Development of a Model for the Professional Competence of Middle Managers in the Educational Administration Headquarters

Hassan. Zobeiri[1] , Fereshteh. Kordestani[2*] , Leila. Saeedi[3]

[1] Phd student of Educational Management Department, West Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Management and Higher Education, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[3] Assistant Professor of Management Department,Tehran west branch, Islamic Azad university, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fe.kordestani92@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Azar Kafashpoor	**Reviewer 1:** Lourdes Atiaja Atiaja
Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran kafashpor@um.ac.ir	Universidad de las Fuerzas Armadas ESPE, Ecuador. Email: natiaja@espe.edu.ec
	Reviewer 2: Mohammad Esmaeil Fadaeinejad Associate Prof., Department of Financial Management and Insurance, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: m-fadaei@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction could be improved by explicitly stating the research gap early on, which would justify the necessity of the study more clearly to the reader.

Increase the depth of the literature review by discussing conflicting studies or theories about middle management competencies, providing a more comprehensive background for your study.

Clarify the criteria used for purposive sampling in the selection of managers and experts. Detailed criteria will enhance the replicability of the study.

The manuscript should describe the development process of the semi-structured interview form in more detail to ensure the reliability of the data collection instrument.

While the content validity and reliability of the interview form are mentioned, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the methods used to assess these metrics.

Expand on the use of MAXQDA software in the thematic analysis. Specific examples of how coding was conducted can substantiate the analysis section.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Provide a justification for the inclusion of each main category and subcategory of competencies. How were these categories derived from the data?

Compare the proposed model with existing models of managerial competence. This comparison could highlight the unique contributions of your research.

Elaborate on how this model can be practically applied within educational administrations. Provide specific examples or scenarios.

Discuss the limitations of the model more thoroughly. Consider potential biases in the selection of interviewees and the subjective interpretation of data.

Suggest specific areas for future research that could test the validity of the model in different educational or cultural contexts.

Recommend strategies for future quantitative testing of the model to enhance its empirical robustness.

Define each of the ten main competency categories in terms of observable behaviors or skills to increase the operational clarity of the model.

Strengthen the section on ethical considerations by detailing the measures taken to ensure confidentiality and informed consent during the interviews.

The theoretical underpinnings of the study should be more clearly articulated, linking the research questions and methodology to existing theories in educational management.

Mention if inter-rater reliability was considered during the coding process to enhance the credibility of the thematic analysis.

Discuss the diversity of the sample and its representation of the wider population of middle managers in education.

Clarify at what point data saturation was achieved in the interviews and how this was determined.

Provide more detailed recommendations for how educational systems can implement this competency model.

Reassess the declaration of interest section to ensure all potential conflicts, including funding sources or affiliations, are transparently disclosed.

Discuss how the findings integrate with the broader educational policies and strategic objectives at national and international levels.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2.   Revised

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