




Validation of the Indigenous Good Governance Model with a Social Justice Approach in the Plan and Budget Organization of the Country

Korush. Nikanjam¹, Mohammadreza. Azadehdel^{1*}, Maryam. Oshaksaraie¹



¹ Department of Public Administration, Ra.C., Islamic Azad University, Rasht, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mr.azadehdel@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Davood Feiz¹
Affiliation: Professor of
Management Department, Semnan
University, Iran
feiz1353@semnan.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Marco Yamba-Yugsi¹
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,
Ecuador
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec
Reviewer 2: Marco Yamba-Yugsi¹
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 methodological description lacks sufficient precision regarding the operationalization of the “indigenous good governance model.” In the paragraph beginning with “The present study was applied in terms of objective and exploratory–explanatory in terms of nature,” the authors mention identifying indigenous dimensions and components, yet they do not clearly explain how these indigenous components were extracted, categorized, or theoretically justified. It is essential to specify whether qualitative coding, Delphi technique, grounded theory, or expert consensus methods were employed in the preliminary phase and how these procedures informed the final SEM structure. Without methodological transparency, the claimed indigenization process remains conceptually weak.

The sampling procedure requires further clarification and statistical justification. The authors state that “managers, senior experts, and decision-makers” of the Plan and Budget Organization constituted the statistical population, yet the exact population size, sampling frame, inclusion criteria, and sample size determination procedure are omitted. Since SEM is highly

sensitive to sample adequacy, the manuscript should explicitly report the final sample size, response rate, power analysis justification, and the rationale for using stratified random sampling. The absence of these details limits the reproducibility and methodological rigor of the study.

Several sections of the Introduction rely heavily on broad descriptive statements without critically engaging with competing governance theories. For example, the paragraph beginning with “Good governance has emerged as one of the most influential paradigms” provides a largely affirmative narrative but does not sufficiently address critical perspectives regarding governance universalism, neoliberal governance models, or postcolonial critiques of imported administrative frameworks. A stronger theoretical balance would considerably improve the scholarly depth of the article.

The manuscript cites important governance scholars such as Grindle, Rothstein, and Osborne; however, the theoretical integration among these perspectives remains fragmented. The literature review currently resembles a sequential summary of sources rather than a synthesized conceptual framework. The authors should develop a more coherent argument explaining how governance capability, institutional trust, social justice, and indigenous administrative culture interact within the proposed model.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The manuscript reports that content validity was confirmed through expert judgment; however, the process is insufficiently documented. The authors should specify the number of experts involved, their disciplinary backgrounds, selection criteria, and the quantitative indices used to evaluate validity, such as Content Validity Ratio (CVR) or Content Validity Index (CVI). Merely stating that “content validity was confirmed” does not satisfy contemporary methodological standards in scale development and validation studies.

The discussion of reliability and validity indices in the Findings section requires more sophisticated interpretation. The manuscript reports Cronbach’s alpha, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), but it does not explain why these thresholds are theoretically appropriate or how they compare with accepted SEM standards. Furthermore, the manuscript should explicitly report discriminant validity statistics such as the Fornell–Larcker criterion or HTMT ratio instead of vaguely stating that “the discriminant validity of the model was also acceptable.”

The authors report a GOF value of 0.663 and interpret it as evidence of acceptable fit; however, the manuscript does not explain the suitability of GOF in PLS-SEM. Given recent methodological debates questioning the appropriateness of GOF indices in PLS models, the authors should justify their choice of fit criteria and additionally report contemporary fit indicators such as SRMR, NFI, or RMS_theta. The methodological section currently reflects an outdated treatment of PLS-SEM evaluation standards.

There is insufficient explanation of the measurement items associated with each latent construct. For example, constructs such as “Administrative Self-Control and Administrative Piety” and “Competent and Servant (Spiritual) Leadership” are theoretically rich and culturally nuanced concepts, yet the questionnaire indicators measuring these variables are not presented. The manuscript would significantly benefit from including an appendix or supplementary table listing all items, factor loadings, and construct dimensions.

The Results section over-relies on narrative description without sufficiently interpreting the substantive meaning of coefficients. For instance, the path “Competent Leadership → Indigenous Culture” is reported with $\beta = 0.843$ and $t = 59.50$, but the manuscript does not explain why this relationship is theoretically strong or what organizational mechanisms may explain such a substantial coefficient. The discussion should move beyond statistical confirmation toward analytical interpretation grounded in governance theory and organizational behavior literature.

The manuscript inadequately addresses potential common method bias, despite relying exclusively on self-reported questionnaire data collected from a single organizational source. The authors should conduct and report diagnostic procedures

such as Harman's single-factor test, full collinearity assessment, or marker-variable analysis to demonstrate that common method variance did not substantially inflate the observed relationships.

The conceptual integration between "good governance" and "social justice" requires stronger theoretical elaboration. Although the manuscript repeatedly states that social justice is both an outcome and an evaluative criterion of governance success, the causal logic underlying this dual role is insufficiently clarified. The authors should explicitly explain whether social justice is conceptualized as a mediating construct, normative governance objective, or institutional outcome within the proposed model.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.