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ABSTRACT

The study employed the cross-sectional design to assess the impact of leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and perceived work control (internal and external) on subordinate’s creativity. The study further examined how demographic characteristics (gender, type of task and tenure of work) influence creativity. The mediation role of perceived control on the relationship between transformational leadership and creativity was also assessed. One hundred and seventy-six (176) employees completed a self-assessed questionnaires measuring demographic characteristics, leadership styles, perceived work control and creativity. The results of the study indicated that both Transformational and Transactional leadership styles significantly correlated with subordinate’s creativity. The amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted by transactional leadership style on employee creativity. Internal perceived control and external perceived control were positively related with creativity. The amount of variance accounted by internal perceived control was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for external perceived control on creativity. Type of task (routine and non-routine) did not have any significant impact on creativity. There was no significant relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity. Males and females did not differ in their level of creativity. The relationship between leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and subordinates’ creativity were partially mediated by subordinates’ perceived control. Findings were discussed with theories of creativity and leadership styles.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Researchers have over the years developed an intense interest in studying different forms of leadership styles and their influence on subordinates’/employees’ creativity. Most of the scientific researchers (e.g., Organ, 1998; Parry, 2003) have devoted much interest on how to develop creativity among employees. Creativity has not been of interest to only scientific researchers, but it has also become a compelling issue in the print and electronic media, with recent articles in Fast Company (Dahl, 2000), Psychology Today (Gryskiewicz, 2000), and in business-oriented publications such as the Harvard Business Review (Hargadon & Sutton, 2000). The question remains why this intense interest, and why now? Part of the answer to the question comes from the nature of science and today’s business climate, especially in competitive fields where the pressure for innovation and maintaining a competitive edge has become more intense.

Creativity has been used interchangeably with innovation. In the public domain, creativity and innovation are closely intertwined; they have also been studied in isolation by researchers using different approaches in terms of methodology and model (Heerwagen, 2002). The literature includes several definitions of creativity and innovation. Creativity is generally defined as useful novelty – a novelty not just for its own sake, but one that can be applied and add value to an organization’s products, goods and services (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Creativity has also included the generation of constructive ideas, alternatives, and possibilities (Smith, 1998).

Innovation that comes as a result of creativity is an imperative factor in the success and competitive advantage of organizations around the world (Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin, 1993).
as well as for a sturdy economy (Drucker, 1985). Almost all organizations around the world today face a dynamic environment characterized by rapid technological change, shortening product life cycles, and globalization. Organizations, especially technologically-driven ones, need to be more creative and innovative than before to survive the growing competition, to compete with others, to grow, and to lead in their chosen line of businesses (Jung & Sosik, 2002; Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999).

Creativity is widely defined as the production of original and beneficial ideas, whilst innovation is the ability to successfully implement these ideas generated through creativity within an organization (Amabile, 1998). “Thus, no innovation is possible without the creative processes that mark the front end of the process: identifying important problems and opportunities, gathering information, generating new ideas, and exploring the validity of those ideas” (Amabile, 2004, p. 1). Hence, creativity takes place at the individual level, while innovation is seen at the organizational level (Oldham & Cummings, 1996).

For an employee to be considered as creative, he/she must see things from more than one perspective and must also be able to question the existing working models (Gagne & Deci, 2005). When problems are solved in the usual ways in which the organizations go about their duty because of cultural norms, it blocks creativity and prevents new ideas from gaining seed within the organization (Asiedu-Appiah, 2014). According to Amabile (2004), there are several organizational factors that either increase or decrease the level of creativity among employees. One potential factor that affects the creative ability of employee’s is leadership styles. Organizational values, culture, change tolerance and employee motivation are determined by leaders. For creativity to occur in organizations, leaders need to support and promote it. This is
because leaders are the individuals who are more knowledgeable about which employee work outcomes should be creative and also have considerable influence over the context within which creativity can occur (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995). The style of the leader is therefore very important.

The concern for the best leadership style relies heavily on the need for leaders who will not only set goals and direct organizations resources towards these goals but also stimulate the right attitude and behaviours among employees to enhance their values and creative tendencies (Parry, 2003). This concern has also led to the advancement of various leadership models such as trait approach, behavioural approach, style approach, situational leadership, contingency model, and, recently, transformational and transactional leaderships (Bursalıoglu, 2005). For instance, the trait approach assumed that leaders are born with unique personal characteristics and qualities that uniquely differentiate them from non-leaders, while behavioural theorists focused on specific behaviours that distinguish leaders from non-leaders (Lord, 2009). Transactional leadership and transformational leadership have gained currency and attention over the last few decades because both are directly related with numerous workplace outcomes more than the traditional classification of leadership (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). The present study therefore focused on how these two leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership) influence employees’ creativity in Non-Governmental Organizations that are wholly Ghanaian.

Transformational and transactional leaders employ different kinds of influence, strategies and different pattern levels to obtain follower effectiveness (Organ, 1998). Transactional leadership style is based on exchange theory. Transactional leaders are always willing to give employees something in return for a good performance review, promotion, new responsibilities or a desired
change in duties. Transactional leaders are proficient at making deals that motivate and this can prove beneficial to an organization (Parry, 2003). Transformational leaders on the other hand seek to change those they lead with the purpose of developing them to become effective employees. Transformational leaders give followers the chance to change, transform and, in the process, develop themselves effectively (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995). The emergent outcome of leadership study proposes that transformational leaders can motivate followers to be creative and perform beyond the normal call of duty (Organ, 1998). On the other hand, transactional leadership also promotes efficient functioning and creativity but because money is not the sole determinant of motivation among all employees, it fails to motivate these employees to engage in creativity. This leadership style is not able to sustain behaviour especially during lean times when resources are stretched thin and there is nothing left with which to make a deal (Organ, 1998).

Among employees’/followers’ characteristics and individual differences, values play an important role in predicting how employees respond to supervisors’/leaders’ influences (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; Shamir, 1991). For example, if employees’ values suggest that it is important to accept and follow supervisors’ influence, the followers will be more receptive to their leaders’ influence, including the type of leadership style the leaders possess and exhibit. On the other hand, if followers value freedom and independence, they will be less receptive to their leaders’ influence. In addition, individualized leadership theory (Dansereau et al., 1995) implies that the influences of leadership vary for subordinates who differ on how they value the relationships between their leaders and themselves.
Employee creativity does not depend only on perceived leadership, although research show that leaders have a substantial influence on it. Perceived control was identified by Spector (1982) as a work-related belief that has the potential to influence the way people perceive leadership and create effectively. Work control deals with how employees attribute events in the organization to either oneself (internal) or to the work situation (external). Individuals with an internal locus of control view events in their lives as the result of their own actions, and their internal special attributes determine what is going to happen in each situation (Asiedu-Appiah, 2014). Those with external locus of control give more importance to external rewards and tend to have the kinds of jobs which have more security than other one.

According to Rashidi and Shahraray (2008), employees with a high internal locus of control believe in their own ability to control themselves and influence the world around them. Their belief in their ability to change things may well make them more confident and creative. Employees with internal locus of control have higher self-confidence and they look for situations in which they can use their knowledge and perseverance for making the future events progress. These people appreciate the internal rewards more, such as the feeling of success which persuades them to be creative. Externals are also able to be creative in situation where they are given enough reward since they respond to external rewards. Unlike individuals with external locus of control who exhibit higher level of creativity under conditions of external rewards, internals are creative under condition of external and internal rewards (Mousavi, 2008).

In sum, this research sought to explain how transformational and transactional leaderships are related to subordinates’ creativity and also established whether there was a relationship between employees’ perceived control and their levels of creativity. First, the researcher investigated the relationship between leadership style (transformational and transactional) and creativity and also
between perceived control and creativity. Second, the research tested for the mediating role of perceived control in the relationship between leadership style and creativity. The role of type of task (routine and non-routine), gender and tenure of work on employee’s level of creativity was also assessed.

1.2 Statement of the problem

A lot of state-owned enterprises in Ghana have performed poorly over the years. As a result over 264 state-owned enterprises had been listed for divestiture as at 2002. In a publication in the Business News of Thursday, May 2, 2002, Owusu (2002) a financial analyst noted that the divestiture programme which started in 1988 has helped to transform a number of enterprises which were making losses and, therefore, draining the government coffers. He cited Coca-Cola Company (Ghana) which got $47million investment for expansion. Ghana Agro Food Company Ltd increased its employment level from 494 to 930 in 1999 after its divestiture. The performance level of Golden Tulip Hotel also improved as it increased employment level to 346 from 116 and the number of rooms shot up from 130 to 234 (Owusu, 2002). The ultimate reason underlying this divestiture was the fact that those enterprises were underperforming which could partly be attributed to poor leadership and lack of creative behaviour of the employees of those enterprises.

Today, Ghana is witnessing a proliferation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) both international and local with diverse missions but with a common goal of making life better for the Ghanaian populace especially the rural folks. If care is not taken in the near future, these international NGO’s may push the local NGO’s into extinction if they fail to plan into the future and encourage their employees to be creative in order to withstand future technological changes and methods of operation.
With the emergence of unstable organizational environment, heightened competition in marketing products, and unpredictable technological change, more and more managers are coming to appreciate that they should encourage their employees to be creative (Shalley & Gilson, 2004). Substantial evidence suggests that subordinate creativity can fundamentally contribute to organizational innovation, effectiveness, and survival (Amabile, 1996; Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). For this reason it is very imperative for leaders to adopt certain leadership styles that can facilitate or better still ignite subordinates creativity. Many organizations are no more effective because of bad leadership that affects their integrity. The bad leadership that is adopted by some leaders generally leads to low productivity. Bad leadership is expensive in the sense that, under the watch of poor leaders and managers, employee morale declines and workers feel less committed to the organization which in the long run dwindle their creative potentials ((Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). This tends to lead to the production of lesser quality products and services and getting tasks done more slowly. Poor leadership can stop employees from producing new ideas and solution to problems.

Poor leadership can leave employees unsure of what role they fill or what specific actions they need to take towards a goal. In addition, employees may be reluctant to do their best work for a leader they do not respect, particularly if the person is verbally abusive or otherwise unpleasant. This will affect the extent to which leaders can be creative. Thus, organizations that suffer from poor leadership are less productive overall. Moreover, one of the reasons that account for the reduction of employee’s creativity is their perceived work control. Employee will be creative when they think they have upper hand of the situation. When employees perceive events to be controlled by the external environment, they also depend on what goes on in the environment
thus feeling reluctant to create new ideas. Studies demonstrate that when employees possess external work control, their willingness to create decreases (Rashidi & Shahraray, 2008).

1.3 Aims and Objectives

The study was aimed at assessing the relationship between leadership styles and employees creativity in Non-Governmental Organizations. The specific objectives were:

1. To find out if leadership style (transformational and transactional leadership) influence subordinates creativity.
2. To determine whether a relationship exists between subordinates’ perceived control and subordinates creativity.
3. To find out whether perceived control will mediate the relationship between leadership style and employees’ creativity.
4. To determine if demographic variables (type of task, gender and tenure of work) predict employees’ creativity.

1.4 Significance of the study

Indeed the creativity of employees has been a subject of major importance to many employers, employees and customers as well. However, the concept of creativity is an elusive one. How can one hope to enhance creativity if the components of employee creativity are not well known? This study is an attempt to provide information and insight into employee creativity and the factors (i.e., leadership style and perceived work control) that influence employee creativity. The knowledge of the effect of these factors will assist managers to implement programs as a defense against them. These programs may reduce the impact that bad leadership and perceived control have on employee’s creativity thus increasing performance and organizational effectiveness.
Research (e.g., Mpofu, Myambo, Mogaji, Mashego & Khaleefa, 2006) on factors influencing employee creativity over the years suggest that the lack of creativity among employees does not depend solely on the basis of their incapability or lack of occupational skills but because employees are not empowered to act proficiently and also do not feel the sense of belongingness. Empowering employees and the feeling of belongingness can all be achieved through effective leadership styles. It is hoped that the study will help leaders to adopt good leadership styles that will empower employees and inculcate in employees a sense of belongingness with the aim of making employees creative. It will also serve as a source of policy guide to leaders and provide necessary incentive for increasing employee awareness of the benefit of creative behaviours.

The study will be able to identify some important roles that leaders can play to foster creativity among subordinates and also help establish an organizational environment in which subordinates will feel safe in trying out innovative approaches without the fear of punishment for failure (Amabile, 1998). This is because when employees are given work autonomy they tend to take charge of whatever they do and hence become very creative. The style that leaders adopt serves as a means of ensuring work autonomy and inducing creative abilities among employees.

Again, the study will help to enlighten the Management of Organizations on the need and importance of having effective leaders in the Organization. It will further enlighten the employee on their roles and obligations to the leadership in the organization and other related matters. The finding will also identify the reason why employees react positively to a particular leadership style of a Manager and also aim at discovering what makes workers to be dedicated and poised to be creative.
The present study will stimulate concerns and promote a platform for addressing the low level of creativity among employees through the presentation of detailed investigations of the influence of leadership style and perceived work control on employee creativity. It will further add to existing literature in the area of leadership and creativity which will go a long way to help future researchers and students as well. Organizations around the world including those in Ghana can also benefit immensely from the outcome of this study by way of putting into practice the most preferred leadership that facilitates and enhances individual creativity.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter looks at theories that are linked to the study of the relationship between leadership style, perceived control and employee’s creativity. The chapter reviews several related studies done in the study area.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study on leadership style, perceived control and creativity among employees in Non-Governmental Organizations in Ghana was based on three theories. These theories are the Transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978), Transactional leadership theory (Bass, 1985) and the Path-Goal theory (House, 1971).

Creativity research has a long history in psychology, focusing on individual differences in personality, cognitive abilities, and problem-solving styles. However, recent theoretical and empirical work looks at creativity as something the brain does naturally (Heerwagen, 2002). This means that creativity is an adaptive feature of normal cognitive functioning that evolved to aid problem solving under conditions of uncertainty. This perspective asserts that all human beings have the potential for creativity because we share common neural processes; however, whether the creativity is expressed or suppressed depends on the socio-cultural context, personality differences, and specific personal experiences (such as knowledge and skills) as well as the environment within which the individual operates. Within work settings, it is also apparent that organizational policies and practices as well as managerial behaviours influence creativity among workers.
By defining creativity as useful novelty, psychologists have clearly placed the emphasis on creativity as an outcome. Others, on the other hand, are beginning to look at creativity as a process that ebbs and flows over time in reaction to challenges that come up unpredictably (Drazin et al, 1999). In this view, creativity is inextricably connected to sense-making, problem solving, and interpretation of events and situations. Although traditional approaches recognize the importance of social processes in creativity, they view social interactions as important for the generation and discussion of ideas, not for sense-making and interpretation. However, as Drazin and colleagues argued, organizational problems that require creativity are often multifarious, fluid, indistinct, and occur over long time periods and thus require significant sense-making activity. In contrast, creativity research has tended to focus on bounded problems solved by small groups.

2.1.1 Transformational Leadership

Burns (1978) is widely acknowledged as initially expressing the ideology of transformational leadership. Burns defined leadership as the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). However, the version of transformational leadership theory that has generated the most research was formulated by Bass (1985) and his colleagues (Yukl, 1999). Burns alleged that transformational leadership was based upon mutually agreed upon goals and objectives of leaders and followers. Transformational leaders motivate subordinates to perform beyond desired expectations by inspiring, stimulating, and developing a higher collective purpose, mission, and vision (Bass, 1985). Conversely, Yukl argued that theories of transformational leadership provide significant insights about the nature of effective leadership.
Northouse (2004) posited that “transformational leaders are recognized as change agents who are good role models, who can create and articulate a clear vision for an organization, who can empower followers to achieve at higher standards, who act in ways that make others want to trust them, and who give meaning to organizational life” (p.198). Furthermore, transformational leaders embrace an energetic, didactic learning environment, one that encourages personal responsibility, innovative thought processes and education practices that push the boundaries of existing theoretical fields.

Avolio and Yammarino (2002) postulated that transformational leaders take the moral high road, that is, they promote individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, personal motivation and inspiration, and high ethical standards. Transformational leaders give emphasis to emotions; values and endeavour to make events momentous for subordinates (Yukl, 1999). Bass and Avolio (2004) defined transformational leaders as being characteristic and proactive – they modify subordinates’ awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Bass and Avolio (2004) delineated the following key aspects that comprise transformational leadership:

- **Idealized Influence (Attributed)** – this characteristic of a transformational leader has to do with instilling pride in followers for being associated with their leader; going beyond self-interest for the good of the group; acting in ways that build others respect and displaying a sense of power and confidence.

- **Idealized Influence (Behaviour)** – this quality reflects leaders who talk about important values and beliefs; specifying the importance of having a strong sense of purpose;
considering the moral and ethical consequences of decisions and emphasizing the importance of having a collective sense of vision in an organization.

- **Inspirational Motivation** – talking optimistically about the future; providing meaning and challenges and talking enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished; articulating a compelling vision of the future and expressing confidence that goals can be achieved by followers.

- **Intellectual Stimulation** – this attribute of transformational leaders is about stimulating subordinates to be innovative and creative by re-examining critical assumptions and seeking varied perspectives when solving problems.

- **Individualized Consideration** – the last characteristic talks about leaders treating subordinates equally, but paying attention to individual differences, needs and abilities; serving as coaches and practicing two-way communication. Teamwork produces a sense of community and a shared commitment which diminishes isolation and uncertainty about effectiveness. Bass and Avolio (1994) suggested that collaborative processes are likely to benefit organizational effectiveness if transformational leadership is involved in the process. Leaders should approve collective decision-making and responsibility; taking calculable risks should be promoted.

Transformational leaders seek new ways of collaboration, seek opportunities in the face of risk, and prefer effective answers to efficient answers (Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Collaboration facilitates learning environments that are conducive to employees’ success and
achievement. By meeting subordinates expectations, a leader can then begin the process of
moving subordinates into greater decision-making and creative thinking roles. Transformational
leadership thrives when subordinates are moved to an increased awareness about what is
intrinsically important and into a higher level of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs which is self-
actualization (Bass & Avolio, 1989). This readiness to rise above one’s basal self-interests, to
promoting the interests of the organization, would act as a channel for developing trust and
confidence within the organization. Bass and Avolio (1994) suspected that developing trust by
empowering subordinates to demonstrate their abilities will challenge subordinates to develop
new abilities and seek unforeseen challenges. Creating a caring, self-enhancing learning
environment should be a participative joint endeavour between leaders, subordinates, and
stakeholders. As organizations move away from centralized decision-making, managers must be
competent to harness input, analyze information, and build consensus among all stakeholders
(Barnett, 2004). Bennis and Nanus (1985) expressed that managers who exhibit collaborative
tendencies bring about confidence on the part of subordinates; these managers are challengers,
not coddlers. In order for any organization to thrive, stakeholders of that organization must be
able to communicate with one another and must have similar beliefs and purposes. When an
overabundance of intoxicating visions and noble intentions exist, many leaders develop rich and
deeply textured agendas, but without communications neither will come to realization (Bennis &
Nanus, 1985).

Communication between leaders, followers and stakeholders of an organization is the key for
establishing trust hence, interaction should occur between all stakeholders in an organization.
The role of the transformational leader in the communication process is that of articulating a
vision and inspiring others to believe in that vision (Bass & Avolio, 1994). In this case an open
door policy is obligatory for organizational leaders, especially for leaders in Non-Governmental Organizations since they work hand-in-hand with the ordinary people in the local communities. An atmosphere of mutual trust and respect must exist among the leader of the organization and stakeholders, proactive interpersonal relationships is practically the same as building efficient communications. According to Bennis and Nanus (1985) “trust is the lubricant that makes it possible for organizations to work. An organization without trust is more than an anomaly, it’s a misnomer” (p.41). Communication can be vertical, horizontal, or lateral. Transformational leaders should employ all three modes of communication to ensure that, employees at all organizational levels understand their responsibilities and are aligned around a central purpose, mission, and vision (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Some of the best ideas come from subordinates and stakeholders and should be passed upward to the leaders. Of course, some decisions have to be made at the top and then filtered down. After all, leaders are ultimately responsible for maintaining an effective organization.

2.1.2 Transactional Leadership

Transactional leaders place much emphasis on the interpersonal exchanges that occur between themselves as leaders and their subordinates. Burns (1978) defined transactional leadership as an exchange-based form of leadership in which “leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another” (p. 4). A “quid pro quo” correlation usually exists in this relationship. Bass (1998) argued that transactional leaders are often motivated by what is easily identifiable and measurable. To the transactional leader issues, problems, and concerns that upset the “status quo” of the organization are reactionary factors. These leaders are not amenable to change. According to Bass (1985) transactional leaders are more reactive than proactive; less creative, novel, and innovative; more reforming and conventional; and more inhibited in their
search for solutions. Yukl (1999) postulated that transactional leadership includes a varied collection of mostly ineffective leader behaviours that lack any clear common denominator. Lowe, Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996) reported that transactional leaders operate within an existing system, avoid risk most of the time, prefer effective answers and are less likely to support the status quo. According to Bass and Avolio (2004) transactional leaders discover prospects and promote performance to achieve those prospects – they are associated with constructive and corrective transactions and act more as managers, rather than leaders. Bass and Avolio delineated the following key aspects that comprise transactional leadership:

- **Contingent Reward** – this aspect deals with providing others with assistance in exchange for their efforts; discussing in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets; and making clear what subordinates can expect to obtain for their efforts and expressing satisfaction when subordinates meet expectations.

- **Management-by-Exception (Active)** – this has to do with focusing attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations from standards; closely monitoring failures and punishing subordinates for their failures; and anticipating problems and making changes before those problems become too bothersome.

- **Management-by-Exception (Passive)** – it is about failing to intervene until problems become serious; avoiding specifying agreements, clarifying expectations and providing goals; and having a firm belief that “if it isn’t broke, don’t fix it.”
• *Laissez-Faire* – showing a total absence of leadership; avoiding getting involved when important issues crop up; being absent when needed; avoiding making decisions; and delaying response to urgent questions that are given to subordinates.

Burns (1978) espoused that transactional leaders motivate followers by appealing to their self-interests and needs. In order for this exchange to take place, goals and objectives, as well as contingency rewards and inducements, must be offered. The primary role of the transactional leader is to find out both the goals and objectives, and the rewards and inducements. Bass (1998) identified three levels of transactional leadership: contingency; management by exception; and laissez-faire.

Bass further stated that management by exception and laissez-faire leadership are the least effective styles of management. A contingency reward system is the method usually followed by transactional leaders. Meanwhile, the use of positive reinforcement to encourage the creation of employee - employee and employee - employer relationships that are long lasting, satisfying, and equally advantageous are benchmarks of contingency rewards (Bass & Avolio, 1994). These rewards could either be intrinsic or extrinsic, immediate or delayed, and also wholly or partially meted out. According to Bass, Avolio, Jung and Berson (2003) subordinates often agree with, accept, or comply with the leader in exchange for praise, rewards and the avoidance of punitive action. In addition to contingent reward, transactional leaders employ two other methodologies when dealing with subordinates, Management-by-Exception (passive and active) and laissez-faire leadership. However, Yukl (1999) countered that transactional leadership practices are vague and have not been studied in an organized manner. Management-by-Exception occurs when the leader reacts only when problems arise, or standards are not met (Bass, 1998). Leaders
who make use of Management-by-Exception avoid giving directives when established policies and procedures are viable and working.

Northouse (2004) indicated that management by exception refers to leadership that involves corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. These leaders allow subordinates to continue the status quo, and will only intervene when a crisis arises or when an objective has not been met. Management-by-Exception as earlier indicated occurs either actively or passively. Management-by-Exception (Active) is a continual process, whereby a leader anticipates problems and addresses the situation to meet these problems before they become unmanageable. It is similar to contingent reward in terms of focusing on outcomes; however, in this case, the leader actively watches for, and acts on, mistakes or errors (Avolio & Yammarino, 2002). These leaders watch subordinates and wait for them to make mistakes or to violate rules and then take remedial action (Northouse, 2004). Leaders who make use of this management style often indicate the standards for compliance and what constitutes ineffective performance – they punish subordinates for being out of compliance with standards (Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003). As a result of this, Management-by-Exception (Active) is classified as a negative transaction whereas Management-by-Exception (Passive) is classified as reactionary process, whereby a leader reacts to problems after the situation arises (Northouse, 2004). Bennis and Nanus (1985) reported that reactive organizations wait for changes to occur and then respond after the fact. A reactive mode is the least expensive, but often the most short-sighted leadership strategy. Avolio and Yammarino (2002) concurred by postulating that passive Management-by-Exception (Passive) is similar to Management-by-Exception (Active); however, passive leaders wait until deviations occur before intervening.
Avolio and Yammarino (2002) further alleged that laissez-faire leaders consistently turn down their responsibility, decision-making and control to subordinates. This usually creates an identifiable, perceptible, avoidance and lack of leadership. Subordinates are given total control and responsibility over almost everything within the organization. The laissez-faire leader employs very limited decision making skills and fails to satisfactorily communicate with all subordinates and stakeholders of the organization. Laissez-faire leaders do relatively little or nothing at all, to affect followers or their behaviours and often there is literally no effective transformation or transaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Laissez-faire leadership is the most inactive form of leadership. Many laissez-faire leaders relinquish their decision making authority under the patronage of subordinate empowerment. In contrast, Northouse (2004) argued that in laissez-faire leadership no exchange whatsoever exists between leaders and subordinates, and that leaders make no attempts to help subordinates grow and advance in skills and creativity. Bass (1997) advocated that this leadership style is a reflection of a leaders’ abandonment and renunciation of one’s responsibility.

Transactional leadership theory explains that some employees are motivated by the desire to get their needs met. These employees are motivated by rewards. Based on this, they are more likely to be creative if such needs are met.

**2.1.3 The Path-Goal Theory**

The path-goal theory was initially developed by House (1971) to explain how a leader’s behaviour affects the motivation and satisfaction of subordinates. House formulated a more elaborate version of his theory that included situational variables. The theory suggests that the effect of leader behaviour on subordinates depends on the situation.
The situation as identified by House (1971) could be the characteristics of the subordinates or the characteristics of the environment within which the employees work. Situational variables also determine subordinate preference for a particular pattern of leadership behaviour, thereby influencing the impact of the leader on subordinate satisfaction, performance and ability to exhibit creative behaviours on the job. The latest version of the Path-Goal theory includes four categories of leader behaviour (House & Mitchell, 1974). These behaviours are; supportive leadership, directive leadership, participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership. According to this theory, the influence of leader behaviour on subordinate can be understood by examining how the leader affects subordinate expectations about the likely outcomes of different courses of action.

Path-Goal theory is fundamentally about how leaders motivate subordinates to achieve selected goals. The stated goal of this leadership theory is to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation thereby increasing employees creative tendencies. The path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader’s style and characteristics of the subordinates (eg. perceived control) and the work setting (eg. nature/type of task). The underlying assumption of path goal theory was derived from expectancy theory, and suggested that subordinates will be motivated if they think they are capable of performing their work, if they believe their efforts will result in a certain outcome, and if they believe that payoffs for doing their work are valuable.

For the leader, the challenge is to use a leadership style that best matches subordinate’s motivational needs. This is done by choosing behaviors that complement or supplement what is missing in the work setting. Leaders attempt to enhance subordinate’s goal attainment by providing information or rewards in the work environment (Indvik, 1986 cited in Antonakis,
Cianciolo & Sternberg, 2004); leaders provide subordinates with the elements they think their subordinates need to reach their full potentials.

Theoretically, the path-goal approach suggests that leaders need to choose a leadership style that best fits the needs of subordinates and the work they are doing. The theory however predicts that a directive style of leadership is best in situations in which subordinates are dogmatic and authoritarian, the task demands are unclear, and the organizational rules and procedures are uncertain. In these situations, directive leadership complements the work by providing guidance and psychological structure for subordinates (House & Mitchell, 1974).

According to House and Mitchell (1974), leadership generates motivation when it increases the number and kinds of payoffs that subordinates receive from their work. Leadership also motivates when it makes the path to the goal of attaining new heights clear and easy to travel through coaching and direction, when it removes obstacles and road blocks to attaining the goal, and when it makes the work itself more personally satisfying.

There are three major strengths of the Path-goal theory. First, the theory provides a theoretical framework that is useful for understanding how achievement oriented styles of leadership affect creativity, productivity and satisfaction of the subordinates. Second, path-goal theory is unique for the reason that it integrates the motivation principles of expectancy theory into a theory of leadership. Hence, any leadership style such as transformational leadership that motivates subordinates thrives in this regard. Third, it provides a practical model that underscores the important ways that leaders rally round subordinates.

The principles of path-goal theory can be engaged by leaders at all levels within the organization as well as for all types of tasks being performed by subordinates. In order to apply path-goal
theory, a leader must carefully assess his or her subordinates and their tasks and then choose an appropriate leadership style to match those characteristics. If subordinates feel apprehensive about doing a task, the leader needs to adopt a style that builds subordinate confidence.

In brief, path-goal theory is designed to explain how leaders can help subordinates along the path to their goals by selecting precise behaviours that are best suited to subordinate’s needs and to the situations in which subordinates are working. According to the theory, effective leaders “engage in behaviours that complement subordinates’ environments and abilities in a manner that compensates for deficiencies and is instrumental to subordinate satisfaction and individual creativity” (House, 1996, 324). Since transformational leaders meet both the social and financial need of employees, they are more likely to elicit higher creativity compared to transactional leaders who meet only the financial needs of employees.

Despite many empirical studies supporting this theory (e.g., House, 1996), path-goal theory has not been adequately tested (Lord, Hanges, & Godfrey, 2003). One of the most frequently noted deficiencies in path-goal research is that of improper measurement. Most research on path-goal theory has relied on various versions of the leader behaviour description questionnaire (LBDQ) to measure leader behaviours. Yet, scholars have repeatedly noted the inappropriateness of this instrument in investigating the relationships posited by path-goal theory, arguing that the scale does not adequately tap the proposed constructs (Lord, Hanges, & Godfrey, 2003). In this regard, much of the early research on path-goal theory is in need of reassessment. Moreover, the path-goal theory has been found to be relatively simplistic, despite the complex nature of the theory. Investigations of directive leader behaviour and supportive leader behaviour have dominated the literature, while research has generally neglected the other types of leader behaviour about which
the theory makes predictions. In order to comprehensively evaluate path-goal theory, all of the hypothesized relationships must be tested (Lord, Hanges, & Godfrey, 2003).

While path-goal leadership theory has generated a considerable amount of criticisms since it was proposed, empirical validation of the theory has been verified. Some hypotheses of the theory have been well supported (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 1999). For instance, hypothesized relationships between leader behaviour and follower performance are more consistently found by previous researcher (Dipboye, Smith, & Howell, 1994; Greenberg & Baron, 2000).

2.2 Review of Related Studies

In addition to the theories discussed above, this section reviewed empirical studies that help in explaining the predicted relationships of the variables considered in the study. It further reviewed studies on the relationship between leadership styles and employee’s creativity, perceived control and creativity, type of task and creativity and the mediating role of perceived control in predicting the relationship between transformational leadership and employee’s creativity. The impact of demographic characteristics (gender and tenure of work) on creativity was also reviewed.

2.2.1 Leadership styles and Employees’ Creativity

Over the past two decades, countless number of management, scholars and practitioners have called for more adaptive leadership by top business executives in responding to the speedy changes confronting today’s organizations (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Studies have found enormous support for the relationship between leadership style and creativity. Shin and Zhou (2003) conducted a study on Transformational leadership,
Conservation, and creativity with evidence from Korea. A sample of 290 employees and their supervisors from 46 Korean companies were used, the researchers hypothesized that, leaders’ transformational leadership is positively related to followers’ creativity. To test this and other hypotheses, the researchers conducted hierarchical regression analyses. It was found that transformational leadership was positively related to follower creativity. The implication of their study was that, given the need for creativity as a solution to the complex challenges faced by organizations, finding neutralizers/enhancers of the link between transformational leadership and creativity is important to practitioners. Also, being aware of mediators helped managers to identify the organizational contexts in which transformational leadership is most likely to enhance creativity, and those in which such enhancement is unlikely to occur. The correlational design employed by Shin and Zhou (2003) disallowed the interpretation that there was a causal relationship between transformational leadership and creativity. Despite the fact that their results were consistent with theoretical logic, the correlational design did not allow them to completely rule out alternative explanations. Using cross-sectional and experimental designs may go a long way to strengthen this causal inference.

Similarly, Shah, Nisar, Rehman and Rehman (2011) did a study on the influence of transformational leadership on employees’ outcomes. The purpose of their study was to find the relationship of transformational leadership with organizational commitment and innovativeness, and to know if empowerment mediates the relationship between transformational leadership and innovativeness. It was hypothesized that transformational leadership is positively correlated with innovativeness, and empowerment. The data was collected through the use of questionnaire from different organizations within the telecom sector. The analysis of the study supported research hypothesis that there is a significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership
and innovativeness. This study though made a meaningful contribution in the existing body of literature. That notwithstanding, there was some limitations in the study which needs to be mentioned. In the first place, data were collected from a single telecom industry in Pakistan which actually restricts the generalizability of the outcomes to other sectors. Using multiple organizations will prove advantageous in generalizing the results.

Moreover, Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) reported on the role of leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership) on followers’ creativity based on existing literatures. Their results revealed that transformational leadership behaviours closely match the determinants of innovation and creativity at the workplace. Some of the transformational behaviours that were found to be positively related to creativity were vision, support for innovation, autonomy, encouragement, recognition, and challenge. Transactional leadership style did not significantly predict creativity. As emphasized by Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011), transformational leaders can encourage creativity through intrinsic motivation, empowerment of followers, and climate supportive of innovation at work environment. It was however, suggested that leaders should develop their style of leadership and learns the transformational leadership components of charisma (idealized influence), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration in order to enhance the creative performance of their employees. Transactional leadership was not found to significantly predict creativity.

Their study only relied on meta-analysis which is influenced by publication bias. Moreover, their report failed to give the number of literature they consulted before drawing the kind of conclusion they made. According to Walker, Kattan and Hernandez (2008), the number of studies which are included in a meta-analytical review determine the reliability of the results.
Furthermore, Jung (2001) also found a significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ number of unique ideas generated when he conducted a study on Transformational and Transactional Leadership and their effects on Creativity in Groups. The study used a 2 (transformational vs. transactional leadership) × 2 (real vs. nominal group) factorial design to observe the effect of different leadership styles and brainstorming conditions on group members’ divergent thinking. During the study, participants performed a brainstorming task, and their performance was assessed using fluency and flexibility. The results clearly supported the hypothesis in that the participants in the transformational leadership condition and in the nominal group condition outperformed their counterparts in the transactional leadership condition and in the real group condition. The participants in the transformational leadership condition generated significantly greater numbers of unique ideas than their counterparts in the transactional leadership condition and also produced more creative ideas, as measured by flexibility, than participants in the transactional leadership condition. Although this study makes an important contribution to our understanding of the effects of transformational leadership on creativity in a face-to-face context, the study had some potential limitations including the student sample and artificial experimental setting which does not match that of the organizational setting.

Another study that has also established a relationship between leadership styles and creativity can be traced to a research that was conducted by Bodewes (2011). The study by Bodewes (2011) was aimed at assessing the effect of transformational and transactional leadership on employee creativity and in-role performance. A cross-sectional survey was conducted in hospitals in the Netherlands. Managers were asked to assess the creativity and in-role performance of each of their employees whilst the employees were asked to fill out questions about their own regulatory focus and about their managers’ leadership style. It was hypothesized that the transformational leadership style will have a positive relation to the creativity of
employee due to its positive relation to the promotion focus of the employee. Transactional leadership style, on the other hand, was expected to have a positive relation to in-role performance where employee prevention focus would function as a mediator. As predicted, the results confirmed the positive relationship of both transformational and transactional leadership on employee creativity. Transactional leadership style predicted higher level of in-role performance than transformational leadership style. Transformational leadership style also predicted higher level of creativity than transactional leadership style.

This study by Bodewes (2011) reinforces the positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ creativity. However, it could not be devoid of limitations. Firstly, the data from the questionnaires was partly based on managers rating their followers; one can therefore argue that managers could have some response bias. Again, the generalization of the findings to other organizations might be limited since the data was collected from a specific type of organizations which are hospitals.

Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009) undertook a study on leadership styles, creativity, and organizational innovation. The study proposed a model of the impact of transformational leadership both on followers' creativity at the individual level and on innovation at the organizational level. Data were collected by two separate questionnaires: one for the employees and the other for their leaders. The results suggested that transformational leadership had important effects on creativity at both the individual and organizational levels. At the individual level, the results of hierarchical linear modeling showed that there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees' creativity. Additionally, transformational leadership influences employees' creativity through psychological empowerment. At the organizational level, the results of regression analysis revealed that transformational leadership
positively associated with organizational innovation, which was measured with a market-oriented criterion developed specifically for developing countries and newly developing industries. Transactional leadership was also found to influence innovation.

The measure of organizational innovation as used in this study was the product of two ratios, namely, the coefficient of innovativeness tendency and the success of product innovations. The coefficient of innovativeness tendency is the ratio of sales generated by product innovations to total sales. This coefficient quantifies the innovativeness orientation of companies that are engaged in other work apart from software development such as marketing computer hardware.

The measure of organizational innovation that this study developed and used would have been useful for studies in industries other than software development, or in industries which produce radical innovation. This in one way or the other compromised the whole study done by Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009).

Another study that was aimed at exploring the relationship between transformational leadership and organizational innovation was conducted by Khan, Rehman and Fatima (2009). The study examined the impact of transformational leadership on organizational innovation. The results revealed that there was a significant positive relationship between all facets of transformational leadership (Attributed Charisma, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration) and organizational innovation except idealized influence. One major limitation of this study by Khan, Rehman and Fatima (2009) is that they failed to assess transformational leadership as a single construct but rather chose to assess some of the individual components of transformational leadership.
Jung, Chow and Wu (2008) did a study on assessing the impact of Transformational and Transactional leadership on employee’s creativity. The results from 53 Taiwanese electronics and telecommunications companies supported the expectation that transformational leadership increases employee creativity compared to transactional leadership style though both significantly had a positive relationship with creativity. Results also showed that culture significantly mediated the relationship between leadership style and creativity. The limitation of this study had to do with the measurement of culture as a variable when indeed their data had come from a relatively homogeneous sector in Taiwan. Expanding the sample to include other industries and cultures could increase the generalizability of their findings especially in an era of increasing globalization of economic activities.

Politis (2004) also assessed the relationship between the leadership dimensions and creativity. The results indicated that both transformational and transactional leaders were positively correlated with creativity. Transformational leadership was more strongly correlated to creativity than transactional leadership. Liang, Chan, Lin and Huang (2010) also found that transformational and transactional leadership styles all predict higher level of creativity with transformational leadership having higher amount of prediction compared to transactional leadership style.

It is not all the available studies which have revealed higher correlation between transformational leadership style and creativity, other have indicated higher relationship between transactional leadership style and creativity. Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011) however found that the level of significance of transformational leadership in relationship to
creativity was positive but weak than the relationship between transactional leadership style and creativity.

To conclude, aside the study by Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011) that revealed that transactional leadership style account for more creativity than transformational leadership style, all the other studies (e.g., Gumusluoglu & Ilsev 2009; Jung, Chow & Wu, 2008; Liang, Chan, Lin and Huang (2010) indicated that transformational leadership predicted higher level of creativity than transactional leadership. More studies however need to be conducted to assess leadership style – creativity relationship since almost all of these studies were conducted in European countries.

2.2.2 Perceived Control (Work Locus of Control) and Creativity

Previous studies reviewed above have proven that there is a relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity as well as transactional leadership and creativity. However, other characteristics of subordinates are more likely to affect the relationship between transformational leadership and employee creativity as theorized by House (1971) in the path goal theory.

The perceived control personality variable is one of the work-related beliefs that employees hold in the workplace which have been found to have direct and indirect effect on creativity. Perceived control assumes that individuals develop a general expectancy regarding their ability to control their lives (Spector, 1982). However, the impact of work control with respect to internal and external work control on creativity has revealed contradictory results. The relationship between work control and creativity was conducted by Sharifi (2004). The results of Sharifi (2004) study indicated that externals (intuitive and sensory) prefer new and exciting
experiences, creativity, and new thoughts take their attention compared to internalizers. On the contrary, Spector (1982) noted that perceived work control is related to compliance with authority and supervisory style and further asserted that externals tend to be more satisfied with direct supervision, to comply more with demands of coercive supervision, and to be more compliant with social demands than internals which make internals more creative than externals because internals seek to bring new events on board without complying to social demands. Studies by Moghimi and Mahram (2008) and Mousavi (2008) also revealed that there is a positive relationship between internal work control and creativity. The contradictions in the reviewed studies indicate the need for further studies to authenticate the inconsistencies.

The outcomes of the researches done by Rashidi and Shahraray (2008) indicated that creative behaviour is predicted by internal work control. According to Rashidi and Shahraray (2008), individuals with internal work control are more independent in thinking, although welcome other ones’ suggestions and information because of considering their internal mastery, they believe that chance and destiny have no effect on their lives, they are self-dependent, not being same as other people and this leads them to be self-directing. They follow less the standards, customs, and social values which are not acceptable by them. The degree of their tolerance is higher in unpleasant situations, in achieving their goals, they are more powerful and self-confident, have more motivation for improvement, and tend to innovative and perform independent jobs, as well as trying more for getting innovative thoughts and actions.

Another study that has also established a relationship between locus of control and creativity can be traced to a research that was conducted by Nehardani and Keavanlou (2013). The purpose of the study was to assess the barriers to personal creativity and its relationship with locus of
control in technical teachers and non-Technical. Findings of the study indicated that locus of control was a significant predictor of creativity with internalizers having higher level of creativity compared to externalizers. The finding also showed that there was a significant negative correlation between locus of control with the barriers to self-confidence, need to adapt and creativity. This means that with increased internal locus of control, barriers to creativity faded.

Asgari and Vakili (2012) assessed the relationship between Locus of control, creativity and performance among 191 employees conveniently selected. The findings of the research indicated a positive and significant relationship between the employees’ locus of control, their creativity, and their performance. In addition, the level of employee’s creativity was higher among individuals with internal locus of control compared to those with external locus of control. Roy and Gupta (2012) also investigated the impact of locus of control and organizational climate on managerial creativity among 100 employees that were selected from different Print and Electronic media. The study revealed that internal locus of control encouraged higher level of creativity compared to external locus of control. Though the findings of Asgari1 and Vakili (2012) and Roy and Gupta (2012) have numerous empirical supports, they assessed creativity among management without taking into consideration the subordinates who are the core of an effective organization.

Fewer studies are reported to have studied the mediating role of employees’ perceived control in the relationship between transformational leadership and employee’s creativity. Among the few that was reviewed includes the work of Howell and Avolio (1993) on the impact of Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Locus of control, and Support for
innovation as key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. The researchers used measures of leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation to predict the consolidated-unit performance of 78 managers. Results of the research revealed that transformational-leadership measures were associated with a higher internal locus of control and significantly and positively predicted business-unit performance over a 1-year interval. Transactional measures of leadership, including contingent reward and management by exception (active and passive), were each negatively related to business-unit performance. Causal relationships between the transformational-leadership behaviours and unit performance were moderated by the level of support for innovation in the business unit. This study explicitly stated a causal relationship between the variables that were studied meanwhile such irrefutable conclusion could only be drawn in other studies and not with correlational studies like what Howell and Avolio studied.

Shoghi, Asgarani, and Ashnagohar (2013) also investigated the impact of managers’ leadership style on employees' creativity; considering the mediating role of organizational structure and locus of control in Metal Industries. The population of the research included 4700 employees working in metal industries of Iranian Kaveh Industrial City and among these population, 355 workers were randomly selected. The regression and correlation matrix analysis of the data showed that there was a significant relationship between the managers’ leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and employee’s creativity. Moreover, beta coefficients indicated that 86% of the employees' creativity is predicted through the transformational leadership style and 13% is predicted through the transactional leadership style with the remaining percentage resulting from the measurement error. Perceived work control was found to mediate the relationship between transformational leadership style and creativity. The over
reliance on employees from Metal industries of Kaveh Industrial City as the only source from where samples were drawn makes it difficult to generalize the outcome of the study.

2.2.3 Demographic Characteristics (gender, tenure) and Type of Task on Creativity

Creativity literature suggests that individuals’ background traits have some influence on creativity (Ai, 1999; Batey & Furnham, 2006). Among the background characteristics, gender and work experience are the investigated targets. Careful review of the literature shows that the findings on the impact of tenure of work and gender on creativity have not been consistent.

Some studies have favoured higher level of creativity among females compared to males. For example, a study was conducted by Nahlinder (2010) on gender differences in creativity among employees in the health sector. The results of the study indicated that creativity among females in the hospital setting were higher than the males. Al-Srour and Al-Oweidi (2013) also investigate the level of creativity among management employees, academic staff and artistes and its relationship with gender, practical experience and age. The findings of the study showed that females exhibited higher level of creativity compared to males. With regard to the years of experience, the findings showed that the creativity level is higher for the employees with less than (10) years’ experience compared to those with more than 10 years’ work experience.

Similarly, Goldsmith and Matherly (1988) gave 118 college students three self-report measures of creativity and found no gender differences. The subjects also completed three self-report measures of self-esteem. There was a positive correlation between the self-report measures of creativity and the self-report measures of self-esteem, but the relationship was both stronger and more consistent for women than for men.
Some studies have also indicated higher level of creativity among males compared to females. Foss, Woll and Moilanen (2013) assessed gender differences in creativity using data from a survey of a large Norwegian energy corporation. Survey items are measured using five-point scales and show good internal consistency levels. Findings of the study indicated that men's innovations were better than women's. Tsai (2013) also found higher level of creativity among males compared to females.

Better still, other studies have revealed no significant difference in level of creativity between males and females. Ghayas, Akhter and Adil (2012) also conducted a study to find out effect of gender and subject on the creativity level of students. The study involved 76 high achievers and 78 low achievers from university. Results have revealed that there was no significant effect of gender and subject of the students on the total score of creativity. Males and females demonstrated equal level of creativity. Baer and Kaufman (2006) assessed gender differences in creativity, including creativity test scores, creative achievements, and self-reported creativity. The impact of work experience on creativity was also assessed. Findings indicated no gender differences in creativity. No significant relationship was also found in the relationship between work experience and creativity.

Chan (2005) conducted a study to assess creativity among males and females and found no significant gender differences for all constructs. Kaufman (2014) also assessed gender differences in 56 different domains of creativity. Of the five factors derived from the 56 domains, males rated themselves higher than females on the science-analytic and sports factors, females rated themselves higher on social-communication and visual-artistic. There were no differences on the verbal-artistic factor. At the domain level, there were significant gender differences in 43 of 56 domains. The level of creativity among males was higher than females in
28 areas and females had higher creativity in 15 areas. Kaufman (2014) indicated that self-assessments were consistent with gender stereotypes that is the discrepancies of gender difference was attributed to internalized gender stereotypes, as opposed to actual differences in creativity.

Henderson (2003) also found no gender differences in creativity among 247 employees. Henderson (2003) also revealed a significant positive relationship between employee tenure of work and employee creativity. Matud, Rodriguez and Grande (2007) examined the relevance of socio-demographic factors on gender differences in creative thinking. Gender differences in creative thought were minimal and dependent upon educational level. Chang and Chiang (2003) explored factors influencing organizational creativity. The survey showed that the most influential five factors to organizational creativity are in the order of design environment, team climate, group /organization culture, design process and motive of work. Results also showed that demographic variables such as gender, employees' educations, professional training, age and working experiences were not significant predictors of creativity. Parjanen (2012) found no significant relationship between employee tenure of work and creativity.

Some researchers have claimed that routinization hinders creativity. However, empirical evidence for this assumption is sparse. In the study conducted by Ohly, Sonnentag and Pluntke (2006), it was argued that routinization may be beneficial for creativity and related behaviour due to available resources that can be used to develop new ideas while working. The study examined the relationship between routinization and four work characteristics (job control, job complexity, time pressure, and supervisor support) on the one hand and a range of creative and proactive behaviours on the other hand in a randomly selected sample of 278 employees of a
German high-tech company. Regression analyses of the data revealed that in addition to work characteristics, routinization is generally positively related to creative and proactive behaviours.

Leong and Rasli (2013) found that the type of task (routine and non-routine) do not significantly affect the level of creativity among employees. Similarly, the impact of type of task on creativity was conducted by Charyton (2006). Finding of the study revealed that there was no significant difference in level of creativity between employees who perform routine task and those who perform non-routine task.

2.3 Rationale of the study

Although a number of studies have investigated the impact of leaders on creativity, however, these investigations have largely focused on issues of leader support (e.g., Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 2004) and leader-member exchange (e.g., Tierney, Farmer, & Graen, 1999). More recently, researchers have begun investigating broader theories of leadership behaviour, such as transformational leadership theory, with mixed results (Tierney, 2008).

Several constructs have been found to predict employee creativity in organizations. Among these constructs is the leadership style of managers/supervisors. Some of the studies report that transformational leaders empower their followers (e.g., Jung & Sosik, 2002) and establish an innovative climate for followers to operate (Jung, Chow, & Wu, 2003). However, available research does not examine the mediating role of employees’ perceived control in the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' creativity.

Moreover, despite the significant impact of leadership styles on employees and the potentially substantial enhancement of creativity, to date, only a handful of studies have focused on an
understanding of how leadership is correlated to individual employees’ creativity especially in Africa (Mpofu, Myambo, Mogaji, Mashego, & Khaleefa, 2006). Nyarko, Asumeng and Atindanbila (2012) noted that most of the studies on creativity were conducted in the Western world (e.g., Henderson, 2003), the Far East (Shin & Zhou, 2003), and in Europe (e.g., Parjanen, 2012). This is startling, given that creativity researchers have often lamented the lack of understanding about which management practices or behaviours are especially effective in enhancing instead of restricting individual creativity (Zhou & Oldham, 2001). This particular study is aimed at addressing this significant yet relatively unstudied issue by identifying some of the management practices or behaviours that are most likely to predict and enhance individual creativity among Ghanaian leaders.

Lewis (2003) did a study on conceptual framework for understanding the nature of ‘NGO management’ as a field of research and practice. It argued that NGOs have become a prominent feature of the policy landscape, but that little attention has so far been given to their organization and management. Since more is increasingly being asked of NGOs recently by both governments and the public, it created a gap that needed to be filled. In terms of practice, the management of development NGOs, perhaps more than other kinds of organization, can be best understood as an improvised performance that continually draws upon new ideas and techniques from other fields as part of an ever-changing, ambiguous and hybrid whole. This invariably increased innovation among development NGOs. However, a report compiled by Edele, A. (2005) on non-governmental organizations in China bemoaned the extent to which sponsoring department which provided support to NGOs seriously hampers innovation and creativity in the NGO sector.
2.4 Statement of Hypotheses

Based on the aims and literatures reviewed above, the study was designed to test the following hypotheses:

1a. There will be a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity.
1b. Transactional leadership will have significant positive relationship with subordinates’ creativity.
1c. The amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style will be significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity.
2a. There will be a significant positive relationship between internal perceived control and creativity.
2b. External perceived control will have significant positive relationship with creativity.
2c. Internal work control will significantly account for higher creativity than external locus of control.
3. Employees with routine task are more likely to be creative than employees with non-routine task.
4. There will be a significant positive relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity.
5. Males will be more creative compared to females.
6. The relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity will be mediated by subordinates’ perceived control.
7. Perceived control will mediate the relationship between transactional leadership and subordinates’ creativity.
2.5. Proposed Model of Relationships
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Figure 1: Proposed model of relationships

Three factors are integrated in the model in this study to assess their influence on creativity. These factors are leadership styles (transformational and transactional), perceived work control and demographic factors (type of work, tenure of work and gender). The model implies that all the three factors will have a significant impact on creativity. The impact of leadership style (transformational and transactional) on creativity was predicted to be mediated by perceived work control.

In general, the model is unique in the sense that the role of perceived work control is not only predicted to have direct impact on creativity but also playing a significant role as a mediator on the relationship between leadership styles and creativity.
2.6 Operational Definition of Terms

**Leadership:** Being in a management position or having an authority in the workplace.

**Transformational:** A score of employees on the transformational leadership subscale higher than score on the transactional leadership subscale.

**Transactional:** A score of employees on the transactional leadership subscale higher than score on the transformational leadership subscale.

**Tenure of work:** The number of years that an employee has worked for the organization.

**Routinization:** Doing monotonous work all the time at the workplace.

**Non-Routinization:** Undertaking different forms of tasks at the workplace.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This quantitative design was purposefully conducted to assess creativity among employees in non-governmental organizations in the Greater Accra region of Ghana. The study determined how leadership styles and perceived control influence employees' creativity. The chapter presents the plan of how the study was conducted. It gives detailed descriptions of the population, sampling and sample size, measures used in collecting data, research design, and description of the data collection procedures which involve pretesting and main data collection. The chapter ends with description of some American Psychological Association (APA) ethical considerations adhered to.

3.1 Population
The population of the study was employees working in Non-Governmental Organizations in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) have had overwhelming impact on residents living in communities in which they operate. They have significantly inspired the Ghanaian society with dynamic, well-trained and dedicated workforce with rich programs and projects since the inception of the establishment of NGO’s in Ghana. Since employees in NGO’s in the Greater Accra Region have been working directly and influencing the lives of local community members, their creativity was of importance to the organization itself and the general public at large. Once again, because of proximity and convenience, Non-Governmental organizations in Accra were appropriate for the study.
Non-Governmental Organizations such as the African Centre for Peace Building, Aid for Humanity-Ghana, Advocate for Youth, African Centre for Human Development and Allies in Development Action were used. The selection of these Non-Governmental Organizations in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana was based on their long existence and the role they have played in the development of the nation. The employees in these Non-Governmental Organizations targeted were estimated to be about 400 in number (Coalition of NGO’s, 2014). Employees working in these organizations were used for the study because they need to be creative to frequently invent rich and strategic planning ideas.

3.2 Sample size and sampling technique

Quality sampling is characterized by the number of participants and the technique used in the study. To avoid wasteful results from undersized sample size, the study employed the approaches proposed by Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001) as well as Cohen (1998) Statistical Power in selecting what is typical to represent the population. According to Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001) table for determining sample size, an estimated population of 400 should have a minimum sample size of 196. Cohen (1998) Statistical Power was also used to determine how adequate the sample size of 196 represents the population.

As emphasized by Cohen (1992), the sample size that is required for correlational and multiple regression analyses are 85 and 116 respectively. This indicates that the sampling size can range from a minimum of 85 for performing correlation and regression analyses to a maximum of 196 as recommended by Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001). Dell, Holleran and Ramakrishnan (2002) also emphasized that with an estimated population size of 400, sample size ranging from 85 to 217 will yield a medium effect size recommended by Cohen (1992). Since a sample size between 85 and 217 was appropriate, questionnaires were distributed among 200 employees.
Probability sampling technique could not be used in selecting the participants because of how disperse the employees were and the inability to obtain the sample frame. Participants for the study were therefore selected using the convenience non-probability sampling technique. In using the convenience sampling, the participation in the study was based on interest and willingness of respondents. Any available employee who had a supervisor and had spent at least one year under that supervisor was selected to take part in the study. This sampling technique was used for the study because it was very easy to carry out with few rules governing how the sample was collected. It is also considered easiest, cheapest and least time consuming. The sample size was also achieved in a relatively fast and inexpensive way.

3.3 Participants

The research targeted only indigenous NGO’s in Ghana. These indigenous NGO’s were African Centre for Peace Building, Aid for Humanity-Ghana, Advocate for Youth, African Centre for Human Development and Allies in Development Action. All employees who have worked for more than a year in the organization under the same supervisor took part in the study. Part time and contract staff were excluded from the study. This was because their status as temporal staff could have been a potential confound to the outcome of the study. The number of targeted participants was 200 employees with 40 questionnaires distributed to each of the five indigenous NGO’s.

From the total sample (N = 200) targeted in the study, 24 refused to return their completed questionnaires. Descriptive statistics of the respondents are demonstrated in Table 1 at the results section.
3.4 Measures

The questionnaires for this study were categorized into four sections. The first section sought for information regarding respondent’s demographic characteristics and basic work information. The second sections consisted of measures of leadership style dimensions. The leadership style dimensions were made up of two (2) subscales measuring transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style using Bass and Avolio (1997) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The third section was the employee creativity scale (Zhau and George, 2001) which measured the extent to which employees are creative. The last section measured employee’s perceived control. Employees’ perceived control was measured using the work locus of control scale developed by Spector (1988). Detailed descriptions of the measures are provided below:

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The demographic data was completed by all respondents. The questionnaire asked respondents to answer questions regarding the name of their organization, gender, position, type of task and tenure of work.

**Employee Creativity Scale**

Creativity was measured with the Employee Creativity Scale (ECS). The Employee Creativity Scale is a 13-item scale designed by Zhou and George (2001). The 13 item scale was averaged for an overall score. Zhou and George (2001) reported the Cronbach’s alpha of the scale to be 0.94. The present study among the 176 respondents revealed Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89. The scale was measured on a five point scale ranging from 1 - “not at all characteristic,” 2 - “a little bit,” 3 - “neutral,” 4 - “characteristic,” 5 - “very characteristic”. Some items on the scale include; I
suggest new ways to achieve goals or objectives, I come up with new and practical ideas to improve performance, I search out new technologies, processes, techniques, or produce ideas etc.

Scores were awarded based on participant’s response to the Likert scale. Since there were 13 items in the scale, scores ranging from 1 – 5 were awarded on each item. The scores for each item were summed to obtain the total score that ranged from 13 – 65 for each respondent. This presupposes that the least mark a respondent could score was 13 and the highest was 65.

**Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)**

The literature review on leadership revealed that for the purpose of this research, the Full Range Leadership Development Theory is a suitable theoretical construct of leadership (Barnett, 2004). The MLQ was put together from this theory by Bass and Avolio (1997). The MLQ is a 45-item Likert self-reporting and rater descriptive scale that consists of nine leadership constructs which were used to measure the full leadership styles and behaviours, three work outcome constructs and frequency of the occurrences of the behaviour. The MLQ is made up of statements that describe the leadership style of the individual being assessed.

The MLQ has two versions: the rater version and the self-rater version. These two versions consist of exactly the same statements, but they are from different perspectives. The leader, for example, would be given the statement, ‘I spend time teaching and coaching’, whereas the subordinate’s statement would say; ‘the person I am rating spends time teaching and coaching’. Since the level of analysis was the individual employee and not the organizational or leaders, the rater version was used. Each of the statements in the rater version corresponds to one of the nine components of either transformational or transactional leadership factors. The modified version
of the leadership scale which consists of 32 items was used. The modified version was used because it has fewer items and as reported by Bass and Avolio (1997) produce significant level of Cronbach alpha (.84) as that of the full version (.85).

The modified version also measures leadership in terms of transactional and transformational leadership behaviours. Transactional leadership style consisted of 17 items and the transformational leadership style consisted of 15 items. The transformational leadership style is based on factors such as idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Individualize Consideration and Intellectual Stimulation. Transactional leadership style is represented by factors known as Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (Active) and Management-by-Exception (Passive). The scale comprises a 5-point Likert scale and it ranges from 0= not at all, 1= once in a while, 2= sometimes, 3 = fairly often to 4 = frequently, if not always. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient for the present study was .89 for the total scale, .82 for Transformational leadership and .86 for Transactional leadership scale. Some items on the scale are “the person I am rating re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate”, “the person I am rating spends time teaching and coaching’, “the person I am rating instill pride in others for being associated with him etc.

The possible maximum and minimum score for transactional components were 0 and 68 respectively and the possible minimum and maximum score for the transformational leadership style were 0 and 60 respectively. To determine a specific leadership style, the scores for the individual scales were summed up and divided by the number of items. The leadership style that had the highest mean score was classified as the dominant leadership style.
Work Locus of Control Scale (WLCS)

Employees’ perceived control was measured using the work locus of control scale developed by Spector (1988). The work locus of control scale is made up of sixteen (16) items with each having two responses. However, the researcher altered the scale of the responses from true/false to an interval scale that enabled the respondents to have a wider range of responses to choose from rather than being restricted to only two responses. Hence, the scale measured employees’ perceived control on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (0) strongly disagree, (1) disagree, (2) neutral, (3) agree and (4) strongly agree. Out of the 16 items 8 measure internal perceived control and the other 8 items measure external perceived control. An example of a statement relating to internal perceived control was “A job is what you make of it”, whereas an example of a statement relating to external perceived control was “Getting the job you want is mostly a matter of luck”. Spector (1988) reported that the eight (8) items measuring internal perceived control display a Cronbach alpha of .83 and the other eight (8) items measuring external perceived control show a Cronbach’s alpha of .81 (Spector, 1988). However, in the present study, internal perceived control had a Cronbach alpha of .78 and external perceived control had 0.84. The whole scale revealed a Cronbach alpha of .92.

The employee perceived control scale was also measured with the same five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (4) to strongly disagree (0) for each item. Each respondents total scores ranged from 0 – 64 for the entire perceived control scale and 0 – 32 for each subsection. The highest possible score for each subsection was 32 and the minimum possible score was 0.

3.5 Level of Analysis

The needs for specifying the level of analysis at which variables and associations are conceptualized have been pointed out by Kozlowski and Klein (2000). Although perceived
control and creativity are clearly individual-level variables, leadership style (transformational and transactional leadership) can be conceptualized at both the individual and group levels (Bass, 1998).

In the present study, leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership) were measured at the individual level for two reasons. First, the researcher recognized that leaders may behave differently across situations and individuals. Work by Avolio and Yammarino (1990) suggests that individual differences in perceptions may account for variation in leadership ratings. The second reason is methodological. Averaging data has the potential of washing out important relationships that might exist, especially when dealing with individual perceptions (Hoffman, Griffin, & Gavin, 2000). Thus, the researcher felt it was appropriate to measure the variables at the individual level to capture the perceptions of respondents.

### 3.6 Design

The design for this study was a survey. A survey is a procedure for collecting information by asking members of some population a set of questions and the responses recorded. The cross-sectional design was the specific survey design used. A five-step process for conducting cross-sectional survey research proposed by Bartlett (2005) was adhered to in the present study. This process consisted of defining the purpose and objectives, deciding on the sample, creating and pre-testing the instrument, contacting the respondents, and collecting and analyzing data. The design is cross-sectional because data were collected from employees across different organizations and departments on level of creativity at the same time. The design was deemed appropriate because it is quantifiable and easy to generalize the entire population if the
population is sampled appropriately with numerous amount of information collected in short period of time (Bartlett, 2005).

A very important advantage of this design is that it is cost effective and very easy to administer. It also allows making further comparisons between subgroups and for relationships between many variables. However, one main disadvantage of this design is that it does not demonstrate causal relationship between variables. However, since the study was not experimental in nature, the cross-section was considered the most appropriate. The independent variables of the present study are sex, tenure of work, perceived control and leadership styles. The dependent variable was creativity.

3.7 Procedure

The procedure used in data collection was in two sections that include pretesting the instruments and main data collection. The study proceeded with a pilot study to ascertain the psychometric properties of the scales. The main study was carried out after the pilot study. The details of the pilot and the main study are provided below.

3.7.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted using a total of 30 respondents from Nestle Ghana Limited which is also an NGO to ascertain the appropriateness of the various measures. Three main scales were tested. The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability was calculated for all the scales. The Creativity Scale yielded a total alpha value of .75 (α = .75). The Cronbach’s Alpha value of α = .76 was recorded for the total leadership style scale with cronbach alpha of .78 for transformational leadership and .76 for transactional leadership style. The perceived work control Scale had an alpha value of α =
.74. This indicates that the scales were reliable. Therefore, it cleared the way for the main data collection.

3.7.2 Main Study

Ethical clearance was sought from the Ethics Committee for Humanities (ECH – ISSER) immediately the thesis title was approved before commencing the study. After the research was ethically cleared, data was collected at the premises of all the selected Non-Governmental Organizations in Accra. The data collection process was executed after submitting an introductory letter from the Department of Psychology to the Management of all selected NGO’s in Accra to seek their permission to conduct the study. The introductory letter specified the main purpose of the study and other information needed regarding the study to the Management and employees of those organizations.

Twelve working days were used for the collection of data from the participants from all the selected NGO’s since they were located far and wide within the Accra Metropolis. The convenient sampling method was used in selecting respondents for the study. This method involves using samples who are readily available (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The questionnaires were given to the selected employees who met the inclusion criteria from the various departments of the selected NGO’s. Questionnaires were put in an envelope for respondents to complete within five working days. Participants were assured of confidentiality of their participation. That is, any information that was provided by participants with regards to their work and terms of employment were kept confidential from the general public except the research findings. The completed questionnaires were collected after five days of administration and analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences.
3.8 Ethical Consideration

Certain ethical considerations were strictly adhered to in accordance with the ethical principles governing the use of human participants for research purpose. Permission was first sought from the management of the NGO’s targeted for the study before data collection begun. The principle of informed consent which is supposed to be a standard feature for ethical consideration in all social research was strictly adhered. This means that participants for the study were based on voluntary participation. No individual was forced to partake in the study.

The researcher ensured high sense of confidentiality and anonymity by making sure the data collected was managed in such a way that the identities of the respondents were protected at all times and that no information was directly traced or associated with any individual participant. With this, no names or codes traceable to the respondents was used.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.0. Analyses of Data

The study was aimed at assessing the relationship between leadership styles, perceived control and employee’s creativity in organizations. In achieving this objective, seven hypotheses were formulated. The version 19 of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used in analyzing the data. Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b and 4 were analyzed using the Bivariate analyses (Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient) because the relationship between two variables was established.

Hypotheses 1c and 2c were analyzed using hierarchical regression analysis because the emphasis was to determine the difference in amount of variance accounted for employee’s creativity by transformational and transactional leadership styles as well as perceived internal and external work control were assessed. The hierarchical analysis was presented in two steps with transformational leadership style (hypothesis 1c) and internal perceived control (hypothesis 2c) presented in the first block and transactional leadership style (hypothesis 1c) and external perceived control (hypothesis 2c) in the second block.

Hypotheses 3 and 5 were analyzed using the independent t-test because the mean scores of two independent groups were compared. Hypotheses 6 and 7 were analyzed using several regression analyses. These hypotheses were tested following Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four (4) step approach in which several regression analyses were conducted and significance of the coefficients examined at each step. This is because the mediating role of perceived control on the
relationship between leadership style (transformational and transactional) and creativity was assessed.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Based on the estimated sample size, two hundred (200) questionnaires were distributed to participants. As a result of the refusals of 24 respondents to submit their completed questionnaires, the final sample comprised of 176 given a response rate of 88%. According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), the response rate of 88% indicates an excellent effort in data collection for analyses. More than half (59.1%) of the participants were men and 40.9% were women. The mean age of the respondents was 35.43 years (SD = 2.15) and the age range was 18 years to 59 years. The mean working experience of the respondents was 4.34 (SD=1.37) and the minimum and maximum educational level of the respondents were from basic school and master’s degree respectively. The table below represents a summary of respondents’ demographic characteristics.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Male (n = 104)</th>
<th>Female (n = 72)</th>
<th>Total (n = 176)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.45 (3.45)</td>
<td>34.41 (1.63)</td>
<td>35.43 (2.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Degree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.42 (1.52)</td>
<td>3.16 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.29 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Assessing the Normality of the Data

The normality of the data was verified. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), a variable is normally distributed when the value for skewness and kurtosis range between +1 and -1. The analysis revealed that all the study variables (i.e. Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership, Perceived Control and Creativity) were normally distributed.

The reliability coefficients of the study variables were also computed and the scales revealed cronbach alpha values ranging from .82 – .92. Since all the cronbach values were above the threshold of .70, the scales were appropriate for psychometric analysis (Wells & Wollack, 2003) (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>9.300</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.937</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>53.95</td>
<td>12.179</td>
<td>-.804</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>84.53</td>
<td>17.196</td>
<td>-.297</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived control</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td>6.908</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>41.72</td>
<td>7.953</td>
<td>-.928</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Correlation matrix

The Pearson correlations among all the variables under study were also computed and a summary of the results is presented in Table 3. The analyses showed that all the variables were positively correlated with each other. Except the relationship between transactional leadership and perceived control (r = .026, p=ns), the relationships between all the variables were significant.
Among the main variables, the relationship between leadership styles and subordinates' creativity was the highest \( r = .517 \), whereas the relationship between leadership style and perceived control was the least \( r = .283 \).

### Table 3: Pearson’s correlation matrix of the study variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>( .268^{**} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leadership</td>
<td>( .731^{***} )</td>
<td>( .853^{***} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Perceived Control</td>
<td>( .026 )</td>
<td>( .380^{**} )</td>
<td>( .283^{**} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Creativity</td>
<td>( .257^{**} )</td>
<td>( .534^{***} )</td>
<td>( .517^{***} )</td>
<td>( .418^{***} )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .05 \), **\( p < .01 \), ***\( p < .001 \)

### 4.4 Testing the Hypotheses

In testing the seven proposed hypotheses, the hypotheses were stated, the summary results followed and the interpretation of the results was then presented.

**Hypothesis 1a and 1b**

There will be a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity. Transactional leadership will have significant positive relationship with subordinates’ creativity.

### Table 4: Relationship between Leadership Styles and Subordinate Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transactional</td>
<td>( .268^{**} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creativity</td>
<td>( .534^{***} )</td>
<td>( .257^{**} )</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\( p < .01 \), ***\( p < .001 \)**
From the bivariate analysis illustrated on Table 4, transformational leadership style is positively related with subordinates creativity \((r = .534, \ p < .001)\). The results therefore support hypothesis 1 which states that “there will be a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity”.

The relationship between transactional leadership and subordinates creativity is also significant as shown on Table 4 \((r = .257, \ p = .01)\). Hence hypothesis 1b which also states that ‘Transactional leadership will have significant positive relationship with subordinates’ creativity’ is supported.

**Hypothesis 1c**

*The amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style will be significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity.*

**Table 5: Hierarchical Regression Coefficients of Transformational and Transactional Leadership as Predictors and Creativity as Criterion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 (Constant)</td>
<td>22.894</td>
<td>2.314</td>
<td>9.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>8.339</td>
<td>.534***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (Constant)</td>
<td>20.854</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>8.181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>7.590</td>
<td>.501***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1.851</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2 = .286\) for step1, \(R^2 = .299\) for step 2, \(\Delta R^2 = .286\) for step 1, \(\Delta R^2 = .013\) for step 2, ***\(p<.001\)

The model of transformational and transactional leadership as predictors and subordinates creativity as criterion was found to be significant \((F (2, 173) = 36.966, \ p < .001)\) with
transformational and transactional leadership styles together accounting for 29.9% ($R^2 = .299$) of the variation in creativity. It was found that transformational leadership accounted for 28.6% ($R^2 = .286$) and transactional leadership explained 1.3% ($R^2 = .013$) of the variability in creativity. Assessing their respective t values, transformational leadership style (t=7.590) accounted for more variance in predicting creativity compared the variation predicted by transactional leadership (t=1.851). This supports hypothesis 1c which states that “the amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style will be significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity”.

**Hypothesis 2a and 2b**

There will be a significant positive relationship between internal locus of control and creativity. External locus of control will have significant positive relationship with creativity.

**Table 6: Relationship between Perceived Control and Creativity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. External</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal</td>
<td>-.221**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creativity</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01

As indicated on the bivariate analysis shown on Table 6, internal locus of control is positively related with subordinates creativity ($r = .360, p < .01$). The results therefore support hypothesis 2a which states that “there will be a significant positive relationship between internal locus of control and creativity”.

External perceived control also have positive and significant relationship with creativity ($r = .139, p < .05$). This means that hypothesis 2b which states that ‘external perceived control will have significant positive relationship with creativity’ is supported.
Hypotheses 2c

Internal locus of control will significantly account for higher creativity than external locus of control.

Table 7: Hierarchical Regression Coefficients of Internal and External Perceived Control as Predictors and Creativity as Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1 (Constant)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalizers</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>5.088</td>
<td>.360***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (Constant)</td>
<td>22.354</td>
<td>3.466</td>
<td>6.449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizers</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>5.817</td>
<td>.411***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizers</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>.230*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .130 for step 1, R² = .180 for step 2, ΔR² = .130 for step 1, ΔR² = .050 for step 2, *p < .001, ***p < .001

The model of the impact of internal and external perceived control on subordinates creativity was found to be significant (F (2, 173) = 18.959, p < .001) with internal and external perceived control together accounting for 18.0% (R² = .180) of the variation in creativity. Out of this variance (18%), internal perceived control accounted for 13.0% (R² = .130) and external perceived control explained 5.0% (R² = .050).

Assessing their respective t values, transformational leadership style (t=5.088) accounted for more variance in predicting creativity compared to external perceived control (t=3.256). This supports hypothesis 2c which states that “Internal perceived control will significantly account for higher creativity than external perceived control”.
Hypothesis 3

Employees with routine task are more likely to be creative than employees with non-routine task.

Table 8: Type of Task (Routine and Non-Routine) on Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Task</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>41.59</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Routine</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05

From Table 8, the effect of type of task on employee creativity was not significant [t (174) = -.241, p > .05]. This indicates that the mean score on creativity of employees who perform routine task (M=41.59, SD=8.33) was not significantly different from the mean score on creativity among employees who perform non-routine task (M=41.89, SD=7.45). The third hypothesis which therefore states that “employees with routine task are more likely to be creative than employees with non-routine task” was not supported.

Hypothesis 4

There will be a significant positive relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity.

Table 9: Relationship between Tenure of Work and Subordinates Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure of Work</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05

Assessing the summarized results of the Pearson Correlation shown on Table 9, the relationship between tenure of work and subordinates creativity was not significant [r = .070, p = .353]. This means that hypothesis 5 which states that there will be a significant positive relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity was not supported.
Hypothesis 5

Males will be more creative compared to females.

Table 10: Gender Differences in Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41.99</td>
<td>7.691</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>8.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferring from Table 10, the impact of gender (males and females) on level of creativity was not significant \([t_{(174)} = .538, p > .591]\). This means that the mean score on employee creativity of males \((M=41.99, SD=7.691)\) was not significantly different from the mean score on employee creativity among females \((M=41.33, SD=8.358)\). The sixth hypothesis which therefore states that “males will be more creative compared to females” was not supported.

Testing for Mediation

The mediating role was tested following Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four (4) step approach in which several regression analyses were conducted and significance of the coefficients examined at each step. The steps are as follows:

Step 1: Simple regression analysis of leadership styles (transformational and transactional) predicting creativity (Path c)

Step 2: Simple regression analysis of leadership styles (transformational and transactional) predicting perceived work control (i.e. Path a)

Step 3: Simple regression of perceived work control predicting creativity (i.e. Path b).
Step 4: Multiple regression analysis of leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and perceived work control predicting creativity.

This can be illustrated diagrammatically as:

![Diagram](https://example.com/diagram.png)

**Figure 2: Mediating Relationship Diagram**

Steps 1, 2 and 3 were to establish that zero-order relationships exist among the variables. In step 4, according to Baron and Kenny (1986) some form of mediation is supported if the effect of leadership styles (transformational and transactional) remains significant after controlling for perceived work control (path b). When leadership styles (transformational and transactional) is not significant in predicting creativity after controlling for perceived work control, then the finding supports full mediation. If transformational leadership is still significant (i.e. both leadership styles and perceived control significantly predict creativity), the finding supports partial mediation.

The analysis presented in table 3 show that the correlation coefficients for each path is statistically significant. This indicates that at the bivariate level, each of the conditions necessary to test for a possible mediator has been met. The regression analysis for the mediating role is shown on Table 11 and 12.

Where there was evidence of some mediation, the software provided by Preacher and Hayes (2004) was used. To conduct the sobel test, four values are important. These are \( a = \) raw (unstandardized) regression coefficient for the association between IV and mediator. \( s_a = \)
standard error of $a$. $b = \text{raw coefficient for the association between the mediator and the DV, } s_b = \text{standard error of } b$.

The sobel test was then conducted using three simple steps:

Step 1: Run a regression analysis with the IV predicting the mediator. This will give $a$ and $s_a$.

Step 2: Run a regression analysis with the IV and mediator predicting the DV. This will give $b$ and $s_b$.

Step 3: Insert the $a$, $b$, $s_a$, and $s_b$ into the cells of the software and the software will calculate the critical ratio as a test of whether the indirect effect of the IV on the DV via the mediator is significantly different from zero.

**Hypothesis 6**

The relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates' creativity will be mediated by subordinates' perceived control.

**Table 11: Results of Multiple Analyses for the mediating role of subordinates’ perceived control on the Transformational – Creativity Relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 (Constant)</td>
<td>22.894</td>
<td>2.314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.534***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (Constant)</td>
<td>14.117</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.439***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived control</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.251**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .286$ for step 1, $R^2 = .339$ for step 2, $\Delta R^2 = .286$ for step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .053$ for step 2, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$
The regression coefficients of the mediation analysis reveal that, there was an initial significant relationship between Transformational leadership and creativity ($\beta = .534, p < .001$) with transformational leadership style accounting for 28.6% ($R^2 = .286, p < .001$) of the variance in creativity. When perceived control was added into the regression model, the regression coefficient of transformational leadership style on creativity reduced ($\beta = .439, p < .001$) though still significant indicating partial mediation. Sobel test for significant mediation indicated that the observed mediation was significant ($Z = 4.91, p < .001$). Therefore the hypothesis ‘the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity will be mediated by subordinates’ perceived control’ received support but was partial mediation.

**Hypothesis 7**

*Perceived control will mediate the relationship between transactional leadership and subordinates’ creativity.*

**Table 12: Results of Multiple Analyses for the mediating role of subordinates’ perceived control on the Transactional – Creativity Relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 (Constant)</td>
<td>34.998</td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2 (Constant)</td>
<td>15.396</td>
<td>3.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.246**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived control</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.411***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .066$ for step1, $R^2 = .235$ for step 2, $\Delta R^2 = .066$ for step 1, $\Delta R^2 = .169$ for step 2, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$
The regression coefficients of the mediation analysis of perceived control on transactional-creativity relationship shows that, the initial relationship between transactional leadership and creativity was significant ($\beta = .257, p < .01$) with transactional leadership style accounting for 6.6% ($R^2 = .066, p < .01$) of the variance in creativity. When perceived control was added into the regression model, the regression coefficient of transactional leadership style on creativity reduced ($\beta = .246, p < .01$) but was still significant indicating partial mediation. Sobel test for significant mediation indicated that the observed mediation was significant ($Z = 3.03, p < .001$). Therefore the hypothesis ‘the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity will be mediated by subordinates’ perceived control’ was supported but the mediation was partial.

4.5 Summary of Results

In summary, the results of the study showed that:

1. Transformational and transactional leadership styles were significantly correlated with subordinates’ creativity.

2. The amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity.

3. Internal and external perceived control positively related with creativity.

4. The amount of variance accounted by internal perceived control was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for external perceived control on creativity.

5. Type of task (routine and non-routine) did not have any significant impact on creativity.

6. There was no significant relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity.

7. Males and females did not differ in their level of creativity.
8. The relationship leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and subordinates’ creativity were partially mediated by subordinates’ perceived control.

4.6 Description of the Structural Model

The final results model illustrates that transformational leadership is positively related significantly to creativity. Transformational leadership is also positive related to perceived creativity. Perceived work control also partially mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates creativity.

The difference between the final model and the hypothetical model is traceable to the demographic factors assessed. None of the demographic characteristics (type of task, tenure of work and gender) was found to have significant impact on creativity as predicted.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Discussion

Due to the shift in market forces and business models which are very competitive, businesses have long been concerned with enhancing employee creativity to achieve better results (Madjar, Chen, & Greenberg, 2011). Employee creative performance is viewed as a complex and dynamic construct which involves the interaction of organizational, managerial, and employee factors (Basadur & Basadur, 2011). Organizations hire the right people, put them in the right jobs, improve their skills, support them in being creative, and reward them when they deliver results, but continue to ask how they can do better in creativity. Perhaps the question to ask is what are the factors inhibiting the level of creativity among employees which organizations are failing to unravel? Given the need for creativity as a solution to the complex challenges faced by organizations, finding the link between leadership style and creativity is important to all organizations. The present study thus assessed the impact of leadership styles, perceived work control on subordinate’s creativity. The role of type of task, gender and tenure of work on creativity was also verified. Seven hypotheses were derived and tested with the results discussed below:

Relationship between leadership style and creativity

Hypothesis 1a which stated that there will be a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity was supported. This means that the level of creativity among employees is indicated partly by leadership styles of leaders and that when leadership adopts the transformational leadership style, employee’s level of creativity increases.
The finding is in line with the study by Shah, Nisar, Rehman and Rehman (2011) on the influence of transformational leadership on employees’ outcomes with the purpose of assessing the relationship between transformational leadership, commitment and subordinates innovativeness. Results of the study indicated that there was a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and innovativeness. According to Shah, Nisar, Rehman and Rehman (2011), transformational leadership style inculcate in individual employees higher level of commitment which intends leads to higher level of innovations.

The finding is also in line with the study conducted by Shin and Zhou (2003) on transformational leadership, Conservation, and creativity with evidence from Korea. A sample of 290 employees and their supervisors from 46 Korean companies were used. It was found that transformational leadership was positively related to follower’s creativity accounting for more than half of the level of employee’s motivation. Similarly, the result agrees with the study by Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) on the role of transformational leadership on follower’s creativity. The result of the study showed a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership styles and creativity. As explained by Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011), transformational leadership behaviours are closely matched with the determinants of innovation and creativity at the workplace. They identified vision, support for innovation, autonomy, encouragement, recognition, and challenge as the transformational leadership behaviours which closely match the determinants of innovation and creativity at the workplace. Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) emphasized that transformational leaders encourage creativity through intrinsic motivation, empowerment of followers, and climate supportive of innovation at work environment.
The result is also in agreement with the study by Khan, Rehman and Fatima (2009). The study by Khan, Rehman and Fatima (2009) revealed that all facets of transformational leadership (Attributed Charisma, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration) have significant impact on creativity except idealized influence. A study by Jung, Chow and Wu (2008) also supported the expectation that transformational leadership increases organizational creativity which is in line with the present finding. Similarly Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009) revealed a significantly positive relationship between transformational leadership style, creativity, and organizational innovation. Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009) explained that transformational leadership style influences employees' creativity through psychological empowerment.

According to Bass and Avolio (2004), transformational leadership improves the performance, morale, motivation, and dedication of both leaders and their teams or supporters. Jung, Chow and Wu (2008) also emphasized that, transformational leadership improves creativity because they are inspirational, trustworthy, and charismatic role models who lead by example. These leaders suggest to employees why a change must occur, promoting a common vision and also lead change in an organized manner. In a situation where the employees fail in their level of creativity to bring a change, they are not castigated by the leaders who are transformational but still encourage them. This has the tendency of providing creativity among employees. Moreover, Transformational leaders foster high levels of personal commitment from their supporters or team to shared goals, whether those goals are for an organization or a movement. Goals are set with high standards in mind, and transformational leadership has been shown to often exceed more typical achievements which can all foster the extent to which an employee become creative (Bass & Avolio, 2004).
Hypothesis 1b which also stated that Transactional leadership will have significant positive relationship with subordinates’ creativity was also supported. This finding means that transactional leadership also promotes significant level of creativity. The finding is inconsistent with the study by Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) who reported on literature associated with the role of leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership) on followers’ creativity. Finding indicated that transactional leadership was not a significant predictor of employee creativity. The inconsistency between the present finding and that of Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) is due to the fact that unlike the cross-sectional design adopted in the present study, Afshari, Siraj, Ghani and Afshari (2011) employed the meta-analytical design which is influenced by publication bias.

The finding however agrees with the study by Bodewes (2011) who also assessed the impact of transformational and transactional leadership on employee creativity and in-role performance in the Netherlands. Results of the study confirmed a positive relation between the two leadership styles (transformational leadership and transactional leadership) on employee creativity. Similarly, Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009) assessed the role of leadership styles, creativity, and organizational innovation. The study proposed a model of the impact of transactional leadership style on employee creativity which was supported. According to Gumusluoglu and Ilsev (2009), transactional leadership style also has an impact on creativity since employees are rewarded for been creative.
The results is also in agreement with the study conducted by Liang, Chan, Lin and Huang (2010) which found that transactional leadership equip followers to exhibit more creativity with the motive of obtaining reward. Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011) also found a positive relationship between transactional leadership and creativity which supports the present finding. The finding is also in line with the study by Politis (2004) which indicated that both transformational and transactional leadership styles are positively correlated with creativity.

The positive relationship between transactional leadership style and creativity can be explained with the Transactional Leadership Theory (Burns, 1978). The transactional leadership theory explains that some employees are motivated by the desire to get their needs met. These employees are motivated by rewards. Base on this, they are more likely to be creative if such needs are met. With the level of poverty and the inability of employees to meet their basic needs in developing country like Ghana, rewards are basic in motivating employees to be creative.

There are two facets of transactional leadership that also help promote higher level of creativity. These are contingent reward and passive management by exception. With contingent reward transactional leaders link the goal to rewards, clarify expectations, provide necessary resources, set mutually agreed upon goals, and provide various kinds of rewards for successful performance. Moreover, with passive management by exception, transactional leaders intervene only when standards are not met or when the performance is not as per the expectations. Transactional leadership involves motivating and directing followers primarily through appealing to their own self-interest (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Since getting a job done dominates the concern of this kind of leader, employees also use any means to achieve the desired results including been creative.
The third part of hypothesis 1 which stated that the amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style will be significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity was supported. The finding means that transformational leadership style leads to higher level of creativity among employees and that when management adopts transformational leadership styles, employees demonstrate higher level of creativity compared to when they engage in transactional leadership styles. Transactional Leadership significantly predicted 6.6% of the variance in creativity whilst Transformational Leadership explained 28.6% of the variance in creativity.

The result is contradictory to the study by Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011) on the impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee’s creativity. The results of the study indicated that the level of significance of transformational leadership in relationship to creativity was positive but weak than the relationship between transactional leadership style and creativity. The inconsistency can be due to the fact that Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011) study was conducted in Pakistan. The culture in Pakistani is of uncertainty and high power distance thus transactional leadership is best suited in order to achieve targets in a bureaucratic nation where one man show rules and autocratic leadership function (Liang, Chan, Lin & Huang, 2010). This explains the contradiction in findings between the present study and that of Paracha, Qamar, Mirza, Inam-ul-Hassan and Waqas (2011).

The finding is however consistent with Jung (2001) study which found a significant higher relationship between transformational leadership and employees’ creativity compared to transactional leadership and employee level of creativity. According to Jung (2001), participants
in the transformational leadership condition generate significant greater numbers of unique ideas than their counterparts in the transactional leadership condition and also produced more creative ideas, as measured by flexibility, than participants in the transactional leadership condition. The finding is also in accordance with the study by Liang, Chan, Lin and Huang (2010) which indicated that transformational leadership behaviour affects followers to exhibit more task performance and exhibit higher level of creativity than transactional leaders do. As explained by Liang, Chan, Lin and Huang (2010), transformational leadership is very important and that it makes employees satisfied compared to transactional leadership, and in turn triggers employees to be creative.

Another study which conforms to the present finding is traced to a research that was conducted by Shoghi, Asgarani, and Ashnagohar (2013). The study was aimed at studying the impact of managers’ leadership style on employees’ creativity by comparing transformational and transactional leaders. Results of the study indicated that 86% of the employees' creativity was predicted through the transformational leadership style and 13% was predicted through the transactional leadership style with the remaining percentage resulting from the measurement error. Hence, transformational leadership style has a stronger role in increasing the creativity of the employees compared to transactional leadership.

According to Jung, Chow and Wu (2008), employees demonstrate higher level of creativity when leaders arouse their emotions which motivate them to act beyond the framework of what may be described as exchange relations. Moreover, Podsakoff (2000) found out that transformational leadership style encourages members to be active and empowered in the work place and thus encourages creativity compared to transactional leadership. Podsakoff (2000)
noted that to promote creativity among employees, creating good perception among employees about justice or fairness within the organizations, and also helping the employees to be more satisfied with their job should be the target of leaders. A model provided by Kuehn and Al-Busaidi (2002) indicated that there is no significant difference between transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles on employees in perceived justice and fairness. However with regard to helping employees to be more satisfied with their job, transformational leadership have upper hand over transactional leadership. This can also explain why transformational leadership accounted for higher level of variance in explaining creativity compared to transactional leadership.

The high prediction of transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership on creativity can be explained by the fact that transactional leadership unlike transformational leadership style starts with the idea that team members agree to obey their leader totally when they accept a job. The transaction is usually the organization paying the team members in return for their effort and compliance (Nielsen, 2009). The leader has a right to punish team members if their work doesn't meet the pre-determined standard and if they exhibit creative abilities which tends to be futile. Since creating something which leads to failure can attract punishment, employees tend to do the job using the old method as means of complying with what the leaders expect from them. Transformational leaders inspire and motivate followers in ways that go beyond exchanges and rewards. Transformational leadership operates especially well in close supervisory relationships, compared with more distant relationships (Nielsen, 2009). This increases the follower's intrinsic motivation through the expression of the value and importance of the leader's goals thus promoting high level of satisfaction and creativity.
The higher amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership compared to transactional leadership style can be explained with the path-goal theory (House, 1971). The theory suggests that the effect of leader behaviour on subordinates depends on the situation. The situation as identified by House (1971) could be the characteristics of the subordinates or the characteristics of the environment within which the employees work. Situational variables also determine subordinate preference for a particular pattern of leadership behaviour, thereby influencing the impact of the leader on subordinate satisfaction, performance and ability to exhibit creative behaviours on the job. According to this theory, the influence of leader behaviour on subordinate can be understood by examining how the leader affects subordinate expectations about the likely outcomes of different courses of action. Path-goal theory explain that leaders can help subordinates along the path to their goals by selecting precise behaviours that are best suited to subordinate’s needs and to the situations in which subordinates are working. Employees do not need only reward but also good interpersonal relationship. Leaders who motivate subordinates through reward and good interpersonal relationship are likely to exhibit higher level of creativity among the employees. Since transformational leadership is more likely to initiate motivation through reward and good interpersonal relationship among employees (Antonakis, Cianciolo & Sternberg, 2004), it promote higher level of creativity compared to leaders who adopt the transactional leadership style.

**Perceived Work Control and Creativity**

Hypothesis 2a which stated that there will be a significant positive relationship between internal perceived control and creativity was supported. This means that as employees develop higher level of internal work control, their level of creativity also increases. The finding is in line with the study by Moghimi and Mahmam (2008) and Mousavi (2008) that revealed that there is a
positive relationship between internal work control and creativity. The finding is also in agreement with the study by Rashidi and Shahraray (2008) which indicated that creative behaviour is predicted by internal work control. According to Rashidi and Shahraray (2008), individuals with internal work control are more independent in thinking, although welcome other ones’ suggestions and information because of considering their internal mastery, they believe that chance and destiny have no effect on their lives, they are self-dependent, not being same as other people and this leads them to be self-directing and creative. They follow less the standards, customs, and social values which are not acceptable by them.

Hypothesis 2b which also stated that external perceived control will have significant positive relationship with creativity was also supported. This also means that developing higher level of externalization is associated with higher level of creativity. The finding is contradictory to the study by Spector (1982) that revealed no significant relationship between external control and creativity. The scale used in assessing perceived control in the present study and that of Spector (1982) can contribute to the inconsistencies in the findings. Spector (1982) used general locus of control scale which differ from the scale used in the present study that measures perceive control associated with the work.

The positive relationship between external work control and creativity is however similar to the study by Sharifi (2004). The results of Sharifi (2004) study indicated that externals (intuitive and sensory) prefer new and exciting experiences, creativity, and new thoughts take their attention compared to internalizers.
The third part of hypothesis 2 which stated that internal work control will significantly account for higher creativity than external work control was also supported. This finding means that though internalization and externalization are positively associated with creativity, internalization contribute significantly higher than externalization. Spector (1982) noted that perceived work control is related to compliance with authority and supervisory style and further asserted that externals tend to be more satisfied with direct supervision, to comply more with demands of coercive supervision, and to be more compliant with social demands than internals which make internals more creative than externals because internals seek to bring new events on board without complying to social demands.

The finding also agrees with the study conducted by Nehardani and Keavanlou (2013) which assessed the barriers to personal creativity and its relationship with locus of control in Technical Teachers and Non-Technical. Findings of the study showed that there was a significant negative correlation between locus of control with the barriers to self-confidence, need to adapt and creativity. The researchers concluded that with increased internal locus of control, barriers to creativity fade. Nehardani and Keavanlou (2013) again emphasized that internalizers have higher self-confident, have more motivation for improvement compared to externalizers which leads to higher level of creativity.

The result is again similar to the study conducted by Asgari and Vakili (2012) on the relationship between perceived work control, creativity and performance among 191 employees conveniently selected. The findings of the research indicated that the level of employee’s creativity was higher among individuals with internal work control compared to those with external work control. It also agrees with the study by Roy and Gupta (2012) on the impact of work control and
organizational climate on managerial creativity among 100 employees that were selected from different Print and Electronic media. The study revealed that internal locus of control encouraged higher level of creativity compared to external locus of control.

**Type of Task (Routine and Non-Routine) and creativity**

Hypothesis 3 which stated that employees with routine task are more likely to be creative than employees with non-routine task was not supported. This finding means that employees who perform routine task and those who perform non-routine task do not differ in their level of creativity. This finding contradicts the study by Ohly, Sonnentag and Pluntke (2006). Regression analyses of the data revealed that in addition to work characteristics, routinization is generally positively related to creative and proactive behaviors. Ohly, Sonnentag and Pluntke (2006) argued that routinization may be beneficial for creativity and related behaviour due to available resources that can be used to develop new ideas while working. This outcome is in definite contradiction to what was revealed in the present study.

The finding is however in line with the study by Leong and Rasli (2013) which found that the type of task (routinization and non-routinization) is not related to employee’s level of creativity. It also agrees with the study by Charyton (2006). Charyton (2006) revealed no significant difference in level of creativity between employees who perform routine task and those who perform non-routine task. As explained by Charyton (2006) whether routine or non-routine task, job description and how it should be done is determine by the management and so do not influence how employee go about their duties such as being creative to get the job done.
The similarity in creativity between employees who perform routine task and those who perform non-routine task can be traced to the cultural contest of the Ghanaian organizations. In the Ghanaian organizations, employees are not given the autonomy to operate. The organizational context is also so fixed that the way employees are to operate is to conform to the organizations way of doing things. In such instance, both internalizers and externalizers are confined as to how they should operate leading to similar level of creativity between them. They are given similar instructions.

**Demographic characteristics and creativity**

The fourth hypothesis that there will be a significantly positive relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity was not supported. This finding implies that the number of years one has served in the organization does not make him or her more creative. This is contradictory to the assumption of the researcher. The researcher assumed that since employee get to understand their job descriptions very well as they spend more time in the organization, they will be more creative as means of delivering their duties well. The finding however indicates that it takes more than years spent in the organization to be creative.

The lack of significant relationship between tenure of work and creativity is in contrast with the study by Al-Srour and Al-Oweidi (2013) that assessed the impact of tenure of work on employee creativity. The results of the study indicated a significant positive relationship between employee tenure of work and employee creativity. Moreover, Henderson (2003) also revealed a significant positive relationship between employee tenure of work and employee creativity which is at variance with the present study. The lack of consistency between the present finding and the previous studies by Al-Srour and Al-Oweidi (2013) and Henderson (2003) can be due to the
difference in the countries where the studies were done. The present study was done in Ghana where employees are given less autonomy to act on their own (Bless & Higson-Smith, 1995) unlike the western countries. The lack of autonomy can hinder level of creativity no matter how one is determined or no matter the experience obtained through the number of years at work.

The finding is consistent with the study by Baer and Kaufman (2006) who found no significant relationship between work experience and creativity. Matud, Rodriguez and Grande (2007) also found no significant impact of years of work experience of employee on creativity and job security which supports the present finding. Moreover, the finding agrees with Chang and Chiang (2003) who explored factors influencing organizational creativity. Results showed that demographic variables such as gender, employees' education, professional training, age and working experiences were not significant predictors of creativity. It is also in agreement with the study by Parjanen (2012) which found no significant relationship between employee tenure of work and creativity.

The fifth hypothesis that males will be more creative compared to females was not supported. This also means that males and females do not differ in their level of creativity. This finding is not surprising because studies on gender differences in creativity have revealed inconsistent results. Some studies (e.g., Goldsmith & Matherly, 1988) have favoured higher level of creativity among females compared to males while others (e.g., Foss, Woll & Moilanen, 2013) have favoured higher level of creativity among males compared to females. Overall, the lack of differences in genders is found in many creativity studies. As emphasized by Kaufman (2014), self-assessments of creativity is consistent with gender stereotypes that is the discrepancies of gender difference is attributed to internalized gender stereotypes, as opposed to actual
differences in creativity. In situations where neutral task is used, no significant difference is expected to emerge.

The non-significant difference in creativity between males and females is at variance with the study conducted by Nahlinder (2010) on sex differences in creativity among employees working in the hospital. Nahlinder (2010) study indicated that females were more creative than males. This inconsistency can be due to the differences in the type of occupation one works in. Nahlinder (2010) employed an occupation that according to Olivier and Rothmann (2007) is male stereotypic. According to Olivier and Rothmann (2007), males are able to innovate more in an organization that is perceived to be male-stereotypic and females also innovate better in an occupation that is female-stereotypic. The organization employed in the present study cannot be assigned to any sex stereotypic occupation and that could account for the insignificant difference.

The finding is also inconsistent with the study by Al-Srour and Al-Oweidi (2013) that investigated the level of creativity among management employees, academic staff and artistes and its relationship with gender, practical experience and age. The findings of the study showed that females exhibited higher level of creativity compared to males. Similarly, the finding is inconsistent with the study by Tsai (2013) which found higher level of creativity among males compared to females. As explained by Baer and Kaufman (2008), this significant difference between males and females in creativity probably stems from an environmental factor.

The finding is in line with the study by Ghayas, Akhter and Adil (2012) which assessed gender differences in creativity level of students. Results revealed no significant effect of gender on the total score of creativity. Males and females demonstrated equal level of creativity. Baer and
Kaufman (2006) assessed gender differences in creativity, including creativity test scores, creative achievements, and self-reported creativity. Findings indicated no gender differences in creativity. The finding again agrees with the study by Chan (2005) which found no significant gender differences for all sub constructs of creativity. The finding is also in line with the study by Matud, Rodriguez and Grande (2007) which examined the relevance of socio-demographic factors on gender differences in creative thinking. Gender differences in creative thought were minimal and dependent upon educational level.

With respect to the lack of significant effect of demographic characteristics (gender and work experience) on employee’s creativity, a possible reason is that the work environment engages employees of both genders and gives them equal platform to operate. No matter the sex of the employee or the work experience, organizational rules and regulation equally impact the ability of all employees to operate which has a greater propensity of shaping the mind-sets and general conceptions of events and, as a result, affecting equally the ability of males and females as well as long and short tenure employees to be creative. The equal impact of organizational culture and perception of organizational factors such as job security on both genders and work experience therefore, is more likely to explain why there was no significant gender difference and level of work experience on creativity.

**Mediating role of perceived control on leadership-creativity relationship**

The sixth hypothesis that the relationship between transformational leadership and subordinates’ creativity will be mediated by subordinates’ perceived control was partially supported. The seventh hypothesis which also stated that perceived control will mediate the relationship between transactional leadership and subordinates’ creativity was also partially supported. These findings
mean that perceived work control partially mediate the relationship between leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and creativity.

The findings are in line with the study by Shoghi, Asgarani, and Ashnagohar (2013). The study was aimed at studying the impact of managers' leadership style on employees' creativity; considering the mediating role of organizational structure and locus of control in Metal Industries of Kaveh Industrial City. Perceived work control was found to mediate the relationship between leadership styles (transformational and transactional leadership style) and creativity.

The result is also in agreement with the study by Howell and Avolio (1993) who conducted a research on Transformational leadership, Transactional leadership, Locus of control, and Support for innovation as key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. This study explicitly stated a causal relationship between the variables that were studied, a mediating role of perceived control on the relationship between leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and creativity. The finding also agrees with the study by Asgari and Vakili (2012) who researched into the relationship between locus of control, creativity and performance. The results of the research indicated that perceived work control mediate the relationship between leadership styles (transformational and transactional) and creativity.

There were several limitations to this study that must be considered in future studies though the results helped in achieving the aims of the study. First, data was collected using structured questionnaires which restricted respondents in the responses they gave. Secondly, the study
confined itself to the cross-sectional design which has attracted numerous criticisms on the extent to which cause and effect relationship can be inferred.

Furthermore, because the sampling method used was a non-probability one, it failed to ensure that every member of the population will have an equal chance of being selected to take part of the sample, and therefore the interpretation must be done with caution. Only employees working in local NGO’s were included in the sample ignoring those in the governmental organizations. For a study of this nature, both governmental and non-governmental organizations must be used to find out if some creativity differs by the occupation one engages in as stipulated by Frese and Zapf (1999).

Lastly, leadership styles and creativity was based on individual level of analyses rather than organizational level. Such level of analysis does not give a true reflection of the impact of leadership styles on creativity. Future research in this area should try to measure employee creativity based on the organizational level. Such level of analyses will give more reflective impact of leadership style on creativity.

5.2 Recommendations and Practical Implications

The study again implies that leadership style influence the creativity level of employees in the organization and thus transformational leadership style have a significant positive influence on creativity. Therefore, to increase creativity, there is the need for management to adopt transformational leadership style. Organizations can maximize productivity through creativity if management adopts the appropriate leadership style.
Another implication of the finding is that management should assess the employee they are working with and adopt the particular style which may suit them and increase their level of creativity since some employees are better off with transactional leadership style. For that reason management should keep in mind that transactional leadership style is not totally bad but transformational pay off more than transactional leadership style. It is, therefore, hoped that these findings will serve as resource materials for the management of all organizations to ensure an effective organization.

Even though the study had some limitations, it invariably yielded reliable results as it supported most of the studies conducted previously and added to the literature on the field of leadership, perceived work control and creativity. The key finding of this study is undoubtedly that leaders, who see what is important, transmit a sense of mission, provide coaching/teaching, and arouse employees to think in new ways are most effective in promoting creativity among employees. Transformational leadership alone significantly predicted 28.6% of the variance in creativity whilst Transactional Leadership explained 6.6% of the variance in creativity. This means that transformational leadership style is able to achieve this aim and so leaders must adopt this leadership style. Moreover, the relationship between leadership styles and creativity is partially mediated by perceived work control which is a unique contribution of the present study.

The findings of this study showed that transformational leadership is a better predictor of creativity than transactional leadership. Thus, transformational leadership is an increasingly important aspect in today’s competitive organizations to increase creativity among employees. This therefore suggest that it is those particular transformational leader behaviours (i.e.
charismatic behaviour, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation) that have the impact on creativity and so should be adopted by contemporary leaders.

Even though, the study has this unique contribution to organizations, expansion on the present study would allow greater knowledge into the predictors of creativity in all spheres of work organization. Future investigations should increase the sample size and rank of work in the study since the position one holds determines whether he or she will have work autonomy and exhibit higher level of creativity. Further research should continue to examine other personal and contextual factors of the work environment. To extend the findings of this study, several areas for further research are recommended below:

a) Firstly, future research should investigate the relationship between leadership style, perceived work control and creativity using data from multiple sources.

b) Secondly, further research should engage in more eclectic approach by concurrently assessing numerous personal characteristics such as rank of work, age, educational level and type of work (manufacturing and non-manufacturing) in a single study. This will help to better explain the predictive relationships.

c) Moreover, despite the robustness of most of our findings over one sample and time periods, statements about generalizability must await the results of research in additional settings.

d) Lastly, to fully pinpoint causality, an ideal study might sample new employees and track leadership style and perceived work control on creativity outcome among employees over several periods using more objective measure.
In assessing these areas, the methodological limitations encountered in the present study need to be addressed. Future researches with these same variables and also exploring the areas recommended should employ either qualitative research approaches or both qualitative and quantitative approaches, for a better understanding of the interaction effects of all the variables in the study. Qualitative research should be considered because during data collection, the researcher realized participants were eager to explain their feelings further. A longitudinal design can also be adopted over the cross-sectional design, for a better understanding of the long term effect of the variables investigated in this study.

5.3 Summary and Conclusion

In summary, the study was a cross-section design which assessed how leadership styles and perceived work control influence subordinates creativity. The study further examined how demographic characteristics (gender, type of task and tenure of work) influence creativity. The mediation role of perceived control in the relationship between leadership styles and creativity was assessed. The results of the study indicated that Transformational and transactional leadership styles were significantly correlated with subordinate’s creativity. The amount of variance accounted by transformational leadership style was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for transactional leadership style on employee creativity. Internal perceived control and external perceived control were positively related with creativity. The amount of variance accounted by internal perceived control was significantly higher than the amount of variance accounted for external perceived control on creativity. Type of task (routine and non-routine) did not have any significant impact on creativity. There was no significant relationship between tenure of work and level of creativity. Males and females did not differ in their level of creativity. The relationship between leadership styles (transformational and
transactional) and subordinates’ creativity were partially mediated by subordinates’ perceived control.

To conclude, this study has demonstrated that leadership styles and perceived work control have significant influence on creativity but type of task and demographic characteristics (gender and tenure of work) do not have direct relationship with creativity. To promote creative environment in the organizations, two main concerns should be placed, creating the good perception from the employees about reward and good interaction between management and the employees. Kuehn and Al-Busaidi (2002) for instance, concluded that transformational leadership ensure these two main concerns and so should be adopted by leadership if they so desire an effective organization that ensure employee creativity. Management should also design programs to train employees to develop internal work control as means of helping in promoting organizational effectiveness.
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