The Impact of Creative Role Identity and Creative Self-Efficacy on Employee Creativity in the Hotel Business*

Ji-Eun KIM

Received: January 29, 2019    Revised: March 21, 2019    Accepted: March 30, 2019

Abstract

The study aims to investigate the nexus of between role identity, self-efficacy, feeling of energy, and employee creativity in the hotel industry of Korea. The employees' innovative behaviors like creativity have been many researchers' interest for decades in the hotel industry. The hypotheses depicting the relationship among the variables have been proposed based on a review of existing literature. The number of 215 cases was used for final analysis and the results were explained through structural equation modeling. The results indicate the hotel employees’ role identity and creative self-efficacy positively influenced their feeling of energy. Feeling of energy makes a positively significant impact on employee creativity. Feeling of energy partially mediates the relationship between the two independent variables and employee creativity. As a result, creative role identity, self-efficacy, and feeling of energy explain the variance of the hotel employees’ creativity. The results present that hotel practitioners need to regard their employees’ creative roles and build organizational culture to support creative activities so as to enhance employee creativity. Finally, theoretical and practical implications for the hotel industry and future studies have been discussed.
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1. Introduction

Rapid globalization and limitless competition result in continuous changes in the business worlds (Adawiyah & Pramuka, 2017). The hotel organizations as a global business confront pressure to develop innovative business items so as to survive or stay stable. Specifically, hotel guests have access to all the information they need so that they tend to willingly change their hotels to stay and don’t have unreasonable loyalty to any specific brand any more. Therefore, the hotel organizations need to provide the guests with innovative service items, programs, and/or facilities. Most of all, these items need to meet the guests’ needs and desires to build reputation and credibility of the organization (Hussain, Konar, & Ali, 2016). The rapid technology growth and information era make not only people change their preference often but also product life cycle shorter (Burke & Cooper, 2004). Under this business background with the needs of continuous growth and development (Burke & El-Kot, 2010), the hotel practitioners need to continue to generate and practice creative and innovative service items from the perspectives of the guests. Creativity and innovation can be main components to keep the maintenance of competition in such a dynamic business condition (Özarrallı, 2015).

Creativity in the organization refers to the activities of generation and introduction of novel and applicable ideas and solutions to the organization (Fadaee & Alzahrh, 2014). As a vital aspect to sustain organizational growth, the antecedents of creative behaviors have already become the abiding interest of studies on organizational behaviors (Li & Zheng, 2014). Personal factor is one of the factors that attract attention in the creative behavior in a company (Oldham & Cummings, 1996). Personal elements include
innate personality, intrinsic motivation like affection toward creativity, and self-efficacy according to Oldham and Cummings (1996).

The self-concept of role identity in relation to a creative role is particularly related to creative activities (Farmer, Tierney, & Kung-McIntyre, 2003) because individuals have a tendency to perform tasks in congruence with their role identity (Callero, Howard, & Piliavin, 1987). To date, although there are considerable studies on the personal factors to predict actual creative performance in the organization, how self-related factors relate to workplace creativity need to be investigated further (Farmer et al., 2003). Particularly, the hotel organizations have a high reliance on human resources so that the employees’ levels of creativity may influence their flexibility in service delivery, innovative ideas, and problem-solving. Therefore, the empirical evidence of personal factors to predict creative actions is likely to provide significant contribution to the hotel business.

This study aims at enhancing understanding on the effect of creative role identity and self-efficacy on creativity mediated through feeling of energy as a positive effect, which focused on the hotel industry. To achieve this goal, this study will specifically propose a conceptual model that portrays the relationship among creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, feeling of energy, and employee creativity. The conceptual model proposed the following research questions: whether the creative role identity has an influence on feeling of energy; whether creative self-efficacy has an influence on feeling of energy; whether creative role identity has an influence on creativity; whether creative self-efficacy has an influence on creativity; whether feeling of energy has an influence on creativity; whether feeling of energy mediate the effect of creative role identity and self-efficacy on employee creativity. The study results may stand to make a theoretical and practical contribution to the hotel business and the researches on workplace creativity.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Creative Role Identity and Feeling of Energy

Creative role identity means that individuals identify themselves as creative workers in the organization (Farmer et al., 2003). This self-attribute comes from two main sources like feedback about the self from others and related self-views (Riley & Burke, 1995). That is, if there is congruence between inputs from others and their own self-views, individuals tend to consider it as a support and verification of their views and apply it to their role identity. Ultimately, a creative role identity reflects an internalized system of creative role with a commitment to the creative role based on such a feedback from others and self-agreement with that feedback.

Welbourne, Andrews, and Andrews (2005) said “motivation at work is really about employee energy (p.56)”. This means individuals’ feeling of energy is a core component to help them give their time and effort unsparingly in the workplace. Individuals with creative role identity think their roles are creative performance and creativity is considered to be their goals. Goal oriented individuals have energy to fulfill their goals (Roberts, Teasure, & Cornoy, 2007). That is, their creative role identity may help them to feel high energy to satisfy their creativity needs.

Further, task-oriented individuals experienced positive feelings according to Duda and Ntoimanis (2009). Biddle Biddle, Wang, Kavussanu, and Spray (2003) also depicted the significant influence of domain specific goals raise pleasant effect and positive feelings. Thus, the individuals who consider creativity as their specific tasks are likely to have feeling of positive energy. Based on the existing literature, this study presents a hypothesis to draw the impact of the hotel employees’ role identity on their feeling of energy.

H1: The hotel employees’ creative role identity makes a positively significant impact on their feeling of energy.

2.2. Creative Self-Efficacy and Feeling of Energy

Creative self-efficacy is individuals’ overall confidence in their own capability of generating novel ideas for new products, service, and problem solution (Tierney & Farmer, 2002). Creative self-efficacy motivates creative activities through intrinsic motivation (Gong, Huang, & Farh, 2009). Intrinsic motivation is internal energy and movement to bring about goal oriented behaviors like creative activities. Individuals with high self-efficacy tend to perform better because they have stable emotion driven by clear goal setting (Bandura, 1991). In other words, individuals with creative self-efficacy are likely to have clear goals for creativity and this will enhance their emotional energy in the workplace.

According to the model of Ford (1996), employee efficacy is a core factor to motivate him or her towards innovative behaviors. That is, individuals are likely to have energy to drive them for creative performance when they have creative self-efficacy. This study presents the following hypothesis based on the previous literature.

H2: The hotel employees’ creative self-efficacy makes a positively significant impact on their feeling of energy.
2.3. Creative Role Identity and Employee Creativity

Creativity is generally defined as “a mental process involving the generation of new ideas or concepts, or new associations between existing ideas or concepts” (Jackson, Witt, Games, Fitzgerald, Eye, & Zhao, 2012, p.370). Therefore, creative individuals in the organization propose novel ideas to solve some problems. Role identities affect relevant role performances because role accomplishment fulfills a need for verifying self-roles (Markus & Wurf, 1987) and other’s recognition (Burke, 1991). Therefore, individuals with creative role identities are motivated to perform creatively to prove their creativity.

According to Fisher (1997), creative performance is likely to be driven by creative role identity. From a sense-making perspective, Farmer et al. (2003)’s study suggests that when the organizations value creative behaviors, individuals with higher creative role identity make more creative outcomes. As follows, the hypothesis to draw the relationship between creative role identity and creativity in the hotel industry based on the existing literature.

H3: The hotel employees’ creative role identity makes a significantly positive impact on their creativity.

2.4. Employee Creative Self-Efficacy and Employee Creativity

Creativity is often a time taking activity of devotion and success is not guaranteed in such a innovative action. Therefore, individuals have the needs for perseverance to support creative actions (Bandura, 1997). There are several studies to conclude self-efficacy is such a perseverance to sustain creativity. In an early study, Redmond, Mumford, and Teach (1993) proved a domain specific self-efficacy is an antecedent to expect employees’ creative actions and thoughts. For example, this study suggested individuals with self-efficacy for marketing skills showed significantly more creative performance related to marketing works.

Tierney and Farmer (2002) also investigated on the impact of creative self-efficacy on creativity sampling employees from a manufacturing and an operation division. A similar relationship in a sample of an R&D unit of a chemical company (Tierney & Farmer, 2004) has been supported as well. Further, Carmeli and Schaubroek (2007) proved that creative self-efficacy significantly influenced creative work involvement in the financial service industry. Sternberg (2006) also emphasized the important role of confidence in creativity to optimize employees’ creative capabilities.

More recently, Tierney and Farmer (2011) investigated creative self-efficacy development and changes in creativity level over time. Results indicated the level of self-efficacy significantly explained the variance of creativity. Creative self-efficacy helps individuals to be engaged in challenge and idea generation so as to accomplish creative performance. They consider creative performance as their expected tasks and make a commitment to relevant performance. Based on the previous studies, the hypothesis is drawn as follows:

H4: The hotel employees’ creative self-efficacy makes a significantly positive impact on their creativity.

2.5. Feeling of Energy and Employee Creativity

Plenty of studies have demonstrated that creative performance can be acquired by time and energy intensive activities (Amabile, 1983). Positive affective states of energy and vitality provide necessary condition for optimal creative activities. This relationship was supported by Fredrickson's Broaden-and-Build model (Fredrickson, 1998, 2001). In this model, it was posited that positive feelings may bring about creative behaviors. Similarly, the relationship was demonstrated in the socially embedded Model of Thriving (Spreitzer, Sutcliffe, Dutton, Sonenshein, & Grant, 2005).

Further, Isen, Daubman, and Nowicki (1987) argued that positive feeling is a significant energy to extend individuals’ cognitive range. This enlarged cognitive condition help individuals to have problem-solving and creative capabilities (Isen, 1999a, 1999b; Isen, 2004). Amabile, Barsade, Mueller, and Staw (2005) further systemized the significant relationship between positive affect and creativity in the workplace and notified positive feeling made cognitive context broaden and keep consistency. More recently, positive affect such as energy or passion increased creative activities through cognitive flexibility (Binnewies & Wörnlein, 2011; De Dreu, Baas, & Nijstad, 2008). Luh and Lu (2012)’s study depicted creative achievement was expected by balanced passion. Similarly, Cardon, Gregoire, Stevens, and Patel (2013) proposed that individuals with energy for invention led to real creative performance. Therefore, feeling of energy as a positive affect is likely to influence individuals’ creativity through cognitive enlargement. Based on the existing studies, this study draws the hypothesis as follows:

H5: The hotel employees’ feeling of energy makes a significantly positive impact on their creativity.

2.6. The Mediating Role of Feeling of Energy

Research reveals that the emotional experience during task conduction is likely to play an important role in the
relationship between motivation and performance (Meyer & Turner, 2002; Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2009). Positive affect is likely to benefit performance because it helps individuals to put great amount of time and effort to the given tasks (Fredrickson, 2001) because positive affect arouses feeling of energy or passion. In contrast, negative affect during task performance may distract individuals’ attention from their tasks (Friedman & Förster, 2010).

According to Gillet, Vallerand, Lafreniere, and Bureau (2013), positive affect played a mediating role for the relationship between motivation and performance.

Goguen (2015)’s study concluded that decreased positive psychological states mediate the negative relationship between hindrance stressor and organizational citizenship behavior. Previous research indicates that individuals’ positive and/or negative state of feeling works as a mechanism for the effect of antecedent variables on outcome variables. Therefore, feeling of energy as a positive affect and motivational component is likely to mediate the effect of creative role identity and self-efficacy on creativity. As follows, it is hypothesized that feeling of energy mediates the effect of creative role identity and self-efficacy on employee creativity in the hotel industry.

H6: The hotel employees’ feeling of energy mediates the positive effect of creative role identity on employee creativity.

H7: The hotel employees’ feeling of energy mediates the positive effect of creative self-efficacy on employee creativity.

3. Research Method and Materials

3.1. Settlement of Proposed Model

As illustrated in Figure 1, based on the propositions developed from the literature review, a conceptual model is proposed to explain the relationship among creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, feeling of energy, and employee creativity.

![Figure 1: Conceptual Model](image)

3.2. Instruments

Creative Role Identity: Farmer et al. (2003)’s three-item scale modified from Callero (1985)’s role identity scale is adapted to measure the extent to which the hotel employees’ creative role has been associated with self-identity. The creative role identity scale includes three items like “I often think about being creative”. The respondents were asked to rate themselves based on their usual self and their answers were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree).

Creative Self-Efficacy: Tierney and Farmer (2002)’s three item scale is used to measure creative self-efficacy. They substantially describe the respondent’s perception on their creative efficacy through idea generation, confidence in problem-solving, and creativity in problem solving. The respondents rated their extent of self-efficacy ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree.” Sample item includes “I am good at generating novel ideas.”

Feeling of Energy: Atwater and Carmeli (2009)’s eight-item scale has been adapted to measure the hotel employees’ feeling of energy. The respondents were asked to rate their sense of eagerness and capability to complete their work in the hotel organization. Sample item is “I feel active and energetic at work.” The answers were recorded on 7-point Likert scale from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree.”

Employee Creativity: Four items from Tierney, Farmer, and Graen (1999) are used to measure the hotel employees’ creativity. Each respondent’s creativity is assessed by their immediate superiors’ ratings of the items. Four item scales were used based on Likert-style questionnaire (1, “strongly disagree”, 7, “strongly agree”). The items included “Tries new ideas or methods first.”

3.3. Data Collection and Sample Frame

This study targets the five-star deluxe hotel employees. A preliminary study was conducted sampling fifty respondents currently working for Grand Hyatt and JW Marriott in Seoul. This had been conducted from March 1 to 15 in 2017 and showed a reasonable fit. At the same time, the respondents were asked to check whether there were any vague items in the survey. This process has been conducted because each item was translated from English to Korean so that some items might not fit Korean language.

The main survey was conducted using convenience sampling including JW Marriott, Grand Hyatt, The Shilla, and Westin Chosun in Seoul, Paradise hotel in Pusan, and the Shilla in Jeju. The main survey has been done using mail survey to each hotel from May 10 to Jun 20 in 2017 after permitted by each business outlet’s managers acquainted with the researcher. The study objective and survey method
had been explained to the managers prior to the survey. Then, they were asked to survey forty cases of subordinates, colleagues, and superiors with more than one year’s work experience in the hotel organization and full time position if possible.

The survey described that each response was confidential and it was conducted after the respondents’ consents. If they didn’t like to continue the survey, they could quit the survey at any time. This was carried out to fulfill the study ethics of human rights. A total number of 230 responses had been collected out of 240 cases requested. Further, after the cases with missing values were subsequently dropped from the collected data, the number of 215 cases has been analyzed.

4. Results

4.1. Demographic Information

As presented in Table 1, out of the 215 respondents, the result shows that 50.3% of them are males (108 persons) and 49.7% of them are females (107 persons). The majority of the respondents (20~29: 67.0%, 30~39: 20.9%) are in the age group of 20-39. Moreover, the majority of the respondents have bachelor’s degrees (68.4%). Also, 110 respondents (51.2%) have 1~3 year(s) of work experience, 66 people (30.7%) have 4~9 years, and 39 people (18.1%) have over 10 years’ experiences in the hotel industry. Most of the respondents such as 164 persons (76.3%) are full time employees. At the same time, their current department are distributed to room division (23.7%), back office (21.4%), food and beverage (19.1%), catering (18.2%); clerk (66.5%), caption (15.3%), manager (7.9%), and director or higher position (10.2%).

4.2. Result of Validity and Reliability

As the survey items are adapted from different streams of studies, it is important to ensure construct reliability and validity. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used to determine reliability of the measurement.

As indicated in Table 2, Conbach’s alpha of each construct in measurement model is ranged from 0.844 to 0.962 and fulfills cutoff; this value is adequate at Cronbach’s a $\geq$ 0.60 (Lee, 2006).

If construct reliability reaches above 0.7, convergent validity or internal consistency is secured (Kim, 2007). Also, convergent validity is procured as long as AVE reaches above 0.5 (Kim, 2007). In terms of construct reliability, the values of five constructs are ranged from 0.758 to 0.946. As illustrated in Table 2, standardized factor loading of all measures were moderate (ranging from 0.743 to 0.928). These present that relevant measurement items adequately explained the designated underlying construct because it fulfills cutoff of above 0.5, explaining construct validity (Kim, 2007). Further, each average variance extracted (AVE) reaches from 0.512 to 0.694. Discriminant validity was established using the procedures outlined by Fornell and Larcker (1981). As a result, these values represent all three constructs, and it is significant to analyze the relationship between those constructs.

Table 1: Result of the Demographic Analysis of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ Characteristics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequencies (%)</th>
<th>Respondents’ Characteristics</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Frequencies (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>108(50.3)</td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>164(76.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107(49.7)</td>
<td>Temporary Contract</td>
<td>51(23.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20~29</td>
<td>144(67.0)</td>
<td>Room Division</td>
<td>51(23.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30~39</td>
<td>45(20.9)</td>
<td>Back Office</td>
<td>46(21.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40~49</td>
<td>22(10.2)</td>
<td>F&amp;B</td>
<td>41(19.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>4(1.9)</td>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>39(18.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>33(15.3)</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>143(66.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>147(68.4)</td>
<td>Caption</td>
<td>33(15.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>31(14.4)</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>17(7.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or Higher</td>
<td>3(1.4)</td>
<td>Director or Higher</td>
<td>22(10.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1(0.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>1~3 years</td>
<td>110(51.2)</td>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4~6 years</td>
<td>45(20.9)</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7~9 years</td>
<td>21(9.8)</td>
<td>Caption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>39(18.1)</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215(100)</td>
<td>Director or Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>215(100)</td>
<td>The Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.C.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Cronbach’s</th>
<th>CCR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Role Identity</td>
<td>Often thinking about being creative.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No clear concept of myself as a creative employee (reverse-coded).</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>11.716</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being a employee is an important part of my identity.</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>12.844</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being good at generating novel ideas.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having confidence in my ability to solve problems creatively.</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>18.524</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being good at finding creative ways to solve problems</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>19.606</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Feeling active and energetic at work</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having high energy to complete my work</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>22.515</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the work day feel full of energy</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>20.199</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having energy to successfully do my job</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>19.624</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When getting to work in the morning having energy for the new day</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>15.425</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling enthusiastic when doing my work</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>19.586</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work in this organization gives me positive energy</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>18.162</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When being at work feeling vital and alive</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>17.988</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Energy</td>
<td>Trying new ideas or methods first.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking new ideas and ways to solve problems.</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>18.881</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generating ground-breaking ideas related to the field.</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>19.254</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A good role model for creativity.</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>17.976</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 (df:127) = 192.026$, $p<0.000$, CMIN/df= 1.512, GFI= 0.913, AGFI= 0.883, RMR= 0.042, NFI= 0.954, CFI= 0.984, TLI= 0.981, RMSEA= 0.049, ***: 0.000 (r):reversed score, CCR: Composite construct reliability, AVE: Average variance extracted

4.3. Result of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The confirmatory measurement model was used to examine the construct validity of the measurement in this study. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) procedures can confirm whether the scales of psychometric properties are reasonable fit to extend beyond exploratory analytic technique (Noar, 2003). Further, CFA can add further information about dimensionality of scale by testing a variety of models against one another (Noar, 2003). The confirmatory factor analysis was completed with maximum likelihood estimation in this study. CFA was applied to all the items and chi-square of 192.026, degree of freedom of 127, and $p$-value of 0.000 ($p<0.001$). Further, the value in chi-square/df should be less than three to secure overall goodness of fit (Kim, 2007). The value of chi-square/df shows 1.512 so that overall goodness of fit is secured.

In assessing model fit, the following indices should be fulfilled (Hooper, Couglan, & Mullen, 2008): GFI (Goodness-of-fit index: desirable at $\geq 0.90$), AGFI (Adjusted Goodness-of-fit Index: desirable at $\geq 0.90$), RMR (Root Mean Square Residual: desirable at $\leq 0.05$, acceptable at $\leq 0.08$), NFI (Normed fit index: desirable at $\geq 0.90$), CFI (Comparative fit index: desirable at $\geq 0.90$), $x^2$(chi-square: desirable at $>0.05$), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index: desirable at $\geq 0.90$), RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation: very desirable at $\leq 0.05$ or moderately desirable at $<0.08$).

As presented in Table 2, NFI (0.954), and AGFI (0.883) indicate unfulfilled indices, however, RMR (0.042), GFI (0.984), CFI (0.984), TLI (0.981), and RMSEA (0.049) indicate the reasonable fit of the data. The relatively small sample sizes limit the possibility of reaching the 0.9 cutoff value for some fit indices and they are not dependable as “a stand-alone index” (Hooper et al., 2008). Further, an acceptable model could be rejected if researchers strictly adhere to suggested cutoff values according to Marsh, Haw and Wen (2004). Therefore, the relationship among the latent variables can be presumed to be a reasonable fit.
4.4. Correlation Matrix

Gold, Malhotra, and Arvind (2001) suggests that discriminant validity is secured when correlation coefficients reach below 0.9. Correlation coefficients presented in Table 3 vary from 0.783 to 0.871 so that each correlation fulfills the desirable level.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix between the Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creative role identity</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling of energy</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee creativity</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at p<0.01, * significant at p<0.05

4.5. Test of Hypotheses Testing

4.5.1. Results of Overall Measurement Model Testing

Table 4 illustrated the strength of the relationships among the constructs, showing path coefficients and overall goodness of model fit indices. Overall, the model is an acceptable fit; \( x^2 \) (df : 129) = 212.610 (p = 0.000), CMIN/df = 1.648, GFI = 0.905, AGFI = 0.874, RMR = 0.043, NFI = 0.949, TLI = 0.975, CFI = 0.979, RMSEA = 0.055.

4.5.2. Results of Hypotheses Testing:

The path coefficients of the constructs were analyzed to examine the suggested hypotheses as follows; First, hypothesis 1, explaining the impact of the hotel employees’ creative role identity on feeling of energy has been supported; the study result presents a path coefficient of 0.440 for the impact of the hotel employees’ creative role identity on their feeling of energy (t=1.96, p<0.001).

Second, hypothesis 2, explaining the impact of the hotel employees’ creative self-efficacy on their feeling of energy has been supported; the result of the study shows path coefficient of 0.490 for the impact of creative self-efficacy on feeling of energy (t=1.96, p<0.001).

Third, hypothesis 3, explaining the impact of the hotel employees’ creative role identity on their employee creativity has been supported; the study result shows a path coefficient of 0.218 for the impact of creative role identity on employee creativity (t=1.96, p<0.001).

Fourth, hypothesis 4, explaining the impact of the hotel employees’ creative self-efficacy on their employee creativity has been supported; the study result shows path coefficient of 0.218 for the impact of creative self-efficacy on employee creativity (t=1.96, p<0.001).

Finally, hypothesis 5, explaining the impact of the hotel employees’ feeling of energy on their involvement in creative work has been supported; the result shows path coefficient of 0.445 for the impact of feeling of energy on involvement in creative work (t=1.96, p<0.001).

In summary, creative role identity and creative self-efficacy make a significantly positive influence on feeling of energy in the hotel industry. In addition, creative role identity and creative self-efficacy make a significantly positive impact on employee creativity. Finally, feeling of energy is significantly associated with employee creativity. To this end, it is withdrawn that the hotel employees’ clear beliefs in their creativity bring about high energy to work and creativity at work.

Table 4: Parameter Estimate in Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>S.C.</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>creative role identity → feeling of energy</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>5.177</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>creative self-efficacy → feeling of energy</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>6.084</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>creative role identity → employee creativity</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>creative self-efficacy → employee creativity</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>feeling of energy → employee creativity</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>4.825</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fit indices \( x^2 \) (df = 129) = 212.610 (p = 0.000), CMIN/df = 1.648, GFI = 0.905, AGFI = 0.874, RMR = 0.043, NFI = 0.949, TLI = 0.975, CFI = 0.979, RMSEA = 0.055

Note: *** significant at <0.001, ** significant at <0.01, * significant at <0.05, S.C.: standardized coefficient

Table 5: Total Effect, Direct Effect, and Indirect Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creative Role Identity</th>
<th>Creative Self-efficacy</th>
<th>Feeling of Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect: feeling of energy</td>
<td>0.440 **</td>
<td>0.490 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effect: employee creativity</td>
<td>0.491 **</td>
<td>0.436 *</td>
<td>0.445 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect: feeling of energy</td>
<td>0.440 **</td>
<td>0.490 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effect: employee creativity</td>
<td>0.296 *</td>
<td>0.218 *</td>
<td>0.445 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effect: employee creativity</td>
<td>0.196 **</td>
<td>0.218*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The significance of indirect effect was verified through bootstrapping, significant at ** p<0.001; * p<0.01; p<0.05
Table 6: Mediating Effect of Feeling of Energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Direct (x→y)</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>creative role identity → feeling of energy → employee creativity</td>
<td>0.296*</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>partial mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative self-efficacy → feeling of energy → employee creativity</td>
<td>0.218*</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>partial mediation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at *** p <0.001, ** p<0.01, *p<0.05

Table 5 and Table 6 depict the mediating effect of feeling of energy for the relationship between creative variables and employee creativity. It is analyzed as follows.

First, Baron and Kenny (1986) argue that an important initiating point for mediation analysis is whether the total effect of X on Y is significant. X and Y represent the independent variable and the dependent measure respectively. From this perspective, the total effects of creative role-identity and self-efficacy on creativity are significant with path coefficient of 0.440 and 0.491 respectively (t>1.96, p<0.01).

Second, after the total effect turned out to be significant and a mediator was statistically processed, the significance of direct effect of X on Y needs to be examined (Rucker, Preacher, Tormala, & Petty, 2011). The result of this study indicates that the direct effect of creative role-identity and self-efficacy significantly make positive effect on creativity with path coefficient of 0.296 and 0.218 (t>1.96, p<0.1).

Finally, after a significant indirect effect has been verified, if there is no longer a significant direct effect of X on Y, the mediating variable fully mediates the effect of X on Y (Rucker et al., 2011). In contrast, if the direct effect of X on Y remains significant, the mediating variable makes a partially mediating effect on the relationship between X and Y (Rucker et al., 2011). The results indicate that the direct effect of creative role-identity on creativity remains significant after the indirect effect of creative role-identity on creativity mediated through feeling of energy is proved to be significant. The direct effect of creative self-efficacy on creativity stays significant after the indirect effect of creative self-efficacy on creativity mediated through feeling of energy turns out to be significant. That is, feeling of energy partially mediates the effect of creative role identity on employee creativity in the hotel industry. In addition, feeling of energy partially mediates the effect of creative self-efficacy on employee creativity in the hotel industry.

5. Discussion

This study represents the empirical evidence to integrate creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, feeling of energy, and the stream of creativity researches focused on the hotel industry. Through this investigation, it provides insight into the hotel employees’ beliefs about their role identity via a mediating link of feeling of energy. Although a number of studies have investigated the personal factors to predict creative behaviors to date, few studies have considered components of self-belief about individuals’ creativity, emotional factor, and creative actions in a structural model. Thus, this study fulfills a need for further empirical studies on the creativity model in the workplace in relation to personal components (Farmer et al., 2003). The study contribution and practical implications are presented as follows.

First, this study made an attempt to objectify the hotel employees’ creativity by using their immediate superiors’ assessment. In other words, it was examined whether the hotel employees’ perception on their creative role identity, creative self-efficacy and feeling of energy significantly influence their creative performances from the superiors’ perspectives. Second, given a need of empirical evidence about the personal factors to predict creativity in the workplace (Farmer et al., 2003), this study added a literature to the existing studies. Third, having emotions make humans distinctive from artificial intelligence and this is one of the factors to foster creativity. These distinctive factors explain how and why humans are able to make creative and innovative actions (De Dreu et al., 2008; Hirt, Devers, & McCrea, 2008). This study’s results indicate that feeling of energy as a positive affect partially mediates the effect of personal factors on creativity. Thus, this depicts emotions, the particular trait that only humans have, plays a role of mechanism to optimize the effect of creative role identity and efficacy on creativity.

On the other hand, this study highlights numerous issues to be noticed by practicing hotel managers regarding organizational creativity and its antecedents. The results suggest that hotel managers need to cognize their employees’ creative role identity and self-efficacy in order to influence their creativity. This firstly implies that hotel managers need to foster contextual background to enhance and/or ingenrate these antecedents. Particularly, creative self-efficacy can be developed via training over time (Mathisen & Bronnick, 2009; Tierney & Farmer, 2011). For example, hotel managers can institute training programs focused on creative self-efficacy building. Further, employee development and performance are influenced by organizational culture, leadership style, reflection on employee needs (Lockwood, 2007). Thus, the organizational culture and leadership, which make the employees come up with new ideas without fear of failure, may help them to feel confident about their creative activities. The hotel managers also should be able to make
the employees perceive the organizational support and expectations on creative performance so as to lead them to recognize the importance of creative roles. This effect was proved by Tierney and Farmer (2004)'s study results, which depicted the effect of supervisors' creativity expectations on employees' perception on the leaders' creativity supportive behaviors.

The results secondly indicate that hotel managers need to consider how to clarify role identity and self-efficacy respectively and execute these so as to enhance the two personal variables. For example, feedback from others plays an important role to build role-identity (Riley & Burke, 1995). Therefore, hotel managers need to provide feedback to the employees who perform creative actions and confirm their creative role-identity. In addition, creative self-efficacy is inspired by job creativity requirement like complex tasks (De Dreu et al., 2008). Thus, hotel managers need to give their subordinates various opportunities to express their ideas so that they will accumulate the experience of job complexity. It is also important to make the employees feel safe from the result of failure.

Finally, the study results imply the importance of emotional aspects. Feeling of energy generates from intrinsic motivation, which means enjoyment and interest in workplace and feeling of solidarity (Isen & Reeve, 2005; Welbourne et al., 2005). Thus, hotel managers need to consider how to boost the employees’ sense of belonging and pride about the hotel organizations. They also need to make the employees recognize that their roles are valued and the organizations are responsible for all the members’ survival.

6. Conclusion

The present study confirmed that creative role identity and self-efficacy, and feeling of energy can improve the level of creativity. Moreover, the findings seem to indicate that positive affect foster the relationship between beliefs in creative self and creative performance. In particular, provision of creativity related personal factors that can be potentially developed seems to be a fruitful approach for the hotel organizations that aspire to strengthen creative performances in their employees. Nevertheless, this study provides the partial components to explain the variance of creativity. For example, individuals’ behaviors can be explained by both personal and contextual factors. Thus, there is now a need for further extended study models that examine both personal and contextual factors as antecedents of creativity to give full explanation of why and how people make a difference in creativity levels in an organization.
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