively correlated with each other. As rewards rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performances and its vice versa. The correlation matrix shows that rewards importance was significantly correlated with employees creative performance ($r = 0.57$). This indicates that rewards and employee creative performance is positively correlated with each other. As rewards importance rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performances and its vice versa. The correlation matrix shows that self efficiency was significantly correlated with employees creative performance ($r = 0.54$). This indicates that self efficiency and employee creative performance is positively correlated with each other. As rewards rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performances and its vice versa.

Table 4. Correlation Matrix of the Study

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1.ECP	1.00				
2.SE	0.54	1.00			
3.R	0.38	0.58	1.00		
4.LC	0.63	0.24	0.10	1.00	
5.RI	0.57	0.12	0.36	0.34	1.00

c. Regression Result

Table 5. Regression Result of the Study

Variables	Coeff	St. Error	t	Sig
Const	0.531	0.036	2.23	0.023
R	0.365	0.789	-3.89	0.048
LC	0.098	0.654	3.58	0.055
RI	0.047	0.123	3.65	0.012
SE	0.052	0.741	-2.87	0.033
R * SE	0.098	0.852	2.96	0.044
R * RI	0.043	0.369	2.78	0.051
R * LC	0.078	0.473	-2.65	0.002

The above table represents the regression result of the study. The estimated coefficient of rewards is positive. This implies that as rewards rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performance. The estimated coefficient of reward is 0.36, which implies that one percent change in rewards would cause to rise the employee creative performances by 36 percent and its vice versa. The estimated coefficient of locus of control is positive. This implies that as locus of control rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performance. The estimated coefficient of locus of control is 0.098, which implies that one percent change in locus of control would cause to rise the employee creative performances by 9.8 percent and its vice versa. The estimated coefficient of rewards importance is positive. This implies that as rewards importance rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performance. The estimated coefficient of rewards importance is 0.047, which implies that one percent change in rewards importance would cause to rise the employee creative performances by 4.7 percent and it's vice versa. The estimated coefficient of Self efficiency is positive. This implies that as self-efficiency rises, this would cause to rise the employee creative performance. The estimated coefficient of self-efficiency is 0.052, which implies that one percent change in self-efficiency would cause to rise the employee creative performances by 5.2 percent and its vice versa. Self-efficiency could be a moderate variable because it is significant highly at five percent significant level. This issues that a rise in self-efficiency would cause to rise the effects of rewards on employees creative performance.

Locus of control could be a moderate variable because it is significant highly at five percent significance level. This issues that a rise in locus of control would cause to rise the effects of rewards on employees creative performance. Rewards importance could be a moderate variable because it is significant highly at five percent significance level. This issues that a rise in rewards importance would cause to rise the effects of rewards on employees creative performance.

d. Model Summary

The below table represents the explanatory power of the independent variable on the dependent variable or it presents the dependency of dependent variable on independent variables of the study. As the R-Square of the study is 0.75, which shows that 75 percent, the independent variables of the study has effects on the dependent variable of the study. In other words, the explanatory power of the model is 75 percent. The explained variables of the study has 75 percent effect on the dependent variable of the study.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. Conclusion

The present study investigates the impact of rewards on creative performance of the employees. The results indicate that the relationship between rewards and creative behavior is direct. Cognitive researchers suggest that when individuals perform activities under the influence of intrinsic rewards, they exhibit behavior that is highly creative (Amabile et al., 1994). The present study confirms this claim by proving that the high intrinsic reward for doing an activity is almost always a manifestation of creative behavior. The present study therefore supports the finding of a stream of cognitive research that demonstrates that intrinsic rewards are the primary driver of creative behavior (Dickey, Kostner, & Ryan, 2001). This study has taken a step forward by demonstrating a psychological process (ie pleasure) that mediates the relationship between innate rewards and creative behavior. So this shows that the intrinsic rewards for doing an activity make it an enjoyable activity for employees, and they behave very creatively when they begin to enjoy their duties. The study also suggests that it is inherent. Rewards are more associated with radical creative behavior than creative incremental behavior. This study reinforces some of the personal and contextual factors that underpin the positive effects of intrinsic rewards on radical creative behavior. It therefore shows situations where the relationship between intrinsic rewards and creative behavior becomes stronger and more relevant.

The relationship between extrinsic rewards and creativity is interesting but complex. Most previous research has examined only the direct effects of external rewards on creative behavior. Some studies have reported positive effects (ie. Eisenberger & Cameron, 1996) while others have reported little or no negative effects of extrinsic rewards on creative behavior (ie, Dickey, Kostner, & Ryan, 1999). However, regardless of the results, almost all previous research will be stopped at this stage. The present study goes a step further by considering the interplay of individual and contextual factors on extrinsic rewards - the creative behavioral relationship. The present study confirms the stream of behaviorist research that extrinsic rewards should not in all situations be seen as a deterrent to creativity (Eisenberger & Aselage, 2009). Confirms that the importance and probability of extrinsic rewards is crucial in determining the impact of rewards on creative behavior (Yoon & Choi, 2010). The present study, using theories (Cognitive Assessment Theory and Self-Determination Theory) produced by Cognitive Theorists (namely Gagan and Desi, 2005), shows that the negative effects of external rewards on creative behavior cannot be generalized to all individuals. . This study identifies

several personal and contextual factors that interact with external rewards to create creative behavior.

These factors include employees' personal circumstances such as place of control, creative self-efficacy, and goal orientation.

b. Recommendations

The present study offers five important managerial implications. This helps managers:

1. Creating an environment that facilitates the conversion of intrinsic rewards into creative behavior
2. Create an environment that facilitates the conversion of extrinsic rewards into creative behavior
3. Encourage incremental or radical creative behavior in line with organizational requirements by coordinating some personal and contextual factors.
4. Making a better person - Job fit, so that the personal conditions of employees are consistent with the type of creative behavior required by their job and organization.
5. Identify personality traits that seem to be unrelated to creativity but are actually important from the perspective of rewards - the relation of creative behavior.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision* 50(2), 179-211.
- Allen, D. G., Weeks, K. P., & Moffitt, K. R. (2005). Turnover intentions and voluntary turnover: The moderating roles of self-monitoring, locus of control, proactive personality, and risk aversion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 980.
- Allinson, C. W., & Hayes, J. (1996). The cognitive style index: A measure of intuition-analysis for organizational research. *Journal of Management studies*, 33(1), 119-135.
- Amabile, T. M. (1979). Effects of External Evaluation on Artistic Creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(2), 221 - 233.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). *The social psychology of creativity*. New York: Springer - Verlag.
- Amabile, T. M. (1985). Motivation and Creativity: Effects of Motivational Orientation on Creative Writers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 393-399.
- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational Synergy: Towards new Conceptualizations of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation in the Workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(3), 185-201.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996a). *Creativity in Context*. Colorado, USA: Westview Press.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996b). *The Motivation for Creativity in Organizations*. Harvard Business School. Retrieved from <http://xa.yimg.com/kq/groups/14102400/144322029/name/creativity.pdf>
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). *Assessing The Work*

- Environment For Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Amabile, T. M., Hennessey, B. A., & Grossman, B. S. (1986). Social Influences on Creativity: The Effects of Contracted-for Reward. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(1), 14-23.
- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., & Tighe, E. M. (1994). The Work Preference Inventory: Assessing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational Orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950-967.
- Anderson, C. H. (1986). Hierarchical Moderated Regression Analysis: A Useful Tool for Retail Management Decisions. *Journal of Retailing*, 62, 186-203.
- Anderson, N. R., & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: development and validation of the team climate inventory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(3), 235-258.
- Choi, J. N. (2004). Individual and Contextual Predictors of Creative Performance: The Mediating Role of Psychological Processes. *Creativity Research Journal*, 16(2/3), 187-199.
- Cohen, S., & Oden, S. (1974). An examination of creativity and locus of control in children. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 124(2), 17-185.
- Colvin, S. S., & Meyer, I. F. (1906). Imaginative Elements in the Written Work of School Children. *Pedagogical Seminar*, 13(1), 84-93.
- Conti, R., Collins, M. A., & Picariello, M. L. (2001). The impact of competition on intrinsic motivation and creativity *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 1273-1289.
- Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 325-334.
- Cooper, R. B., & Jayatilaka, B. (2006). Group Creativity: The Effects of Extrinsic, Intrinsic, and Obligation Motivations. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(2), 153- 172.
- Crutchfield, R. (1962). Conformity and creative thinking. In H. Gruber, G. Terrell & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Contemporary approaches to creative thinking* (pp. 120-140). New York: Atherton.
- Cummings, L. (1965). Organizational climates for creativity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 8(3), 220-227.
- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 385-400.
- Deci, E. L. (1972). Intrinsic motivation, extrinsic reinforcement, and inequity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 22(1), 113-120.
- Deci, E. L., & Cascio, W. F. (1972). Changes in Intrinsic Motivation as a Function of Negative Feedback and Threats. Paper presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Meeting; Massachusetts, USA., Massachusetts, USA.
- Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 627-668.
- Deci, E. L., Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic motivation of the rewardee. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(1), 1-10.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes. In

- L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 39-80). New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dewar, R. D., & Dutton, J. E. (1986). The adoption of radical and incremental innovations: An empirical study. *Management Science*, 32(4), 1422–1433.
- Dewett, T. (2007). Linking intrinsic motivation, risk taking, and employee creativity in an R&D environment. *R&D Management*, 37(3), 197-208.
- DuCette, J., Wolk, S., & Friedman, S. (1972). Locus of control and creativity in black and white children. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 88(2), 297-298.
- Dweck, C. S., & Elliott, E. S. (1983). Achievement Motivation. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Social and Personality Development* (Vol. 4, pp. 643-691). New York: John Wiley.
- Eisenberger, R. (1992). Learned industriousness. *Psychological Review*, 99, 248-267.
- Eisenberger, R., Arneli, S., & Pretz, J. (1998). Can the Promise of Reward Increase Creativity? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 704-714.
- Eisenberger, R., & Aselage, J. (2009). Incremental effects of reward on experienced performance pressure: positive outcomes for intrinsic interest and creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(1), 95-117.
- Eisenberger, R., & Cameron, J. (1996). Detrimental Effects of Reward. *American Psychologist*, 51(11), 1153-1166.
- Eisenberger, R., & Cameron, J. (1998). Reward, Intrinsic Interest, and Creativity: New Findings. *American Psychologist*, 53, 676-679.
- Eisenberger, R., Pierce, W. D., & Cameron, J. (1999). Effects of Reward on Intrinsic Motivation - Negative, Neutral and Positive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 677- 691.
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2001). When openness to experience and conscientiousness are related to creative behavior: An interactional approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 513-524.
- Gerrard, L. E., Poteat, G. M., & Ironsmith, M. (1996). Promoting Children's Creativity: Effects of Competition, Self-Esteem, and Immunization. *Creativity Research Journal*, 9(4), 339.
- Gilhooly, K., Wynn, V., & Osman, M. (2004). Studies of Divergent Thinking. Paper presented at the British Psychological Society, London.
- Gilson, L. L., Lim, H. S., D'Innocenzo, L., & Moye, N. (2012). One Size Does Not Fit All: Managing Radical and Incremental Creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 46(3), 168-191.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American psychologist*, 48(1), 26-34.
- Gong, Y., Huang, J. C., & Farh, J. L. (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.
- Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W. (2011). The Necessity of Others is the Mother of Invention: Intrinsic

- and Prosocial Motivations, Perspective Taking, and Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(1), 73-96.
- Guilford, J. P. (1981). Higher-order structure-of-intellect abilities. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16(4), 411-435.
- Hill, A., Tan, A. G., & Kikuchi, A. (2008). International High School Students' Perceived Creativity Self-Efficacy. *The Korean Journal of Thinking and Problem Solving*, 18(1), 105-115.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5): Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). Attitudes, values and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies*, 19(3), 477-493.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51(5), 469-477.
- Horan, R. (2007). The Relationship between Creativity and Intelligence: A Combined Yogic-Scientific Approach. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(2/3), 179-202.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the Death of Dispositional Research are Vastly Exaggerated. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 203-224.
- Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for Creativity: A Quantitative Review. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(1), 69-90.
- Ivcevic, Z., Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). Emotional Intelligence and Emotional Creativity. *Journal of Personality*, 75(2), 199-236.
- Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 368-384.
- Jo, N. Y., & Lee, K. C. (2012). The Effect of Organizational Trust, Task Complexity and Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Creativity: Emphasis on Moderating Effect of Stress. *Human Centric Technology and Service in Smart Space*, 199-206.
- Johnson, J. A. (1997). Units of analysis for the description and explanation of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 73-93). San Diego: Academic Press.
- King, N., & Anderson, N. (1995). *Innovation and change in organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Kirton, M., & Kirton, M. J. (1994). *Adaptors and innovators: Styles of creativity and problem solving*: Routledge London.
- Kristeller, P. O. (1983). "Creativity" and "Tradition". *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 44(1), 105-113.
- Kuder, G. F., & Richardson, M. W. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika*, 2, 151-160.
- Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic interest with extrinsic reward: A test of the overjustification hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 129-137.

- Litwin, G. H., & Stringer, R. A. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Harvard: Division of Research Graduate School of Business Administration Harvard University.
- Luna-Arocas, R., & Tang, T. L. P. (2004). The Love of Money, Satisfaction, and the Protestant Work Ethic: Money Profiles Among University Professors in the USA and Spain. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(4), 329-354.
- Madjar, N., Greenberg, E., & Chen, Z. (2011). Factors for radical creativity, incremental creativity, and routine, noncreative performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0022416.
- Madjar, N., Oldham, G. R., & Pratt, M. G. (2002). There's no place like home? The contributions of work and nonwork creativity support to employees' creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 757-767.
- Mooney, R. L. (1963). A conceptual model for integrating four approaches to the identification of creative talent in *Scientific Creativity: Its Recognition and Development*, ed. CW Taylor and F. Barron. In C. W. Taylor & F. Barrons (Eds.),
- Moss, S. A., & Ritossa, D. A. (2007). The impact of goal orientation on the association between leadership style and follower performance, creativity and work attitudes. *Leadership*, 3(4), 433-456.
- Muller, D., Judd, C. M., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. (2005). When moderation is mediated and mediation is moderated. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(6), 852-863.
- Mumford, M. D., & Gustafson, S. B. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application, and innovation. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(1), 27-43.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nettle, D. (2006). Schizotypy and mental health amongst poets, visual artists, and mathematicians. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(6), 876-890.
- Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 607-634.
- Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., Wallace, A. M. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 379-408.
- Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Prabhu, V., Sutton, C., & Sauser, W. (2008). Creativity and Certain Personality Traits: Understanding the Mediating Effect of Intrinsic Motivation. *Creativity Research Journal*, 20(1).
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and Resampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., & Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13(1), 65-105.
- Putwain, D. W., Kearsley, R., & Symes, W. (2011). Do creativity self-beliefs predict literacy achievement and motivation? *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(3).
- Richmond, B. O., & de la Serna, M. (1980). Creativity and locus of control among Mexican college

- students. *Psychological Reports*, 46(3), 979-983.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1), 1-28.
- Rummel, A., & Feinberg, R. (1988). Cognitive evaluation theory: A meta-analytic review of the literature. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 16(2), 147-164.
- Ruscio, J., Whitney, D. M., & Amabile, T. M. (1998). Looking Inside the Fishbowl of Creativity: Verbal and Behavioral Predictors of Creative Performance. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11(3), 243.
- Schwab, D. P., Olian-Gottlieb, J. D., & Heneman, H. G. (1979). Between-subjects expectancy theory research: A statistical review of studies predicting effort and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(1), 139-147.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Boehnke, K. (2004). Evaluating the structure of human values with confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38(3), 230-255.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.
- Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L., & Blum, T. C. (2000). Matching Creativity Requirements and the Work Environment: Effects on Satisfaction and Intentions to Leave. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 215-223.
- 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.
- Simonton, D. K. (1999). Creativity and genius. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 629-652). New York: Guilford.
- Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms: An experimental analysis*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1999). A propulsion model of types of creative contributions. *Review of General Psychology*, 3(2), 83-100.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2006). The Nature of Creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 18(1), 87- 98.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Creativity research handbook* (pp. 1-19). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Taggar, S. (2002). Individual creativity and group ability to utilize individual creative resources: A multilevel model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(2), 315-330.
- Taylor, C. W. (1988). Various approaches to and definitions of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The concept of creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives* (pp. 99-121). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- VandeWalle, D., Brown, S. P., Cron, W. L., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (1999). The influence of goal orientation and self-regulation tactics on sales performance: A longitudinal field test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(2), 249-259.

- VandeWalle, D., Cron, W. L., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (2001). The role of goal orientation following performance feedback. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 629-640.
- Venkatesh, V. (2000). Determinants of Perceived Ease of Use: Integrating Control, Intrinsic Motivation, and Emotion into the Technology Acceptance Model. *Information Systems Research*, 11(4), 342-365.
- Wallach, M. A. (1970). Creativity. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's manual of child psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 1211-1272). New York: Wiley.
- Wallach, M. A., & Kogan, N. (1965). Modes of thinking in young children: A study of the creativity-intelligence distinction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ward, T. B. (2004). Cognition, creativity, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19, 173-188.
- West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wiersma, U. J. (1992). The effects of extrinsic rewards in intrinsic motivation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65(2), 101- 114.
- Winston, A. S., & Baker, J. E. (1985). Behavior analytic studies of creativity: A critical review. *The Behavior Analyst*, 8, 191 - 205.