

# A Study of Proactive Personality, LMX Quality and Employee Creativity in Delhi and NCR Organisations

Nishita Gupta<sup>1\*</sup> and N. K. Chadha<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Sri Aurobindo College, Delhi University, New Delhi - 110017, Delhi, India; nishitagupta88@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Dean, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Chairperson Research and Doctoral Program, Manav Rachna International University, Delhi - 121004, India; nkc\_du@yahoo.co.uk

## Abstract

This study investigated the impact of LMX quality and proactive personality on employee creativity as assessed by their supervisors. On the basis of theoretical linkages among the constructs, a conceptual model and hypotheses were established. The sample was drawn from nine Indian firms in Delhi and NCR. The results suggested that proactive personality and LMX quality contributed to employee creativity. Compared with LMX Quality, however, proactive personality had higher impact on employee creativity. Three of six hypotheses were supported. The relationship between proactive personality, LMX quality and Employee creativity at lower and upper level of management turned out to be non-significant.

**Keywords:** Employee Creativity, LMX Quality, Proactive Personality

**Paper Code:** 16045; **Originality Test Ratio:** 07%; **Submission Online:** 01-April-2017; **Manuscript Accepted:** 11-April-2017; **Originality Check:** 17-April-2017; **Peer Reviewers Comment:** 24-April-2017; **Double Blind Reviewers Comment:** 07-May-2017; **Author Revert:** 13-May-2017; **Camera-Ready-Copy:** 18-May-2017

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays organisations are faced with the constant pressure of fierce domestic and International competition and rapidly changing technological, regulatory, economic, and market conditions. To overcome these hurdles, they are under extensive pressure to become more creative, not just in new product development or marketing but almost in everything that they do. Hence, it is argued that creativity, the first step in the configuration of the innovation process, is an imperative requirement to ensure an organisation's survival, effectiveness and competitive advantage. The theme of the World Economy Forum's 2006 was centered on The Creative Imperatives in response to the pace of change. Various factors have resulted in creativity becoming more crucial across jobs and organizations. For example, creativity has become and will remain vital as organizations and their environments change fundamentally<sup>20,21</sup>, and work designs include more autonomy and as jobs become more complex<sup>32</sup>. In order to adapt, survive, and gain competitive advantage, organizations need to unleash their employees innate creative potential, because employees creative ideas can be used as building blocks for organizational change, competitiveness and innovation<sup>1,48-50</sup>. Human assets are considered as the principal source of value, growth, and sustained competitive advantage. In the 1960's,<sup>18</sup> foresaw the surfacing of knowledge workers who could exert theoretical and analytical knowledge that was gained through formal education to developing new products or services. Hence,

human creativity is the ultimate economic resource, arguing creativity is eventually what raises productivity and hence living standards. Creativity does not occur in a vacuum. Even though it is irrefutable that creativity originates from individual ability, whether or not individual creativity is activated, exercised, and channeled into a final product or service is a result of the work environment, or the contextual characteristics that may be required in supporting and stimulating creativity. The main elements of the contextual characteristics can be grouped into individual, job, group or team, and organizational level factors<sup>42</sup>.

## 2. Problem Statement

Generally, most studies on creativity have focused on personal characteristics, such as cognitive ability and personality, and on the creative few individuals. Focus has moved away from the individual and the creative few towards the contextual view and then towards the integrative view. Research on the effect of contextual characteristics on creativity has been growing since the late 1980s and early 1990s. Also, most research has relied on procedures to assess contextual factors at only one level (i.e., organizational, job or group level) (Zhou & Shalley, 2003). Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin (1993) generate an interactionist model of creativity, asserting that employee creativity is influenced by cross-level factors (i.e., individual, organizational and group). Although researchers have proposed that the integrative view of creativity

is important, little research has been conducted to date. The problem that serves as the basis for this study is that practitioners and researchers need more empirical evidence in terms of an integrative model for employee creativity that directs at investigating the interaction of the personal and contextual characteristics and their effects on employee creativity. The extent of research on creativity has greatened during the past two decades but still lags far behind most significant topics. Sternberg and Lubart<sup>43</sup> studied the number of references to creativity in *Psychological Abstracts*, using the keywords of creativity, creativity measurement and divergent thinking. From 1975 to 1994, only 0.5% of the articles indexed concerned creativity. Ford (1995) reported that, of approximately 1,100 papers presented at the Academy of Management Meeting(1994), no empirical studies of creativity were presented. Although creativity is commonly mentioned in the popular press, it is hard to understand why studies on creativity are so rare among psychology and management scholars. Additionally, creativity models and theories have been developed predominantly in western cultures. Creativity in the international context needs indigenous research, “a type of design in which the researchers prioritize their efforts on identifying and uncovering distinct creativity enhancing or restraining factors that are embedded in a non-western context”. This research is one such effort to respond to these problems.

### 3. Review of Literature

#### 3.1 Proactive Personality and LMX Quality

Proactive personality is a uni-dimensional but complex and multiple-caused construct that has crucial organizational and personal consequences (Crant, 2000). Proactivity is positively related to “a number of significant individual and organizational outcomes, including leadership effectiveness, job performance, tolerance for stress in demanding jobs, participation in organizational initiatives, entrepreneurship and work team performance” (Seibert, Crant and Kraimer(1999)). By definition, employees

with a proactive personality are predisposed to enact their environments (Crant, 2000). One’s social network is a highly salient aspect of the organizational environment. Proactive people are likely to search ways to construct a social environment conducive to their own success on the job. The concept of proactivity is grounded in the interactionist approach described by social cognitive learning theory<sup>9,10</sup>, which has a triadic system (i.e., the person, behaviour, and environment); these three components continuously impact each other<sup>16</sup>. The previous studies of proactive employee behaviours emphasised on socialization during organizational entry (Morrison, 1993). As Thompson<sup>46</sup> described, researchers explored ways in which new employees embrace a proactive role in their own socialization through behavioural self-management<sup>38</sup>, uncertainty reduction<sup>29,30</sup>, and feedback seeking<sup>8</sup>. Similarly, it is expected that proactive personality will influence employee creativity through a social context such as LMX.

#### 3.2 LMX Quality and Employee Creativity

Numerous studies have examined the link between a supervisor’s LMX quality and employee creativity (Shalley et al., 2004). The vast majority of these studies supply substantial support for the expected relationships between controlling (negative) and supportive (positive) LMX quality and creativity (Amabile, 1996;<sup>7,5</sup>; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Amabile & Conti, 1999; Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, & Kramer, 1996; 2004;<sup>28,45</sup>, 2004; Zhou & George, 2003; Shalley & Gibson, 2004). Many studies of supervisory encouragement have pointed to the role of project managers or direct supervisors, particularly in the areas of goal clarity, open interaction between supervisor and subordinates<sup>27</sup>, and supervisory support of a team’s work and ideas<sup>33</sup>. Andrews and Farris (1967) found that scientist’s creativity was higher when their organizations were supportive and when managers listened to employee’s concerns and asked for their input into decisions affecting them. In a similar vein, studies have shown that open interactions with supervisors, support and encouragement improve creativity and innovation (e.g., Kimberly &

**Table 1.** Definitions of Key Terms

Term	Definition
Employee creativity (Outcome variable)	The development of ideas about products, services, practices, processes, and procedures that are judged to be original and novel, and appropriate and potentially useful (Amabile, 1996; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Woodman et al., 1993; Zhou & Shalley, 2003).
LMX quality (Group/social context)	The quality of the interpersonal exchange relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor <sup>23</sup> that is related to employee satisfaction with supervisor and overall satisfaction, performance, commitment, role conflict, role clarity, member competence, and turnover intentions <sup>19</sup> .
Proactive personality (Personal characteristic)	A belief in one’s ability to overcome constraints by situational forces and to affect changes in the environment (Bateman & Crant, 1993) that involves “challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present conditions” <sup>15</sup> , p. 436).

Evanisko, 1981). Therefore, a supportive work environment should complement the creativity requirements of jobs (Shalley et al., 2000). It is likely that perceived supervisory support and open supervisory interactions operate on creativity through the same techniques that are associated with fair, supportive evaluation. Under these circumstances, employees are less likely to experience the fear of negative criticism that can undermine the intrinsic motivation imperative for creativity (Amabile, 1993). Thus, it is likely that the higher the quality of LMX, the higher employee creativity will be.

### 3.3 Proactive Personality and Employee Creativity

Zhou and Shalley (2003) were of the opinion that more in depth research is needed to develop a better understanding of what, why and how certain individual differences along with contextual factors impact the creative performance of employees. Turner (2003) declared that proactive personality is a strong predictor of motivation to learn which in turn gives rise to self development behaviour among employees. The results thus hold an important implication for the learning organizations where an employee's zest to learn can lead to different positive outcomes including creativity and innovation. Joo<sup>25</sup> examined in his study that employees showed the highest creativity when they were supervised in a supportive fashion, worked on complex jobs, the organization had a higher learning culture and employees possessed Proactive Personality that positively affected perceived job complexity and LMX quality. Zhang<sup>51</sup> expressed the role of empowering leadership in influencing creativity among employees through creative process engagement and psychological empowerment as mediators in a study of IT company in China. The study also showed that the proactive characteristics of employees played an important role in bolstering the positive influence of intrinsic motivation and creative process engagement on employee creativity. Using SEM Kim, Hon and Lee<sup>26</sup> in their longitudinal study of newcomers, established a link between Employee Creativity and Proactive Personality which in turn significantly linked to perceived insider status and career satisfaction with a mediation effect. Further, the same study examined that Proactive Personality along with the contextual factors i.e. supportive supervision, complex jobs and a higher learning culture resulted in higher Employee Creativity. In a study of matched pairs of subordinate and superior, it was found that pro-activity among employees led to better exchange of information resulting in higher trust ultimately leading to enhanced creativity among employees. Seibert (1999) found a positive connection between Proactive Personality and the two indicators of career success i.e. objective (promotions and salary) as well as subjective (career satisfaction). Navigating through the literature, Proactive Personality was also found to have a notable

association with successful job search among college graduates work engagement<sup>17</sup>

## 4. Research Methodology

### 4.1 Sample Size

Primary data to test the hypotheses was collected by administering a newly developed structured questionnaire to a sample of 200 individuals (lower and middle level managers) working in 9 different companies.

### 4.2 Sampling Procedures and Design

The population for this study was from employees of 9 companies of Indian industry, which consists of large and small companies from Delhi and NCR. Non-random purposive sampling would be used to select companies from the various public and private sector companies.

Commonly organizations have three management levels: lower-level management, middle-level management, and top-level management. The managers at each level are grouped as per a hierarchy of authority and fulfil varied tasks. In most of the organizations, number of managers at each level gives rise to the organization structure.

This study has been organized into middle and upper level of management. Upper level management includes executive, senior level manager and deputy level manager. Middle level management includes manager, assistant manager and non-management employees.

### 4.3 Data Collection

To collect the appropriate data, a structured questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. A total of 300 employees from 9 different companies working on different levels and designations. Data has been collected from among the companies which belonged to online travel industry, three of the "big four" accounting firms, management consulting firms, IT services firm, an airline company, an American multinational electronic design automation (EDA) software and engineering services company and a prominent firm engaged in manufacturing, supplying and exporting an unparalleled range of Electrical and Electronics Products.

## 5. Description of the Tools

**Employee Creativity-** In the present study, employee creativity of employees is measured by employee creativity questionnaire developed by Zhou and George (2001). The same is adapted and

standardized by the investigator. The scale developed by Zhou and George (2001)<sup>22</sup> is a 13-item scale, which adopts three items from Scott and Bruce<sup>40</sup>.

**LMX Quality-** The 7-item LMX scale developed by Scandura and Graen (1984) was used to measure LMX Quality. The instrument measures the degree to which supervisors and subordinates have mutual respect for each other’s capabilities, feel a deepening sense of reciprocal trust, and have a strong sense of obligation to one another<sup>39</sup>.

**Proactive Personality-** The study used a 10-item scale of the proactivity personality survey (PPS) (Seibert et al., 1999) which is a short version of the instrument originally developed by Bateman and Crant (1993).

Employee Creativity Karl Pearson Correlation method was applied and associations were measured accordingly.

**Table 2.** Relationship Leader-member exchange quality, Proactive Personality and Employee creativity of Indian Companies  
N = 200

Variables of The Study	Leader Member Exchange	Proactive Personality	Employee Creativity
Leader Member Exchange	+1.000		
Proactive Personality	0.526** (0.000)	+1.000	
Employee Creativity	0.579** (0.000)	0.862** (0.000)	+1.000

## 6. Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: **There is no relation between** LMX quality and employee creativity.

Hypothesis 2: **There is no relation between** Proactive personality and employee creativity.

Hypothesis 3: **There is no relation between** Proactive personality and LMX quality.

Hypothesis 4: **There is no difference in employee** creativity at lower and middle level management.

Hypothesis 5: **There is no difference in leader member exchange** at lower and middle level management.

Hypothesis 6: **There is no difference in proactive personality** at lower and middle level management.

The above table shows that there is high degree of positive correlation between employee creativity and leader member exchange (R=+0.579) and Proactive Personality (R=+0.862) and also between LMX Quality and Proactive Personality (R=+0.526).

To examine the relationship between dependent variable (Employee creativity) and Independent Variables (LMX Quality, Proactive Personality) at middle and upper levels of management t test was applied.

Table 3 shows that there is no significant relationship between dependent variable (Employee creativity) and Independent Variables (LMX Quality, Proactive Personality) at middle and upper levels of management. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternate hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance. In other words, there is no significant difference in creativity at middle and upper levels of management.

Middle and upper level of management do not differ significantly with respect to LMX Quality (T=0.034) at 5% level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternate hypothesis is rejected. In other words, leader member exchange is almost same at different management levels.

Middle and upper level of management do not differ significantly with respect to Proactive Personality (T=0.337) at 5% level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted

## 7. Results

Data has been analysed through different statistical tools namely: Karl Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient, Chi Square analysis, Regression analysis, t test and these tools have been done on each dependent (Employee creativity) and independent variables (Leader-member exchange quality, Proactive Personality).

To examine the relations of independent variables such as Leader-member exchange quality, Proactive Personality with

**Table 3.** Mean Response of Employee Creativity on Sample Group of Middle and Upper level Management

S.No.	Dimensions	Management level				t value	significance value
		Middle(n=131)		Upper(n=69)			
		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D		
I	LMX Quality	25.09	4.971	25.12	4.711	0.034	0.973(NS)
II	Proactive Personality	37.04	6.602	37.36	6.191	0.337	0.736(NS)
III	Employee Creativity	49.04	8.043	49.65	7.288	0.530	0.597(NS)

and alternate hypothesis is rejected. In other words, Proactive Personality is almost same at different management levels.

## 8. Discussion and Conclusion

First, all of the correlation coefficients were positive and significant. Second, each measurement model demonstrated an adequate level of reliability (.68 - .95).

The null hypothesis 1, 2 and 3 are not accepted and alternate hypothesis are accepted. In other words, there is significant positive correlation between Proactive Personality and LMX quality, LMX quality and Employee Creativity, and Proactive Personality and Employee Creativity.

The null hypothesis 4, 5 and 6 is accepted and alternate hypothesis is rejected. In other words, there is no significant difference in Employee Creativity, LMX Quality and Proactive Personality at middle and upper levels of management.

## 9. Proactive Personality and Employee Creativity

Today employees are expected to create their own opportunities for growth and development, due to the new employment contract<sup>24</sup>. Accordingly, researchers are paying increased attention to the career impact of having a proactive personality<sup>14,41</sup>; Parker, 1998; Thompson, 2005). While research on proactive personality has been increasing in the last decade, not many studies have investigated the relationship between proactive personality and employee creativity. Narula, Budhiraja and Malhotra<sup>31</sup>, authenticate that Proactive Personality is positively associated with Employee Creativity and also acts as an antecedent to the Employee Creativity. In correlation analysis, a significant association of Proactive Personality with Employee Creativity ( $r = 0.862$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) justifies that the results sync with the findings of the earlier studies that Proactive individuals look for opportunities and act on them, show initiative, take action, and are persistent in successfully implementing change<sup>11</sup>; Crant, 2000). Proactive Personality initiative leads to identification of new ideas for improving work processes (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001) and openness to learn new things<sup>47</sup>.

## 10. Proactive Personality and LMX Quality

Little research on the relationship between proactive personality and LMX quality was identified. Proactive employees who indicated high performance at work strive to build social capital by

means of network building to create the latitude to foster productive change and pursue initiatives within their organizations<sup>35</sup>. In this study proactive personality turned out to be significant ( $r = 0.526$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This is consistent with previous findings. Other research has suggested that there might have been a stronger relationship, as some have suggested that proactive behaviour has become more important in terms of socialization<sup>34,37</sup>. For example, new employees may adopt a proactive role in their own socialization through feedback seeking (Ashford & Cummings, 1985) and behavioural self-management (Saks & Ashforth, 1996). It has been argued that proactive employees do not operate in a social vacuum. Rather, they leverage the support of others in their pursuit of self managed objectives (Thompson, 2005). In this vein, proactive personality may be related to social capital theory that argues that one's relationship network determines the extent to which one can gain access to information, wield influence, and effect change within an organization<sup>13</sup>. As social capital is critical for collective work and effective interpersonal coordination<sup>12</sup>, proactive employees may strive to establish a strong supportive network with his/her supervisor to effect change within the organization (Thompson, 2005).

## 11. LMX Quality and Employee Creativity

LMX quality turned out to be significantly related to employee creativity ( $r = +0.579$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). That is, when LMX quality is higher, employees' creativity was assessed more highly by their supervisors. Several studies have examined the relationship between a supervisor's LMX quality and employee creativity (Shalley et al., 2004). The majority of these studies provided substantial support for the expected relationships between supportive (positive) and controlling (negative) LMX quality and creativity<sup>2,3,4,6</sup>; Amabile & Gryskiewicz, 1989; Andrews & Farris, 1967; Andrews & Gordon, 1970; Madjar et al., 2002; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley & Gibson, 2004; Tierney & Farmer, 2002, 2004; Zhou & George, 2003). Thus, a supportive work environment should complement creativity on the job (Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley et al., 2000). It is likely that open supervisory interactions and perceived supervisory support operate on creativity through the same mechanisms that are associated with fair, supportive evaluation. Under these circumstances, people are less likely to experience the fear of negative criticism that can undermine the intrinsic motivation necessary for creativity. Thus, replicating the previous research, this study confirmed that, when employees perceived higher LMX quality, they were more likely, to engage in creative activities in the workplace.

## 12. References

1. Amabile TM. A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 1988; 10:123–68.
2. Amabile TM. *Creativity in context: Update to the social psychology of creativity*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. 1996.
3. Amabile TM, Conti R. Changes in the work environment for creativity during downsizing. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1999; 42(6):630–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256984>
4. Amabile TM, Schatzel EA, Moneta GB, Kramer SJ. Leader behaviours and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2004; 15:5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003>
5. Amabile TM, Gryskiewicz ND. The creative environment scales: Work environment inventory. *Creativity Research Journal*. 1989; 2:231–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400418909534321>
6. Amabile TM, Conti R, Coon H, Lazenby J, Herron M. Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39:1154–84. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256995>
7. Andrew FM, Farris GF. Supervisory practices and innovation in scientific teams. *Personnel Psychology*. 1967; 20:497–575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1967.tb02446.x>
8. Ashford SJ, Cummings LL. Proactive feedback seeking: The instrumental use of the information environment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. 1985; 58:67–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1985.tb00181.x>
9. Bandura A. *Social learning theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1977.
10. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1986.
11. Bateman TS, Crant JM. The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1993; 14(2):103–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202>
12. Bolino MC, Turnley WH, Bloodgood JM. Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*. 2002; 27(4):505–22. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2002.7566023>. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4134400>
13. Brass DJ. Social capital and organizational leadership. In: Zaccaro SJ, Klimoski RJ editors. *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer. 2001; 132–52.
14. Crant JM. The proactive personality scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1995; 80(4):532–7. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.4.532>
15. Crant JM. Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*. 2000; 26(3):435–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304>
16. Deluga RJ. American presidential proactivity, charismatic leadership, and rated performance. *Leadership Quarterly*. 1998; 9(3):265–91. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(98\)90030-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(98)90030-3)
17. Drown DT. *Work Design Characteristics as Moderators of the Relationship between Proactive Personality and Engagement* (Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University). 2013.
18. Drucker P. The new society of organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, September-October. 1992; 95–104. PMID:10121319
19. Elkins T, Keller RT. Leadership in research and development organizations: A literature review and conceptual framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2003; 14(4-5):587–606. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00053-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00053-5)
20. Ford CM. Creativity is a mystery: Clues from the investigators' notebooks. In: Ford CM, Gioia DA editors. *Creative action in organizations: Ivory tower visions and real world voices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 1995; 12–49. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243535.n2> PMID:7636583
21. Ford CM, Gioia DA. Multiple visions and multiple voices: Academic and practitioner conceptions of creativity in organizations. In: Ford CM, Gioia DA editors. *Creative action in organizations: Ivory tower visions and real world voices* (). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 1995; 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243535.n1> PMID:7598277
22. George JM, Zhou J. When Job Dissatisfaction Leads to Creativity: Encouraging the Expression of Voice. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2001; 44(4):682–96. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069410>
23. Graen GB, Uhl-Bien M. Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*. 1995; 6(2):210–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(95\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5)
24. Hall DT, Moss JE. The new protean career contract: Helping organizations and employees adapt. *Organizational Dynamics*. 1998; 26(3):22–37. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(98\)90012-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(98)90012-2)
25. Joo BKB. The impact of contextual and personal characteristics on employee creativity in Korean firms. University of Minnesota. 2007.
26. Kim TY, Hon AH, Lee DR. Proactive personality and employee creativity: The effects of job creativity requirement and supervisor support for creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*. 2010; 22(1):37–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400410903579536>
27. Kimberly JR, Evanisko MJ. Organizational innovation: The influence of individual, organizational, and contextual factors on hospital adoption of technological and administrative innovations. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1981; 24(4):689–714. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256170>
28. Madjar N, Oldham GR, Pratt MG. There's no place like home? The contributions of work and nonwork creativity support to employees' creative performance. *Academy of Management*. 2002; 45(4):757–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069309>
29. Miller VD, Jablin FC. Information seeking during organizational entry: Influences, tactics, and a model of the process. *Academy of Management Review*. 1991; 16:92–120. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258608>. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1991.4278997>
30. Morrison EW. Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1993; 36:557–89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256592>
31. Narula E, Budhiraja S, Malhotra M. Proactive Personality as an Antecedent of Employee Creativity: A study of Bank employees in India. *I J A B E R*. 2014; 12(4):1353–66.

32. Oldham GR, Cummings A. Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39(3):607–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256657>
33. Organ DW. The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In: Staw BM, Cummings LL editors. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 1990; 12:43–72.
34. Parker SK. Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1998; 83(6):835–52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.6.835> PMID:9885197
35. Parker SK, Wall TD, Cordery JL. Future work design research and practice: Towards an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 2001; 74(4):413–40. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317901167460>
36. Parker SK, Wall TD, Jackson PR. That's not my job: Developing flexible employee work orientations. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1997; 40:899–929. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256952>
37. Parker SK, Williams HM, Turner N. Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2006; 91(3):636–52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.636> PMID:16737360
38. Saks AM, Ashforth BE. Proactive socialization and behavioural self management. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 1996; 48(3):301–23. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0026>
39. Scandura TA, Graen GB. Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1984; 69(3):428–36. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.428>
40. Scott SG, Bruce RA. Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1994; 37(3):580–607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256701>
41. Seibert SE, Crant JM, Kraimer ML. Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1999; 84(3):416–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416> PMID:10380421
42. Shalley CE, Gibson LL. What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2004; 15(1):33–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.004>
43. Sternberg RJ, Lubart TI. The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. 1999; 3–15.
44. Tierney P, Farmer SM, Graen GB. An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships. *Personnel Psychology*. 1999; 52(3):591–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1999.tb00173.x>
45. Tierney P, Farmer SM. Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 2002; 45(6):1137–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069429>
46. Thompson JA. Proactive personality and job performance: A social capital perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2005; 90(5):1011–7. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.1011> PMID:16162073
47. Turner JE. Proactive personality and the Big Five as predictors of motivation to learn (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University). 2003.
48. Woodman RW, Sawyer JE, Griffin RW. Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review*. 1993; 18(2):293–321. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258761>. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1993.3997517>
49. Zhou J, George JM. Awakening employee creativity: The role of leader emotional intelligence. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 2003; 14(4-5):545–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(03\)00051-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00051-1)
50. Zhou J, Shalley CE. Research on employee creativity: A critical review and directions for future research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*. 2003; 12:165–217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-7301\(03\)22004-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0742-7301(03)22004-1)
51. Zhang X. Linking empowerment and employee creativity: The mediating roles of creative process engagement and intrinsic motivation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park). 2007.

**Citation:**

**Nishita Gupta and N. K. Chadha**  
 “A Study of Proactive Personality, LMX Quality and Employee Creativity in Delhi and NCR Organisations”,  
*Global Journal of Enterprise Information System*. Volume-9, Issue-2, April-June, 2017. (<http://informaticsjournals.com/index.php/gjeis>)

**Conflict of Interest:**

Author of a Paper had no conflict neither financially nor academically.