

Designing a Reemployment Model for Retired Education Personnel with a Mixed Approach

Fatemeh. Bina Baji¹⁽¹⁰⁾, Hamid. Rezaeifar²*⁽¹⁰⁾, Mohammad. Mohammadi²⁽¹⁰⁾, Monireh. Salehnia²⁽¹⁰⁾

¹ Phd Student in Business Management, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran
² Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: h_rezaiefar@yahoo.com

Editor	R e v i e w e r s
Marion Fortin [®] Full Professor, TSM-Research, CNRS, University Toulouse Capitole, France marion.fortin@tsm-education.fr	Reviewer 1: Mehrdad Bayat Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101, Ecuador Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction effectively highlights the evolving nature of retirement and the potential for continued engagement in work or other activities post-retirement. However, it could benefit from a clearer articulation of the specific challenges or gaps in the current understanding of reemployment among retired education personnel. Provide more detailed background on the issues retired education personnel face when seeking reemployment and the significance of addressing these challenges for the education sector.

While the introduction mentions the critical role of decision-making in education, it stops short of directly linking this to the need for a reemployment model for retired personnel. Suggestion: Explicitly connect the dots between decision-making in education, the value retired personnel can bring post-retirement, and how a reemployment model addresses existing gaps.

Assuming there is a literature review section, it should critically examine previous research on retirement, reemployment, and the unique aspects of retired education personnel's reentry into the workforce. Highlight the theoretical and empirical gaps that your study aims to fill, focusing on the distinct needs and contributions of retired education personnel in the reemployment process.

The document suggests a mixed-methods approach but does not detail the methodology used for model development. Describe the quantitative and qualitative methods employed, including sample selection, data collection techniques, and analytical strategies. Clarify how these methods complement each other in developing the reemployment model.

The reemployment model's development should be grounded in a strong theoretical framework. Present a detailed overview of the model, including its theoretical underpinnings, the components or stages of the model, and the rationale for its design. Explain how the model specifically addresses the needs and opportunities for retired education personnel.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Address potential challenges in implementing the reemployment model. Explore barriers to reemployment for retired education personnel (e.g., societal perceptions, regulatory hurdles) and suggest strategies for overcoming these challenges based on model findings.

Reflecting on the study's limitations enhances its credibility. Acknowledge limitations related to the research design, sample size, or generalizability of the findings. Discuss how these limitations might influence the interpretation of the results and propose areas for future research.

The conclusion should succinctly summarize the study's contributions and the reemployment model's potential benefits. Highlight the model's unique contributions to the field of education management and workforce development. Emphasize practical recommendations for stakeholders involved in reemployment efforts.

Identify avenues for further investigation. Suggest longitudinal studies to examine the long-term outcomes of reemployment for retired education personnel or comparative studies across different regions or education systems.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

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

