August 25, 2022

Professor Weng Marc Lim

Editor

*Global Business and Organizational Excellence*

Dear Professor Lim,

Re: Manuscript GBOE-2022-02-0020 (new title) “What drives creativity in the workplace? Exchange and contextual variables in their relationship to supervisor and self-report creativity./”

Thank you for your letter of July 23, 2022. I appreciate your encouraging reply and thank you and the reviewers for the helpful comments. Following these closely, we have revised our manuscript significantly. I believe that in the current version we have satisfactorily clarified and corrected the issues existing in the previous version. I hope that the paper in its current form meets with your satisfaction. I would be pleased to incorporate any further changes that you may consider necessary.

Best regards,

Aaron Cohen

**Responses to the Editors' comments and suggestions**

*As suggested by the editor, all the comments of the reviewers have been answered and their suggestions integrated in the revised paper.*

**Editor Comments to Author:**

1*. It is important that GBOE manuscripts take on the challenge to advance knowledge from a theoretical standpoint whilst using context as evidence to support the theorization that is taking place in the research. That is to say, the theoretical contribution should clearly take center stage, and the context (e.g., country, industry, population) is simply a means to develop evidence to show that what you have attempted to theorize has methodological-sound support. Therefore, please ensure that you tone down on context and bring the concepts to the forefront more prominently throughout the paper.*

The contextual factors of country, industry, and occupation are toned down in the paper and are mentioned mainly to inform the readers of the basic information about the target population. As I mention in my reply to one of the reviewer’s comments below (number seven), Israel is a Westernized modern country. There is no need to focus on this aspect as many of the studies on this topic were performed in similar Westernized modern cultures.   
  
2. *In addition, please explicitly “acknowledge the contributions” and “highlight the extant gaps in the literature” from both “theoretical and practical perspectives” in order to demonstrate “the need and novelty for your study.” The urgency and industry relevance aspects of your study could also be strengthened with more recent global events and/or statistics.*

The revised paper, particularly in the introduction (pp. 3–6) and in the discussion (pp. 22–25) emphasizes its contribution.  
  
3. *I would like to see good use of a table that can sharply and succinctly summarize the key findings of the study (i.e., what were the key findings, what are the key implications).*

As reviewer one suggested in comment number 3, the revised paper included a figure of the research model (see Figure 1). Also, responding to the editor’s comment, a table that summarize the key findings of the study is also included in the revised paper (see Figure 2).

4. *Review GBOE and other journals and update your paper with the recent and relevant literature. A good target is to have at least 30% of literature underpinning the study to be within the last 3 years (2020-2022).*

As suggested by both the reviewer and the editor the literature review was significantly updated with more recent studies.  
4. *Relook into your abstract and ensure that it is sharp and succinct, and convey all key findings. Also relook into your keywords. The idea is to ensure that you optimize your title, abstract, and keywords with the right and consistent words for search engine optimization. The abstract is also where you "sell" the "value" of your paper, and it helps readers who cannot afford to pay for the paper to glean on the key insights that you found through your study. Also, relook into your title to ensure that it is sharp and succinct.*

As suggested by the editor the abstract and the title were revised.   
  
5. *Ensure all headings and sub-headings are properly numbered and have consistent capitalization.*

Headings and subheadings are properly numbered in the revised paper.

6. *The literature review could be sharper and more organized in its flow, wherein concepts are introduced, defined, have their importance highlighted, and then connected to the intention of the review (e.g., showcasing gap, explaining the rationale why it is reasonable to suspect that concepts are related, etc).*

The literature review was updated and is better organized.   
  
7. *Provide a more detailed explanation with reference to the literature on the methodological procedure (i.e., transparently disclosing and justifying selected methods and steps taken) and rigor (e.g., what thresholds are available and have they been met; what biases exist and what steps were taken to mitigate them) of your study.*

As mentioned in the response to the reviewer, all variables in this study were measured using established scales. The revised study also used HTMT as further step that examines the discriminant validity of the scales.   
8. *The implications need to be stronger, wherein (1) theoretical implications as a sub-section should clearly demonstrate how does the current findings advance existing knowledge and what do the findings mean for future knowledge development, whereas (2) managerial implications as a sub-section should clearly explain how can the findings inform practice and policy and what can be done moving forward, with each implication in each sub-section clearly signposted (first, second, third, etc.). The same goes with future research directions, which need to be more focused on driving the creation of new knowledge and explaining why this new knowledge is important. In other words, the idea behind these comments is for you to provide actionable insights for both theory and practice, rather than simply stating the obvious (e.g., confirming prior studies; broad and thus vague recommendations). While the introduction is where you sell the value of your research, the implications part is where you deliver the value that you have promised. Making a lucrative promise and then delivering it well is therefore key to publishing in GBOE.*

Following the editor’s comment, the theoretical justifications and implications were significantly elaborated and strengthened in the revised paper. Subsections were added to the revised paper.

9. *Have your revised paper professionally edited and proofread before resubmission.*

The revised paper was proofread by professional editing services.

10. *In hindsight, this is a manuscript with good potential. It might be worthwhile exploring whether your university or any co-authors have any resources to support open access options to potentially improve the visibility of the manuscript once it is published.*

This journal has an open access option in the library of University of Haifa.

**I would like to refer the Editor to the tone of some of the comments below made by the reviewer. Comment 14, and particularly item D in this comment, as well as comments 15 and 16 are very unusual comments.**

**REVIEWER’S COMMENTS MANUSCRIPT NUMBER GBOE-2022-02-0020**

1.*Your abstract is good, but don’t you think it needs to clearly state the purpose of the research? Don’t you think it would be more beneficial to include a statement that captures the problem the research is trying to find solution to? Won’t it be helpful to highlight what theory supports the study here?*

The abstract of the paper was revised according to the suggestions of the reviewer. The title of the paper was also changed to a more theory oriented one (see the new abstract).

2. *Given the rapidly changing times, don’t you think your entire content should mirror some sort of evidence from recent research, as your latest citation is an article published in 2019? Do you mean there have been no updates on the subject matter investigated during the periods of 2020 to 2022?*

The literature review in the revised paper was updated and includes studies from 2021 and 2022.

*3. Don’t you think it would be better to also provide a figure of the conceptual framework that captures all hypothesized paths for all variables investigated in the study?* *Also, consider making all their respective definitions much clearer especially in the introduction section.*

As suggested by the reviewer the revised paper provides a figure of the conceptual framework. As also suggested by the reviewer the revised paper provides a clearer presentation of the study variables in the introduction (p. 4).

4. *Why are there several statements without a clear justification – are there no supporting*

*literature for the statements? For example, see the statement... “An innovative culture is a work environment that is risk-taking, results-oriented, stimulating, challenging, and/or imaginative. In terms of motivation, employees are advised to be creative and dynamic. Emphasizing novelty, equality of members, openness, and flexibility, such a culture is thought to promote creativity through the powerful signals it sends regarding norms and values, indicating that it is safe for employees to start risky, exploratory, and failure-prone activities that rely on creativity.”. I find this statement and a several others very questionable and generic without their relative citations. You can’t possibly justify that Hon and Leung (2011), which by the way is quite old, addressed all the issues in the above quoted statement... and you can’t possibly argue that this study is the only literature that have examined the several concepts in the above quoted statement. I strongly encourage you to review your entire literature using recent research outputs. I also strongly recommend the following articles that would very much*

*be of some help for you.*

*1. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59916-4\_8*

*2. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJB-12-2017-0043*

*3. https://doi.org/10.18536/bcce.2018.10.8.1.05*

*4. Https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.032*

*5. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJB-09-2019-0068*

*6. https://doi.org/10.1177/2319714519891668*

*7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.060*

*8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2020.10.007*

*9. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2754*

*10.* [*https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-021-09784-8*](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-021-09784-8)

The relevant paragraph was revised following the reviewers’ suggestion (p. 9). As mentioned in my response to comment number two above, more recent literature (2019–2022) was integrated in the revised paper. My profound thanks to the reviewer for the comprehensive long list recommended articles. I am certain that integrating these papers contributed significantly to this paper. I intended to integrate all of the them in my paper butI believe that it might have been a bit problematic to cite so many references from the same first author. Therefore, I was not able to integrate all of them. However, I am entirely convinced that the papers of Dr. Samuel Ogbeibu that I did integrate in my paper improved it significantly.

*5. In your methodology section, don’t you reckon it would be better to clearly discuss how the variables were operationalized? For example, it is not clear whether the creativity variable was adopted or adapted or self-developed. Please, provide a table of all the items that were used to measure all the variables.*

The methodology section in the paper (before the revisions) very clearly states the source of every variable used in this study. For example, when presenting the measurement of creativity, the relevant paragraph states: *“…For this variable, we applied the scale advanced by Zhou and George (2001), which includes 13 items (e.g., “Is a good source of creative ideas,” “Is not afraid to take risks,” and “Promotes and champions ideas to others”)….* My paper also states that for**perceived obligations**, I applied the scale advanced by Robinson, Kraatz, and Rousseau (1994) and for **organizational justice** Iused Niehoff and Moorman's (1993) 20-item scale to measure the three dimensions of organizational justice– distributive justice, formal procedures, and interactional justice.The other independent variables, **Psychological contract breach**, **organizational environment for creativity**, and **employee well-being,** were evaluated using the five-item scale by Robinson and Morrison (2000), the nine-item scale by Mayfield and Mayfield (2010),and the the six-item scale by Warr (1990), respectively. I believe that the scales used in the study are clearly indicated in prose and that providing a table would unecessarily burden the paper, I am, of course, willing to do so should the editor agree with the reviewer’s assessment.

6. *Wouldn’t it be better to justify why the GFI and NFI value in the “All independent variables” role of Table 2 falls below 0.9? Also consider the GFI value of the same role that is below 0.9 in Table 1. Are there any supports in the literature for this?*

The overall findings of the CFA for both studies are satisfactory to argue for an acceptable discriminant validity. The findings of the HTMT analysis support the conclusions based on CFA.

7*. Is it not better to thoroughly emphasize on what the problem(s) is that you are trying to solve in the introduction and probably further expound on it in the literature review section? Do you think providing scant literature on relative gaps without a convincing support of contextual (country where data was collected) gaps is enough? Don’t you think the problem statement is important to help raise your motivation for the study?*

The introduction in the revised paper was revised significantly. Israel in a Westernized modern country. There is no need to focus on this aspect as many of the studies on this topic were performed in similar Westernized modern contexts. The goals of the study were sharpened and clarified as a result of the revisions (pp. 3–5). The revised title also sharpens the focus of this paper.

8*. It is not clear if all constructs used in this study have been self-developed or directly adapted or adopted from prior research. Don’t you think providing more details as to their how they were obtained and how the data was collected would be helpful for replication of this study in future?*

This comment is a replication of comment five above. My reply to comment five above responds to this reviewer’s comments too. The original submission as well as the revised version are very clear about the use of established existing scales and very clearly mentioned the sources of each and every one of them and credited them as should be.

9. *In your actual data collection process, you used self-rated measures and given that it is not clear what sampling technique was employed and why, this can be problematic due to issues of common method bias. How have this been thoroughly addressed prior to, and post data collection, beyond just Kock (2015) recommendation?*

The revised paper mentions that the data were collected by convenience samples (p. 17). The paper very clearly describes the data collection process. There is no evidence for common method bias as demonstrated in the results section and particularly in the CFAs. The use of principals’ reports (another source for the dependent variable) strengthens the contribution of the paper.

10*. You claim to have addressed discriminant validity concerns... however, the recommended approach is the use of the HTMT method especially considering your tool for statistical analysis. Can the HTMT information be provided accordingly?*

HTMT is a very new method. Its validity is still very questionable. I am sure that the reviewer is familiar with the recent paper by Rönkkö and Cho (2022) *(Rönkkö, M., & Cho, E. (2022). An updated guideline for assessing discriminant validity. Organizational Research Methods, 25(1), 6-14.)‏.* This paper examined and compared HTMT, CFA, and other methods for discriminant validity using comprehensive Monte Carlo simulation. The main findings of this paper showed that

*“…HTMT index is simply a scale score correlation disattenuated with parallel reliability (i.e., the standardized alpha) and thus should not be expected to outperform modern CFA techniques, which our simulation demonstrates. (P. 32).”*

However, in addition to the CFA, following the reviewer suggestion, we also performed HTMT and presented the findings on p. 20 in the revised paper. The findings supported the discriminant validity of the measures used in this study.

11. *You evidence mediation analysis in your model. Don’t you think you should have*

*considered including the effect sizes (v effects) of your specific indirect effects? See the*

*following study for how to execute it regardless of the statistics software for analysis employed. Ogbeibu, S., Jabbour, C. J., Gaskin, J., Senadjki, A., & Hughes, M. (2021). Leveraging STARA competencies and green creativity to boost green organisational innovative evidence: A praxis for sustainable development. Bus Strat Env., 1-20. doi:10.1002/bse.2754 Also see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e-594jcFVxY&t=105s and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kyPUHCMjPyg for a more practical approach.*

*Consider re-writing the hypothesis that has been provided already for H6. Two mediating paths have been hypothesised. So split them to H6a and H6b or better, H6 and H7.*

After reading the paper several times I was not able to find any mention of any intention to examine mediation effects in this study. Using the command “find” in Word to search for the term mediation or any similar terms in the paper resulted in “No matches”. There was no intention in the paper to examine any mediation effect and there is no conceptual justification for doing so. I believe that the cause of this misunderstanding is the phrasing of hypothesis 6. Therefore, the phrasing of the hypothesis was changed from “*Perceived obligations through relational contracts are positively related to creativity, while perceived obligations through transactional contracts are negatively related to creativity”* in the old version to *“**Perceived relational obligations are positively related to creativity, while perceived transactional are negatively related to creativity”* in the revised version (p. 14)*.* I am convinced that that this correction will satisfy the reviewer.

12*. Would you strongly consider studying the following articles below as a guide to help you further in your review of the literature and especially the arguments in the theoretical framing and discussion sections?*

*Amabile, M. T. (1997). Motivating Creativity in Organisations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. CALIFORNIA MANAGEMENT REVIEW, 40(1), 39-58.*

*Amabile, T. M., & Mueller, J. S. (2008). Studying Creativity, Its Processes, and Its*

*Antecedents: An exploration of the componential theory of creativity. In J. Zhou, & C.*

*E. Shalley, Handbook of Organizational Creativity (pp. 33-64). New York: Lawrence*

*Erlbaum Associates.*

*Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and*

*innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. Research in*

*Organizational Behavior, 36, 157–183. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2016.10.001*

The above papers were integrated in the revised paper.

13*. Given the literature above, would you not consider extensively improving your discussion section? Don’t you think they would be very helpful to clearly justify the constructs and debates evidenced in your study?*

As suggested by the reviewer and the editor, the discussion section was revised and improved.

14. *I find that one of the weakest parts of your work is the discussion and theoretical and*

*practical implications sections. These sections should be split and clearly represented in their sub-headings. Do you think that after examining the suggested literature below your*

*theoretical contributions and implications might be strongly revamped? Would it not be very meaningful to see how your findings challenge, advance and compliment your working theories as the contribution of your manuscript to both theory and practice could be made clearer? To further help in this wise, would you consider the articles below?*

*a) Whetten, D. A. (1989). 'What constitutes a theoretical contribution?', Academy of*

*Management Review, 14, 490-495; and Suddaby, R. (2014). 'Editor's comments: Why*

*theory?', Academy of Management Review, 39, 407-411.*

*b) Bacharach, S. B. 1989. Organizational theories: Some criteria for evaluation.*

*Academy of Management Review, 14: 496-515.*

*c) Cresswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed*

*methods approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

*d) Daft, R. L. 1995. Why I recommended that your manuscript be rejected and what you*

*can do about it. In L. L. Cummings, & P. J. Frost (Eds.), Publishing in the*

*organizational sciences: 164-182. Thousand Islands, CA: Sage.*

I thank the reviewer for the illuminating papers and books suggested. These books were immensely instructive HoweverI prioritized using more recent literaturein this paper as was also recommended by reviewer one.

15. *Do you think the review of the above literature may help you provide answers to the*

*questions below?*

*• What kind of unique contributions have your study been able to make to advance our*

*understandings of the theory used?*

*• Was the theory challenged by your findings?*

*• Have the theory been falsified or confirmed or complimented and how?*

*• How have the change in your context challenged the theory used?*

*• Why has the theory worked in other context and not so much or worked so well in your*

*context – given your distinct findings?*

*• What’s so unique about your context that have fostered such positive findings whereas,*

*similar studies have presented contrasting results based on their context?*

I thank the reviewer for acknowledging the positive and interesting findings of this study. I agree with the reviewer that these findings can contribute to our knowledge regarding creativity as well as to the scientific literature.

16. *So after a review of the above literature and questions, would you agree with me that they lack depth and are not as clear as you initially had thought?*

I would like to thank the reviewers for all the insightful and illuminating constructive, conceptual, and methodological comments which contributed so much to the improvement of all aspects of the paper. Thank you indeed. I learned a lot from your reviews.