

Formulation of a Model for Employee Empowerment and Job Embeddedness with the Mediating Role of Social Capital in National Sports Federations

Taher. Khani Kalkhoran¹, Mohammad. Nasiri^{2*}, Masoud. Imanzadeh³, Mehrdad. Moharamzade⁴

¹ PhD Student in Sports Management, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

² Assistant Professor of Sports Management, Department of Physical Education, Khoy Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khoy, Iran

³ Department of Physical Education, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

⁴ Professor, Sports Management, Mohaghegh Ardabili University, Ardabil, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Nasiri@iaukhoy.ac.ir

Editor

Rey Segundo Guerrero-Proenza^{id}
Departamento de Inteligencia
Computacional, Facultad 4,
Universidad de las Ciencias
Informáticas, La Habana, Cuba
reysgp@uci.cu

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Manijeh Haghighinasab^{id}
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran
Email: haghighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Alireza Rajabipoor Meybodi^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Yazd University,
Yazd, Iran
Email: Rajabipoor@yazd.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

On page 2, the discussion of job embeddedness relies heavily on Mitchell et al. (2001). While the foundational theory is well-cited, the literature review could benefit from incorporating more recent studies (e.g., Lee et al., 2014) to reflect developments in the field over the past two decades.

In the "Methods and Materials" section, the sampling method and size (269 employees) are discussed. However, there is no justification for why this sample size is appropriate. Could you explain why 269 is sufficient for SEM analysis and discuss any considerations of statistical power?

The methodology mentions the use of Spritzer's, Putnam's, and Edwards and Kilpatrick's questionnaires but does not explain if any validity tests (e.g., confirmatory factor analysis) were performed on these tools. Including details on the validation process would strengthen the methodological rigor.

The conclusion would benefit from a section on policy implications. For instance, how can policymakers in national sports federations use your findings to create more empowering environments? This would help bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The introduction mentions strategic thinking in sports organizations but lacks sufficient references to the broader literature. Consider expanding the theoretical foundation by integrating more recent studies on strategic thinking in human resource management (HRM), particularly in sports federations (e.g., Hartline et al., 2018).

On page 5, you mention that the path coefficient for the mediating role of social capital is 0.67. While this is statistically significant, there is no mention of confidence intervals for these path coefficients. Including confidence intervals would provide a clearer understanding of the precision of your estimates.

The model fit indices are described well, but the RMSEA value of 0.080 might raise concerns as it approaches the upper boundary of acceptable fit (0.08). Consider addressing whether this is sufficient, and if not, discuss possible modifications to improve the model fit.

The findings indicate that 55.8% of respondents were male and 44.2% female. However, the implications of this gender distribution are not explored. Discuss how gender might influence job embeddedness or social capital and whether this aspect was analyzed in the study.

In the discussion, you conclude that enhancing social capital strengthens the relationship between empowerment and job embeddedness. However, there is limited discussion of how this can be practically implemented in sports federations. Consider providing actionable recommendations for managers.

While you reference previous studies such as Almasi (2019) and Davoodi et al. (2022), there is little comparison of your findings with theirs. More explicit contrasts with these studies would help position your work within the existing literature.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.