

Presentation of a Professional Competency Model for Employees of Bank Mellat, Islamic Republic of Iran, with a Qualitative and Quantitative Approach

Seyed Mahmoud. Kianezhadtejenaki¹, Seyed Ahmad. Jafari Kalarijani^{2*}, Asadollah. Mehrara², Mohammad Hasan. Shakki²

¹ Ph.D. Student, Department of Management, Qaemshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Qaemshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: kjas_51@yahoo.com

Editor

Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghghinasab^{id}
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
Email: haghghinasab@srbiau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mehrdad Bayat^{id}
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the sentence, "Organizations that ensure long-term survival are those that possess skilled and high-quality human resources," the claim is strong but lacks a cited reference. Adding a citation would strengthen this assertion.

The demographics in the qualitative section mention age and gender but lack additional relevant details such as the participants' roles or specific qualifications. For instance, "The youngest participant was 28 years old, while the oldest was 55 years old," could be expanded to explain the diversity of perspectives included.

In the methodology section, "The reliability coefficient of 0.81, calculated for this research, indicates high reliability of the themes," should specify the benchmark or standard for comparison. For example, mention whether 0.81 is considered acceptable based on prior thematic studies.

In the findings, it is stated that saturation was achieved after 17 interviews, but interviews were conducted with only 15 participants. This inconsistency needs clarification.

In Table 1, the relationship between basic themes and overarching themes is clear, but the table would be improved by providing examples or direct quotes from participants that illustrate these themes.

The statement, "The distribution of all variables is normal," in Table 2's analysis should reference a specific test (e.g., Shapiro-Wilk) and include p-values to confirm normality.

In Table 3, while all factor loadings are above 0.50, it would be helpful to explain why this threshold was chosen. For example, reference a standard from SEM literature.

The discussion mentions themes like "Creativity and innovation" but lacks integration with theoretical frameworks or prior studies. Linking these themes with referenced studies would enhance the academic rigor.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction mentions gaps in the literature but does not adequately cite specific studies that failed to address these gaps. The claim, "Despite the extensive and growing body of research, there is still limited consensus on the core components of professional competencies based on human and social development," would benefit from a detailed critique of specific studies to substantiate the argument.

The methodology section states, "The sample size was determined using Cochran's formula," but does not provide the exact parameters used (e.g., confidence level and margin of error). Including these details would enhance transparency.

The Fornell-Larcker criterion is mentioned but not explained in detail. Including a brief explanation of this criterion would help readers unfamiliar with SEM to understand its relevance.

The goodness-of-fit indices are presented as "The overall model fit value was 0.693, indicating a strong model fit." Include a comparison with benchmarks or thresholds from similar studies to contextualize this result.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.