

Predicting Innovative Work Behavior from High-Performance Work Practices and Perceived Organizational Support: The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement

Adrian. Tan Wei Ming¹, Martina. Torres^{2*}

¹ Department of Strategy and Policy, NUS Business School, National University of Singapore, Singapore

² Department of Human Resource Management, Universidad de San Andrés, Victoria, Argentina

* Corresponding author email address: mtorres@udesa.edu.ar

Editor

Mohammed Abdul Imran Khan
Department of Financial
Management and Economics,
Dhofar University, Oman
mimran@du.edu.om

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir

Reviewer 2: Abbas Monavarian
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The theoretical treatment of high-performance work practices should be strengthened in the Introduction paragraph beginning “Theoretically, high-performance work practices can promote innovative work behavior through several interrelated mechanisms.” The explanation currently combines ability enhancement, motivation, opportunity, social exchange, and resource mechanisms without explicitly specifying an overarching theoretical framework. The authors should consider organizing the hypotheses using the Ability–Motivation–Opportunity framework together with Job Demands–Resources theory or social exchange theory and explicitly indicate which theoretical mechanism explains each proposed path. This would make the mediation model theoretically derived rather than primarily assembled from previous empirical associations.

In the paragraph stating that “At the same time, the effects of high-performance work practices cannot be assumed to be uniformly positive,” the manuscript appropriately acknowledges the possible dark side of high-performance work systems, but this argument is not subsequently incorporated into the empirical model or discussion. The authors should either develop this tension more explicitly as a boundary condition—for example, through perceived work intensification—or shorten this section.

As currently written, the manuscript introduces a theoretically important competing mechanism but leaves it unresolved, which may lead readers to expect tests that are not presented.

The Data Collection Tools section requires fuller psychometric specification. For example, the manuscript states that “Employee engagement was assessed using the nine-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9)” and that innovative work behavior was measured using “Janssen’s nine-item Innovative Work Behavior Scale,” but it does not report the exact response anchors, scoring ranges, language version, translation procedure, or evidence of prior validation in Argentine or Spanish-speaking populations. The authors should indicate whether validated Spanish versions were used. If translation was undertaken for this study, forward translation, back-translation, expert review, pilot testing, and linguistic equivalence procedures should be reported.

The treatment of high-performance work practices as a single composite construct requires stronger psychometric justification. The Methods state that “an overall composite score was calculated by averaging responses across the relevant items,” although HPWP is described as multidimensional and composed of conceptually different HR practices. The authors should clarify whether HPWP was modeled reflectively, formatively, as a higher-order factor, or simply as an observed composite. If a latent SEM approach was employed, the measurement specification should correspond to the conceptual structure of HPWP. Reporting only overall Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability is insufficient to establish the validity of a multidimensional HR system.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The Introduction paragraph beginning “Perceived organizational support represents another important organizational factor that may shape innovative work behavior” would benefit from a more explicit account of how perceived organizational support is theoretically distinct from the supportive meaning employees may already attribute to high-performance work practices. The reported correlation between these constructs is $r = .58$, indicating substantial overlap. The authors should explain why HPWP and POS are modeled as separate antecedents, what unique organizational information each represents, and why their simultaneous inclusion does not amount to conceptual redundancy. This distinction is important for interpreting their unique structural effects.

The manuscript should articulate explicit hypotheses before the Methods section. The final Introduction currently culminates in the sentence “Accordingly, the aim of this study was to predict innovative work behavior from high-performance work practices and perceived organizational support and to examine the mediating role of employee engagement among employees in Argentina,” but the proposed relationships are not formally stated as testable hypotheses. The authors should specify hypotheses for the effects of HPWP and POS on engagement, the effects of HPWP, POS, and engagement on innovative work behavior, and the two indirect effects through engagement. Doing so would create a direct correspondence between theory, statistical tests, and conclusions.

In the Study Design and Participants section, the sentence “A total of 384 employees from Argentina participated in the study and provided complete and usable responses for the final statistical analyses” requires substantially greater methodological documentation. The authors should report how the target sample size was determined, whether an a priori power analysis was conducted, which effect size and statistical power assumptions were used, how many questionnaires were initially distributed, how many were returned, how many were excluded, and the resulting response rate. The seemingly exact sample size of 384 should not appear arbitrary, particularly because structural equation modeling was used.

The sampling description requires clarification. The Methods state that “Participants were recruited from organizations operating in different occupational sectors” and that “Participants were selected using a convenience sampling procedure,” but no information is provided regarding the geographical regions of Argentina represented, the number of organizations involved, organizational recruitment procedures, or whether observations were clustered within organizations. If multiple respondents

came from the same organizations, the independence assumption underlying conventional SEM may be weakened. The authors should report the organizational sampling structure and, where relevant, assess the intraclass correlation or justify why multilevel modeling was unnecessary.

The demographic reporting should be reconsidered with respect to representativeness. The Findings state that “164 employees (42.71%) worked in public organizations and 220 (57.29%) were employed in private organizations,” while participants were also distributed across administrative services, education, finance, commerce, information technology, manufacturing, and other sectors. The authors should provide sufficient sectoral information to allow readers to assess sample composition and should discuss whether the sample approximates the characteristics of the Argentine employed population. Given the convenience sampling method, claims concerning “employees in Argentina” should be phrased carefully to avoid implying national representativeness.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.