





Presenting a Model of Managers' Psychological Capability in Public Organizations

Majid. Dadkhah Tehrani¹, Akbar. Etebarian^{2*}, Mehrdad. Sadeghi Dehcheshmeh³, Mehraban Hadi. Peykani¹

¹ Department of Public Administration, Is.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Department of Public Administration, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan), Iran

³ Department of Cultural Management and Planning, Is.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: etebarian@khuisf.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Khaliquzzaman Khan  Associate Professor, School of Business Administration, Al Dar University College, United Arab Emirates khaliquzzaman.khan@aue.ac	Reviewer 1: Abbas Monavarian  Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran. Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh  Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran. Email: rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the sentence “psychological capability as a critical, yet under-theorized, construct in management and organizational research”, the claim of being “under-theorized” would benefit from a clearer delimitation. Please specify whether the gap is conceptual (lack of integrative theory), methodological (overreliance on quantitative scales), or contextual (public-sector focus), as this will sharpen the study’s theoretical positioning.

While the manuscript reviews constructs such as psychological empowerment, psychological capital, and psychological safety, the distinction between these constructs and the proposed notion of psychological capability remains implicit. A short comparative synthesis paragraph clarifying what psychological capability adds beyond aggregation would strengthen construct clarity.

The discussion of ethical leadership states that ethical competence is “frequently treated as a normative attribute rather than as a psychologically grounded capability.” This is an important claim; however, it would benefit from a brief conceptual explanation of what makes a capability psychological rather than normative in analytical terms.

The rationale for collapsing 17 organizing themes into exactly four global themes is not fully articulated. Please clarify whether this structure emerged inductively or was influenced by existing psychological or leadership frameworks.

The statement “the relevant dimensions were identified and extracted” is methodologically vague. Please specify whether this extraction was iterative, team-based, or sequential to enhance analytical transparency.

The claim that the model “extends existing leadership and management literature” would benefit from a more explicit articulation of extension—for example, whether it integrates, reframes, or challenges dominant models.

While emotional regulation and psychological energy are discussed together, the analytical distinction between these constructs is not always clear. Please clarify whether energy is treated as an outcome, a resource, or a regulatory mechanism.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The aim sentence is clear, but it could be strengthened by explicitly stating the intended level of theory building (e.g., exploratory framework, mid-range theory, or conceptual model) to align expectations regarding the study’s theoretical contribution.

The classification of the study as “developmental–applied,” “descriptive,” and “exploratory” simultaneously may create conceptual ambiguity. Please clarify how these methodological labels coexist and which one primarily guided design decisions.

Although purposive sampling and saturation are mentioned, the criteria for participant selection (e.g., managerial level, years of experience, organizational type) are not sufficiently specified. Providing these criteria is essential for assessing transferability.

The manuscript states that thematic analysis followed Attride-Stirling’s approach, but does not explain how researcher reflexivity was managed. Please clarify whether reflexive memos, peer debriefing, or audit trails were used.

Table 1 provides rich excerpts; however, the logic linking each excerpt to the assigned basic theme is sometimes implicit. Consider adding a brief analytic justification column or clarifying this linkage in the narrative text.

The transition from 94 basic themes to 17 organizing themes is a major analytical step. Please elaborate on the criteria used for functional similarity, possibly with an illustrative example in the text.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.