

The Relationship of Sense of Coherence, Wisdom, and Mindfulness with Teachers' Calling: The Mediating Role of Spiritual Ability

Ata. Karamiyar¹, Afsaneh. Sobhi^{2*}, Mohammad Saeed. Ahmadi³

¹ Department of Psychology, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanzan, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Za.C., Islamic Azad University, Zanzan, Iran

³ Department of Psychology and Counseling, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: A.sobhi@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Fahime Bahonar Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The eligibility paragraph specifies that participants “were between 25 and 60 years of age,” yet the Findings section reports that “ages ranged from 25 to 65 years.” This discrepancy directly challenges adherence to the stated inclusion criteria and raises questions about sample screening. The authors should verify the raw data and determine whether participants aged 61–65 were incorrectly retained, whether the inclusion criterion was actually 25–65 years, or whether the descriptive range is erroneous. The manuscript should then be corrected consistently, and any protocol deviation should be acknowledged.

The manuscript introduces “workplace spirituality” in Table 4 as an independent predictor of calling, with a standardized coefficient of .21 and $p < .001$, but workplace spirituality is not defined as a study variable in the conceptual model, is not described among the instruments, and is not included in the correlation matrix. This is one of the most important internal inconsistencies in the manuscript. The authors must clarify whether workplace spirituality was genuinely measured as a separate construct. If it was, its theoretical role, measurement instrument, reliability, descriptive statistics, correlations, and position in the SEM must all be reported. If it was not measured, the corresponding path and all references to it in the abstract, findings, and discussion should be removed.

In the Abstract, the sentence “sense of coherence, wisdom, spiritual ability, and workplace spirituality had significant direct effects on teachers’ calling” reproduces the same unexplained workplace-spirituality variable found in Table 4. Because the central study model is described as involving sense of coherence, wisdom, mindfulness, spiritual ability, and calling, inclusion of a sixth construct makes the abstract inconsistent with the title, stated aim, and methods. The abstract should be revised only after the authors resolve whether workplace spirituality actually belongs to the tested model.

The Spiritual Attitude Questionnaire (SOMQ) paragraph states that “only the spiritual ability subscale was used,” which is essential because spiritual ability is the mediator. However, the paper does not explain whether the 19 items were modeled individually, aggregated into parcels, or summed into a single observed score. Figure 1 depicts spiritual ability as a rectangle rather than an oval, implying that it was treated as an observed variable, despite being a multi-item psychological construct. The authors should justify this modeling decision or, preferably, model spiritual ability as a latent variable with appropriate indicators to account for measurement error.

The authors should substantially expand the reporting of the measurement model before interpreting structural paths. Figure 1 presents loadings ranging from approximately .28 to .93, and several wisdom indicators have very low loadings, particularly “Openness” at .28 and several others below .50. A loading of .28 is especially problematic and suggests weak convergence with the latent construct. The authors should report standardized factor loadings, standard errors, significance levels, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and discriminant validity, and should explicitly justify retaining indicators with weak loadings.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sample-size justification paragraph contains the sentence “To estimate the required sample size for structural equation modeling, recommendations provided by Tabachnick and Fidell (2019), Kline (2016), and Hair et al. (2019) were considered,” but it does not show how these recommendations produced the final sample size of 590. A rigorous SEM manuscript should report the number of observed indicators, estimated parameters, anticipated effect size, desired statistical power, and/or a formal power analysis. Merely citing rules of thumb such as “5–10 participants per observed variable” is insufficient. The authors should demonstrate quantitatively why 590 participants were necessary and adequate for the specified model.

The Calling and Vocation Questionnaire description states that “it comprises six components categorized under two principal dimensions: presence of calling and search for calling.” This description requires greater psychometric precision because the six first-order dimensions shown in the model—presence/search of transcendent summons, purposeful work, and prosocial orientation—appear to reflect a hierarchical structure. The authors should clearly explain the scoring model used in the present study, specify the number of items assigned to each dimension, indicate whether a total calling score is psychometrically justified, and report whether the measurement model supported the assumed six-factor or higher-order structure in this specific sample.

In the paragraph describing the Langer Mindfulness Scale, the manuscript reports that “reliability coefficients were .63, .74, .83, and .63” for four subscales, whereas the original Persian text contained an additional value of .54 despite naming only four dimensions. This discrepancy should be checked against the original validation source. More importantly, the authors should report reliability coefficients for each mindfulness subscale in the present sample rather than only Cronbach’s alpha of .72 for the total score, particularly because the SEM explicitly models the four subdimensions as indicators of the latent mindfulness construct.

The Wisdom Scale paragraph reports six dimensions and a total Cronbach’s alpha of .79 for the current sample, but no current-sample reliability estimates are given for the individual dimensions represented in the measurement model. Because “Experience,” “Practical,” “Paradoxical,” “Openness,” “Reflective,” and “Interactive” are treated as indicators of wisdom in

Figure 1, the authors should report internal consistency or composite reliability for these dimensions and preferably provide confirmatory factor analytic evidence supporting the proposed higher-order representation of wisdom.

The description of the SOC-13 contains a conceptual and psychometric inconsistency. The manuscript states that international research supports a three-factor structure, while the Persian validation reportedly explained 53.49% of variance through “four identified factors.” Since the empirical model presented in this manuscript uses exactly three indicators—comprehensibility, meaningfulness, and manageability—the authors should explain why the three-factor specification was selected despite citing a Persian four-factor solution. A confirmatory factor analysis of the SOC-13 in the present sample would resolve this issue and should be reported.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.