

A Pilot Investigation of the Determinants of Workplace Innovation Behaviour in Service Industry of Pakistan

Saima Rafique¹ Naveed R. Khan^{2,*}

¹Department of Management Sciences, SZABIST Larkana, Pakistan, ²Department of Management Sciences, Bahria University, Karachi, Pakistan

Email: saimarafique2002@gmail.com

*Email: naveed.r.khan@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to establish as well as examine the validity and reliability of the instrument to measure the antecedents of workplace innovation behaviour of women. The instrument was adopted and adapted from the original sources and data collected from 46 women employees was analyzed. The content and face validity were analyzed by experts of field and internal construct validity was also measured. The reliability of instrument was measured by internal consistent reliability through alpha coefficient along with intra-class correlation coefficients. Construct validity was measured by analyzing convergent and discriminant validity. Moreover, criterion-related validity was measured through correlation coefficients and internal construct validity was also analyzed by inter-item correlations and co-variances. The inter-item correlation for the variables used in the study shows that each item of the study correlates to all other items. All the items correlate with one another, though there are some lower values as well representing that those items have low correlation with each other but are considered acceptable. Statistical analysis suggested that test measures for constructs are reliable with the researchers' comprehension of the nature of factors. All items met the level of acceptability. Hence, the results suggested that adapted instrument is valid and reliable in context of the selected respondents in Pakistan and a large-scale analysis can be done through this instrument.

Keywords: Workplace Innovation, LMX, Validity, Reliability, Women.

1. Introduction

Women make up 48.5% and 69.3% of total labor force in the world and developing economies respectively (Verick, 2018b). In 2018, Pakistani women's participation rate was 25.12% in 2019,

and it has been on rise since 2010 (PFLFP-TheGlobalEconomy.com, 2018). Women's growing share in the labor force has convinced researchers to investigate various aspects of women's workplace behavior but innovation. Workplace innovation behavior is described as intended efforts to create, promote, and implement innovative ideas so as to benefit work performance in groups and organizations (Agarwal & Bhargava, 2014; Bos-Nehles & Veenendaal, 2019). Workplace innovation is considered essential in routine tasks within those organizations that wish to remain competitive in turbulent business environments (Pan et al., 2017). Theory suggests that organizational factors affect innovation behaviors in the workplace. For example, earlier studies have reported leader role expectation (Subramaniam et al., 2010), expectations related to image and performance outcomes (Yuan and Woodman, 2010), and learning goal orientation (Montani et al., 2014) as determinants of workplace innovation behavior. The relationship between workplace innovation behavior and its antecedents is expected to be controlled by gender to some extent (Belghiti-Mahut et al., 2016; Nählinder & Eriksson, 2019).

The engagement of women in working activities in Pakistan is widespread and their contribution varies from formal to the informal sector. With this growing participation of female workforce in labor market having different employment statuses, it becomes evident that females contribute significantly in economic activities (Verick, 2018). The participation of female employees has been on the rise as the role of women is undergoing a dramatic change worldwide. Women share the spotlight with men almost in all the fields, and in particular organizations are focusing on diversity as a way forward to increase their competitive edge and effectiveness (A. M. B. Mirza & Jabeen, 2011). The progress of women in education, employment, healthcare, and politics is considered uneven, albeit there have been dramatic changes around the globe. Women are still facing difficulties and challenges in countries with strong cultures and traditions. Thus, women's role in the organizational settings is needed to be equal as that of their male counterparts in order to excel in different ways.

Organizations fostering the climates of change and innovation must be aware that whether they affect all the employees to the same extent (Shanker et al., 2017). It should also be figured out that every employee is getting similar chances to be innovative and creative within their organization. Considering the differences in roles and functions among staff, perhaps the major discrepancy can arise between male and female employees. In a society like ours it is doubted that whether women can face and handle difficult situations and their competence is also questioned. Hence, there is a

need to evaluate the role of female employees in different organizational settings to determine how they respond when they are confronted with challenges, and whether they can play a better role in bringing positive outcomes within workplace.

Gender diversity and innovation are repeatedly found to be positively related (Ostergaard et al., 2011; Pitcher & Smith, 2001; Teruel et al., 2015; Torchia et al., 2011). Gender diversity is known as balance between male and female genders (Ostergaard et al., 2011), which includes knowledge diversity, skills and experiences (Mirza et al., 2012). These can perhaps be complimented by each other and lead to development and innovation (Zhang & Luo, 2020). As innovation is widely acknowledged as the most important factor for business and economies alike (Wojnicka-Sycz & Sycz, 2016), it has been seen that role of women in innovation is understated, however, the gender diversity plays an important role in promoting innovations in firms of developed nations (Østergaard et al., 2011; Ritter-Hayashi, Vermeulen, & Knobens; Teruel et al., 2015). It is observed that men and women having different experiences and career orientations also differ in human and social capital backgrounds (Lin, 2000), who in turn bring diversified knowledge base and different set of skills. Consequently, they lead to innovation in the organization (Quintana-García & Benavides-Velasco, 2008). Research has also shown that women are more likely to support flexible work atmosphere, which enhances interaction and creates interpersonal relationships to expand idea and knowledge sharing (Sandberg, 2003). Ultimately, innovation is benefited because of rich interaction and communication exchanges (Østergaard et al., 2011). Moreover, literature suggested that leaders in the firm can also significantly influence on the ability of innovation and change of an employee.

According to leadership theorists, leader behavior is one of the most important predictors of workplace innovation and employee creativity (Qu et al., 2017). LMX theory pertains to the relationship quality and interactions between a leader and his followers in order to determine the attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of followers (Wang et al., 2017). These positive outcomes further lead to benefit the organization (Dulebohn et al., 2012). Among other leadership styles, LMX is found to be effective in creating and promoting employees' innovative work behavior (Schermuly et al., 2013; Volmer et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2017). Organizations offering schedule flexibility are benefited with constructive employee outcomes, because employees feel valued by organization and they are more likely to engage in positive behaviors. Schedule flexibility improves employee efficiency, and work focus (Kossek & Lambert, 2005). However, even though LMX and schedule

flexibility can lead to better employee outcomes, the knowledge on whether it may lead to innovative behavior among women employees is still dormant.

Workplace innovation is achieved through different employee behaviors, of which empowerment has progressively become important factor in predicting innovation at workplace. There is wide evidence which links empowerment to work behaviours of employees supported by Social Cognitive Theory, which deals in human functioning through cognitive processes (Bandura, 1986). It is likely that empowered employees are more inclined to generate new ideas and innovative attributes, which ultimately leads to increase their ability to respond more effectively in confronting extensive changes of work environments. In other words, empowered employee is said to respond to changes more quickly and is engaged in innovating new ideas at workplace. Bruns & Stalker, (1961), highlighted that change is an essential and important part of creativity which entails organizational adaptation and growth, but it also causes difficulties for employees who confront change.

To assess and quantify the workplace innovation and its antecedents this study aims to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaires. A well-established instrument accurately assesses any defined variable then it is considered as a valid instrument for that variable. An instrument is valid when it is measuring what is claimed to measure. Validity can be categorized as; face validity, criterion validity, and content validity and construct validity. Face validity can be defined as whether the test is valid or not apparently. Criterion validity is demonstrated in the actual study to develop its requirement. It entails a good knowledge of theory relating to the concept and a measure of the relationship between measure and factors. Whereas, content validity is used to assess the content of items, whether it measures the concept being measured in the study. Finally, the construct validity is used to check an instrument to accurately measure a theoretical construct that it is designed to measure. Moreover, reliability, on the other hand, checks which test scores are free from measurement error. Reliability concerns with a measurement of a phenomenon that provides stable and consistent results. It is a measure of stability or internal consistency of an instrument measuring certain concepts.

2. Literature Review

2.1. LMX, Schedule Flexibility and Employee Empowerment

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory focuses on a dyadic relationship between a leader and his followers. In support, O'Donnell et al., (2012) suggested that LMX develops dyadic

process through which different roles are created by interaction of leader and followers, resulting in an exchange process between them, and are affected by leaders' behavior. Relationships created in high LMX are said to be obligatory and support reciprocation thereby rendering socially constructed relations (Gouldner, 1960; Wayne et al., 1997). On the other hand, low quality LMX relationships, which are based on economic exchanges, are "formally agreed on", "immediate", and/or "equitable reciprocation of tangible assets". These include employment contracts focusing on pay for performance (Blau, 1968). Since LMX is established through norms of reciprocity (Homans, 1958a) and exchange theory (Blau, 1964), it is proposed that behavioral outcomes of engaged parties are controlled by mutual standards developed during the interaction process (Blau, 1964; Homans, 1958b).

Employee empowerment is a continuation from being powerless to being empowered. This notion is supported by various authors who focused on the role of managers in empowering employees (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Honold, 1997). Empowerment can also be viewed as a power process through which employees achieve a sense of competence and control (Idris et al., 2018). LMX theory proposes that several quality relationships are formed between a supervisor and subordinates. In high quality in-group relationships, members are supposed to receive greater support, trust, rewards, and other privileges from their supervisors. On the other hand, members in low quality relationships are treated otherwise. The literature shows positive outcomes with respect to LMX relationship quality (Gerstner & Day, 1997), and employee empowerment (Seibert et al., 2004).

To link LMX relationship quality with employee empowerment, Social Exchange Theory (SET) proposes that exchange of resources between supervisors and subordinates may lead to positive as well as negative outcomes (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In other words, when LMX and empowerment are high, positive outcomes are expected and vice versa. Under SET, it is posited that high quality LMX relationships lead to employee empowerment, which enables employees to perform well, make them satisfied with work, and encourage them to engage in extra-role behaviors (Kim et al., 2017).

One of the most important aspects of workplace flexibility is schedule flexibility (Jacob et al., 2008; Jeffrey Hill et al., 2008). Schedule flexibility is a work characteristic that is increasingly favored by employees because it provides ease of changing work hours (McGuire & Liro, 1986). It reduces role conflicts and personal stress to improve work attitudes (Krausz et al., 2000; Sparks

et al., 2001). According to Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristic theory, schedule flexibility is expected to have positive impact on employee empowerment. The job characteristic theory suggests that autonomy is one of the important factors that affect psychological empowerment. Autonomy is the degree to which employees are given freedom to manage and schedule their work while determining procedures that are used to carry it out (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). In their study of empowerment, Kim et al., (2017) found salient effects of schedule flexibility on empowerment among South Korean employees. Therefore, it is suggested that when employees are provided with flexible work schedules, they feel more empowered and have positive feelings about their work. Likewise, SET theory posits that organizations create basis for reciprocity with employees when they grant employees specialized work arrangements (Hornung et al., 2008).

2.2. Employee Empowerment, Response to Change and Workplace Innovation Behavior

There is an increasing interest in employees' attitude towards change entailing current situations where labels and definitions of constructs pertaining to change are used interchangeably such as, readiness to change, resistance to change, commitment to change, openness to change, and response to change (Oreg et al., 2007). Piderit (2000) conceptualized employee's response to change as a three-dimensional construct comprising of emotional, cognitive, and intentional dimension. Emotional dimension ranges from strong negative (fear or anger) to strong positive emotions (happiness or excitement). Cognitive dimension ranges from strong negative (change may lead to failure) to strong positive (change essential for success) beliefs. Lastly, intentional response to change might be positive (to support change) or negative (to oppose change) (Piderit, 2000). To ensure positive employee attitude towards organizational change, empowerment seems to receive wide support in organizational change literature (Appelbaum et al., 2012).

Erstad (1997) defined empowerment as a change strategy to improve organizations' as well as individuals' ability to act. Through empowerment, organizations create a culture where employees develop their response to change (Erstad, 1997). Empowering employees can help organizations change (transform) successfully from current state to the desired one (Paper et al., 2001). In earlier studies, empowerment is found to have positive relationship with strategic change

implementation (Lines, 2007). When employees feel autonomous and empowered, they are likely to be open to change.

Workplace innovation is defined as “new and combined interventions within the organizations, HRM, and supportive technologies” (Pot, 2011). It is also explained as “the process implemented within organizations when they are confronted with changes in terms of managing and organizing human and material resources, which can be beneficial for enhancing organizational performance” (Pot et al., 2012). Earlier studies reported various factors that have been studied as chief determinants of innovative work behavior on both organizational and individual levels (e.g. Janssen, Van de Vliert, & West, 2004; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002; Sanders, Moorkamp, Torka, Groeneveld, & Groeneveld, 2010; Taştan, 2013). Several authors have studied differences of individuals and their effects on innovative work behaviors by focusing on personal-characteristics (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004; Woodman et al., 1993; Yuan & Woodman, 2010), cognitive features of individuals (Dorenbosch et al., 2005; Scott & Bruce, 1994), and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Farr & Ford, 1990). The pioneering study of Hurt et al. (1977) revealed that willingness to change is a personality-based aspect of individual innovation at work.

3. Research Methodology

Since it is important to pretest the validity and reliability of the instruments used in the study before conducting a larger survey, this pilot study was needed to be carried out. Pilot test is a pre-requisite for conducting the main study as it provides researcher with an opportunity to assess, refine, and modify the scales used. For analyzing the reliability and correlation of the instrument, it is suggested that 30 records are enough to be included in pilot study (Hair et al., 2010).

The purpose of pilot test for this study is to validate and analyze the reliability of the scale items used, and to modify the questionnaire items accordingly. This study is causal and cross-sectional, non-probability, purposive sampling technique was used for approaching the respondents. This study used seven-point choices Likert scale ranges from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree) to measure the items. Initially 46 online survey questionnaires through google forms were received from the working women of service sectors in Karachi city. The questionnaire administered includes 9 demographic variables with respect to the social lab of the study and adopted questionnaire items for different variables used in the study are also included. A total of 36 items were used to measure “Leader-Member-Exchange (7-items)”, “Schedule Flexibility (4-items)”, “Employee

Empowerment (12-items)”, “Response to change (6-items)”, and “Workplace Innovation (7-items)”.

The internal consistency of the item scales was measured using Cronbach’s alpha along with intra class correlation coefficients. Content and face validity were conducted through panel of two subject experts and one field expert from social lab. Further, criterion-related validity through correlation coefficient and internal construct validity were also analyzed by inter-item correlations and co-variances. It facilitated to develop necessary modifications in the questionnaire, allowing the researcher to make necessary revisions within the study. It is believed that these revisions were made possible because of conducting pilot study, providing further insights into understanding of used tools in the study. SPSS version 23 was used for statistical analysis.

3.1. Research Instrument

The questionnaire adopted for the study includes nine demographic variables with respect to the social lab of the study which is working women from selected sectors of service industry. A total of 36 items were used to measure “Leader-Member-Exchange (7-items)”, “Schedule Flexibility (4-items)”, “Employee Empowerment (12-items)”, “Response to change (6-items)”, and “Workplace Innovation (7-items)”. Participants will be asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item using seven point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7 (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Slightly Disagree, 4=Neither Disagree nor Agree, 5=Slightly Agree, 6=Agree, and, 7=Strongly Agree) is designed so that respondents may find it easy to answer the questions. The sources from where the questionnaire instruments is adopted are provided in the Table 1.

Table 1: Sources of Instrument

Variable Name	Instrument Reference	Number of items	Scale
Leader-Member-Exchange	Liden&Graen, 1980; Scandura&Graen, 1984; Wayne, Shore &Liden, 1997)	07	1-7
Schedule Flexibility	McNall, Masuda, &Nicklin, 2010	04	1-7
Employee Empowerment	Spreitzer (1995)	12	1-7
Response to Change	Holt et, al 2007	06	1-7
Workplace Innovation Behavior	Scot & Bruce, 1994	07	1-7

4. Results and Analysis

4.1.Face and Content Validity

One of the types of validity is face validity. It is a subjective and superficial assessment of whether the measurement use in a study appears to be a valid measure of a given variable or construct. It is also called surface validity or appearance validity. Whereas, content validity refers

to how adequately measurement tool taps into the various aspects of the construct in question. For assessing content and face validity two subject experts and one field expert were asked to provide comments on content and understandability of the questionnaire. The experts were requested to edit and improve the items of questionnaire if necessary to enhance clarity, understandability, readability, and content adequacy. Additionally, they were also asked to revise the items that were incomprehensible and needed to be improved. After a detailed review the questionnaire was validated by the experts and few changes were suggested, which was incorporated accordingly.

4.2. Construct Validity and Reliability

The construct validity and reliability of the constructs used for this pilot study are presented in the section below. The construct reliability was measured through Dijkstra Henseler’s Rho, Joreskog’s Rho, and Cronbach’s Alpha. Moreover, construct validity was measured through inter-item co-relations and co-variance. To measure the construct validity and reliability the tests of inter-item correlations and co-variances, internal consistency through Cronbach alpha and intra class correlation coefficient, criterion related validity through correlation coefficient, were employed and are presented below.

4.2.1. Construct Reliability

In construct reliability Dijkstra Henseler’s Rho, Joreskog’s Rho, and Cronbach’s Alpha are considered as the measures of internal consistency, which shows how items of questionnaire are closely related as a group. The accepted level for Dijkstra Henseler’s measurement is considered to be greater than 0.07 (Dijkstra & Henseler, 2015). The threshold level of Joreskog’s rho is said to be above or equal to 0.07 (Werts et al., 1978). According to Sekaran & Bougie, (2010), the value for Cronbach’s Alpha is accepted to be 0.70 or above in most of the business and social science research. The Table 2 shows the reliability statistics of the items used in this study.

Table 2. Construct Reliability

Construct	Dijkstra Henseler’s Rho	Joreskog’s Rho	Cronbach’s Alpha	Number of Items
Leader-Member-Exchange	0.9570	0.9200	0.9037	07
Schedule Flexibility	0.8622	0.8180	0.6812	03
Employee Empowerment	0.9107	0.8859	0.8755	12
Response to Change	0.9107	0.8037	0.6947	06
Workplace Innovation	0.8192	0.8481	0.8022	07

The Table 2 above shows the reliability statistics i.e. the internal consistency of the items with different reliability measures. Since the values in the Table 2 given above are above 0.7 showing the consistency of the items is highly reliable except of Cronbach’s Alpha value for

Schedule Flexibility which is recorded 0.68 and Response to Change 0.69. However, these values are considered to be acceptable. The reason may be the less number of respondents and can be further improved by increasing the number of responses.

4.2.2. Intra Class Correlation Coefficient

Another way to determine the reliability of measurements or ratings the intra class correlation coefficient (ICC) is used. It represents the set of coefficients which represent the relationship between variables of the same class. The ICC values less than 0.5 represent poor reliability, values ranging from 0.5 to 0.75 indicate moderate reliability, values lying between 0.75 and 0.9 show good reliability, and the values more than 0.9 are considered to be of excellent reliability.

The Table 3 below show the intra class reliability of all the variables used in this study. The values for intra class correlation of LMX (.902), Schedule flexibility (.641), Employee Empowerment (.841), Response to change (.593), and Workplace innovation (.770), indicate that all these values fall within the ranges of moderate to excellent reliability of the ratings of this study.

Table 3. Intra-class Correlation Coefficient

Variable	Measure	Intra-class	Sig
Leader-Member-Exchange	Single Measures	.567 ^a	.000
	Average Measures	.902 ^c	.000
Schedule Flexibility	Single Measures	.373 ^a	.000
	Average Measures	.641 ^c	.000
Employee Empowerment	Single Measures	.306 ^a	.000
	Average Measures	.841 ^c	.000
Response to Change	Single Measures	.195 ^a	.000
	Average Measures	.593 ^c	.000
Workplace Innovation Behavior	Single Measures	.323 ^a	.000
	Average Measures	.770 ^c	.000

4.2.3. Construct Validity through Inter-Item Correlations and Co-variances

The validity of a construct is measured in order to test the accuracy of the construct i.e. what is to be measured through this particular measurement. In this pilot study, the convergent as well as divergent validity of the constructs were measured. The most common measure of convergent validity is Average variance extracted (AVE). If the first factor extracted from a set of indicators explains more than one half of their variance, there cannot be any second, equally important factor. An AVE of 0.5 or higher is therefore regarded as acceptable (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Moreover, for discriminant validity two criteria have been developed i.e. Fornell-.Larcker criterion and Hetro-trait mono-trait criterion (HTMT) proposed by (Dijkstra & Henseler, 2015).

Table 4. Convergent Validity

Construct	AVE
Leader-Member-Exchange	0.6241
Schedule Flexibility	0.6064
Employee Empowerment	0.4104
Response to Change	0.4510
Workplace Innovation Behavior	0.4468

The above mentioned Table 4 represent the convergent validity of all the constructs used in this pilot study. The values for LMX, and Schedule Flexibility are above the threshold level of 0.05, showing that constructs are valid. The remaining three values for Employee Empowerment, Response to change and Workplace Innovation Behavior show slightly lower values, which are considered to be acceptable. The lower values can be due to the small sample size which could be improved with further data.

Table 5. Discriminant Validity (HTMT)

Construct	LMX	SF	EE	RC	WI
LMX					
SF	0.3860				
EE	0.3591	0.3640			
RC	0.1780	0.5238	0.6834		
WI	0.1913	0.1964	0.7725	0.8010	

Table 6. Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker)

Construct	LMX	SF	EE	RC	WI
LMX	0.6241				
SF	0.1405	0.6064			
EE	0.2002	0.2411	0.4140		
RC	0.0348	0.1436	0.3129	0.4510	
WI	0.0349	0.0372	0.3500	0.4162	0.4468

Moreover, the above Table 5 and 6 show the discriminant validities. The discriminant validity of the constructs was analyzed through HTMT (Hetro-trait Mono-trait Criterion) and Fornell-Larcker's Criterion. The threshold value for AVE through HTMT and Fornell-Larcker should exceed their correlation. The values above however show the minimum acceptable levels, which could be further improved with the increase in data.

4.2.4. Inter-Item Correlations

The Tables given below show the inter-item correlations for the variables used in this study. The table shows how each item of the study correlates to all other items. All the items show correlations with one another; however, there are some lower values as well representing that these items have less correlation with each other but are considered acceptable.

5. Conclusion

Workplace innovation is one of the most important aspects for manager to consider for success. Organization who would like to engage their employees in innovation need to foster the climate of change and innovation. Therefore, managers need to keep the gender diversity balance in the organization while considering other organizational factors. Literature suggested that empowered employees are more inclined to generate new ideas and innovative attributes hence they respond to changes more quickly and are engaged in innovating new ideas at workplace. Employee engagement in change and innovation may also be increased through supporting flexible work atmosphere and leader-member exchange. As discussed earlier this pilot study is used for obtaining first-hand experience with an objective of further enhancing the research design, conceptualization, interpretation of findings and ultimately results. The instrument of the current research is adopted after thorough study of literature review. The analysis shows that the values of Cronbach's Alpha are found acceptable and hence instrument is open for further data collection. The results of internal consistency also met the threshold value. Moreover, experts examined and endorse the face and content validity of the questionnaire. The variables selected for this study has a significant value in organizational setting, moreover the social lab of women employees at workplace is an under studied area, hence, the results will significantly contribute in the body of knowledge of this specific area.

References

- Agarwal, U. A., & Bhargava, S. (2014). The role of social exchange on work outcomes: A study of Indian managers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(10), 1484–1504.
- Appelbaum, S. H., Habashy, S., Malo, J., & Shafiq, H. (2012). Back to the future: Revisiting Kotter's 1996 change model. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(8), 764–782.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The Explanatory and Predictive Scope of Self-Efficacy Theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4(3), 359–373.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Macmillan.
- Belghiti-Mahut, S., Lafont, A.-L., & Yousfi, O. (2016). Gender gap in innovation: A confused link? *Journal of Innovation Economics Management*, 1, 159–177.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Blau, P. M. (1968). Social exchange. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 7, 452–457.
- Bos-Nehles, A. C., & Veenendaal, A. A. (2019). Perceptions of HR practices and innovative work behavior: The moderating effect of an innovative climate. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(18), 2661–2683.
- Bruns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). The management of innovation. *Tavistock, London*.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471–482.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.

- Dijkstra, T. K., & Henseler, J. (2015). Consistent partial least squares path modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 39(2).
- Dorenbosch, L., Engen, M. L. van, & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 129–141.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange: Integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715–1759.
- Erstad, M. (1997). Empowerment and organizational change. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9(7), 325–333.
- Farr, J. L., & Ford, C. M. (1990). *Individual innovation*.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). *Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 161–178.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., & Babin, B. J. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. Pearson Education.
- Homans, G. C. (1958a). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606.
- Homans, G. C. (1958b). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606.
- Honold, L. (1997). A review of the literature on employee empowerment. *Empowerment in Organizations*, 5(4), 202–212.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., & Glaser, J. (2008). Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 655.
- Idris, A., See, D., & Coughlan, P. (2018). Employee empowerment and job satisfaction in urban Malaysia: Connecting the dots with context and organizational change management. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(3), 697–711.
- Jacob, J. I., Bond, J. T., Galinsky, E., & Hill, E. J. (2008). Six critical ingredients in creating an effective workplace. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 11(1), 141–161.
- Janssen, O., Van de Vliert, E., & West, M. (2004). The bright and dark sides of individual and group innovation: A special issue introduction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(2), 129–145.
- Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' Goal Orientations, the Quality of Leader-Member Exchange, and the Outcomes of Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 368–384.
- Jeffrey Hill, E., Jacob, J. I., Shannon, L. L., Brennan, R. T., Blanchard, V. L., & Martinengo, G. (2008). Exploring the relationship of workplace flexibility, gender, and life stage to family-to-work conflict, and stress and burnout. *Community, Work and Family*, 11(2), 165–181.
- Kim, P. B., Lee, G., & Jang, J. (2017). Employee empowerment and its contextual determinants and outcome for service workers: A cross-national study. *Management Decision*, 55(5), 1022–1041.
- Kossek, E. E., & Lambert, S. J. (2005). “*Work-family scholarship*”: *Voice and context*.
- Krausz, M., Sagie, A., & Bidermann, Y. (2000). Actual and preferred work schedules and scheduling control as determinants of job-related attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(1), 1–11.

- Lin, N. (2000). Inequality in Social Capital. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(6), 785–795.
- Lines, R. (2007). Using Power to Install Strategy: The Relationships between Expert Power, Position Power, Influence Tactics and Implementation Success. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(2), 143–170.
- McGuire, J. B., & Liro, J. R. (1986). Flexible work schedules, work attitudes, and perceptions of productivity. *Public Personnel Management*, 15(1), 65–73.
- Mirza, A. M. B., & Jabeen, N. (2011). Gender Stereotypes and Women in Management The Case of Banking Sector of Pakistan. *South Asian Studies (1026-678X)*, 26(2).
- Mirza, H. H., Andleeb, S., & Ramzan, F. (2012). Gender diversity and firm performance: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Social and Development Sciences*, 3(5), 161–166.
- Montani, F., Odoardi, C., & Battistelli, A. (2014). Individual and contextual determinants of innovative work behaviour: Proactive goal generation matters. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(4), 645–670.
- Mumford, M. D., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B., & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(6), 705–750.
- Nählinder, J., & Eriksson, A. F. (2019). Outcome, process and support: Analysing aspects of innovation in public sector organizations. *Public Money & Management*, 39(6), 443–449.
- O'Donnell, M., Yukl, G., & Taber, T. (2012). Leader behavior and LMX: A constructive replication. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2007). Organizational member's reactions to organizational change: A review of empirical findings. *Annual Meeting of Academy of Management, Philadelphia, PA*.
- Østergaard, C. R., Timmermans, B., & Kristinsson, K. (2011). Does a different view create something new? The effect of employee diversity on innovation. *Research Policy*, 40(3).
- Pan, W., Sun, L.-Y., & Lam, L. W. (2017). Employee–organization exchange and employee creativity: A motivational perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1–23.
- Paper, D. J., Rodger, J. A., & Pendharkar, P. C. (2001). A BPR case study at Honeywell. *Business Process Management Journal*, 7(2), 85–99.
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking Resistance And Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View Of Attitudes Toward An Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Review*, 13.
- Pitcher, P., & Smith, A. D. (2001). Top Management Team Heterogeneity: Personality, Power, and Proxies. *Organization Science*, 12(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.1.1.10120>
- Pot, F. (2011). Workplace innovation for better jobs and performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 60(4), 404–415.
- Pot, F., Dhondt, S., & Oeij, P. (2012). Social innovation of work and employment. In *Challenge social innovation* (261–274). Springer.
- Qu, R., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2017). Leader–member exchange and follower creativity: The moderating roles of leader and follower expectations for creativity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(4), 603–626.
- Quintana-Garcia, C., & Benavides-Velasco, C. A. (2008). Innovative competence, exploration and exploitation: The influence of technological diversification. *Research Policy*. 37(3), 492–507.
- Ritter-Hayashi, D., Vermeulen, P. A. M., & Knoblen, J. (n.d.). *Gender Diversity and Innovation*.
- Sandberg, K. W. (2003). An exploratory study of women in micro enterprises: Gender-related differences. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*. 10(4), 408–417.

- Sanders, K., Moorkamp, M., Torka, N., Groeneveld, S., & Groeneveld, C. (2010). How to support innovative behaviour? The role of LMX and satisfaction with HR practices. *Technology and Investment*, 1(01), 59.
- Schermuly, C. C., Meyer, B., & Dämmer, L. (2013). Leader-member exchange and innovative behavior. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580–607.
- Seibert, S. E., Silver, S. R., & Randolph, W. A. (2004). Taking Empowerment To The Next Level: A Multiple-Level Model Of Empowerment, Performance, And Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 332–349.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). Theoretical framework in theoretical framework and hypothesis development. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach*, 80.
- Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 67–77.
- Sparks, K., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2001). Well-being and occupational health in the 21st century workplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 489-509.
- Subramaniam, A., Othman, R., & Sambasivan, M. (2010). Implicit leadership theory among Malaysian managers: Impact of the leadership expectation gap on leader-member exchange quality. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(4), 351–371.
- Tastan, S. B. (2013). The influences of participative organizational climate and self-leadership on innovative behavior and the roles of job involvement and proactive personality: A survey in the context of SMEs in Izmir. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 75, 407–419.
- Teruel, M., Robles, M. D. P., & Blasco, A. S. (2015). *Gender diversity and innovation in manufacturing and service firms*.
- Torchia, M., Calabrò, A., & Huse, M. (2011). Women Directors on Corporate Boards: From Tokenism to Critical Mass. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102(2), 299–317.
- Verick, S. (2018a). *The puzzles and contradictions of the Indian labour market: What will the future of work look like?*
- Verick, S. (2018b). Female labor force participation and development. *IZA World of Labor*.
- Volmer, J., Spurk, D., & Niessen, C. (2012). Leader–member exchange (LMX), job autonomy, and creative work involvement. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(3), 456–465.
- Wang, P. Q., Kim, P. B., & Milne, S. (2017). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and its work outcomes: The moderating role of gender. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 26(2), 125–143.
- Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82–111.
- Werts, C. E., Linn, R. L., J, K. G., Reskog, O., Joreskog, Q., & Thillo, V. (n.d.). *be considered. I. Joreskog's General Model for the Analysis of Covariance Structures*.
- Wojnicka-Sycz, E., & Sycz, P. (2016). Public innovation policy and other determinants of innovativeness in Poland. *The Innovation Journal*, 21(3), 1.
- Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a Theory of Organizational Creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(2), 293–321.
- Yuan, F., & Woodman, R. W. (2010). Innovative Behavior In The Workplace: The Role Of Performance And Image Outcome Expectations. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 53(2), 323–342.

Zhang, Z., & Luo, T. (2020). Knowledge structure, network structure, exploitative and exploratory innovations. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 32(6), 666–682.

Table 7(a). Inter-Item Correlation Matrix(LMX)

	LMX_1	LMX_2	LMX_3	LMX_4	LMX_5	LMX_6	LMX_7
LMX_1	1.000						
LMX_2	.737	1.000					
LMX_3	.415	.621	1.000				
LMX_4	.240	.375	.563	1.000			
LMX_5	.545	.594	.507	.712	1.000		
LMX_6	.682	.764	.494	.488	.717	1.000	
LMX_7	.560	.777	.475	.473	.664	.798	1.000

Table 7(b). Inter-Item Correlation Matrix (Schedule Flexibility)

	SF_2	SF_3	SF_4
SF_2	1.000		
SF_3	.532	1.000	
SF_4	.249	.383	1.000

Table 7(c). Inter-Item Correlation Matrix (Employee Empowerment)

	EE_1	EE_2	EE_3	EE_4	EE_5	EE_6	EE_7	EE_8	EE_9	EE_10	EE_11	EE_12
EE_1	1.000											
EE_2	.781	1.000										
EE_3	.627	.767	1.000									
EE_4	.320	.492	.402	1.000								
EE_5	.451	.663	.515	.822	1.000							
EE_6	.114	.276	.292	.512	.412	1.000						
EE_7	.479	.445	.328	.384	.489	.284	1.000					
EE_8	.415	.375	.480	.426	.363	.292	.719	1.000				
EE_9	.278	.168	.233	.196	.099	.100	.476	.696	1.000			
EE_10	.335	.266	.169	.170	.247	.178	.559	.556	.684	1.000		
EE_11	.213	.140	-.003	.077	.154	-.103	.504	.367	.539	.594	1.000	
EE_12	.323	.241	.049	.033	.140	-.048	.497	.311	.464	.619	.825	1.000

Table 7(d). Inter-Item Correlation Matrix (Response to Change)

	R_1	R_2	R_3	R_4	R_5	R_6
R_1	1.000					
R_2	.675	1.000				
R_3	-.043	.129	1.000			
R_4	.287	.440	.091	1.000		
R_5	.121	.207	-.093	.390	1.000	
R_6	.583	.563	-.125	.609	.485	1.000

Table 7(e). Inter-Item Correlation Matrix (Workplace Innovation)

	WI_1	WI_2	WI_3	WI_4	WI_5	WI_6	WI_7
WI_1	1.000						
WI_2	.383	1.000					
WI_3	.343	.504	1.000				
WI_4	.263	.452	.226	1.000			
WI_5	.080	.539	.441	.227	1.000		
WI_6	.504	.252	.331	.293	.246	1.000	
WI_7	.424	.532	.156	.688	.384	.379	1.000