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ABSTRACT
This paper aims to examine the impact of supervisor’s monitoring styles on the salesperson’s creativity where work engagement is considered as a mediating factor. This study is based on the concepts driven on the basis of Social Exchange Theory and Leader Member Exchange Theory by describing certain monitoring styles of supervisors and measures its impact on salespersons’ creativity in different pharmaceutical companies of Pakistan. The data collected from a total of 350 salespersons of 30 pharmaceutical companies on the basis of a random selection and 318 valid responses were used for the analysis part. After analysis of data, it is established that sales person’s creativity can be improved by employing effective supervisory monitoring styles. Also work engagement is tool which has a vital intermediary effect over the relationship of sales person’s creativity and supervisory monitoring. The study may also be expanded to other sectors of the economy for the generalization.
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INTRODUCTION
Management of sales force is one of the key concerns for every market oriented and profit centered organization. In many organizations, sales force is the only revenue generating unit and as such its effective performance is always desired for the overall growth, profitability and sustainability of the organization. Thus salespeople play a critical role in facilitating new product launches and cross functional product development process of different organizations. Forming promising settings is more prospective to get intrusion than innovative behavior and idea, and the effect of surroundings can be apparent in short period (Jian, Zhenxing, Shuangyu, and Yuijia, 2017). In this situation, creativity plays a energetic part in the organization’s capability to crop (or adopt) and sell new products, facilities or practices where creative workers can bid a new way of viewing stuffs and yields (Bidisha, Elisa, and Bhumika, 2018).

Creativity of sales force in an organization refers to the unique characteristics including personal trails, talent, innovated problem solving approaches, insights and productive thinking etc. which collectively help the organization (Bi, Lin & Lee, 2016). Creativity makes the salespeople to perform more effectively (Zoltners, Sinha, & Lorimer, 2008). The former studies have focused on the personality (Gupta & Singh, 2014), adaptive selling skills (Miao & Wang, 2016), and flexibility (Roman & Iacobucci, 2010). Similarly other constructs like relationship development skills (Marshel Goebel, & Moncrief, 2003) and the functioning ability within the sales team (Deeter-Schmelz, & Ramsay, 1995) have also been identified the factors contributing to sales performance.

Creativity is a cognitive variable and it does not happen at once rather reacted to some positive cognitive factors like, emotions, e.g. interest, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation etc. In past, studies have posted and discussed relationships of the monitoring styles with the subordinates of innovation through creativity and investigated it directly under the guidance of SET (Litchfield, Ford, & Gentry,
Creativity as a generic term is the generation of new ideas which are appropriate and useful for working (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, & Herron, 1996; Hon, Bloom, & Crant, 2014). Research has shown that different leadership styles affect the employee’s creativity differently. Monitoring is a style of leadership that focuses on the information gathering behaviors of the supervisors (Larson, & Callahan, 1990). Monitoring is a leadership behavior that influences the individual as well organization performance (Avolio, & Bass, 1995). Monitoring styles can affect the job attitudes, quality of relationship and work behaviors of the subordinates which in turn affect their creativity. Therefore, this study is of view that some cognitive variable should be there which stimulates the creativity.

The relationships of the monitoring styles with the creativity always have some intermediary influence in form of a cognitive variable. The studies are still lacking wherein work engagement has been considered a dominating factor for median between monitoring styles and creativity. Persons who are involved in their work have high heights of vigor, are excited about their work, and are entirely engrossed in their work doings (Arnold & Simon, 2018). However, research over the past decade has shown that work engagement may also fluctuate within persons –across time and situations (Reina-Tamayo et al., 2017). Thus, this study proposes that work engagement as a cognitive variable intervene between monitoring styles and creativity.

Pharmaceutical companies are facing a healthy competition. As a result, Pharmaceutical firms pay reasonable attention to the sales and marketing department along with planning department. The marketing approach is the visit of salespeople to the doctors and dispensers i.e. chemists. The sales people hold one on one meeting besides their companies’ efforts for arranging seminars in which the prominent doctors and chemists are invited and they are briefed about their products and related functions.

Drawing on the concepts of Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, this study focuses on the different monitoring styles of supervisors and measures its impact on salespersons’ creativity in different pharmaceutical companies.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Salesperson’s Creativity**

Creativity has been studied in the fields of art and music and recognized over a long time in those fields. The introduction of innovative products on a steady basis and varying purchaser anxieties usually energize job completion process for the salespeople (Juliano, Valtor and Raj, 2017). The concept of selling recommends that it is a procedure that would work superior if the salespeople engaged are talented to produce creativity in their sales dealings (Bidisha et.al., 2017). Regardless of the standing of creativity in a sales framework, there is slight pragmatic confirmation available in this arena of research (Miao & Wang, 2016).

Creativity appeared in sales and its outcomes are job performance and job satisfaction and now research focus on finding out the ways and to understand how to encourage the creative performance of salesperson (Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Zhou, & George, 2003). Researchers of this study take this idea in term of behavior, thought product and output. Creativity therefore, can be termed a trial and a process in which an idea is first generated and then put in to a strategic response (Sasser, & Koslow 2008). A number of cognitive characteristic e.g. intuition, attraction to complexity, and toleration of ambiguity, self-confidence and aesthetic sensitivity relate positively to assess the creative performance (Oldham and Cummings 1996).

Researchers have found that individuals facing high intrinsic motivational level are more creative and focused on the task, taking risk and are problem solvers (Reina-Tamayo et al., 2017). According to the intrinsic motivation perspective, an individual’s task influences intrinsic motivation in the context he/she performs, and affects creative achievement (Terje and Gudbrand, 2016). According to Wang and Netemeyer (2004), when the salespersons builds a new idea, looks for solution of old problems and solves a new problem, his/her creativity, emerges apparent to everyone.
Salesperson creativity performance as defined by Wand and Netemeyer (2004, P, 806) is, “the amount of new ideas generated and novel behaviors exhibited by the salesperson in performing his or her job activities”. The Wang, & Netemeyer (2004) present the following seven dimensions scale including: making sales presentation in new ways, carrying out sales tasks in ways that are resourceful, present new ideas, generate and evaluate alternatives for customer problems, take fresh perspectives of old problem, improve problem solution methods, and generate creative selling ideas.

The literature on creativity shows linkage of the personal and contextual characteristics with the creative performance while after investigating personality and cognitive style. Salesperson adaptive selling is relevant in this context as the salesperson identifies and adapt to the needful in customer and that of the circumstance purely on his abilities and skills (Weitz, Sujan, & Sujan 1986).

This study is focusing on the impact of various monitoring styles on the salespersons’ creativity through work engagement. In organizational context, supervisor styles are also considered antecedents of the employee’s creativity and at work (Juliano et.al, 2017; Arnold & Simon 2018).

**Supervisor’s Monitoring**

As per the business literature monitoring surges energy and discourages lying performance inside an organization (Brian and Charles, 2016). Monitoring not only decreases chance for lying, but also controls the person’s interior moral inspiration, and upturns the capacity to vindicate dishonesty (Hogan, Rezaee, Riley, & Velury, 2008). Monitoring styles can affect the job attitudes, quality of relationship and work behaviors of the subordinates which in turn affect their creativity (Bidisha et.al., 2017). Job attitudes refer to the trust and distrust in the supervisor, whereas the quality of relationship is measured through the LMX. In an organization the salesforce is effectively supervised only when the supervisors have full information about the sales force work performance (Miao and Wang, 2016).

Supervisors collect information about the work behavior of the salespeople not only for the betterment of the organizational growth but also for their performance evaluation, and for the incentive distribution among them (Gibson, Tanner, & Wagner, 2012). How supervisors collect information regarding salespeople’s performance may have some implications on the salesforce reactions because different monitoring styles have different perspectives associated (Brian & Charles, 2016). Based on the respective monitoring styles of the supervisor, the salesforce thus becomes either skeptical and see distrust in their supervisors or perceive higher level of fairness in their supervisor (Hogan et.al, 2008). It is not clear why the monitoring reduces the subordinate performance in some research based studies. From this we argue that various supervisors’ monitoring styles may differently influence the subordinate reactions.

A number of scholars have opinions that leadership behaviors or styles can address the creative works (Mumford et al., 2002; Tieney, 2008). Since different managerial monitoring styles may differently affect subordinates, therefore, this study has considered the observational and interactional monitoring.

**Observational Monitoring**

Observational monitoring can be defined as the collection of information regarding the work progress and outcome of the subordinates without taking direct input from them. This monitoring style is termed as a top-down and includes behaviors like going to the subordinate’s workplace, observing them during their work, and closely checking their work behaviors, instant reactions and responses at the workplace (Sam, Miaooqi and Sécén, 2018).

Subordinates perceive observational monitoring very negative for the reasons that in such monitoring style they perceive being kept away from expressing their ideas or have been excluded from giving any input in the decision making process (Block 1988).

Observational monitoring includes supervisor’s behavior of following closely the subordinates’ work behavior. Supervisors notes and examines the subordinate’s responses to a problem or new tasks (Rajiv, Seok, Gordon and Dhinu, 2010). Thus the authenticity of the information of salesperson’s work becomes suspicious with a negative perception. SET advocates that individual’s reciprocation is
always positive or negative when they perceive likewise i.e. positive or negative dealings from the other party (Cook, & Rice, 2006).

The subordinates in response, perceive distrust in the supervisor and are likely to negatively reciprocate. Thus, it can be argued that the observational monitoring negatively presents the trust factor in the supervisor and hence negatively affects the creativity among the salesperson. Leadership is an antecedent of the work engagement (Bakker, Albrecht, Leiter, 2011) and is viewed an important driving factor in the business success (Strom, Sears, & Kelly, 2014). Therefore, the study is examining the relationship of the leadership style i.e. the observational monitoring with the employee work engagement and that how it affects the salesperson creativity through the work engagement as a mediator.

**Interactional Monitoring**

When the information about the subordinates’ work progress and outcome is gathered by the supervisors and the subordinates are taken on board in the process through meetings and interactions etc, such a monitoring style is termed as the Interactional monitoring (Mahmoud 2015).

Researchers have found that engaging subordinates in an open discussion, their perceptions of good intentions are boosted which likely strengthen the dyadic relationship (Tjosvold, 2008). This style of monitoring is generally viewed favorably by the subordinates as it provides them the opportunity to explain their mistakes if any or inadequate performance. In such interactions they inform the supervisors about their accomplishments and also explain the personnel views, concerns and dissatisfactions.

The engaging subordinates in open discussions generates among them perception of good intentions (Tjosvold, 2008). The subordinates accordingly reciprocate it in term of high productivity and performance same way as has been guided by the SET. Thus the relationship of this leadership style is also based on SET and that of the LMX which characterize the extent of quality in such a relationship between the supervisors and the salespeople. SET Blau (1964) suggests that individuals often reciprocate either positively or negatively in response to the other party’s actions, perceived positively or negatively. Interactional monitoring may impact creativity in the subordinate through work engagement. The more intrinsically the individuals get involved, the more likely they will pay attention to their problems ultimately engaging them in a creative process (Kanfer, 1990). We therefore argue that interactional monitoring positively influence the work engagement which in turn influences the creativity.

**Work Engagement**

Work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption (Klaus and Eva, 2017). A meta-study performed by Harter et al. (2013) has marked a constrictive link between firm performance and paradigms of work engagement. A number of studies are based on the Kahan’s (1990) conceptual foundation who defined that the personal engagement as when employees (bring in) themselves during work, invest their individual energy and feel an emotional attachment with the work. From this conceptual foundation two important characteristics can be noted; a psychological connection with the work and putting oneself i.e. self-investment of personal resources in the work. Thus engagement brings together physical, emotional and cognitive energies in individuals toward their work role (Rich et al., 2010). Though, it can be claimed that employers should amount performance standards in standings of time versus efficiency (Mahmoud, 2015). Similarly, employees can be compensated or remunerated for time disbursed on specific chores or on the quantity of work accomplished.

Dedication is logic of challenge, inspiration, significance, enthusiasm and pride. Absorption is a state in which a person fully concentrates on his/her job (Agarwal, Datta, Blake-Beard, & Bhargava, 2012). Work engagement is a relationship of employees with their work (Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2008).
Work engagement is a novel concept which includes key features like self-presence, high energy and high involvement at work (Britt, Dickinson et al. 2007). In response to the fair consideration by the managers, subordinates feel a sense of attachment to the job and show more willingness towards investment of their work. Similarly, the quality of LMX positively influences emotions and attitudes of the followers (Gerstner & Day, 1997). The work engagement is fully based on the SET when it is influenced by the leadership styles as well it influences the creativity.

**Sales Person Creativity, Supervisor’s Monitoring & Work Engagement**

SET has provided the base for the current study. SET guides the current study in two key ways. First, as norm of reciprocity Blau (1964) suggests that there is a tendency in the individuals to positively or negatively reciprocate when they positively or negatively perceive the actions from other party (Cook & Rice, 2006). SET informs that the positive reciprocation stimulates the quality interpersonal relationship (Blau, 1964). LMX is the theory that captures this relationship quality in subordinate’s supervisor dyad (Graen, & Uhl-Bein, 1995). Therefore, LMX serves as theory that conceptualizes the monitoring impact on salespersons’ creativity supervisors have dominate styles (Avolio, & Bass, 2004) and these styles will affect the ways subordinate respond.

In this study salesperson creativity is a dependent variable. Creativity is a mind related activity which can be influenced by the leadership styles. Leadership styles are contextual factors. In research model, therefore a variable i.e. work engagement is mediating the relationship between the monitoring styles and salesperson creativity. Work engagement has three cognitive demission’s namely vigor, dedication and absorption. Work engagement a motivational psychological state and thus is affected by the contextual antecedent i.e. leadership (Bakker, Albrechet, & Leiter, 2011). We therefore argue that under SET the monitoring styles can be positively to the employees work engagement and which in turn will affect the salesperson creativity.

In past, the studies have linked monitoring with different connotations e.g., (Komaki, 1986) looks monitoring in a neutral way, Zhou (2003) considers it with negative connotation and Tjosould (2008) sees monitoring in positive perspective. Work engagement has contextual drivers in the forms of leadership styles. There is no single study that has investigated the relationship of the leadership styles with salespersons’ creativity through the mediation of work engagement. Putting work engagement as mediator in relationship of the two monitoring styles with the salesperson creativity is a novel idea that is considered a gap and hence needs an investigation.

**Conceptual Model**

This study has examined the relationships between observational monitoring, and interactional monitoring with work engagement, and that of the work engagement with the salesperson’s creativity. Based on the principles of SET and above cited literature the conceptual model for this study is framed in such a way that it has permitted us to empirically test the linear and complex relationships between the study variables.

**Figure 1. Conceptual Model**

Based on the literature review and SET, the study has proposed the following hypotheses:

**H1:** Observational monitoring positively relates with salesperson’s work engagement.
H2: Interactional monitoring positively relates with salesperson’s work engagement.
H3: Work engagement positively relates with salesperson’s creativity.
H4: Work engagement mediates the relationship between observational monitoring and salesperson’s creativity
H5: Work engagement mediates the relationship between interactional monitoring and salesperson’s creativity.

METHODOLOGY
Population and Determination of Sample Size
Pharmaceutical industry of the Pakistan is mix of domestic and multinational companies. As per the data of Pakistan Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Association (PPMA), there are almost 90 pharmaceutical companies operational in cities of Islamabad & Rawalpindi. The idea to select the pharma industry was due to the fact that in Pakistan this industry has employed largest sales force. The data for the study was collected from the pharmaceutical companies’ salesperson of the Islamabad and Rawalpindi. In order to avoid the heterogeneity in the nature of respondents, only field salespersons of the Pharmaceutical industry were selected. The existing sales force of 90 pharma companies operational in Islamabad and Rawalpindi is ranging between 950-1000 sales personnel. Though, 350 cases or sample size was chosen for this study as per the table of Morgan (1960) the said sample size is sufficient for the population between 950-1000 and also suggested by Hair et al., (2014) based (rule of thumb) that the sample size must be 10-20 times larger than the total number of variables of the study.

Moreover, due to the largest sales force employed i.e. having nearly 800 companies nationwide, the pharmaceutical industry of Pakistan was selected for the purpose. Therefore, our sample was the salespersons of the pharmaceutical companies both multinational and national based at Islamabad and Rawalpindi. With the assistance of different pharmaceutical firms’ managers, a total of 350 salespersons of 90 pharmaceutical companies were randomly contacted of which 318 valid responses were received. Respondents for this research study were the medical representatives (sales personnel).

Data Collection
Data was collected in one shot i.e. (cross-sectional). For data collection researchers of this study approached the selected sample of salespeople through their managers. Accordingly, the have been given questionnaire at their office place. The items of questionnaires were explained to the respondents. The data was collected during the month of May and June, 2018 for the study.

Research Measures
The research instrument was divided into two sections. Section A constituted of forty items adapted from different studies. The first ten items relate with the independent variables including five items each for independent variables, i.e. observational monitoring and interactional monitoring were adapted from Hinkin's (2005) study. For the next seventeen items i.e. from item number eleven to item number twenty seven relating to the Work Engagement, the UTWES by Schefuli et al. (2002) has been utilized. The work engagement variable has three dimensions namely the vigor, the dedication, and the absorption for which separate items numbering to six, five and six respectively have been adapted the aforesaid UTWES. The last thirteen items adapted from Zhou and George’s (2001) study related to creativity variable and are serial numbered from twenty eight to forty.

The second section dealt with demographics that included information about the salespersons like age, gender, education, total experience and their company status.

Data Collection Procedures
The study has utilized questionnaire survey to collect the data through simple random sampling.

Data Analysis Techniques
Outliers and missing values were checked through software after compilation of the data. None of the value was found missing from the data. The results of skewness and kurtoses showed that the data was normally distributed. The data collected was subjected to further statistical test on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20 software. Reliability and validity of the variables has been
measured before finding results of correlations and regression. Confirmatory factor analysis of the variables was done through AMOS 18 software. The alpha value of the variables meets the standard value of 0.6 that has been established by Sekaran (2003).

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS
Confirmatory Factor Analysis
Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed using AMOS 18.0 to establish that how well the forty (40) indicators calculated the four (4) constructs. CFA was assessed in the stated manner. Loadings represented the standardized regression weights that are good indicators of CFA, values above .5 are considered good enough to proceed with further analysis. Comparative fit index (CFI) value, Goodness of fit index (GFI), Normed fit Index (NFI) and Root mean square error approximation (RMSEA) was considered for finalizing the items. The cut off values for CFI, GFI, and NFI according to literature should be more than 0.90 and for RMSEA it should be less than 0.05.

Results from CFA shows that all factors loadings (standardized regression weights) mostly are in acceptable range, and are satisfactorily high and significant, that illustrates considerably good fit of the data. Cronbach’s alpha for all the constructs exceeds the threshold value of 0.70, thus indicating good internal-consistency and reliability. Table 1, 2, 3 & 4 represents CFA analysis of all the constructs and thus establishing reliability of the instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Initial Values</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>Final Values</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation Monitoring</td>
<td>OM1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>Items Removed</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM3</td>
<td>$\chi^2 / df$</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 / df$</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM4</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM5</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>$e_1 \leftrightarrow e_2$</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All factor loadings are significant at $p < 0.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Initial Values</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>Final Values</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Monitoring</td>
<td>IM1</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>22.36</td>
<td>Items Removed</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1 0 .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM3</td>
<td>$\chi^2 / df$</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2 / df$</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM4</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IM5</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>$e_1 \leftrightarrow e_2$</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All factor loadings are significant at $p < 0.001$
## Table 3. CFA Results for Work Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Initial Values</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>Final Values</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VG1</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>518.91</td>
<td>Items Removed</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>421.0</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG3</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>VG2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG4</td>
<td>χ² / df</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>χ² / df</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG5</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG6</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD1</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.80 e16↔e1</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD2</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.10 e8↔e9</td>
<td>41.52</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD3</td>
<td>e4↔e9</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD4</td>
<td>e1↔e6</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD5</td>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD6</td>
<td>AB2</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD7</td>
<td>AB3</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD8</td>
<td>AB4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD9</td>
<td>AB5</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD10</td>
<td>AB6</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All factor loadings are significant at p < 0.001

## Table 4. CFA Results for Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Initial Values</th>
<th>Modifications</th>
<th>Final Values</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>280.84</td>
<td>Items Removed</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>183.90</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>VG2</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR3</td>
<td>χ² / df</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>χ² / df</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR4</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>Covariance</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR5</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR6</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.90 e12↔e1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR7</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.10 e7↔e8</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR8</td>
<td>e4↔e9</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR9</td>
<td>e1↔e8</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit Date: 05.07. 2018, Acceptance Date: 22.08.2018, DOI NO: 10.7456/1080SSE/353

Research Article - This article was checked by Turnitin
Copyright © The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication
Hypotheses Testing

Table 5. Regression Analysis of WE w.r.t OM and IM (N=318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.22**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>55.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.38**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>5.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Table 5 shows the results of regression analysis and addressing the relationship between the observational monitoring and the work engagement. The value of R² = .26 shows that 26% variation has been brought in the work engagement due to the observational monitoring. The β value of .26 signifies that observational monitoring has caused a positive and significant change in the work engagement. Hence, therefore H1 is accepted. Similarly, the value of R² = .26 shows that 26% variation has been brought in the work engagement due to independent variables. The β value of .31 signifies that the interactional monitoring has brought a positive and significant change in the work engagement. Hence, H2 is accepted.

Table 6. Regression Analysis of Creativity w.r.t WE (N=318)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.61**</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>367.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>19.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

The value of R² indicates that how much independent variable is explaining dependent variable. R² can also be defined as if there is 1% change in independent variable then there is R² change in dependent variable. The R² of creativity is 0.53 which means 53% of the total change in creativity of salespersons is predicted by work engagement. The model shows positive impact of work engagement on creativity of salespersons, the value of t stat is (19.17) above the standard value and sig. value (.01) which shows highly significant relation between these two variables, hence H3 is accepted.

Mediation Analysis

Hypothesis H4 states that the salespersons’ work engagement mediates between observational monitoring and salesperson's creativity. Similarly, hypothesis H5 states that the work engagement mediates between interactional monitoring and salesperson's creativity based on the concepts driven from Baron and Kenny (1986) mediation model.

The Table 7 highlights the mediation analysis. In the first phase, a regression analysis was run to predict the salesperson's creativity from observational monitoring. This step provided information that facilitated in evaluating the nature of strength of relationship between observational monitoring and salesperson's creativity.
The second regression was carried out to predict work engagement from the observational monitoring. The results give values ($F = 62.50, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.46, R^2 = 0.19$). The third regression was performed in Model-III to predict the creativity from both observational monitoring and work engagement. The results provided values ($F = 189.37, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.10, R^2 = 0.68$). When observational monitoring and the work engagement were regressed together on the salesperson's creativity in the third regression model, it was found that the regression coefficient $\beta$ was significantly reduced and $\Delta R^2 = 0.38$. Hence H4 is accepted.

Table 8 shows the results for mediation analysis. Initially, a regression was run to predict salesperson's creativity from Interactional monitoring. This step provided information that facilitated in evaluating the strength of relationship between Interactional monitoring and salesperson's creativity. The results of Model-I have confirmed that the on the whole, effect of the interactional monitoring on the salesperson's creativity is statistically significant ($F = 15.14, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.38, R^2 = 0.14$) Thus, the second regression was carried out to predict work engagement from the interactional monitoring. The results give values ($F = 87.13, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.46, R^2 = 0.21$). The third regression was performed in Model-III to predict the creativity from both interactional monitoring and work engagement. The results provided values ($F = 188.84, p < 0.01, \beta = 0.05, R^2 = 0.54$). When interactional monitoring and the work engagement were regressed together on the salesperson's creativity in the third regression model, it was found that the regression coefficient $\beta$ was significantly reduced from 0.38 to 0.05.

The Table 8 shows the values of $R^2 = 0.14$ in Model-I, and that of the $R^2 = 0.54$ in Model-III where it can be observed that the value of $R^2$ has been increased from Model-I to Model-III. Based on change in $\beta$ values and $\Delta R^2$, it is established that the work engagement partially mediates the effects of interactional monitoring and salesperson's creativity. Hence, H5 is accepted.

**DISCUSSION**

This study contributes by adding into the existing literature of monitoring styles and its impact on the salespersons’ creativity (Juliano et.al., 2017). Earlier, the literature on the domain, there was a clear indication that the monitoring styles would differently result if applied in different environments, under different contexts and conditions (Schmitz and Ganesan, 2014). However, the earlier literature...
had no solid research with concrete reference to the impact of monitoring styles on the salespersons’ creativity particularly through the mediating role of the work engagement (Arnold and Simon, 2018).

The work engagement is a cognitive variable among the salesperson that faces the perception of the different monitoring styles first, before transferring its real impact on to the creativity factor (Albrecht et al., 2018). In this study the two different monitoring styles bring along clear and distinctive value for impacting the work engagement which causes a significant reaction onward on the salesperson's creativity.

CONCLUSION
In past, the literature has mention that the observational monitoring styles had a negative impact on the subordinates as compared to the interactional monitoring style that had a positive impact based on the two way communication between the supervisors and the salesperson (Brian and Charles, 2016). This research studied four variables in a network i.e. observational monitoring, interactional monitoring, work engagement, and the salesperson creativity. The findings of the relationships of the two monitoring styles with creativity have been confirmed by this study with additional findings that these relationships go on further strengthening when a variable like work engagement is included in the model.

The result of this study support the previous study findings of the distinctive nature of the two monitoring styles but also add that theses monitoring styles are not inverse of each other in relationship. This study has investigated the creativity aspect of the salesperson in response to the different monitoring styles, in addition to that of the behavior and attitude which is not available earlier in the literature.

Thus the results of the study in hand argue that the different outcome of creativity is caused due to the different tendencies of salespersons in response to the different monitoring styles (Bidisha et.al, 2017). These tendencies play a major role in transforming the impact of the monitoring styles and serve as a medium between the actual drivers and that of the outcome.

Practical Implications
The results of this study would be helpful in providing guidance to the managerial professionals and practitioners of the sales department of pharmaceutical firms. It suggests that the management should focus and carry on that particular monitoring style which positively impacts the work engagement of the salesperson.

Future Research
During the survey, quite a few numbers of new avenues for research were explored. These include investigating the existing research model by enhancing the population to other industries, extending across the country, together with focusing on the others leadership styles like servant leadership etc, and including the total gender aspect i.e. female as salesperson in the research.

5.1.3. Limitation of the Research
This research was restricted to a single industry and to a limited geographical territory i.e. Rawalpindi and Islamabad. The study based on cross sectional data only so causal linkages cannot be established.
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