

Yilmaz Akgunduz / Gaye Kizilcalioglu / Sabahat Ceylin Sanli

The effects of job satisfaction and meaning of work on employee creativity: An investigation of EXPO 2016 exhibition employees

Abstract

Ensuring customer satisfaction is essential for success in the service sector. To satisfy customers, employees should respond rapidly to their demands and display creative behaviours. This empirical study investigates the effect of job satisfaction and meaning of work on employee creativity for employees working at EXPO 2016 in Antalya, Turkey, through a questionnaire survey. The 266 completed questionnaires were analysed by hierarchical regression. It was found that both intrinsic job satisfaction (skill and opportunity) and meaning of work effect employee creativity directly. Recommendations are made to organization managers to benefit from employee creativity, particularly those working in facilities with an intense customer-employee relationship.

Key words: employee creativity; job satisfaction; meaning of work; hotel employees; Turkey

Introduction

In the service sector, it is important to meet the needs of customers and address their complaints promptly to ensure customer satisfaction. Therefore, hiring innovative and creative employees has become a fundamental function of human resources managers while one of the primary missions of senior managers is to increase employee creativity to benefit from their creativity skills.

Implementing change as part of organisational development depends on employee creativity. The more that employees are creative, the more an organisation's innovativeness can increase (Yao, Yang, Dong & Wang, 2010). Therefore, factors affecting creativity should be identified to ensure organisational success. In the service sector, customer demands are increasingly changing so addressing immediate needs and demands are not enough; rather, organisations need to recruit creative employees to conduct demands.

This study analyses the variables of job satisfaction and meaning of work, which are thought to affect employee creativity. There are different definitions of job satisfaction and meaning of work in the literature. Here, job satisfaction is defined as a judgement of employees after they have assessed their work while meaning of work is the compliance between employees' aims and values and the organisation or job's goals and values.

This study investigates the effect of two independent variables (job satisfaction and meaning of work) on the dependent variable of employee creativity. First, it reviews the relevant literature and presents the hypotheses. The relationship between employee creativity is explained from the perspectives of Conservation of Resources Theory (CRT) (Hobfoll, 1989) and Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964) while the explanation of the relationship between employee creativity and meaning of work

Yilmaz Akgunduz, PhD, Associate Professor, Dokuz Eylul University Seferihisar Fevziye Hepkon School of Applied Sciences Izmir, Turkey; E-mail: yilmazakgunduz@hotmail.com

Gaye Kizilcalioglu, MSc, Antalya AKEV University, Faculty of Art and Design, Antalya, Turkey; E-mail: gayepazar@hotmail.com

Sabahat Ceylin Sanli, MSc, Mersin University, Social Science Institution Mersin, Turkey; E-mail: ceylin_sanli@hotmail.com

is based on Self-Congruity Theory (SCT) (Klipfel, Barclay & Bockorn, 2014). Data collected from employees of EXPO 2016 in Antalya, Turkey, are then analysed in terms of frequency, correlation and hierarchical regression. Lastly, the results are compared with other findings in the literature and some recommendations for practitioners are made. This study differs from previous research in two key respects: it was conducted with employees working in an international organisation and it examined the variables of job satisfaction, meaning of work and employee creativity together.

The literature on events has generally focused on identifying participants' motivations (Li & Petrick, 2006; Gelder & Robinson, 2011; Gyimóthy, 2012; Yolal, Rus, Cosma & Gürsoy, 2015) and economic (Getz, 2008; Quinn, 2009; Raj & Musgrave, 2009), and sociocultural (Getz, 2008; Pasanen, Taskinen & Mikkonen, 2012) or environmental effects of the events (David, 2009; Smith, 2009; Smith-Christensen, 2009). In addition, there are also studies on the destination image of activities and its effect on marketing (Hall, 2001; Getz & Page, 2016), and event planning and experience (Carter, 2007; Jepson & Clarke, 2013; Getz & Page, 2016). This study differs previous work in the field in its specific focus on job satisfaction, meaning of work and employee creativity of employees working at an EXPO. This research will therefore contribute to the literature that has only limited studies on employees working in events.

Literature review and hypothesis development

Event management

Many researchers define an event as gathering for a specific purpose (e.g. Hall, 1992; Carter, 2007; Goldblatt, 2011) or unique rituals in which people gather for a certain time (Bladen, Kennell, Abson & Wilde, 2012). According to Brown and James (2011), most events come up with a good idea while all definitions of events are based on a reflection of culture. By participating in an event, the host destination integrates with its own values while the individuality of each activity encourages people to participate (Getz, 2008; Derrett, 2011). Event management includes the planning and production of all types of events, including spectacular shows, sport events, special sections, other cultural celebrations, festivals, exhibitions, meetings, conferences and other special events (Getz, 2005). Event management is thus the organization and coordination of everything required to effectively achieve event goals (Bladen et al., 2012). Because events are intertwined with each individual's life, they are considered an important part of the tourism industry (Robinson, Dickson & Wale, 2010). Recent tourism research on events has therefore focused on destination development and strategic marketing to increase the economic benefits of holding events (Getz, 2005).

People have been participating in events since ancient times (Ferdinand, Shaw & Forsberg, 2017), with the first known example of an event being the Olympic Games conducted in Ancient Greece (Bladen et al., 2012). Ancient Rome had amphitheatres and arenas to hold events and temples for religious rituals (Robinson et al., 2010). The first modern international event was the Grand Tour organized by Thomas Cook (Withey, 1997, p. 136; Ferdinand et al., 2017). He was also the first person to introduce the British to large-scale exhibitions with the Hyde Park exhibition in 1851 in London and an international exhibition in Paris in 1855 (Ferdinand et al., 2017). In 1859, organisers distributed brochures on trains for a music festival with 2,000 musicians in Crystal Palace, London. This event continued successfully until the 1920s (Jago, 1997). When Walt Disney opened Disneyland in California in 1955, it was perhaps the first special event described as "the happiest place in the world" (Goldblatt, 2011, p. 5). Although events date back to ancient times, event tourism has only developed

within the tourism industry recently (Getz, 2008). Since then, the events industry has spread globally (Tassiopoulos & Johnson, 2009). Special event studies were first carried out in the tourism literature in the 1970s (Hede, 2007), before research rapidly grew during the 1980s (Getz, 2008).

Classification of events

The classification of events is based on several criteria. In simplest terms, events may be planned or unplanned (Oklobdžija, 2015). Planned events, which have a predetermined location and fixed end date, only take place following a long planning stage conducted by the event management team. People know about and therefore expect this event (Getz, 2005; Gelder & Robinson, 2011). Unplanned events are unusual events such as natural disasters or accidents. Event management focuses on planned activities (Oklobdžija, 2015).

Hall (1989) prefers to classify activities as mega, private, hallmark and local. Examples of mega activities include the Olympic Games and world exhibitions. The Grand Prix and Americas Cup are private activities whereas hallmark activities include both national and international activities, local activities are classified national or regional events.

Getz (2008) classifies events as cultural celebrations (festivals, carnivals, commemorations and religious ceremonies), political and official (summit) meetings, royal events, political events and interviews with VIPs, arts and entertainment events (music and award ceremonies), business and trade events (meetings, congresses, consumer and trade shows, fairs and markets), educational and scientific events (conferences, seminars, clinics), sports events (amateur or professional, audience or participant) and private events (weddings, parties, social events).

Wagen and White (2010) classify events as business (meetings, congresses and conferences), exhibitions, incentives, competitive and non-competitive (charitable) sports, cultural (arts), entertainment (e.g. music), online, anniversary celebrations, social activities, political actions, life cycle stages (birth, death, marriage) and religious rituals.

Goldblatt (2011) classifies events as city events, exhibitions, fairs and festivals, hallmark events (Olympic Games, national soccer leagues), accommodation, commercial events, social life events and sports events. Quinn (2013) categorizes meetings, incentives, conferences and exhibitions (MICE) under business events as a part of international tourism activities.

EXPOS as international events

According to Ferdinand et al. (2017) an activity should have four basic features to be international event. These are international participants, a significant impact on the host destination, national and international media interest and economic benefits such as increased visitors and new business and job opportunities. EXPO fairs are the most visited international events and require the most expertise and technology to host. They have become important in many ways (science, art, technology, sport, society) for modern countries' cultural activities (Roche, 2000). This phenomenon has grown since the Second World War, especially in America and Europe, though the recent exhibition in Shanghai hosted 70 million visitors (Roche, 2011a). World exhibitions (EXPO), which usually last about six months, are organized by the International Exhibitions Bureau (BIE / Paris) (Roche, 2011b). At first sight, this event and sustainability seem contradictory since the activities are short-lived. However, previous research shows that EXPO style events can revive cities in the longer term (Smith, 2009). Science, knowledge and technology, exhibiting product variety in a cultural way, the host country or

countries and international visitors can all play a vital role in spreading the international ideology of EXPO worldwide (Roche, 2011b).

Employee creativity

As already mentioned, it is important for organisations to recruit employees with creative behaviours to develop their business in changing and uncertain work environments (Tang, 1998). Creative employees play a significant role in enabling organisations to survive in a competitive business world (Oldham & Cumming, 1996; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange, 2002; Zhou & George, 2003; Mumford, Connelly & Gaddis, 2003; Dayan, Zacca & Benedetto, 2013).

The most widely-used definition of creativity in the literature is creating new, innovative and useful ideas in any field (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron, 1996). In the organisational literature specifically, creativity is defined as producing, conceptualising and developing new and useful ideas, processes and procedures by an individual or a group of people working together (Shalley, Gilson & Blum, 2000). This definition includes creative solutions to problems, creative business strategies and creative changes in business processes (Zhou & Shalley, 2003). Organisational creativity involves developing a valuable, practical and new product, service, idea, process or procedure (Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin, 1993). Creativity may vary across different groups, organisations and cultures while also evolving over time (Martins & Terblanche, 2003).

Amabile (1985) suggests that creativity has three dimensions: specialisation, creative thinking skill and motivation. Specialisation includes task knowledge and technical skills, based on inputs such as cognitive skills and education/training. Creative thinking requires heuristic method knowledge, education and experience to produce ideas. Intrinsic motivation is considered more important in creativity than extrinsic motivation (Dewett, 2007). Creativity is located at the intersection of these three components. As performance in each dimension increases, creativity also increases (Amabile, 1988).

Research shows a positive relationship between employee creativity and employee information literacy and employee happiness (Chang & Hsu, 2015), and between the emotional intelligence of leaders and the creativity of followers (Castro, Gomes & Sousa, 2012). Bledow, Rosing and Frese (2013) found that creativity transforms negative emotions into positive emotions.

Meaning of work

Meaning of work is the relationship between the values or standards of an employee and the values and aims of a task or job. This relates to the extent an employee cares about the business (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Meaningfulness expresses agreement between job requirements and the values, beliefs and behaviours of an employee (Hochwalder & Brucefors, 2005; Fock, Chiang, Au & Hui, 2011). It thus reflects a personal bond with or sense of purpose related to the job (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). Meaningful work requires agreement between the duties and aims of employees' organisational task roles and their personal values (Janssen, 2004).

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) argue that meaning of work is one of the four dimensions of psychological empowerment: impact, meaning, competence and self-determination. Psychological empowerment is defined as the identification of factors causing disempowerment and the process of increasing employees' self-efficacy by removing these factors by formal and informal administrative practices (Conger & Konungo, 1988). Meaning of work increases an employee's perceived psychological empowerment (Akgunduz & Bardakoglu, 2015).

Meaning represents the mutual relationship between the inner world of the employee and the external context of the work place (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006). It is also related to the agreement between the meaning employees attach to the aims of their workplace tasks or goals and their ideals or standards. When these agree, the work is perceived as meaningful and vice versa. If employees experience meaning of work then their loyalty to the organisation and interest in their job increases and vice versa (Arslantaş, 2007).

When employees find their jobs as meaningless or unnecessary, they may feel disempowered. However, if they consider their jobs meaningful, they feel psychologically empowered (Fock et al., 2011). Employees who find their job meaningful feel that the job is important for them (Quinn & Spreitzer, 1999).

There are positive correlations between meaning of work and cooperative employee behaviours (Bardakoğlu & Akgündüz, 2016), work happiness (Bassi, Bacher, Negri & Fave, 2013), comprehensive performance measurement systems and role clarity (Hall, 2008), and job characteristics and organisation commitment (Liden, Wayne & Sparrowe, 2000).

Job satisfaction

The most common definition of job satisfaction is "an employee's overall affective evaluation of the job situation" (Bettencourt & Brown, 1997, p. 42). Another commonly accepted definition is a "positive emotional state that a person obtains from a work s/he wants or cares about" (Locke, 1976, cited in Olsen, 1993, p. 458). Job satisfaction is thus a positive emotional reaction of an employee to a particular job that arises from a person evaluating their work in comparison with their desire, expect or deserve (Oshagbemi, 1999).

Job satisfaction can be examined under two dimensions: intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction (Kal-leberg, 1977; Austin & Gamson, 1983; Olsen, 1993; Chiu & Chen, 2005). Intrinsic job satisfaction is the extent an employee feels satisfied about job independence, stability of work, the job's significance for society, practical opportunities, feelings responsibility, creativity, and feelings of success. Extrinsic job satisfaction is defined as the satisfaction the employee gets from the working conditions, policies and praise (Chiu & Chen, 2005). Thus, intrinsic job satisfaction concerns the use of talents core to the job, responsibility, creativity, helping others, freedom and achievement whereas extrinsic job satisfaction is about promotion opportunities at work, salary, institution policies and practices, working conditions, management understanding and job guarantees (Biçkes, Yılmaz, Demirtaş & Uğur, 2014).

Employees with low job satisfaction are expected to hold negative attitudes towards the organisation (Price, 1997). There is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and organisational variables such as motivation (Davis & Wilson, 2000), performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono & Patton, 2001), absenteeism (Sagie, 1998) and turnover intention (Lu, Lin, Wu, Hsieh & Chang, 2002). Job satisfaction one of the most studied concepts in the literature (Çekmecelioğlu, 2005), with many researchers (e.g. Oliver, 1980; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Igarria & Guimaraes, 1993; Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2001; Yang, 2010) trying to determine the causes and effects of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction affects several desirable attitudes and behaviours from an individual and organisational perspective. It increases positive outcomes, such as organisation productivity (Çekmecelioğlu, 2006) and organisation communication (Eroğluer, 2011), and decreases negative outcomes, such as absenteeism (Ybema, Smulders & Bongers, 2010) and turnover intention (Samad, 2006).

Hypotheses development

Research in behavioural psychology shows that a satisfied employee is more productive and effective at work (Achor, 2010). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee creativity can be explained in terms of CRT and SET. According to the first of these theories, people try to obtain, retain and protect that which they value (Hobfoll, 1998). Hobfoll (1998) proposes two important principles. Firstly, resource loss is much more important than resource gain. Secondly, people must invest resources in order to protect against resource loss, recover from losses, and gain resources. These resources may include objects, personal characteristics, conditions or energies (Hobfoll, 1989). According to CRT, employees with high job satisfaction will contribute more to organisational effectiveness by displaying creative behaviours to ensure work is successful, thereby protecting the resources they have (Hobfoll, 2001). That is, by displaying creative behaviours, employees can protect the material and non-material resources provided directly or indirectly to them.

According to SET, behaviour is based on people's expectation of future help in return for having helped others when not obliged to them (Blau, 1964). This theory therefore predicts that employees' performance depends on their expectations of their organisation. When organisations financially or morally invest in their employees, the employees respond with improved work performance. This mutual exchange between an organisation and its employees is called social change. Also according to this theory, employees tend to display more creative behaviours to increase their contribution to the organisation in return for the opportunities provided to them by the organisation during the process of job satisfaction. Previous empirical research shows that there is a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and creativity (Sacchetti & Tortilla, 2011; Taherkhani, 2015; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016). Thus, based on theories (CRT and SET) and empirical research, it can be expected that job satisfaction increases employee creativity, leading to the following hypotheses:

H1. Job satisfaction of employees increases their creativity.

H1a. Intrinsic job satisfaction of employees increases their creativity.

H1b. Extrinsic job satisfaction of employees increases their creativity.

The relationship between employees' meaning of work and creativity can be explained in terms of SCT. This is based on the preference of organisations for employees with characteristics that match of their own personality. According to SCT, it is necessary to match people's egos with their preferences (Usakli & Baloglu, 2011, p. 114). As the level of congruity increases, level of intention or preference also increase (Ekinici & Riley, 2003).

According to SCT, when employees' values and standards match the values of the organisation and standards of the job, they will display more innovative and creative behaviours, which are desired by organisations (Redmond, Mumford & Teach, 1993). Agreement between individual values and aims and organisational values and aims will increase the meaning of the work, which makes employees more likely to display desirable behaviours such as creativity. In addition, when the meaning of work is high, it will increase employees' contributions to the organisation by increasing their intrinsic motivation (Ros, Schwartz & Surkiss, 1999). Drawing on SCT and empirical research (Akgündüz, Adan Gök & Alkan, 2017), the meaning of work is expected to increase creative behaviours of the employees, as in the following hypothesis:

H2. When employees find work meaningful, their creativity increases.

Methodology

Measures

Data was collected in a four-part questionnaire. The first part was the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Form, developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist (1967). This scale has three factors to measure extrinsic (8 items), intrinsic (12 items) and general satisfaction levels (20 items). General satisfaction is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the relevant items for each factor (Weiss et al., 1967). Weiss et al. (1967) reported reliability values (α) ranged from 0.88 to 0.90.

The second part used the four-item Employee Creativity Scale, developed by Jaiswal and Dhar (2015). This scale was developed for employees to assess their own creativity. Jaiswal and Dhar (2015) reported a reliability level (α) of 0.94.

The third part used the three-item meaning of work subscale of the Psychological Empowerment Scale (PES), developed by Spritzer (1995). The three items in the dimension of meaning of work of the PES were developed to determine the conformity between the values of employees and the values of the work or organization. Spreitzer (1995) reported a reliability value (α) of 0.85 for this dimension.

Aforecited three scales were used as they are valid and reliable measurement tools and consistent with the main concepts of current study. All the constructs were measured by a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. All questionnaire items are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The last part of the questionnaire was primarily a demographic form to collect data on each employee's age, gender, education level, foreign language ability and desire work in a similar organisation again.

Sample

The data was collected using convenience sampling from employees working at EXPO 2016 in Antalya, Turkey, under the theme of Flower & Child between April 23rd and October 30th, 2016. There was no precise information regarding the number of employees working in the EXPO so all accessible employees working in various departments are included in the population. After receiving necessary permission for data collection, 266 valid questionnaires were collected by the researchers.

Permission was taken from the Exhibition Regulation and Management Board to distribute the questionnaires to the employees. The purpose and scope of the research was explained. According to the board's instructions, the researchers contacted the managers of each department. Some allowed the researchers to distribute the survey directly to employees while in other departments the questionnaires were left and collected later on. The questionnaires were administered at lunch time and in meal breaks when the number of visitors was relatively low due to the hot weather in the departments where questionnaires were administered face to face. Data collection continued until October 2016, when the sample size was achieved.

Data analysis

In the first stage of data analysis an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to identify the factor structures of the three scales. For this purpose, principal component factor analysis was used with Eigenvalues greater than one through varimax rotation. The results of the rotated component matrix are presented in Tables 2 and 3. All analyses (validity, reliability, description, correlation and regression) were made using IBM SPSS Statistics 23.

Results

The sample profile of the respondents is presented in Table 1. Of the 256 respondents, 66% (124 people) were men, 63% (164 people) were single, 53% (140 people) were between 26 and 35 years old, 46% (123 people) had bachelor degree and 68% (175 people) had received education or training related to their task and job. Of these, 54% (129 people) stated that the education or training they received was sufficient. In addition, 59% (130 people) of the respondents can speak only English while 53% (140 people) do not want to work in such an organisation again.

Table 1
Profile of participants

	n	%		n	%
Gender			Task		
Women	91	34	Host	79	31
Men	174	66	Supervisor	20	8
Level of education			VIP press	2	1
Primary and secondary school	20	8	Other	19	7
High school	63	23	Security	70	27
Associate degree	40	15	Photographer	2	1
Bachelor's degree	123	46	Cleaner	3	1
Master's degree	16	6	Technical service	14	5
Doctorate	3	1	Logistics	7	3
Marital status			Fair hostess	17	6
Married	97	37	Field crowd management	25	10
Single	164	63	Foreign languages		
Age			English	130	59
25 and under	76	29	Germany	7	3
26 and 35	140	53	French	2	1
36 and above	49	18	Arabic	3	2
Education			English - German	21	9
Received training	175	68	English - Italian and	4	2
No training received	82	32	English - Russian and	17	8
Self-assessment of training			English - French	4	2
Sufficient	129	54	English - French - German	4	2
Insufficient	110	46	English - Spanish	4	2
Task request			English - Serbian	2	1
Yes	76	29	English - German - Russian	9	4
No	140	53	English - Korean	2	
Undecided	49	18	English - Arabic	3	1
			Other (English-Japanese, German-Russian, English-German-Russian, Russian-French-German, English-Chinese Russia, Dutch, Macedonian, Chinese-English, English-German-Dutch, Italian, Russia)	10	5

Table 2 presents the factor analysis results for the Meaning of Work Scale and Employee Creativity Scale. As a result of the exploratory factor analysis, it was determined that the meaning of work scale consisted of one factor and that the total explained variance was 81% (first part of Table 2). The scale's KMO value was 0.746 and Bartlett test result was significant ($p < 0.001$). The item factor loadings ranged between 0.902 and 0.896. The alpha value of the scale was 0.883 and the mean was 4.141.

Table 2

Factor analysis results of meaning of work scale and employee creativity scale

Scales/Items	Factor load	Mean	Eigen-value	Alpha	Variance
Meaning of work		4.141	2.428	0.883	80.947
My job activities are personally meaningful to me	0.902	4.0155			
The work I do is meaningful to me	0.901	4.1843			
The work I do is very important to me	0.896	4.2364			
Employee creativity		3.903	2.688	0.845	67.209
I demonstrate originality in my work	0.859	4.0551			
I seek new ideas and ways to solve problems	0.858	4.0627			
I generate novel, but operable work-related ideas	0.848	3.8504			
I identify opportunities for new ways of dealing work	0.703	3.6417			

For the Employee Creativity Scale, the four items were collapsed to one factor according to EFA (second part of Table 2). The scale's KMO value was 0.795 and Bartlett's value was significantly determined. The total variance of the items was approximately 67%. The mean was 3.903 and the factor loading varied between 0.859 and 0.703. The scale's alpha value was 0.845.

Table 3 presents the EFA for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Its KMO value was 0.902 and the Bartlett test was significant. One item had a factor loading of less than 0.30 so it was omitted from the analysis. Although the original scale had two subscales, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction, in this study the 19 items clustered into 3 subscales. Shriesheim, Powers, Sandura and Gardiner (1993) and Hirschfeld (2008) also found that the short form of this scale can produce different factor structures. Hirschfeld (2000), Hançer and George (2003), Koroğlu (2012) grouped the items in the short form under different factors and noted that the items under these factor may vary.

The first factor of the scale in this study included 8 items and explained approximately 21% of the total variance. The mean of the factor was 3.482 and alpha value was 0.863. The factor loadings ranged between 0.733 and 0.441. Because the items in this factor included statements about intrinsic job satisfaction, the subscale was named Intrinsic Job Satisfaction – Skill and Opportunity.

The second factor had 7 items and explained 20% of the total variance. The mean was 3.432 and the alpha value was 0.853. The factor loadings ranged between 0.789 and 0.492. These items referred to extrinsic job satisfaction so this factor was named Extrinsic Job Satisfaction.

The last factor had 4 items and explained approximately 15 % of the variance. The mean was 3.488 and the alpha value was 0.697. The factor loadings ranged between 0.730 and 0.527. While the items related to both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction, they predominantly referred to job satisfaction so the factor was named Intrinsic Job Satisfaction - Autonomy.

Table 3

Factor analysis results of job satisfaction scale

	Factor loadings	Mean	Eigen-value	Alpha	Variance
Intrinsic job satisfaction – skill and opportunity		3.482	3.928	0.863	20.673
The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	0.733	3.5000			
The way my job provides for steady employment	0.689	3.2955			
The chances for advancement on this job	0.653	3.1445			

Table 3 Continued

	Factor loadings	Mean	Eigenvalue	Alpha	Variance
The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	0.640	3.7068			
The freedom to use my own judgment	0.617	3.3722			
The chance to be 'somebody' in the community	0.529	3.9125			
The chance to tell people what to do	0.479	3.5326			
My pay and the amount of work I do	0.441	3.4432			
Extrinsic job satisfaction		3,432	3.745	0.853	19.710
The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	0.789	3.2992			
The way my boss handles his/her workers	0.785	3.4542			
The working conditions	0.633	3.5649			
The way my co-workers get along with each other	0.599	3.7132			
The chance to try my own methods of doing the job	0.566	3.5154			
The praise I get for doing a good job	0.559	3.3094			
The way company policies are put into practice	0.492	3.3218			
Intrinsic job satisfaction- autonomy		3,488	2.759	0.697	14.519
The chance to work alone on the job	0.730	3.6423			
The chance to do different things from time to time	0.717	3.8054			
Being able to keep busy all the time	0.532	3.6615			
The chance to do things for other people	0.527	3.8889			

KMO = 0.899 Bartlett's test of sphericity = 1,931.852 Sig = 0.001 Total explained variance = 0.54902.
Overall reliability = 0.916 Mean = 3.496 F = 13.904.

EFA identified three subscales for the Minnesota Satisfaction Scale, which originally had two subscales: 1) Intrinsic job satisfaction - Skill and opportunity, 2) Intrinsic job satisfaction – Autonomy and 3) Extrinsic job satisfaction. Therefore, H1 was revisited as a result of the factor analysis.

H1: Employees' job satisfaction increases their creativity.

H1a. Employees' intrinsic job satisfaction from skills and opportunities increases their creativity.

H1b. Employees' intrinsic job satisfaction from autonomy increases their creativity.

H1c. Employees' extrinsic job satisfaction increases their creativity.

Correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between dependent and independent variables (Table 4). The analysis showed that employees' creativity is positively and significantly correlated with meaning of work ($r = 0.705$ $p < 0.01$), intrinsic job satisfaction – skill and opportunity ($r = 0.345$ $p < 0.01$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($r = 0.291$ $p < 0.01$) and intrinsic job satisfaction – autonomy ($r = 0.260$ $p < 0.01$). Meaning of work is positively with intrinsic job satisfaction – skill and opportunity ($r = 0.323$ $p < 0.01$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($r = 0.222$ $p < 0.01$) and intrinsic job satisfaction – autonomy ($r = 0.206$ $p < 0.01$).

The factor analysis of the job satisfaction scale shows that the subscales had a significant relationship, ranging between 0.530 and 0.730. The correlations between 0.20 and 0.80 demonstrates convergent and discriminant validity between the subscales.

Table 4
Correlation analysis

	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5
1. Creativity	3.903	0.82	1				
2. Meaning of work	4.141	0.89	0.705**	1			
3. Intrinsic job satisfaction – skill and opportunity	3.482	0.84	0.345**	0.323**	1		
4. Extrinsic job satisfaction	3.432	0.85	0.291**	0.222**	0.730**	1	
5. Intrinsic job satisfaction – autonomy	2.741	0.72	0.260**	0.206**	0.618**	0.530**	1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Hierarchical regression was carried out to test the research hypotheses presented in Table 5 in order to determine which model best explained the effects of multiple independent variables on the dependent variable. In this analysis, the researcher can analyse the variables in a desired order or in groups. Thus, the first model here determined the effect of job satisfaction on job creativity whereas the second model added meaning of work to observe the effect of job satisfaction and meaning of work on job creativity.

Table 5
Hierarchical regression analysis

Model		Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.	VIF
		β	SE	β			
1	(Constant)	2.502	0.270		9.265	0.000	
	Intrinsic job satisfaction- skill and opportunity	0.246	0.092	0.250	2.684	0.008	2.522
	Extrinsic job satisfaction	0.076	0.085	0.077	0.892	0.373	2.145
	Intrinsic job satisfaction- autonomy	0.073	0.087	0.063	0.836	0.404	1.672
2	(Constant)	0.694	0.237		2.928	0.004	
	Intrinsic job satisfaction- skill and opportunity	0.023	0.070	0.024	0.333	0.740	2.652
	Extrinsic job satisfaction	0.092	0.063	0.093	1.463	0.145	2.146
	Intrinsic job satisfaction- autonomy	0.067	0.065	0.058	1.033	0.303	1.672
	Meaning of work	0.616	0.043	0.664	14.366	0.000	1.121

1. Model R = 0.354 R² = 0.125 Δ R² = 0.115 F = 12.116 Sig. = 0.001.

2. Model R = 0.720 R² = 0.518 Δ R² = 0.511 F = 68.034 Sig. = 0.001.

Dependent variable: Employee creativity.

In the first model, the independent variables (subscales of job satisfaction) can explain 12.5% of the variation dependent variable (employee creativity). In the second model, adding meaning of work, which explained 39.3% of the variance, increased the explained variance increased to 51.8%. Intrinsic job satisfaction –skill and opportunity- ($\beta = 0.246$ $p < 0.01$) significantly increased employee creativity in the first phase. In the first model, a one-unit increase in intrinsic job satisfaction –skill and opportunity- caused a 0.246 increase in employee creativity. Based on the first model, H1a is accepted but H1b and H1c are rejected. In the second model of the analysis, when meaning of work was added to the three subscales of job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction –skill and opportunity- lost its significant effect on employee creativity. In the second model, only meaning of work ($\beta = 0.616$ $p < 0.01$) significantly increased employee creativity. A one-unit increase in meaning of work caused a 0.616 increase in employee creativity. Therefore, H2 hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusions

This study drew on CRT (Hobfoll, 1989), SET (Blau, 1964) and SCT (Klipfel et al., 2014). CRT explains how people behave when they lose or face the possibility of losing the opportunities and resources they have. SET explains people's mutual relationships. SCT explains the effect of agreement

or disagreement of an employee's personal values and standards with the values and standards of a job or an organisation. This study aimed to identify how the job satisfaction and meaning of work levels of EXPO 2016 employees affected their creativity.

The first prediction, that job satisfaction increases employee creativity, was partially supported because the results showed that intrinsic job satisfaction –skill and opportunity- increased employee creativity. However, extrinsic job satisfaction had no significant effect. This finding suggests that those employees at EXPO 2016 who experienced satisfaction about the intrinsic features of their job, such as recognition, appreciation or job responsibility, had higher levels of creativity.

The second prediction, that meaning of work increases employee creativity, was confirmed. Those EXPO 2016 employees who perceived that their own values agreed with the values of their job or organisation or perceived that their job was important reported higher levels of creativity.

This study also demonstrated a positive correlation between meaning of work and intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. That is, assigning employees to tasks which they find meaningful is a way to increase job satisfaction. More specifically, meaning of work has a stronger positive correlation with intrinsic job satisfaction than with extrinsic job satisfaction.

In finding that intrinsic job satisfaction increased the creativity of EXPO 2016 employees, this study confirms the findings of Tongchaiprasit and Ariyabuddhiphongs (2016), İmamoğlu, Keskin and Erat (2004), who also reported that satisfied employees increase an organisation's productivity. This finding also confirms that the prediction of SET and CRT, that employees display more positive behaviours like creativity in order to keep a job that they find valuable and maintain its benefits. This implies that employees who believe that the work they do contributes to society and who get a sense of responsibility and display more creative behaviours.

Another important finding is that employees who experience meaning of work display more creative behaviours. This proves that if the job's requirements and the values, beliefs and behaviours of employees coincide then employees will display creative behaviours to improve their own performance in the organisation and contribute to organisational productivity. This also confirms the findings of Akgündüz et al. (2017), Çekmecelioğlu and Özbay (2014), Buil, Martinez and Matute (2016), Chiang and Hsieh (2012), whose research likewise indicates that employees are more likely to show desirable behaviours such as creativity if they undertake tasks that match their values. Finally, this also supports the SCT in that employees will work even harder to maintain this congruence if the employee's own values overlap with those of the organisation.

In the service sector, because it is almost impossible to compensate for customer dissatisfaction, customer demands and complaints should be met as much as possible. Employees in the service sector should use their creativity skills to maintain and increase customer satisfaction. This study shows that intrinsic motivation and meaning of work have increase employees' creativity behaviours.

As employees' intrinsic job satisfaction increases, they display more creative behaviours. Therefore, managers should define acceptable service standards, create an organisation climate based on trust between practices and employees, provide career opportunities for employees and grant them authority to increase their intrinsic job satisfaction (Araslı, Daşkın & Saydam, 2014). This will make it more likely that employees will display creative behaviours.

This study also showed that when the meaning employees attach to their work increases, their job satisfaction also increases. Therefore, managers should provide feedback and share knowledge (Robbins et

al., 2002) in order to increase the meaning of work and employee job satisfaction. This will ultimately increase the display of creative behaviours by employees.

This study has several limitations. First, the data is specific to the employees at EXPO 2016, which makes it difficult to generalize. Further studies can collect data in different regions from different events and focus on different themes. Comparison of findings from these different contexts will enable greater generalisation. Another limitation is that the participants of this study are only employees. Therefore, job satisfaction and creative behaviours are examined only from the employee perspective. Further research can look into creativity and job satisfaction from the perspectives of managers and customers as well as employees.

References

- Achor, S. (2010). *The happiness advantage: The seven principles of positive psychology that fuel success and performance at work*. United States: Crown Publishing,
- Akgunduz, Y. & Bardakoglu, O. (2015). The impact of perceived organizational prestige and organization identification on turnover intention: The mediating effect of psychological empowerment. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-17. DOI:10/1080/13683500.2015b1034094.
- Akgündüz, Y., Adan Gök, Ö. & Alkan, C. (2017). Örgütsel destek algısı, iş stresi, işin anlamlılığı ve proaktif kişilik özelliklerinin çalışanların yaratıcılığına etkisi: Beş yıldızlı bir otel çalışanlarında uygulama. *Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Özel Sayı 1*, 50-68.
- Amabile T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J. & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154-1184.
- Amabile, T. M. (1985). Motivation and creativity: Effects of motivational orientation on creative writers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 393-399. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.48.2.393.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity of innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 123-167.
- Araslı, H., Daşkın, M. & Saydam, S. (2014). Polychronicity and intrinsic motivation as dispositional determinants on hotel frontline employees' job satisfaction: Do control variables make a difference. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1395-1405. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.643.
- Arslantaş, C. C. (2007). Güçlendirici lider davranışının psikolojik güçlendirme üzerindeki etkisini belirlemeye yönelik görgül bir araştırma. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 227-240.
- Austin, A. E. & Gamson, Z. F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 10. Washington DC: The George Washington University.
- Bardakoğlu, Ö. & Akgündüz, Y. (2016). Otel çalışanlarının örgütsel prestij ve psikolojik güçlendirme algılarının işbirliği davranışlarına etkisi. *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*, 12(30), 145-158.
- Bassi, M. Bacher, G., Negri, L. & Fave, A. D. (2013). The contribution of job happiness and job meaning to the well-being of workers from thriving and failing companies. *Applied Research Quality Life*, 8, 427-448.
- Bettencourt, L. A. & Brown, S. W. (1997) Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 39-61. DOI: 10.1016/S0022-4359(97)90014-2.
- Biçkes, D. M., Yılmaz, C., Demirtaş, Ö. & Uğur, A. (2014). Duygusal emek ile iş tatmini arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik sermayenin aracılık rolü: Bir alan çalışması. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 9(2), 97-121.
- Bladen, C., Kennell, J., Abson, E. & Wilde, N. (2012). *Events management: An introduction*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley Publications.
- Bledow, R., Rosing, K. & Frese, M. (2013). A dynamic perspective on affect and creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(2), 432-450.

- Brown, S. & James, J. (2011). Event design and management: ritual sacrifice? In I. Yeoman, M. Robertson, J. Ali-Knight, S. Drummond & U. Mc Mahon-Beattie (eds.), *Festival and events management an international arts and culture perspective* (pp. 53-65). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Brown, S. P. & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(1), 63-77. DOI:10.2307/3172514.
- Buil, I., Martinez, E. & Matute, J. (2016). From internal brand management to organizational citizenship behaviours: Evidence from frontline employees in the hotel industry. *Tourism Management*, 57, 256-271. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.06.009.
- Carter, L. (2007). *Event planning*. Bloomington, Indiana: Author House.
- Cartwright, S. & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 199-208. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2006.03.012.
- Castro, F., Gomes, J. & Sousa, F. (2012). Do intelligent leaders make a difference? The effect of a leader's emotional intelligence on followers' creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 21(2), 171-182.
- Çekmecelioğlu, H. (2005). Örgüt ikliminin iş tatmini ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Bir araştırma. *CÜ İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2), 23-39.
- Çekmecelioğlu, H. (2006). İş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık tutumlarının işten ayrılma niyeti ve verimlilik üzerindeki etkilerinin değerlendirilmesi: Bir araştırma. *İş, Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 8(2), 153-168.
- Çekmecelioğlu, H. G. & Özbay, G. K. (2014). Linking psychological empowerment, individual creativity and firm innovativeness: A research on Turkish manufacturing industry. *Business Management Dynamics*, 3(10): 01-13.
- Çelik, A. & Göçmen, Z. (2013). Yerel yönetim bakış açısıyla etkinlik turizmi motivasyonlarını belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. *Üçüncü Sektör Sosyal Ekonomi Dergisi*, 48, 2, 70-89.
- Chang, C. & Hsu, P. (2015). The correlation between employee information literacy and employee creativity. *Qual Quant*, 49, 221-234.
- Chiang, C. F. & Hsieh, T. S. (2012). The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 180-190. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.04.011.
- Chiu, S. F. & Chen, H. L. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(6), 523-540. DOI: 10.2224/sbp.2005.33.6.523.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: integrating Theory and Practice. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 471-482. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.1988.4306983.
- David, L. (2009). Environmental impacts of events. In R. Raj & J. Musgrave (eds.), *Event management and sustainability* (pp. 66-76). London: CABI.
- Davis, J. & Wilson, M. (2000). Principals' efforts to empower teachers: Effects on teacher motivation and job satisfaction and stress, *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 73(6), 349-353. DOI: 10.1080/00098650009599442.
- Dayan, M., Zacca, R. & Benedetto, A. D. (2013). An exploratory study of entrepreneurial creativity: Its antecedents and mediators in the context of UAE firms. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 22(3), 223-240. DOI: 10.1111/caim.12036.
- Derrett, R. (2011). Festivals, events and the destination. In I. Yeoman, M. Robertson, J. Ali-Knight, S. Drummond & U. Mc Mahon-Beattie (eds.), *Festival and events management an international arts and culture perspective* (pp. 32-52). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dewett, T. (2007). Linking intrinsic motivation, risk taking, and employee creativity in an R & D environment. *R & D Management*, 37(3), 197-208. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9310.2007.00469.x.
- Ekinci, Y. & Riley, M. (2003). An investigation of self-concept: Actual and ideal self-congruence compared in the context of service evaluation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 10, 201-214.

- Erođlu, K. (2011). Örgütsel iletişim ile iş tatmini unsurları arasındaki ilişkiler: Kuramsal bir inceleme. *Ege Academic Review*, 11(1), 121-163.
- Ferdinand, N., Shaw, S. J. & Forsberg, E. (2017). Understanding international events. In N. Ferdinand & P. J. Kitchin (eds.), *Event management an international approach* (pp. 5-35). London: SAGE Publications LTD.
- Fock, H., Chiang, F., Au, K. Y. & Hui, M. K. (2011). The moderating effect of collectivistic orientation in psychological empowerment and job satisfaction relationship. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 319-328. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.08.002.
- Gelder, G. & Robinson, P. (2011). Events, festivals and the arts. In P. Robinson, S. Heitmann & P. Dieke (eds.), *Research themes for tourism* (pp. 128-146). Oxford and Cambridge: CABI.
- Getz, D. & Page, S. J. (2016). *Event studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Getz, D. (2005) *Event management and event tourism*. Lincoln: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Getz, D. (2008) Event Tourism, Definition, Evolution and Research, *Tourism Management*, 29, 403-428.
- Goldblatt, J. (2011) *Special events a new generation and the next frontier*. USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gyimóthy, S. (2012). Casual observers, connoisseurs and experimentalists: a conceptual exploration of niche festival visitors. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9(2-3), 177-205. DOI:10.1080/15022250903157413.
- Hall, C. M. (1989). The definition and analysis of hallmark tourist events. *Geojournal*, 19(3), 263-268.
- Hall, C. M. (1992) *Hallmark Tourist Events: Impacts, Management, and Planning*. London: Belhaven Press.
- Hall, C. M. (2001). Imaging, tourism and sports event fever. In C. Gratton & I. P. Henry (eds.), *Sport in the city: The role of sport in economic and social regeneration* (pp. 167-183). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hall, M. (2008). The effect of comprehensive performance measurement systems on role clarity, psychological empowerment and managerial performance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33, 141-163.
- Hançer, M. & George, R. T. (2003). Job satisfaction of restaurant employees: An empirical investigation using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 27(1), 85-100. DOI:10.1177/1096348002238882.
- Hede, A. (2007) Managing special events in the new era of the triple bottom line. *Event Management*, 11, 13-22.
- Hirschfeld, R. R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire short form make a difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 255-270. DOI:10.1177/00131640021970493.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 4(3), 513-524. DOI:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1998). *Stress, culture, and community: The psychology and philosophy of stress*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(3), 337-421.
- Hochwalder, J. & Brucefors, A. B. (2005). Psychological empowerment at the workplace as a predictor of ill health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(1), 1237-1248. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.04.010.
- Igbaria, M. & Guimaraes, T. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction among information center employees. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 9(4), 145-174. DOI: 10.1080/07421222.1993.11517983.
- İmamođlu, S. Z., Keskin, H. & Erat, S. (2004). The relationships between salary, career, creativity and job satisfaction: An application in textile sector. *Management and Economy*, 11(1), 167-176.
- Jago, L. K. (1997). *Special events and tourism behaviour: A conceptualisation and an empirical analysis from a values perspective* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Victoria University, Department of hospitality, tourism and marketing, Faculty of Business.
- Jaiswal, N. K. & Dhar, R. L. (2015). Transformational leadership, innovation climate, creative self-efficacy and employee creativity: A multilevel study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 30-41. DOI:10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.07.002.

- Janssen, O. (2004). The barrier effect of conflict with superiors in the relationship between employee empowerment and organizational commitment. *Work & Stress*, 18(1), 56-65. DOI: 10.1080/02678370410001690466.
- Jepson, A. & Clarke, A. (2013). Events and community development. In R. Finkel, D. McGillivray, G. McPherson & P. Robinson (eds.), *Research themes for events* (pp. 6-18). Boston: CABI.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E. & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1), 124-143. DOI:10.2307/2117735.
- Klipfel, J. A. L., Barclay, A. C. & Bockorn, K. M. (2014). Self-Congruity: A Determinant of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Development and Competitiveness*, 8(3), 130-143.
- Köroğlu, Ö. (2012). İçsel ve dışsal iş doyum düzeyleri ile genel iş doyum düzeyi arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi: Turist rehberleri üzerinde bir araştırma. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 13(2), 275-289.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, L. H. & Barton, S. M. (2001). The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal*, 38(1), 233-250.
- Li, X. & Petrick, J. F. (2006). A review of festival and event motivation studies. *Event Management*, 9, 239-245.
- 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.
- Lu, K., Lin, P., Wu, C., Hsieh, Y. & Chang, Y. (2002). The relationships among turnover intentions, professional commitment, and job satisfaction of hospital nurses. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 18(4), 214-219. DOI: 10.1053/jpnu.2002.127573.
- Martins, E. C. & Terblanche, F. (2003). Building organisational culture that stimulates creativity and innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 6(1), 64-74. DOI:10.1108/14601060310456337.
- Mishra, A. K. & Spreitzer, G. M. (1998). Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work redesign. *Academy of Management Review*, 22, 567-588. DOI: 10.2307/259295.
- Mumford, D.M., Connelly, S. & Gaddis, B. (2003). How creative leaders think: Experimental findings and cases. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 411-432. DOI:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00045-6.
- Mumford, D. M., Scott, G. M., Gaddis, B. & Strange, J. M. (2002). Leading creative people: Orchestrating expertise and relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(1), 705-750. DOI:10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00158-3.
- Oklobdžija, S. (2015). The role of events in tourism development. *Bizinfo Journal*, 6(2), 83-97.
- Oldham, G. R. & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3), 607-634. DOI:10.2307/256657.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(1), 460-469. DOI:10.2307/3150499.
- Olsen, D. (1993). Work Satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(4), 453-471. DOI:10.2307/2960052.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Satisfaction with co-workers'behavior. *Employee Relations*, 2(1), 88-106.
- Pasanen, K., Taskinen, H. & Mikonnen, J. (2012). Impacts of cultural events in Eastern Finland-Development of a Finnish event evaluation tool. In T. D. Andersson, D. Getz & R. J. Mykletun (eds.), *Festival and event management in Nordic countries* (pp. 4-22). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Price, L. (1997). Handbook of organizational measurement. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(4, 5, 6), 305-558. DOI:10.1108/01437729710182260.
- Quinn, B. (2009). *Festival, events and tourism*. Dublin: Arrow.
- Quinn, B. (2013). *Key concepts in event management*. London: SAGE Publications LTD.
- Quinn, R. E. & Spreitzer, G. M. (1997). The road to empowerment: Seven questions every leader should consider. *Organizational Dynamics*, 26(2), 37-48. DOI:10.1016/S0090-2616(97)90004-8.

- Raj, R. & Musgrave, J. (2009). The economics of sustainable events. In R. Raj & J. Musgrave (eds.), *Event management and sustainability* (pp. 56-66). London: CABI.
- Redmond, M., Mumford, M. & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55(1), 120-151. DOI: 10.1006/obhd.1993.1027.
- Robbins, T. L., Crino, M. D. & Fredendall, L. D. (2012). An integrative model of the empowerment process. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12(3), 419–443. DOI:10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00068-2.
- Robinson, P., Wale, D. & Dickson, G. (2010) Events management: an introduction. In P. Robinson, G. Dickson & D. Wale (eds.), *Events management* (pp. VIII-XVII). Cambridge: CABI.
- Roche, M. (2000). *Mega events modernity: Olympics and expos in the growth of global culture*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Roche, M. (2011a). Festivalization, cosmopolitanism and European culture: on the sociocultural significance of mega events. In L. Giorgi, M. Sassatelli & G. Delanty (eds.), *Festival and the cultural public sphere* (pp. 124-142). USA and Canada: Routledge.
- Roche, M. (2011b). Mega events and cosmopolitanism: Observations on expos and european culture in modernity. In M. Roverso & M. Nowicka (eds.), *The ashgate research companion to cosmopolitanism* (pp. 69-87). UK: Ashgate.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S. H. & Surkiss, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48(1), 49-71. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00048.x.
- Sacchetti, S. & Tortilla, E. C. (2011). *Satisfaction with creativity: A study of organisational characteristics and individual motivations*. University of Trento, Department of Economics, 9/2011.
- Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: another look. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 52(1), 156-171. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.1997.1581.
- Samad, S. (2006). The contribution of demographic variables: Job Characteristics and job satisfaction on turnover intentions. *Journal of International Management Studies*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Powers, K. J., Sandura, T. A., Gardiner, C. C. & Lankau, M. J. (1993). Improving construct measurement in management research: Comments and a quantitative approach for assessing the theoretical content adequacy of paper-and-pencil survey-type instruments. *Journal of Management*, 19(2), 385-417. DOI:10.1177/014920639301900208.
- Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L. & Blum, T. C. (2000). Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: Effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 215-223. DOI:10.2307/1556378.
- Smith, A. (2009). Events and sustainable urban regeneration. In R. Raj & J. Musgrave (eds.), *Event management and sustainability* (pp. 32-43). London: CABI.
- Smith-Christensen, C. (2009). Sustainability as a concept within events. In R. Raj & J. Musgrave (eds.), *Event management and sustainability* (pp. 22-32). London: CABI.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465. DOI:10.2307/256865.
- Taherkhani, E. (2015). Review of relation between creativity and job's satisfaction of physical education teachers. *Cumhuriyet University Science Journal*, 36(3), 279-287.
- Tang, H. K. (1998). An integrative model of innovation in organizations. *Technovation*, 18(5), 297-309. DOI:10.1016/S0166-4972(98)00009-1.
- Tassiopoulos, D. & Johnson D. (2009). Social impact of events. In R. Raj & J. Musgrave (eds.), *Event management and sustainability* (pp. 76-90). London: CABI.
- Thomas, K. W. & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681. DOI:10.5465/AMR.1990.4310926.
- Tongchaiprasit, P. & Ariyabuddhiphongs, V. (2016). Creativity and turnover intention among hotel chefs: The mediating effects of job satisfaction and job stress. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 33-40. DOI:10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.02.009.

- Usakli, A. & Baloglu, S. (2010). Brand personality of tourist destinations: An application of self-congruity theory. *Tourism Management*, 32, 114-127.
- Wagen, L. & White, L. (2010). *Human resource management for the event industry*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W. & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 22, 120.
- Withey, L. (1997). Traveling with the millions. In *Grand tours and Cook's tours: A history of leisure travel 1750 to 1915* (pp. 135-166). New York: William Morrow and Company Inc.
- Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E. & Griffin R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(2), 293-321. DOI:10.2307/258761.
- Yang, J. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 23(1), 609-619. DOI:10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.11.002.
- Yao, X., Yang, Q., Dong, N. & Wang, L. (2010). Moderating effect of Zhong Yong on the relationship between creativity and innovation behaviour. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 13(1), 53-57. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-839X.2010.01300.x.
- Ybema, J. F., Smulders P. G. W. & Bongers, P. M. (2010). Antecedents and consequences of employee absenteeism: A longitudinal perspective on the role of job satisfaction and burnout. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19(1), 102-124. DOI:10.1080/13594320902793691.
- Yolal, M., Rus, R. V., Cosma, S. & Gursoy, D. (2015). A pilot study on spectators' motivations and their socio-economic perceptions of a film festival. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 16(3), 253-271.
- Zhou, J. & George, J. M. (2003). Awakening employee creativity: The role of leader emotional intelligence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(1), 545-568. DOI:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00051-1.
- Zhou, J. & Shalley, C. E. (2003). Research on employee creativity: A critical review and directions for future research. *Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 22, 165-217. DOI:10.1016/S0742-7301(03)22004-1.

Submitted: 24/02/2017

Accepted: 25/08/2017