The Link between Leadership Empowerment and Employee Creativity: A study based on Zhejiang enterprises

Zhu Huafeng

Abstract:
In today's increasingly fierce competition, the continuous creativity of employees is the main way to solve the uncertainty of enterprises. How to improve the creativity of employees is the survival way of sustainable development of enterprises. Many organizations and business managers have realized the importance of empowering leadership to promote employee creativity, but there are few empirical studies on the impact of empowering leadership on employee creativity. Therefore, based on the theory of behavior exchange and organizational competence, This paper studies the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, constructs the influence model of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, and deeply explores the mechanism of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, so as to provide important support for theoretical support and management practice. In this study, 489 valid questionnaires were obtained by means of questionnaire. Descriptive analysis, reliability and validity analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, were used. The results show that: Leadership empowerment has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment; leadership empowerment has a significant positive impact on knowledge sharing among employees; organizational commitment has a significant positive impact on employee creativity; knowledge sharing among employees has a significant positive impact on employee creativity. This study reveals the influence of organizational commitment and empowerment on employee creativity through the specific context of knowledge sharing. It enriches and improves the relevant research and theory in the fields of leadership empowerment, organizational commitment, knowledge sharing, responsible personality and employee creativity. Finally, the paper gives some specific measures and suggestions on how to improve employee creativity, which provides theoretical support for academics and practitioners.

About Author (s)

Zhu Huafeng, Asia Metropolitan University, Malaysia.

Introduction
Background of Study
In today's economic globalization and increasingly fierce competition, enterprises are facing domestic and foreign problems, coupled with mass entrepreneurship, innovation and other national strategic background, more and more scholars and practitioners realize that innovation can bring vigor and vitality to enterprises. Zhejiang is one of the most innovative regions in China. The innovation ability of an organization is based on the innovation of all employees. Employee creativity is the key to the sustainable innovation of an organization (Tu et al., 2016; Shaly, Gilson and Blum, 2000), and the survival way for an organization to solve internal and external problems (Smabile et al., 1996). In the existing enterprises, especially in Zhejiang, there are many enterprises with internal centralization. Although the organizational structure of some Internet enterprises is designed to be flat, such as Alibaba and Netease, it also fails to solve the problem of power concentration of top management. This phenomenon causes the employees cannot give full play to their initiative and enthusiasm, and then the employees' creativity cannot be stimulated. Therefore, how to stimulate the employees' creativity is a thorny problem that many scholars and practitioners need to solve urgently.

Because organizational leaders are most familiar with organizational mechanism and environment, organizational leadership is the most important factor to stimulate employees' creativity (Sun and Lu, 2016; Shalley and Gilson, 2004). Some scholars pay attention to the influence of leader style on employee creativity, such as transformational leadership (Hu et al., 2012; Wang and Rode, 2010; Cai et al., 2013; Liu and Zou, 2013), empowering leadership (Zhang and Bartol, 2010; Forrester, 2000; Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Zhou, 2014), ethical leadership (Walumbwa et al, 2011; Mayer et al, 2012; Wang and Ye, 2015), humble leadership (Lei et al., 2015; Tang, Long and Zhou, 2015), pro social leaders (Li, Zhang and Wang, 2019) have a positive impact on employees' creativity. Furthermore, more and more scholars are aware of the important role of leadership empowerment (Konczak, Stanley and Trusty, 2000; Zhang and Wang, 2009; Li and Mei, 2018). However, there is little literature on the mechanism of leadership empowerment affecting employee creativity.

Leadership empowerment refers to empowering, trusting and participating in decision-making (Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp, 2005). At present, there is little research on leadership empowerment, mainly from the perspective of organizational identity (Yuan, Ding and Li, 2014), working passion (Farmer, Tierney and Kung, 2003), work efficiency (Koberg et al., 1999), Job satisfaction (Laschinger et al., 2004; Li et al., 2006), emotional commitment (Finegan and Laschinger, 2001; Kuokkanen, Leino and Katajisto, 2003) and job burnout (Spreitzer, Janasz and Quinn, 1999). There is little research on the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity. In addition, employee creativity is the product of complex personal and situational factors (Woodma, Sawyer and Griffin, 1993), so more personal and situational factors should be considered (Tang, Li and Li, 2012). In this paper, due diligence personality is regarded as a personal factor and selected as a moderating variable. The reason is that due diligence personality is beneficial to improving employees' job performance (Zhang and Long, 2016). However, we still don't know how due diligence personality affects creativity. Therefore, this paper studies the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity from the perspective of employee due diligence personality. Taking enterprises in Zhejiang Province as an example, this paper empirically analyzes the influence mechanism of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, so as to provide theoretical guidance for academics and practitioners.

Problem Statement

Innovation is the soul of sustainable survival of an enterprise, and employee creativity is an important embodiment of organizational innovation (Sun and Lu, 2016). Many scholars realize that leadership style has a positive impact on creativity. For example, transformational leadership (Hu et al., 2012; Wang and Rode, 2010; Cai et al., 2013; Liu and Zou, 2013), empowering leadership (Zhang and Bartol, 2010; Forrester, 2000; Ahearne et al., 2005; Zhang and Zhou, 2014), ethical Leadership (Walumbwa et al, 2011; Mayer et al, 2012; Wang and Ye, 2015), humble Leadership (Lei et al, 2015; Tang, Long and Zhou, 2015), and pro social leadership (Li, Zhang and Wang, 2019). At present, the literature still focuses on the important role of empowering leadership, but ignores the key role of empowering leadership in organizations (Tang, Li and Li, 2012). The difference between empowering leadership and empowering leadership lies in "Empowering", that is to say, in addition to empowering employees, employees are also allowed to take responsibility and make decisions independently (Konczak, Stanley and Trusty, 2000). This "Empowering" can greatly stimulate the potential of employees and bring immeasurable benefits to the organization (Luo et al., 2017). Therefore, this paper takes Zhejiang enterprises as an example to study whether leadership empowerment affects employee creativity? How does empowerment further influence employee creativity? Do employees with different personality characteristics show the same results, that is, in the context of conscientious personality characteristics, how does leadership empowerment affect organizational commitment and then employee creativity? How does leadership empowerment affect knowledge sharing among employees and then employee creativity? These questions will be the main content of this paper.

Research Questions

Based on the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, this study seeks the mechanism of the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, in order to open the "black box" between leadership empowerment and employee creativity, and introduces organizational commitment and knowledge sharing within the organization as mediating variables between leadership empowerment and employee creativity. In addition, considering that employees' personal factors also have an impact on their creativity (Woodma, Sawyer and Griffin, 1993; Tang, Li and Li, 2012), this paper takes employees' conscientiousness personality as a moderator to verify whether it has an impact on the relationship between leadership empowerment and employees' creativity.

To sum up, this paper mainly studies five questions: (1) How does leadership empowerment affect organizational commitment, and then how does organizational commitment affect employee creativity? In other words, does organizational commitment mediate between leadership empowerment and employee creativity? (2) How does leadership empowerment affect knowledge sharing within an organization, and then how does knowledge sharing within an organization affect employee creativity? In other words, does knowledge sharing play a mediating role between leadership empowerment and employee creativity?

Research Objectives

Firstly, through literature search, this paper reviews the relevant literature on leadership empowerment, responsible personality, organizational commitment, knowledge sharing within the organization and employee creativity, analyzes and summarizes the shortcomings of existing research, puts forward the research model of this paper, and uses spss21.0 and amos21.0 to test the research model. Finally, according to the test results, this paper analyzes the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, and from the research results, puts forward some management suggestions on how to cultivate employee creativity.

To sum up, this study can be divided into two objectives
(1) Based on the literature review, analyzes the impact of employee empowerment on organizational commitment and organizational commitment.
(2) Review the relevant literature on leadership empowerment, knowledge sharing within the organization and employee creativity, analyzes and summarizes the research deficiencies of the relevant literature, puts forward the hypothesis that leadership empowerment has an impact on knowledge sharing within the organization, and then affects employee creativity, and uses statistical analysis method for data analysis, obtains the empirical results and puts forward management enlightenment and suggestions.

Literature Review
Employee Creativity
It is generally believed that the origin of creativity came from Galton's genetic genius in 1869, and the substantial research was put forward by Guilford, a famous American psychologist in the 1950s. Since the follow-up development, creativity has become a hot research issue in management and psychology.

Because creativity is composed of knowledge, intelligence, ability and other complex factors, there is no consistent definition of creativity in academic circles (Huang, Lin and Wang, 2005). Some scholars believe that creativity is the psychological process of problem solving, the ability to produce ideas, discover problems and create new things. Some scholars believe that creativity is to create a subversive product, which can make users more satisfied than the previous products; some scholars believe that creativity is a personality trait. Therefore, scholars define creativity from the perspective of creative process, creative results and personality traits of creators. We can classify previous scholars' definitions of creativity into three categories: process definition (Lumsden, 1999; Leonard and Swap, 1999; Hirst, Knippenberg and Zhou, 2009; Ambile et al., 1996); personality definition (Guilford, 1950; Jia and Lin, 2004; Feldhusen, 1995; Dredehl, 2000), and the results definition (Barron, 1955; Bruner, 1969; Amabile, 1982; Zhou and George, 2001). The details are shown in Table 2-1.

Table 2-1 Definition of creativity

Type	Scholar	Content
Process definition	Lumsden(1999), Leonard & Swap(1999), Hirst, Knippenberg & Zhou(2009), Ambile et al.(1996)	Creativity is the ability to surpass the original experience and habits and form new ideas, things or products, which are recognized by the public. Creativity is the process for employees to achieve goals, solve problems and challenges.
Personality definition	Guilford(1950), Jia & Lin (2014), Feldhusen (1995), Drevdehl (2000)	Employee creativity refers to the valuable and novel ideas put forward by employees in their work. Creativity is an individual's unique ability, and creative personality is the key to the study of creativity. Creativity is the intellectual quality that individuals use their own resources and knowledge to form valuable products. Creativity is influenced by knowledge, skills, personality and intelligence. Creativity is the psychological quality of using the above factors to produce novel and valuable products.
Result definition	Barron(1955), Bruner(1969), Amabile(1982), Zhou & George(2001)	Creativity is the ability to produce new things or products, which can be recognized by the public and used for a long time, rare and of practical value. Creativity is a valuable view on new products, new ideas, new understanding, new methods, new management processes, etc.

Source: Author

Leadership Empowerment

Although more and more enterprises design their own organizational structure as flat, it cannot solve the problems that employees have to report everything to the leaders, and employees are lazy and cannot give full play to their potential. It is this phenomenon that many scholars and practitioners realize the importance of stimulating the ability of employees. Leadership empowerment is a kind of leadership style to stimulate employees' ability (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). More and more scholars began to study leadership empowerment.

In the early research, leadership empowerment means leadership decentralization. However, with the continuous improvement of the research on the content of leadership empowerment, leadership empowerment includes not only decentralization, but also participation in decision-making and other important activities (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). At present, foreign scholars have done more research on the empowerment of leadership (Zhang and Bartol, 2010), while domestic research on the empowerment of leadership is relatively less, so it is urgent to do research on the empowerment of leadership in order to make up for the vacancy of domestic research on the empowerment of leadership.

On the concept of empowerment of leadership, different scholars have different definitions of empowerment of leadership, but they all embody "leadership devolves power and endows employees with vitality". Some scholars believe that leadership empowerment is to empower employees, stimulate their enthusiasm, and enable them to achieve their work goals (Konczak, Stanley and Trusty, 2000; Zhang and Bartol, 2010); others believe that leadership empowerment is to empower employees with all the resources they need in their work, so that they can achieve the company's business goals (Matthews, Diaz and Cole, 2003). Arnold et al. (2000) believe that leadership empowerment is to give employees more power to improve their sense of self-efficacy (Geng, 2011). In addition, some scholars define leadership empowerment from two aspects: decentralization and resource sharing. They believe that leadership empowerment is to delegate more rights and share more resources to meet the daily work needs of employees (Ford and Fotler, 1995).

To sum up, based on the research of the above scholars, this study believes that leadership empowerment is an activity that gives employees sufficient trust, power and resources, and gives employees the opportunity to participate in major decision-making, so that they can motivate employees' attitude and behavior.

Methodology
Questionnaire design
Questionnaire survey method has the characteristics of flexibility, convenience, high efficiency and low cost, which is favored by the majority of scholars. As the relevant data of this study is difficult to obtain on the open platform, this study adopts the method of questionnaire survey to collect data, so as to obtain reliable first-hand data more efficiently. The data collection of this study is divided into two stages, namely, the questionnaire about employees' understanding of the basic information of the enterprise and the questionnaire about employees' basic understanding of leadership style. The specific questionnaire design process is as follows:

(1) Basic information design. According to the content of this study, the basic information of the respondents will be included in the questionnaire items, such as gender, age, education background, working years and unit. In order to obtain the information with high accuracy, the respondents were selected to fill in the questionnaire.

(2) The items of each variable were compiled. Read a large number of domestic and foreign literature about leadership empowerment, responsible personality, organizational commitment, knowledge sharing and employee creativity. According to the specific situation to be studied in this study, the concepts of leadership empowerment, responsible personality, organizational commitment, knowledge sharing within the organization and employee creativity are defined, and then a large number of literature on the main variables are combed to find the maturity scale of each variable. For the foreign instrument, first find the translation of domestic literature, and finally select the most suitable translation as the measurement item of the variable. If the existing translation can not be found, the supervisor and experts of organizational behavior will be entrusted to help translate this item, and finally the translation will be adopted after repeated checking.

(3) Form the initial questionnaire. In terms of the items, variable dimensions, language semantics, questionnaire structure, etc. involved in the questionnaire, the suggestions of experts and professors are solicited and modified according to their opinions to form a questionnaire on the relationship between leadership empowerment and employee creativity.

(4) Prediction and finalization of the questionnaire. Through face-to-face interviews, telephone calls, e-mails and electronic questionnaires, 30 employees were invited to conduct a pre-test. It was found that there were unclear and ambiguous items in the questionnaire. Then exploratory factor analysis was conducted on these small batch of questionnaire data to remove some items with poor reliability and validity. Finally, the final questionnaire was determined.

Population/Sampling/Unit of Analysis
A total of 560 subjects were interviewed and 489 valid questionnaires were collected. The effective rate was 87.32%. From the efficiency of the sample, the validity of the questionnaire collected in this study is high, indicating that the sample questionnaire is more reliable, which also provides support for the reliability and trustworthiness of the data analysis below.

First of all, descriptive analysis of the basic information of the interviewees. This study uses SPSS 21.0 to make statistical analysis of the basic information of the interviewees. The basic information of the interviewees, such as gender, age and education background, is shown in Table 3-6. From the perspective of gender composition, most of the interviewees were men, accounting for 64.0% of the total sample, while women accounted for 36.0%, which was generally balanced and in line with China's national conditions. From the perspective of age composition, 26-35 years old accounted for the most, accounting for 51.7%, followed by 36-45 years old, accounting for 25.2%, followed by 46-55 years old, accounting for 10.2%, and finally under 25 years old and over 55 years old accounted for 9.8% and 3.1% respectively. According to the degree of the interviewees, the overall situation is relatively balanced, with undergraduate degree accounting for 52.1%, junior college degree accounting for 26.8%, master degree or above accounting for 14.1%, and senior high school or below accounting for 7.0%. From the educational background of the interviewees, it shows that the "post-80s" and "post-90s" are the main force of the labor market. Through the analysis of the basic information of the interviewees, such as gender, age and education background, it can be concluded that the interviewees are generally reasonable, each region has coverage, and the collected questionnaire has a certain representativeness, which provides certain support for the follow-up reliability and validity analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, structural equation model analysis, hypothesis test and multi-level linear regression analysis.

Table 3-2 Statistical table of basic information of sample enterprises (N=489)

Index	Items	No. Of people	Percentage
Gender	Male	313	64.0%
	Female	176	36.0%
Age	Under 25 years old	48	9.8%
	26-35 years old	253	51.7%
	36-45 years old	123	25.2%
	46-55 years old	50	10.2%
	Above 55 years old	15	3.1%
Education level	High school and below	34	7.0%
	Junior College	131	26.8%
	Bachelor degree	255	52.1%
	Master degree and above	69	14.1%

Source: Author

Secondly, descriptive analysis is made on the basic information of the respondents' enterprises. This study uses SPSS 21.0 to make statistical analysis on the basic information of the respondents' enterprises. The enterprise years, property rights, industries and scale of the sample enterprises are shown in Table 3-7. In the composition of enterprise years, 10-20 years accounted for the most, accounting for 39.1%, followed by 5-10 years, accounting for 20%, 3-5 years, accounting for 16.8%, followed by more than 20 years, accounting for 15.3%, and finally less than 3 years, accounting for 8.8%. This shows that most of the interviewees are from long-standing companies, which is different from the background of Zhejiang enterprises. Zhejiang is a province full of innovation and vitality. Theoretically, Zhejiang has more small and medium-sized enterprises, but this sampling survey accounts for less, which may be due to the influence of the author's social network. In the composition of enterprise property rights, the proportion of private enterprises is relatively large, accounting for 68.7%. It can be seen that most of Zhejiang enterprises are private enterprises, which is basically the same as the background of Zhejiang enterprises. The second is state-owned or state-owned holding enterprises, accounting for 19.8%, the third is foreign-funded enterprises, accounting for 8.6%, and the last is other enterprises, accounting for 2.9%. In the industry structure of enterprises, the proportion of information technology service enterprises is the highest, up to 35.0%, followed by the manufacturing industry, accounting for 29.9%, which indicates that Zhejiang enterprises mainly focus on information technology services and manufacturing industry, which is basically the same as the background of Zhejiang enterprises. The third is transportation and wholesale and retail, accounting for 8.0% and 6.1% respectively. Then came other industries and recreation, accounting for 9.2% and 4.1% respectively, followed by education, construction, finance, agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry and fishery, accounting for 2.9%, 2.0%, 1.8% and 1.0% respectively. In the composition of enterprise scale, enterprises with more than 1000 employees accounted for the highest proportion, accounting for 44.8%, followed by enterprises with 20-200 employees, accounting for 18.6%, enterprises with 300-500 employees and 500-1000 employees, accounting for 15.3%, and enterprises with less than 20 employees, accounting for 6.7%. From the analysis of the composition of enterprise scale, we can see that most of the respondents come from large companies, but the enterprises in Zhejiang Province are mainly small and medium-sized enterprises. This result may be due to the influence of the author's social network. From the analysis of the sample enterprises' enterprise years, property right nature, industry and scale, it can be concluded that the visiting enterprises are generally reasonable. Each region has coverage, and the collected questionnaire has a certain representativeness, which provides certain support for the follow-up reliability and validity

analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, structural equation model analysis, hypothesis testing and multi-level linear regression analysis.

Validity and Reliability Test
Reliability test

Reliability test refers to the reliability of the data measured by the scale, which represents the consistency and stability of the data. The important standard of reliability test is cronbachs' α value, so this study uses cronbachs' α value as the method of reliability test. The results show that cronbachs' α value above 0.8 indicates good reliability, α value between 0.7 and 0.8 indicates good reliability, α value between 0.6 and 0.7 indicates acceptable reliability, and α value below 0.6 indicates poor reliability, so the internal structure of the scale needs to be modified. This study uses spss21.0 to measure the reliability level of sample data, and the specific measurement results are shown in Table 3-8. The cronbachs' α value of leadership empowerment variable is 0.889, that of organizational commitment variable is 0.922, that of knowledge sharing variable is 0.932, and that of conscientiousness personality variable is 0.861. The cronbachs' α value of employee creativity variable is 0.908, the cronbachs' α values of all variables and their corresponding dimensions are greater than 0.8, and the overall reliability of the questionnaire reaches 0.980, indicating that the data of this study has a high level of reliability. High reliability level is the premise of high-efficiency level. Only after the high-level reliability of questionnaire is verified can the validity level of sample data be verified.

Table 3-3 Reliability test of sample

Item	Number	Cronbachs'α	Ref. range
LE	12	0.889	
OC	15	0.922	
KS	5	0.932	≥0.7
CP	6	0.861	
EC	13	0.908	
Total	51	0.980	

Source: Author

Validity test

Validity test is to measure the accuracy of the data obtained by the scale, that is, the results obtained by the measurement tools can reflect the degree of the content investigated. The higher the validity is, the more consistent the results are with the content to be investigated. When the facet is composed of multiple items, we need to test whether these items can explain the facet well. In this study, confirmatory factor analysis is used to test the convergence validity and discriminant validity of the variables involved in this study. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is the basis of structural equation modeling. It is reasonable to conduct structural equation analysis only when the measurement results can accurately reflect the measured planes.

Findings
Profile of Respondents

A total of 560 subjects were interviewed and 489 valid questionnaires were collected. The effective rate was 87.32%. From the efficiency of the sample, the questionnaire collected in this study is more effective, which indicates that the sample questionnaire is more reliable and also confirms that the research results are highly reliable.

First, the basic information of the respondents was analyzed. From the perspective of gender composition, the overall balance was still balanced, with the majority of men interviewed, accounting for 64.0% of the total samples and 36.0% of the female. From the perspective of age composition, 26-35 years old accounted for the most, accounting for 51.7%, followed by 36-45 years old, accounting for 25.2%, followed by 46-55 years old, accounting for 10.2%, and finally under 25 years old and over 55 years old accounted for 9.8% and 3.1% respectively. According to the degree of the interviewees, the overall situation is relatively balanced, with undergraduate degree accounting for 52.1%, junior college degree accounting for 26.8%, master degree or above accounting for 14.1%, and senior high school or below accounting for 7.0%. Through the analysis of the basic situation of the interviewee, such as gender, age, education background, we can get that the interviewee is generally reasonable, each area has coverage, and the collected questionnaire has a certain representativeness, which provides some support for the subsequent reliability and validity analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, hypothesis test and regression analysis.

Secondly, the basic information of the enterprise in which the interviewee is located is analyzed. In the composition of enterprise years, 10-20 years accounted for the most, accounting for 39.1%, followed by 5-10 years, accounting for 20%, 3-5 years, accounting for 16.8%, followed by more than 20 years, accounting for 15.3%, and finally less than 3 years, accounting for 8.8%. In the property right structure of enterprises, the proportion of private enterprises is relatively large, accounting for 68.7%. It can be seen that most of Zhejiang enterprises are mainly private enterprises, followed by state-owned or state-owned holding enterprises, accounting for 19.8%, and foreign-funded enterprises, accounting for 8.6%, and the last 2.9% of other enterprises. Among the industry components of the enterprises, the proportion of information technology services is the highest, up to 35.0%, followed by manufacturing, accounting for 29.9%. It shows that Zhejiang enterprises mainly focus on information technology services and manufacturing, and then transportation and wholesale and retail industries, accounting for 8.0% and 6.1% respectively. Then there are other and recreational industries, each accounting for 9.2% and 4.1%, and finally education, construction, finance and agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry and fishery, accounting for 2.9%, 2.0%, 1.8% and 1.0% respectively. Among the enterprises, the proportion of enterprises with more than 1000 employees is the highest, accounting for 44.8%, which indicates that most of the respondents are from large companies. Secondly, 20-200 enterprises, accounting for 18.6%, and enterprises with 300-500 and 500-1000 people, accounting for 15.3%, and finally enterprises with less than 20 people, accounting for 6.7%. From the analysis of the enterprise years, property rights, industry and scale of sample enterprises, it can be concluded that the visiting enterprises are generally reasonable, each area has coverage, and the collected questionnaires are representative, which provides some support for the subsequent reliability and validity analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, hypothesis test and regression analysis.

The Relationship between Leadership Empowerment and Organizational Commitment
In this study, correlation analysis is used to compare the correlation types among the variables of the model, so as to preliminarily test the theoretical model and the reasonable type of research hypothesis, and lay the foundation for the next hypothesis test. The specific verification results are shown in table 4-1 below. The results show that the correlation between each variable reaches the significant level of 0.01. Among them, leadership empowerment (LE) and organizational commitment (OC) (r = 0.494, P < 0.01), leadership empowerment (LE) and knowledge sharing (KS) (r = 0.489, P < 0.01), leadership empowerment (LE) and responsible personality (CP) (r = 0.310, P < 0.01). The results showed that leadership empowerment (LE) and creativity (EMC) (r = 0.480, P < 0.01),

organizational commitment (OC) and knowledge sharing (KS) (r = 0.741, P < 0.01), organizational commitment (OC) and responsible personality (CP) (r = 0.348, P < 0.01), organizational commitment (OC) and creativity (EMC) (r = 0.411, P < 0.01). Knowledge sharing (KS) and responsible personality (CP) (r = 0.401, P < 0.01), knowledge sharing (KS) and creativity (EMC) (r = 0.425, P < 0.01), responsible personality (CP) and creativity (EMC) (r = 0.249, P < 0.01). The results provide preliminary support for the following hypothesis.

Table 4-4 Correlation coefficient of each variable

Variable	LE	OC	KS	CP	EMC
LE	1				
OC	0.494**	1			
KS	0.489**	0.741**	1		
CP	0.310**	0.348**	0.401**	1	
EMC	0.480**	0.411**	0.425**	0.249**	1
Mean	3.6704	3.983	4.0143	3.8553	4.1164
SD	0.41812	0.54647	0.60696	0.72475	0.54304

Note: the results are from spss21.0, * P < 0.05, * * P < 0.01, * * P < 0.001 (two-tailed).
Source: Author

Based on the above verification factor analysis and correlation analysis, amos21.0 is used to establish the structural equation model to verify the correctness of the main effect model and the main effect model hypothesis. The results of specific measurement model fit of this study are shown in Table 4-2, RMSEA is 0.043, less than 0.1, CFI is 0.902, more than 0.9, IFI is 0.902, more than 0.9, TLI is 0.896, very close to 0.9, χ^2 / DF is 1.896, between 1-3. The results show that the fitness index of each model has reached the standard of fitness, which shows that the model of this study fits well and is reasonable.

Table 4-5 Fitness of structural equation model

Index	Result	Standard
RMSEA	0.043	<0.05（Excellent），0.05-0.08（Good），0.08-0.10（General）
CFI	0.902	＞0.80
IFI	0.902	＞0.80
TLI	0.896	＞0.80
χ^2 / DF	1.897	< 1 (over fit), 1-3 (good fit), 3-5 (general fit), > 5 (poor fit)

Source: Author

After the model fitness test, this study further evaluated the model parameters through amos21.0 to verify the research hypothesis. The specific verification results are shown in Table 4-3 and Figure 4-2. Table 4-3 shows the standardized path coefficient, non-standardized path coefficient, standard deviation and t value of each path of this research model. Figure 4-2 shows the standardized path coefficient, significance level and t value of this research model.

This study constructs a multiple mediating model of the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity, and explores the mediating mechanism and boundary conditions. The results are shown in Table 4-21. Through the research, we find that: Leadership empowerment has a significant positive impact on organizational commitment; leadership empowerment has a significant positive impact on knowledge sharing within the organization; organizational commitment has a significant positive impact on employee

creativity. Organizational commitment has a significant positive impact on knowledge sharing within the organization; organizational commitment plays a significant intermediary role between leadership empowerment and employee creativity; and knowledge sharing within the organization has a significant positive impact on employee creativity. Knowledge sharing within the organization plays a significant intermediary role between leadership empowerment and employee creativity. Due diligence personality has a significant positive effect on the regulation of leadership empowerment and organizational commitment, while due diligence personality has a significant positive role in regulating the leadership empowerment and knowledge sharing within the organization. All the hypotheses involved in this study have been verified by data analysis, which provides reliable theoretical support for the suggestions and Enlightenment in the future.

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the relevant research background, this paper takes Zhejiang enterprises as an example to study the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity. Taking organizational commitment and knowledge sharing as mediating variables, this paper puts forward several questions, namely, what are the pre internal factors of organizational commitment? What are the pre internal factors of knowledge sharing within an organization? In Zhejiang, an active land of innovation and entrepreneurship, will organizational commitment affect employee creativity? Does knowledge sharing within an organization affect employee creativity? When employees are conscientious, does empowerment affect organizational commitment? When employees are conscientious personality characteristics, will the empowerment of leadership affect the knowledge sharing among employees in the organization? To solve these six problems, this study proposes the relationship between leadership empowerment, organizational commitment, knowledge sharing, conscientiousness and employee creativity. In order to verify the true and false nature of the relationship between models, this study used questionnaires to collect data from 489 enterprises in Zhejiang province. According to the data collected, descriptive statistics analysis, reliability and validity test of related variables, correlation among variables, structural equation modeling and hypothesis testing were conducted. Finally, the results are shown in Table 5-1: Leadership empowerment is conducive to organizational commitment; leadership empowerment is conducive to knowledge sharing among employees within the organization; organizational commitment has a significant positive impact on knowledge sharing among employees; organizational commitment has a significant positive impact on employee creativity; knowledge sharing among employees has a significant positive impact on employee creativity; conscientiousness personality has a positive moderating effect on the relationship between leadership empowerment and organizational commitment; Conscientiousness Personality has a significant positive moderating effect on the relationship between leadership empowerment and knowledge sharing among employees.

According to the above conclusions, leadership empowerment can directly or indirectly affect employee creativity. For example, leadership empowerment indirectly affects employees' creativity through organizational commitment and knowledge sharing, and in the context of employees' conscientious personality, conscientious personality can positively regulate the impact of leadership empowerment on organizational commitment, and conscientious personality can positively regulate the impact of leadership empowerment on knowledge sharing within the organization. These conclusions have some implications for academic research and management practice.

With the increasingly fierce market competition, employee creativity is becoming more and more important in the sustainable development of enterprises. Based on behavioral exchange

theory and organizational competence theory, this paper studies the influence of leadership empowerment on employee creativity by introducing organizational commitment and knowledge sharing as mediating variables in the context of conscientious personality. The results show that leadership empowerment has a positive impact on employee creativity through organizational commitment, and leadership empowerment has a positive impact on employee creativity through knowledge sharing within the organization. The higher the Conscientiousness Personality, the deeper the impact of leadership empowerment on organizational commitment. The more conscientious the employees are, the deeper the influence of leadership empowerment on knowledge sharing is.

The generation of employee creativity not only includes novel and valuable ideas, but also involves the cognitive process and behavioral process of creative thinking. Research on the impact of employee creativity should consider its results and process. Organizational commitment and knowledge sharing within the organization reflect leaders' attention to employee creativity in both results and process. In this paper, organizational commitment and knowledge sharing within the organization are included in the research framework to more comprehensively reveal the important role of organizational commitment and knowledge sharing within the organization in the process of employee creativity promotion, so as to attract more research attention to the process of creativity generation, and also help to guide the empowerment practice in different situations.

References

Ahearne, M. , Mathieu, J. , & Rapp, A. . (2005). To empower or not to empower your sales force? an empirical examination of the influence of leadership empowerment behavior on customer satisfaction and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(5), 945-955.

Ajmal, M., Helo, P., & Kekäle, T.. (2010). Critical factors for knowledge management in project business. *Journal of knowledge management, 14*(1), 156-168.

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E.. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, (1), 107-136.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P.. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior, 49*(3), 252-276.

Amabile, T. M.. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of management journal 39*(5), 1154-1184.

Amayah, A. T.. (2013). Determinants of knowledge sharing in a public sector organization. *Journal of knowledge management, 17*(3), 454-471.

Anastasios, Z., Constanti, P., & Theocharous, A. L.. (2014). Job involvement, commitment, satisfaction and turnover: Evidence from hotel employees in Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, (41), 129-140.

Anderson, N., Potočnik, K., & Zhou, J.. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of management, 40*(5), 1297-1333.

Arnold J A, Arad S, & Rhoades J A, et al. (2000). The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(3), 249-269.

Arnold, J. A., Arad, S., & Drasgow, R. F.. (2000). The Empowering Leadership Questionnaire: The Construction and Validation of a New Scale for Measuring Leader Behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*(3), 249-269.

Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., & Koh, W.. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, *Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25*(8), 951-968.

Baer, M. O., & Greg, R.. (2006). The Curvilinear Relation Between Experienced Creative Time

Pressure and Creativity: Moderating Effects of Openness to Experience and Support for Creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 963-970.

Bagozzi, R. P.. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: A comment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(3), 375-381.

Baker, T. J., & Bichsel, J.. (2006). Personality predictors of intelligence: Differences between young and cognitively healthy older adults. *Personality & Individual Differences, 41*(5), 861-871.

Baron, R. M., & David, A. K.. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 51*(6), 1173.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K.. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology, 44*(1), 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K.. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the big five personality dimensions and job performance. *Journal of applied Psychology, 78*(1), 111.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Gupta, R.. (2003) Meta-analysis of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and Holland's occupational types. *Personnel psychology, 56*(1), 45-74.

Becker, H. S.. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology, 66*(1), 32-40.

Birdi, & Kamal. (2008). The impact of human resource and operational management practices on company productivity: A longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology, 61*(3), 467-501.

Bodla, A. A., Tang, N., & Jiang, W.. (2018). Diversity and creativity in cross-national teams: The role of team knowledge sharing and inclusive climate. *Journal of Management & Organization, 24*(5), 711-729.

Buchanan, B.. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, (3), 533-546.

Cai, Y. H., Jia, L. D., You, S. Y., Zhang, Y., & Chen, Y. L.. (2013). The impact of differentiated transformational leadership on knowledge sharing and team creativity: an explanation of social network mechanism. *Journal of Psychology, 45*(5), 585-598.

Carmeli, A., & Paulus, P. B.. (2015). CEO ideational facilitation leadership and team creativity: The mediating role of knowledge sharing. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 49*(1), 53-75.

Chan, A. W., & Snape, E.. (2013). Are cultural values associated with organizational and union commitment and citizenship behavior? A study of Chinese manufacturing workers. *Asia Pacific journal of management, 30*(1), 169-190.

Chen, F.. (2016). *Research on the influence mechanism of organizational innovation climate, work motivation and work characteristics on employee creativity*. (Doctoral dissertation).

Chen, L. Y.. (2002). An examination of the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational commitment at steel companies. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, 7*(2), 122-142.

Chen, Y. X., Jia, L. D., & Li, C. P.. (2006). Transformational leadership, psychological empowerment and employees' organizational commitment: An Empirical Study in China. *Management World*, (1), 96-105.

Chiregi, M., & Navimipour, N. J.. (2016). A new method for trust and reputation evaluation in the cloud environments using the recommendations of opinion leaders' entities and removing the effect of troll entities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, (60), 280-292.

Conger, J. A., & Rabindra, N. K.. (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.

Du S., & Xu, J.. (2010). Team innovation atmosphere: promoting individual innovation with team level. *Scientific and technological progress and Countermeasures*, *27(*2), 150-152.

Du, P. C., Yao, Y., & Fang, Y.. (2018). The influence of social interaction on employees' innovative behavior -- a mediating moderator. *Soft Science, 32*(9), 36-39..

Duan, J. Y., Tian, X. M., & Wang, X. H.. (2013). The influence of emotional intelligence on employee creativity. *Scientific research management*, (8), 106-114.

Farmer, S. M., & Mcintyre, T. K.. (2003). Employee Creativity in Taiwan: An Application of Role

Identity Theory. *The Academy of Management Journal, 46*(5), 618-630.

Finegan, J. E., & Laschinger, H. K. S.. (2001). The antecedents and consequences of empowerment: A gender analysis. *The Journal of Nursing Administration, 31*(10), 489-497.

Ford, R. C., & Fottler, M. D.. (1995). Empowerment：A matter of degree. *The Academy of Management Executive, 9*(3), 21-29.

Forrester, R.. (2000). Empowerment: Rejuvenating a potent idea. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 14*(3), 67-80.

Ganesan, S., & Weitz, B. A.. (1996). The impact of staffing policies on retail buyer job attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of retailing, 72*(1), 31-56.

Gardner, H.. (1993). Multiple intelligences. *The theory in practice. 32*(6), 304.

Geng, X.. (2011). *The influence of leadership authorization and empowerment on employee innovation behavior*. (Doctoral dissertation, Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaotong University).

Geng, Z. Z., Liu, X. M., & Yang, C. H.. (2012). The influence of strategic orientation and external knowledge acquisition on Organizational Creativity. *Nankai management review*, (4), 15-27.

Grant, A. M., & Berry, J. W.. (2011). The Necessity of Others is The Mother of Invention: Intrinsic and Prosocial Motivations, Perspective Taking, and Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 54*(1), 73-96.

Grant, R. M.. (1996). Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments: Organizational capability as knowledge integration. *Organization science, 7*(4), 375-387.

Greenbaum, R. L., Mawritz, M. B., & Eissa, G.. (2012). Bottom-line mentality as an antecedent of social undermining and the moderating roles of core self-evaluations and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(2), 343.

Griffin, B., & Hesketh, B.. (2003). Adaptable behaviours for successful work and career adjustment. *Australian Journal of psychology, 55*(2), 65-73.

Guilford, J. P.. (1950). Creativity. *American Psychologist, 5*(9), 444

Hakimi, N., Knippenberg, D. V., & Giessner, S.. (2010). Leader Empowering Behaviour: The Leader\"s Perspective. *British Journal of Management, 21*(3), 701-716.

Han, J., & Brass, D. J.. (2013). Human capital diversity in the creation of social capital for team creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(1), 54-71.

Han, Y.. (2008). The relationship between job performance and job satisfaction, organizational commitment and goal orientation. *Journal of Psychology, 40*(1), 84-91.

Hoarau, H., & Kline, C.. (2014). Science and industry: Sharing knowledge for innovation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, (46), 44-61.

Homans, G. C.. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American journal of sociology, 63*(6), 597-606.

Hooff, B. V., & Weenen, F. I.. (2004). Committed to share: commitment and CMC use as antecedents of knowledge sharing. *Knowledge and process management, 11*(1), 13-24.

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J. & Mullen, M. R.. (2008). Structural Equation Modeling: Guidelines for Determining Model Fit. *Electronic Journal on Business Research Methods, 6*(1):141-146.

Hou, Y. B., & Gu, S. Y.. (2017). Perfectionism and procrastination of knowledge workers. *Journal of Peking University: Natural Science Edition,* (53), 578.

Hu, H., Gu. Q. X., & Chen, J. X.. (2012). A review of the impact of transformational leadership on organizational creativity and innovation. *Nankai business review*, (5), 26-35.

Hu, M. L. M., Horng, J. S., & Sun, Y. H. C.. (2009). Hospitality teams: Knowledge sharing and service innovation performance. *Tourism management, 30(*1), 41-50.

Huang, C. C.. (2009). Knowledge sharing and group cohesiveness on performance: An empirical study of technology R&D teams in Taiwan. *Technovation, 29*(11), 786-797.

Huang, S. L., Lin, C. D., & Wang, Y. W.. (2005).Research on implicit theory of creativity: origin and current situation. *Progress in Psychological Science, 13*(6), 715-720.

Huang, X., Hsieh, J. J., & He, W.. (2014). Expertise dissimilarity and creativity: The contingent roles of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 99*(5), 816.

Huang, Z. H., Bai, X. W., Lin, L., & Song, Y.. (2014). The mediating mechanism of conscientiousness and neuroticism on procrastination. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *22*(1), 140-144.

Jafri, M. H.. (2010). Organizational commitment and employee's innovative behavior: A study in retail sector. *Journal of Management Research, 10*(1), 62.

Jafri, M. Hassan, D., & Sonam, C.. (2016). "Emotional intelligence and employee creativity: Moderating role of proactive personality and organizational climate." *Business Perspectives and Research, 4*(1), 54-66.

Jia, L., Shaw, J. D., & Tsui, A. S.. (2014). A social–structural perspective on employee–organization relationships and team creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(3), 869-891.

Jia, X. J., & Lin, C. D.. (2014). Creativity research: four orientations in Psychology. Journal of Beijing Normal University, (1), 61-67.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S.. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, (2), 102-138.

Johnson, R. E., & Chang, H. H.. (2008). Relationships between organizational commitment and its antecedents: Employee self-concept matters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*(2), 513-541.

Jolaee, A., MdNor, K., & Khani, N.. (2014). Factors affecting knowledge sharing intention among academic staff. *International Journal of Educational Management, 28*(4), 413-431.

Judge, T. A., & Ilies, R.. (2002). Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of applied psychology, 87*(4), 797.

Kessler, E. H., & Chakrabarti, A. K.. (1996). Innovation speed: A conceptual model of context, antecedents, and outcomes. *Academy of management review, 21*(4), 1143-1191.

Kirkman, B. L., & Rosen, B.. (1999). Beyond Self-Management: Antecedents and Consequences of Team Empowerment. *The Academy of Management Journal, 42*(1), 58-74.

Koberg, C. S., Boss, R. W., & Senjem, J. C.. (1999). Antecedents and outcomes of empowerment: Empirical evidence from the health care industry. *Group & organization management, 24*(1), 71-91.

Konczak, L. J., Stelly, D. J., & Trusty, M. L.. (2000). Defining and Measuring Empowering Leader Behaviors: Development of an Upward Feedback Instrument. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*(2), 301-313.

König, C. J., Probst, T. M., & Staffen, S.. (2011). A Swiss–US comparison of the correlates of job insecurity. *Applied Psychology, 60*(1), 141-159.

Kuokkanen, L., Leino, K. H., & Katajisto, J.. (2003). Nurse empowerment, job-related satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of nursing care quality, 18*(3), 184-192.

Lang, Y., & Wang, H.. (2016). Empowering leadership behavior and organizational citizenship behavior: the role of employee leadership identity and Organizational Psychological Ownership. *Psychological Science*, (5), 1229-1235.

Laschinger, H. K. S., Finegan, J. E., & Shamian, J.. (2004). A longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on work satisfaction. Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, *Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25*(4), 527-545.

Laschinger, S., Heather, K., & Finegan. (2001). The Impact of Workplace Empowerment, Organizational Trust on Staff Nurses' Work Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Health care management, 26*(3), 7-23.

Lee, J. N.. (2001). The impact of knowledge sharing, organizational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success. *Information & management, 38*(5), 323-335.

Lei, X. H., Shan, Z. W., & Su, T. Y.. (2015). The influence of humble leadership on employee creativity. *Management science*, (2), 115-125.

Lekhawipat, W., Wei, Y. H., & Lin, C.. (2018). How internal attributions affect knowledge sharing behavior. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 22*(4), 867-886.

Lepine, J. A., Colquitt, J. A., & Erez, A.. (2000). Adaptability to changing task contexts: Effects of general cognitive ability, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. *Personnel psychology, 53*(3), 563-593.

Lepine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E.. (2002). The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: a critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology, 87*(1), 52.

Li C. P. X., & Shi, K. C, X.. (2006). Psychological Empowerment: Measurement and its Effect on Employees' Work Attitude in China. *Acta Psychologica Sinica, 38*(01), 99-106.

Li, C. P., Li, X. X., & Shi, K.. (2006). Measurement of empowerment and its relationship with

employees' work attitude. *Journal of Psychology*, *38*(1), 99-106.

Li, H., Li, Y. Z., & Chen, H.. (2014). The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on employees' organizational commitment and job satisfaction -- considering the mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Technology economy, 33*(1), 66-74.

Li, J. P., Zhang, P. F., & Wang, X.. (2016). The influence of quiet leadership and organizational commitment on job performance. *Hunan Social Sciences*, (1), 110-115.

Li, W. D., & Liu, H.. (2014). Research on the relationship between R & D team members' trust and knowledge sharing intention: the mediating role of knowledge power loss and mutual benefit. *Management review*, *26*(3), 128-138.

Li, W. M., & Li, S. Q.. (2015). How entrepreneurs can improve their creativity through organizational support in local context. *Leadership Science*, (35), 51-54.

Li, W., & Mei, J. X.. (2018). Research on the influence of leadership empowerment on employees' innovation behavior: a moderating mediating model. *Soft science*, *32*(12), 79-83.

Li, X. J., & Wei, F.. (2007). Research on the influence of organizational justice and transactional leadership on organizational commitment. *Nankai Business Review, 10*(5), 82-88.

Li, Z. W., Zhang, Y., & Wang, F. R.. (2019). The influence of prosocial leadership on Team Creativity: the mediating role of information acquisition and knowledge sharing within organizations. *Modern management science*, (8), 30.

Liden, R. C. , Wayne, S. J., & Sparrowe, R. T.. (2000). An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between the job, interpersonal relationships, and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(3), 407-416.

Liebowitz, J.. (1999). *Knowledge Management Handbook*. New York: CRC Press.

Lin, C. P.. (2007). To share or not to share: Modeling tacit knowledge sharing, its mediators and antecedents. *Journal of business ethics, 70*(4), 411-428.

Liu, J. J., & Zou, H. M.. (2013). The influence of transformational leadership and psychological empowerment on employee creativity. *Scientific research management*, *34*(3), 68-74.

Liu, X. M., Cui, T. H., & Shen, L.. (2016). Job stress and employee creativity: moderating effect of personality traits. *Journal of Xi'an Jiaotong University*, (4), 37-44.

Locke, E. A., Alavi, M., & Wagner, J. A.. (1997). Participation in decision making: An information exchange perspective. *Decision support system*, (15), 293-331.

Luo, Z. W., Li, X. J., Song, X., & Li, Y. G.. (2017). The evolution of enterprise organizational structure from "empowerment" to "empowerment": a case study of Handuyishe. *China's industrial economy*, (9), 174-192.

Ma, Z., Long, L., Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., & Lam, C. K.. (2017). Why do high-performance human resource practices matter for team creativity? the mediating role of collective efficacy and knowledge sharing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 34*(3), 565-586.

Mackinnon, D. P., Fritz, M. S., & Williams, J.. (2007). Distribution of the product confidence limits for the indirect effect: program prodclin. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(3):384.

Marsh, & Robert, M.. (1992). A research note: Centralization of decision-making in Japanese factories. *Organization Studies, 13*(2), 261-274.

Matthews, R. A., Wendy, M. D., & Steven, G. C.. (2003). The organizational empowerment scale. *Personnel Review, 32*(3), 297-318.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., & Greenbaum, R. L.. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(1), 151-171.

McFerran, B., Aquino, K., & Duffy, M.. (2010). How personality and moral identity relate to individuals' ethical ideology. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 20*(1), 35-56.

Men, C., Fong, P. S. W., & Luo, J.. (2017). When and how knowledge sharing benefits team creativity: The importance of cognitive team diversity. *Journal of Management & Organization*, (1), 1-18.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J.. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review, 1*(1), 61-89.

Michailova, S, & Minbaeva, D. B.. (2012). Organizational values and knowledge sharing in multinational corporations: The Danisco case. *International Business Review, 21*(1), 59-70.

Mishina, Y., Pollock, T. G., & Porac, J. F.. (2004). Are more resources always better for growth?

Resource stickiness in market and product expansion. *Social Science Electronic Publishing, 25*(12), 1179-1197.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M.. (1981). *Employee-organization linkages : the psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. Academic press.

Mumford, M. D., Baughman, W. A., Maher, M. A.. (1997). Process-Based Measures of Creative Problem-Solving Skills: IV. Category Combination. *Creativity Research Journal, 10*(1), 59-71.

Nielsen, C., & Cappelen, K.. (2014). Exploring the Mechanisms of Knowledge Transfer in University-Industry Collaborations: A Study of Companies, Students and Researchers. *Higher Education Quarterly, 68*(4), 375-393.

Parker, R. J., & Kyj, L.. (2006). Vertical information sharing in the budgeting process. Accounting, *Organizations and Society, 31*(1), 27-45.

Perry, S. J. E., & Shalley, C. E.. (2014). A social composition view of team creativity: The role of member nationality-heterogeneous ties outside of the team. *Organization Science, 25*(5), 1434-1452.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F.. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 879-891.

Qv, C. X., & Wang, Z.. (2012). The relationship between personality traits, general self-efficacy and adaptive performance of employees. *Soft science*, (4), 105-109.

Ramayah, T., Yeap, J. A. L., & Ignatius, J.. (2014). Assessing knowledge sharing among academics: A validation of the knowledge sharing behavior scale (KSBS). *Evaluation review, 38*(2), 160-187.

Randall, D. M.. (1990). The Consequences of Organizational Commitment: Methodological Investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(5), 361-378.

Raub, S., & Robert, C.. (2010). Differential effects of empowering leadership on in-role and extra-role employee behaviors: Exploring the role of psychological empowerment and power values. *Human relations, 63*(11), 1743-1770.

Redding, S. G.. (1980). Cognition as an aspect of culture and its relation to management processes: An exploratory view of the Chinese case. *Journal of Management Studies, 17*(2), 127-148.

Rhodes, M.. (1961). An analysis of creativity. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 42*(7), 305-310.

Riege, A.. (2009). Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of knowledge management, 9*(3), 18-35.

Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L.. (2004). What leaders need to know: a review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *Leadership Quarterly, 15*(1), 33-53.

Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R.. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: where should we go from here?. *Journal of Management, 30*(6), 933-958.

Shin, S. J., Kim, T. Y., & Lee, J. Y.. (2012). Cognitive team diversity and individual team member creativity: A cross-level interaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(1), 197-212.

Siddique, C. M.. (2012). Knowledge management initiatives in the United Arab Emirates: a baseline study. *Journal of knowledge Management, 16*(5), 702-723.

Song, Y. F., Shi, Z., & Fengm S. L.. (2014). Research on the relationship between organizational commitment, knowledge sharing and individual innovation behavior. *Research on financial problems*, (12), 137-143.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Robert, E. Q.. (1996). Empowering middle managers to be transformational leaders. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 32*(3), 237-261.

Spreitzer, G. M., Janasz, S. C., & Quinn, R. E.. (1999). Empowered to lead: The role of psychological empowerment in leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 20*(4), 511-526.

Spreitzer, G. M.. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, and Validation. *The Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1442-1465.

Srivastava, A., & Bartol, K. M., (2006). Locke E A. Empowering leadership in management teams: Effects on knowledge sharing, efficacy, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*(6), 1239-1251.

Steers, & Richard, M.. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative science quarterly*, (1), 46-56.

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I.. (1991). An Investment Theory of Creativity and Its Development. *Human Development, 34*(1), 1-31.

Stewart, G. L., & Nandkeolyar, A. K.. (2006). Adaptation and intraindividual variation in sales outcomes: Exploring the interactive effects of personality and environmental opportunity. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(2), 307-332.

Sun, D. Y., Xiong, J., & Rong, Y.. (2016). Research on the relationship between employees' organizational commitment and knowledge sharing intention. *Journal of North China University of Technology*, (2), 70-75, 80.

Sun, S. L., & Lv, J.. (2016). The impact of empowering leadership on employee creativity: an analysis from the perspective of integration. *Research and development management,* (4), 117-125.

Swailes, S.. (2000). Goals, creativity and achievement: commitment in contemporary organizations. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 9*(3), 185-194.

Tang, C. Y., Hu, P., & Chen, Y.. (2008). An empirical study on the relationship between five personality traits and related performance and its dimensions of Chinese employees. *Soft science*, (9), 17-19.

Tang, G. Y., Li. P. C., & Li, J.. (2012). An analysis of the research frontiers of authorized leadership abroad and its future prospects. *Foreign economy and management*, *34*(9), 73-80.

Tang, H. Y., Long, L. R., & Zhou, R. Y.. (2015). Humble leadership behavior and subordinates' work engagement: a mediating moderating model. *Management science*, *28*(3), 77-89.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A.. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic management journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

Thoresen, C. J., Bradley, J. C., & Bliese, P. D.. (2004). The big five personality traits and individual job performance growth trajectories in maintenance and transitional job stages. *Journal of applied psychology, 89*(5), 835.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M.. (2011). Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 277-293.

Tierney, P., Farmer, S. M., & Graen, G. B.. (1999). An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships. *Personnel psychology, 52*(3), 591-620.

Tu, X. Y., Yang, B. Y., & Zhang, Q.. (2016). Learning goal orientation, willingness to share and employee creativity: mechanism and path. Science of science and management of science and technology, *37*(2), 161-171.

Vandelst, T., Cuyper, N., & Baillien, E.. (2016). Perceived control and psychological contract breach as explanations of the relationships between job insecurity, job strain and coping reactions: Towards a theoretical integration. *Stress and Health, 32*(2), 100-116.

Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L.. (2010). Empowering leadership: An examination of mediating mechanisms within a hierarchical structure. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(3), 0-542.

Wah, L.. (2000). Making knowledge stick. *The knowledge management yearbook*, (1), 145-156.

Walumbwa, F. O., Mayer, D. M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., & Christensen, A. L.. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: the roles of leader–member exchange, self-efficacy, and organizational identification. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 115*(2), 204-213.

Wang, D. X., & Hong, Y.. (2010). Research on the mediating mechanism of organizational climate influencing employee creativity. *Journal of Zhejiang University, 41*(2), 77-83.

Wang, D. X., Zhu, X. J., & Wang, Z. W.. (2009). An empirical study on the influence of team commitment on R and D personnel's creativity: knowledge sharing within the organization as a mediating variable. *Science of science and management of science and technology, 30*(12), 184-187.

Wang, H., Wu Z. Y., Zhang, Y., & Chen, S. Q.. (2008). Dimension confirmation and measurement of leadership empowerment behavior. *Journal of Psychology, 40*(12), 1297-1305.

Wang, P., & Rode, J. C. (2010). Transformational leadership and follower creativity: the moderating effects of identification with leader and organizational climate. *Human Relations, 63*(8), 1105-1128.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A.. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human resource management review, 20*(2), 115-131.

Wang, Y. Y., & Ye, J. J.. (2015). Ethical leadership, creativity, self efficacy and employee creativity: the moderating effect of performance. *Science of science and management of science and technology*, *36*(9), 164-172.

Wasti, S. A., & Can, Ö.. (2008). Affective and normative commitment to organization, supervisor, and coworkers: Do collectivist values matter?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(3), 404-413.

Watson, D. C.. (2001). Procrastination and the five-factor model: A facet level analysis. *Personality and individual differences, 30*(1), 149-158.

Wen, P., & Liao, J. Q.. (2010). The difference effect of different types of performance appraisal on employee appraisal reaction: a study from the perspective of appraisal purpose. *Nankai management review*, (2), 142-150.

Wiener, Y.. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of management review, 7*(3), 418-428

Cite this article:

Published by