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Abstract
The purpose of this study is to investigate what conditions can promote the creative performance of employees in the workplace. Notwithstanding lack of previous empirical studies linking between employee’s supervisor, psychological empowerment, innovative climate and organizational support to employee creativity and performance, this study attempts to integrate the results of 57 related studies that have examined in cross-level organizations from the year 1990-2011 by using the meta analytic technique. Employee creativity and performance are good, when there are high quality relationships between the employee and his/her supervisor. Likewise, psychological empowerment contributes significantly to employee creativity and performance. Additionally, organizational support and innovative climate moderate the effect of leader and psychological empowerment on employee creativity and employee performance.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Research background

Creativity has become increasingly valued across a variety of tasks, jobs, and industries. In a dynamic work environment, more and more managers are realizing that they need their employees to be actively involved in their work and exhibit creative behaviors in order to remain competitive (Mumford et al., 2002). Nowadays, understanding the dynamics of creativity in organizations is a high priority in organizational behavior research (Zhou & Shalley, 2008).

According to Amabile (1998), individual creativity is classified by three components: expertise, creative-thinking skills, and motivation. Managers can influence these components-for better and worse-through workplace practices and conditions. Expertise and creative-thinking skills are more difficult and time consuming to achieve than motivation. Intrinsic motivation stimulates high level of persistence and creative effort in work contexts where creativity is clearly valued. While some theories of creativity suggest that creative work is primarily sustained by intrinsic motivation (Amabile, 1998), emerging research evidence suggests that extrinsic rewards can complement intrinsic motivation.

Several recent studies of leadership have examined the influence of leaders on employees’ creative behaviors. Followers’ creativity achievement is likely to be mediated primarily by their degrees of psychological involvement in creative processes (Carmeli & Schaubroeck, 2007). In linking to creativity, theoretical have suggested that psychological empowerment, in turn, makes a critical contribution to employee creativity by positively affecting an employee’s intrinsic motivation (Amabile et al., 1996; Spreitzer, 1995). Psychological empowerment is conceptualized as an experienced psychological state or set of cognitions (Zhang & Bartol, 2010). Therefore, this study aims to test the potential impact of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support, LMX, and psychological empowerment to employee creativity and
employee performance by using the systematic and quantitative meta-analytic review from cross-level organizations. Simultaneously, the indirect effects of innovative climate and organizational support that contribute significantly to employee creativity and performance in the workplace are evaluated accordingly.

1.2. Research objective

Based on the above research motivation, the objectives of this study are: (1) to investigate the antecedents of employee creativity and employee performance; (2) to investigate the positive influence of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX to psychological empowerment; and (3) to investigate the influence of employee creativity on employee performance.

2. Literature review and hypotheses development

2.1. Employee creativity

Creativity is not only generated from the overall firm strategy and access to resources but more fundamentally from the minds of the individual employees, alone or with others, carrying out the work of the organization every day. Creativity is derived from an individual’s accumulated creative thinking skills and expertise based on their formal educations and past experiences (Amabile, 1998; Gong et al., 2009; Tierney et al., 1999). How necessary to which employees will produce creative-novel and useful-ideas depends not only on their individual characteristics but also on the work environment that they believe around them (Amabile et al., 1996).

Creativity is important to organizations because creative contributions can not only help organizations become more efficient and more responsive to opportunities, but also help organizations adapt to change, grow and compete in the global market. Researchers have mentioned that some level of creativity is needed in almost any job (Shalley, Gilson, & Blum, 2000; Unsworth, 2001; Ford & Gioia, 2000). Specifically, creativity influences innovation implementation. For example, when considering the tasks performed by R&D professionals, employee creativity is desirable and necessary. Shalley and Gilson (2004) further indicated that even for the jobs of cashiers or assembly line workers, an incremental change in how work can be done efficiently is still dependent on employee creativity.

2.2. Employee performance

Employee work performance is multidimensional and critical for organizational success (Dyne, et al., 2002) and effectiveness (Ohly & Fritz, 2010). Work performance is described as “synonymous with behavior it is what people do that can be observed and measured in terms of each individual’s experience or level of contribution” (Pulakos et al., 2000, p. 612). George and Jones (2008) further indicated that performance can be viewed as an evaluation of the results of a person’s behavior which includes determining how well or poorly a task has been completed.

Performance provides a comprehensive picture of subordinate workplace behavior (Kacmar, Collins, Harris & Judge, 2009), therefore several researchers have carried out studies on job performance behaviors with regard to supervisor rated task performance (Andrews, Kacmar, & Harris, 2009), organizational citizenship behavior (Andrew, et al., 2009; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Kacmar, et al., 2009), and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

2.3. Person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX

The match between characteristics of individuals and their work environments is commonly connected to as person-environment fit (P-E fit). A last form of P-E fit that exists in the dyadic relationships between individuals and their supervisors is likely to impact both employee motivation and organizational effectiveness (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2010; Werbel & Johnson, 2001). The fundamental of person-supervisor fit (P-S fit) is to create organizational values and individual employees’ perceptions of working environment.

Supervisor characteristics may be an important factor influencing employees’ behaviors and attitudes (Van Vianen, et al., 2010). If employees feel that their values fit with their leaders, this may make them feel satisfied with their job and work environment (Wexley, Alexander, Greenawalt, & Couch, 1980). The componental theory of creativity helps achieve as the theoretical basis for the claim that supervisor’s support “exerts and influence on subordinates’ creativity through direct help with the project, the development of subordinates expertise, and the enhancement of subordinate intrinsic motivation” (Amabile et al., 2004, p.6).
Moreover, theory and research have noted that an influential way to energize the workplace and increase involvement in the job is through high-quality interpersonal relationships (Dutton, 2003). Relationships between leader and subordinate have been examined in leader member exchange (LMX) literature (Liden et al., 1997). And some studies have focused on relationship between leader-member exchange and creativity (Elkins & Kelles, 2003; Tierney et al., 1999). Therefore, the effects of positive consequences from person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX on employee creativity are investigated in this study. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 1: The degree of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX has a positive influence on employee creativity.

Empirical studies provide suggesting evidence that person-supervisor fit is an important determinant of long-term consequences for employee work performance (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005). It is mentioned that P-S fit would explain significant variance in job performance. Hence, supervisors should work on encouraging and supporting their employees as well as developing fostering relationships. Several studies of supervisory encouragement suggested that the role of projects managers or direct supervisors, especially in goal clarity, open interaction, and supervisor support of a team’s work has a great impact on employee performance (Joo, 2011).

Furthermore, leader member exchange (LMX) is a key view of leadership that emphasizes the quality of relationship between leader and subordinate. Such relationship derived from work and emotional exchanges and the quality connections should, more or less, be related to employee performance. Previous research has demonstrated that the LMX quality is positively related to support and creates a sense of commitment in individuals, who tend reciprocate through higher levels of performance (Joo, 2011). Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 2: The degree or person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX have a positive influence in employee performance.

2.4. Psychological empowerment

Pieterse, van Knippenberg, Schippers, and Stam (2010, p. 613) indicated that “psychological empowerment is a motivational construct originating in an employee’s perception of having choice in initiating and regulating actions, having the ability to perform the job well (i.e., self-efficacy), being able to have an impact on the environment, and the meaningfulness of the job.” Thomas and Velthouse (1990) defined empowerment as an intrinsic motivation demonstrated in four cognitions reflecting an individual’s orientation to his/her work role: meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact. Meaning is the part of the job characteristics model which concerns a sense of individual’s work goal is important (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Competence refers to self-efficacy specific to work or an individual’s belief in their capacity to perform work activities with skill (Bandura, 1988; Gist, 1987; Spreitzer, 1995). Self-determination is an individual’s perception of having choice in initiating and deciding on the work methods used to carry out tasks (Deci et al., 1989; Spreitzer, 1995). Impact indicates “the degree to which an individual’s behavior can influence the strategic, administrative, or operational outcome at work” (Spreitzer, 1995, p.1443).

A key objective of psychological empowerment is to release the potential within employees to make a positive change in their work roles, work units, or organization (Seibert et al., 2011). Empowerment is one of the most important factors driving organizational effectiveness and individual task performance (Ahearne et al., 2005), and it has the potential to positively influence outcomes that benefit both individual and organizational outcome levels (Liden et al., 2000). This study defined psychological empowerment as the process of putting employees in charge of an organization’s authority to make important decisions and to be responsible to achieving their creativity and performance. Thus the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3: The degree of psychological empowerment has a positive influence on employee creativity.

Hypothesis 4: The degree of psychological empowerment has a positive influence on employee performance.

Spreitzer, Lam and Fritz (2008) concluded that a supportive, trusting relationship with one’s leader is an important contextual antecedent of psychological empowerment. High Person-Supervisor fit perceptions may ultimately lead to employees’ positive perceptions of empowerment based upon their individual psychological response to their work environment (Kraimer et al., 1999; Van Vianen et al., 2010) and play in shaping the work experience of followers (Liden et al., 2010). Liu, Keller and Shih (2011) further
indicated that contextual factors such as organizational culture and top level support can be viewed as an influencing empowerment.

Two key social relationships at work are those with superiors and subordinate have been used to examine in leader member exchange (LMX) literature (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). With an LMX approach, leaders are expected to provide the support and resources to subset of their subordinates. Higher levels of decision-making influence and responsibility provide meaning, feelings of self-efficacy, a sense of impact, and perceptions of self-determination that are defined as being key ingredients of empowerment (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Spreitzer, 1995). Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

**Hypothesis 5:** The degree of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX has a positive influence on psychological empowerment.

“Creative efforts lay the groundwork for creative performance in at least three ways: creative effort reflects the extent to which the individual seeks new information and ideas, whether they explore new approaches regardless of their difficulty, and the levels of persistence in this information searching process” (Hirst et al., 2009, p. 966). Empirical study defined a link between creative efforts to foster creative performance.

Creative responses may include thinking up new procedures or processes for carrying out tasks, or identifying products or services to better meet customer needs (Zhou & Shalley, 2004). It may also take the form of refinements of existing procedures or processes to enhance efficiency or to look for alternative procedures or processes that are more effective. According to Amabile et al., 1996, when employees exhibit creativity at work, they generate novel responses that are useful in dealing with tasks at hand. Zhang and Bartol (2010) found that there was a curvilinear relationship between creative process engagement and employee overall job performance. Therefore, this study proposed that there is a positive influence of employee creativity on employee performance. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

**Hypothesis 6:** The degree of employee creativity has a positive influence on employee performance.

### 2.5. Innovative climate

The climate concept has been described as employees’ perceptions of their organizations. The dominant approach conceptualizes climate as employees’ shared perceptions of organizational events, practices, and procedures (Patterson et al., 2005). It is assumed to be primarily descriptive rather than affective or evaluative. The main purpose of an organizational climate study is to recognize the variables which result in an organization’s ability to organize its workforce in order to achieve business goals and enhance performance (Abbey & Dickson, 1983; Baer & Frese, 2003).

Research has found that structures of organization that promote open, ongoing contact with others or information seeking from multiple sources were relates to creativity (Shalley et al., 2004). Justice and fairness climate have to be in innovative climate. Fair context is one where individuals can focus on their work. Component of procedural justice for instance, being able to participate in decision making and it found to be a key process in enhancing innovation (West & Anderson, 1996). One of the keys to remain competitive advantage for organizations is to promote the continuously innovative atmosphere to set in movement in its internal processes, procedures, and capabilities (Merrifield, 2000; Chen & Huang, 2007).

Through formulating an innovative climate, employees are encouraged to think freely and communicate their opinions and ideas openly, employees, thus, are more willing to interact with others for sharing knowledge and creating thoughts (Edmonson, 1999; Jaw & Liu, 2003; Norrgren & Schaller, 1999). Chen and Huang (2007, p.106) claimed that “an innovative climate will increase the social interaction among organizational members.” Specifically, when innovative ideas occur to individuals, cooperation between individuals becomes extremely important for developing and implementing these ideas (Jaw & Liu, 2003; Sveiby & Simons, 2002). Such effective collaboration leads to competitive advantages of the firm (Gibson, 2001; Spender & Grant, 1996). Thus the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 7a:** The characteristics of innovative climate contribute significantly on employee creativity.

**Hypothesis 7b:** The characteristics of innovative climate contribute significantly on employee performance.

### 2.6. Organizational support

The concept of perceived organizational support (POS) originally introduced by Eisenberger et al. (1986) to explain how the development of employee commitment to an organization can link to job performance
Eisenberger et al. (1986, p. 501) suggested that “employees develop global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being”. The general forms of perceived favorable treatment received from organization (i.e., fairness, supervisor support, organizational rewards and job conditions) should increase POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Employee with high perceived support would be predicted loyalty and also be associated with expectancies. Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) in their meta-analysis found that POS positively related to performance and expectancies such as opportunities for greater recognition, pay and promotion. And employees may attempt to be creative when they perceive that creativity is valued and supported by an organization (Scott & Bruce, 1994). This conditions make the potential risk associated with creativity is minimized and perception of creative ideas being effective should be high (Madjar, 2008). Thus the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 8a: The characteristics of organizational support contribute significantly to employee creativity.

Hypothesis 8b: The characteristics of organizational support contribute significantly to employee performance.

3. Methodology

3.1. The research model and construct measurement

The conceptual framework in figure 1 describes the relationships between employee creativity and employee performance with its antecedents based on the literature review.

<Insert Figure 1 about here>

3.2. Procedure

This meta-analysis searched the acquired empirical studies in different scientific database in order to identify the studies relevant to the research. This performed an extensive electronic and manual search using the keywords of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support, leader member exchange, psychological empowerment, innovative climate and organizational support to identify published articles, conference papers, working papers and doctoral dissertations from sources as aforementioned in table 1.

<Insert Table 1 about here>

4. Analysis

All identified studies were examined and then determined the following relevant variables: authors, year, journal, total sample size, the statistic measurement of each variable, and effect sizes. Two alternatives were used for inclusion: (1) Correlational studies have to present the correlation coefficient (r) or the standardized regression (beta) coefficient. Peterson and Brown (2005) investigated the empirical relationship between simple correlation coefficients and standardized regression slopes as the effect-size metric from published articles in behavioral journals. The result indicate that under certain conditions, using knowledge of corresponding beta coefficients to input missing correlations (effect sizes) generally produces relatively accurate population effect-size estimates; (2) Studies have to present the related statistic (t-test, p-value) for the relationship between related variables. These statistics could be converted to effect size (r) and Fisher Z effect using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) Software. Then comparing and combining effect sizes and significance levels. In addition, this paper also incorporated those studies that provided only the standardized regression (beta) coefficients using the formula suggested by Peterson and Brown (2005) to estimate the correlations from the beta coefficients. The formula used is $r = 0.98\beta + 0.05\gamma$, where $\lambda$ is a variable that equals 1 when $\beta$ is non-negative and 0 when $\beta$ is negative.

There is also homogeneity analysis which tests whether the assumption that all of the effect sizes are estimating the same population mean is a reasonable assumption. Homogeneity of the effect size distribution was tested by the Q statistic proposed by Cochran and defined (Hedges, 1981; Hedges & Olkin, 1985) as,

$$Q = \sum w_i(T_i - \overline{T})^2$$
where $W_i$ is the weighting factor for the $i$th study assuming a fixed-effects model, and $f_i$ is defined as the usual estimate of a mean effect size consists of weighting every effect estimate by its inverse variance. $W_i$ Under the null hypothesis, the Q statistic is distributed as an asymptotic chi-square with degree of freedom calculated by $k - 1$ where $k$ is the total number of effect sizes. The null hypothesis of the Q statistic is that the effect sizes are homogeneous. If $Q$ values higher than critical point for a given significance level ($\alpha$) enable us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude there is statistically significant between-study variation.

5. Results

The findings of this study prove all of the hypotheses. It shows all from 57 previous studies prove for the influences of antecedents (including person-supervisor fit, supervisor support, leader member exchange, psychological empowerment, innovative climate and organizational support) on employee creativity and employee performance. Table 2 presents the results from integration of effect sizes of the variable. Reminds as stated in Lipsey and Wilson (2001) for analyzing the magnitude of effect sizes ($r < 0.10$ as small; $r = 0.25$ as medium, and $r > 0.40$ as large effect size).

<Insert Table 2 about here>

Hypothesis 1 proposes that the degree of person-supervisor fit, supervisor support and LMX has a positive influence on employee creativity. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.383, which means these two variables have medium effect size. Hypothesis 2 proposes the degree of P-S fit, supervisor support and LMX has a positive influence on employee performance. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.267, which means these two variables have medium effect size. Hypothesis 3 proposes the degree of psychological empowerment has a positive influence on employee creativity. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.345, which means these two variables have medium effect size. Hypothesis 4 proposes the degree of psychological empowerment has a positive influence on employee performance. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.337, which means these two variables have medium effect size. Hypothesis 5 proposes the degree of P-S fit, supervisor support and LMX has a positive influence on psychological empowerment. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.486, which means these two variables have large effect size. Hypothesis 6 proposes the degree of employee creativity has a positive influence on employee performance. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.413, which means these two variables have large effect size.

Hypothesis 7a proposes the characteristics of innovative climate contribute significantly on employee creativity. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.472, which means these two variables have large effect size. Hypothesis 7b proposes the characteristics of innovative climate contribute significantly on employee performance. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.224, which means these two variables have small medium effect size. Hypothesis 8a proposes the characteristics of organizational support contribute significantly to employee creativity. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.523, which means these two variables have large effect size. Hypothesis 8b proposes the characteristics of organizational support contribute significantly to employee performance. The results show coefficient correlation of these two variables is 0.359, which means these two variables have medium effect size.

6. Conclusion

The study has integrated the quantitative research that exists in the workplace that should be of interest to leaders within a framework of how leaders can manage their human resources to enhance employee creativity and performance. The practical implications for day-to-day management of creative people should be highlighted. First, across the empirical studies reviewed, individuals need to feel they are working in supportive work environment. Second, leaders should communicate and support the goal or role requirements of being creative in the workplace to employee and encourage them through the behaviors leaders engage in creative ways. Third, organizational support and innovative climate develop employee’s creativity in a collective endeavor and involves collaboration and interactions with others and help to achieve his/her better performance at work.

To extend the findings of this study, there are some recommendations for future investigations. Future research might examine leader in upper level from supervisor contribute significantly on employee creativity and performance. Future research should examine whether the mediating of psychological empowerment have significant influences between supervisor to employee creativity and performance. In
addition, future research should examine the moderating variables of organizational support and innovative climate have significant influences between leader and psychological empowerment to employee creativity and employee performance.
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Annexure

Figure 1. Conceptual framework
Table 1. Studies alphabetically by source and codes for hypotheses tests a, b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Study Details</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Study Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amabile, et al., 2004 (SPV, EC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raub &amp; Robert C., 2010 (PE, EP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordin, et al., 2007 (SPV, PE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spreitzer, G.M., 1995 (PE, EC, EP, IC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen, C.J. &amp; Huang, J-W., 2007 (EC, IC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tierney, P., 1999 (EC, IC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang, C-F., &amp; Hsieh, T-S., 2012 (EP, OS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tierney, P. et al., 2004 (SPV, PE, EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, W.N., &amp; Meyer D.G., 2008 (EC, IC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Vianen, et al., 2011 (SPV, PE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenberger, et al., 2002 (EC, OS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wei, F., et al., 2010 (SPV, PE, EC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergeneli, et al., 2007 (SPV, PE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yoon, J., &amp; Lim, J-C., 1999 (EP, OS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilson, L.L., &amp; Shalley C.E., 2004 (EC, IC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zhou, J., &amp; George, J.M., 2001 (EC, OS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Codes in parentheses: SPV=Person-Supervisor Fit, Supervisor Support, & Leader-Member Exchange; PE=Psychological Empowerment; EC=Employee Creativity; EP=Employee Performance; IC=Innovative Climate; OS=Organizational Support.

### Tabel 2. Meta-analysis of the antecedents on employee creativity and employee performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyp P</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Effect Size &amp; 95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antecedents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13252</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Person-Supervisor Fit</td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9727</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational-level factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Innovative Climate</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7836</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Innovative Climate</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>Employee Creativity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>0.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25347</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>