Workload and Creative Performance: The Buffering Role of Intrinsic Motivation

Mercedes Narcisa. Idrovo[1*], Yirsa. Meza Villanueva[2], Stephanie. Flores Carrera[3]

[1] Marketing & Behavioural Science Division, Universidad de La Sabana INALDE Business School, Chia, Colombia
[2] Department of Social Psychology and Quantitative Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Barcelona, 08007 Barcelona, Spain
[3] Department of Psychology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, US

* **Corresponding author email address**: narcisa.idrovo@inalde.edu.co

Editor	Reviewers
Azizuddin Khan Professor, Psychophysiology Laboratory, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Maharashtra, India aziz@hss.iitb.ac.in	**Reviewer 1:** Thseen Nazir Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr **Reviewer 2:** Abolghasem Khoshkanesh Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The theoretical integration is promising but underexplored. Expand on how SDT's autonomy/competence needs directly connect to JD-R's concept of personal resources buffering job demands. A short conceptual model or explicit hypotheses at the end of the introduction would help.

This section leans heavily on leadership literature although the study does not measure leadership. Consider either trimming this portion or clarifying its relevance as theoretical background rather than a testable part of your model.

Add standardized residuals or modification indices to support the claim of excellent fit. Also clarify if any model re-specifications were done (e.g., adding covariances) before finalizing the fit indices.

Discuss practical significance beyond statistical significance. For instance, how meaningful is $\beta = -.29$ in organizational settings? Compare with effect sizes in similar motivation–creativity studies.

You mention the cross-sectional limitation but could suggest more specifically which future designs (e.g., diary studies, experimental workload manipulation) would best address this gap.

Provide details about which "statistical checks" for common method variance were applied (e.g., Harman's single-factor test, CFA marker technique). This strengthens transparency.

The model diagram lacks clarity. Add R^2 values for endogenous constructs (creative performance, intrinsic motivation) and label paths clearly with significance levels. Consider increasing resolution for publication quality.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Provide sample items and psychometric properties specific to the Colombian context. While Cronbach's alpha is referenced from previous studies, report your own alpha reliability coefficients for each scale in this study to show internal consistency.

Clarify the stratified random sampling procedure: Which strata were used (e.g., industry type, job level)? Also, indicate the response rate and whether any non-response bias checks were conducted.

The gender imbalance is notable. Discuss potential implications for creativity outcomes, as previous research shows gender differences in intrinsic motivation and creativity. A t-test or at least commentary on this imbalance would strengthen the interpretation.

Clarify how moderation was statistically tested. Was an interaction term created, or was a multi-group SEM approach used? Include the effect size or simple slope test results to show how creativity differs at high vs. low motivation levels.

This is well done but consider including skewness and kurtosis cut-offs explicitly (e.g., ±2). Also, note whether Mardia's test for multivariate normality was considered, given SEM's sensitivity.

The implications are insightful but mostly generic. Provide industry-specific recommendations (e.g., for Colombian service or manufacturing sectors) or examples of job crafting initiatives that could be applied.

Digitalization is an interesting context but feels underdeveloped. Either expand on how digital workload specifically was captured or discuss its absence as a limitation/future research angle.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.