

Explainable AI Models of Organizational Creativity: Influences of Inclusive Leadership and Team Psychological Safety


Eleanor. Hughes¹, Rizky. Pratama^{2*}

¹ Department of Management, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom



² Department of Management and Entrepreneurship, Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

* Corresponding author email address: rizky.pratama@ui.ac.id

Editor

Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti¹
Educational Administration, Faculty
of Psychology and Educational
Sciences, Semnan University,
Semnan, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Masoud Hoseinchari¹
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Shiraz University, Shiraz,
Iran. Email: hchari@shirazu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abbas Monavarian¹
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening sections are rich but dense, with long sentences and limited navigation cues. Consider reorganizing into clearly labeled sub-themes (e.g., drivers of creativity → team mechanisms → inclusive leadership → AI/explainability) with explicit transitions that justify why each block is included and how it leads to the proposed model. (Source: IJIMOB-6-1-KH12.docx, early literature overview—retrieved excerpt, comment 2.)

The review covers transformational, ethical, and inclusive leadership, but inclusive leadership's conceptual distinctiveness needs sharper articulation. Since it is central to the model, explicitly contrast its core mechanisms (belongingness/uniqueness, openness, managing diversity, inviting dissent) against transformational/ethical leadership to justify why it is the best predictor of psychological safety and creativity in your context.

Provide full measurement details and address common method concerns. Because constructs like inclusive leadership and psychological safety are measurement-sensitive, the paper should report scale sources, adaptation/translation steps (if applicable), reliability and validity evidence (convergent/discriminant), and steps to mitigate common method bias (procedural remedies and/or statistical tests). This is essential for credibility and replicability.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Deepen theorizing on psychological safety with boundary conditions. Psychological safety is described convincingly, but it remains somewhat generic and citation-driven. Strengthen the causal logic by stating when and why psychological safety should translate into creativity, and when it might not (e.g., low expertise, norm pressure, excessive harmony), and specify how inclusive leadership behaviors activate (or fail to activate) these pathways.

Avoid conceptual diffusion around silence/injustice unless integrated into the model. Organizational silence and perceived injustice are discussed as barriers to creativity, but they appear peripheral to the implied core model. Either streamline them as contextual background or explicitly incorporate them as mediators/moderators with aligned hypotheses and measures; otherwise, the theory section risks feeling unfocused relative to the title and research questions.

Substantially strengthen the “Explainable AI” component to match the title. The title sets an expectation of an explainable AI (XAI) modeling contribution, yet the AI discussion is brief and largely descriptive. You should specify what “AI capabilities” mean operationally, what makes the approach “explainable” (e.g., SHAP/LIME, interpretable models, rule-based explanations), and how XAI is used in the study (prediction, theory testing, decision support) rather than treated as a future-looking aside.

Tighten methodological transparency and alignment with claims. The manuscript should more clearly present the research design: sampling frame, sample size, setting/industry, recruitment, and data-collection procedures, with justification of appropriateness for creativity/leadership research. If SEM (or similar) is used, report model fit indices and the rationale for the analytic approach to ensure the evidentiary strength matches the conceptual ambition.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.