

A Multi-Grounded Model of Organizational Extra-Role Behavior in the Banking Sector: A case of Tejarat Bank

Kaveh. Salimian¹, Zeinab. Molavi^{2*}, Ali Naghi. Amiri³

¹ PhD Student in Organizational Behavior, Aras International Campus, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Accounting, University of Tehran, College of Farabi, Qom, Iran

³ Professor, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Accounting, College of Farabi, University of Tehran, Qom, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Ze_molavi@ut.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Rey Segundo Guerrero-Proenza ^{id} Departamento de Inteligencia Computacional, Facultad 4, Universidad de las Ciencias Informáticas, La Habana, Cuba reysgp@uci.cu	Reviewer 1: Mehrdad Bayat ^{id} Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mohammad Esmail Fadaeinejad ^{id} 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 research gap at the end of the Introduction should be formulated more sharply. The manuscript currently argues that previous studies have “typically focused on specific relationships involving leadership, organizational support, justice, engagement, compensation, personality, job satisfaction, climate, or performance.” This is plausible, but the precise theoretical deficiency remains somewhat diffuse. The authors should explicitly state whether the primary gap is the absence of a multilevel model, insufficient attention to the dark side of extra-role behavior, lack of qualitative theorization in banking, inadequate contextualization in Iran, or the failure to integrate these dimensions. A concise gap statement immediately before the study aim would substantially improve the manuscript’s argumentative trajectory.

In Study Design and Participants, the manuscript identifies the methodology as “Multi-Grounded Theory (MGT),” but its epistemological and procedural positioning requires greater specification. The authors should clearly identify which

formulation of MGT was followed, describe its distinctive analytical stages, and explain how it differs operationally from classical, Straussian, or constructivist grounded theory. The current methodology contains elements associated with several grounded-theory traditions, including open, axial, and selective coding, constant comparison, theoretical sampling, theoretical saturation, theoretical matching, and reflexivity. Without a more explicit methodological anchor, readers may perceive the approach as an eclectic combination rather than a rigorously implemented MGT design.

The manuscript states in Study Design and Participants that “The final sample included 25 employees,” whereas the Findings later introduce Table 1 as coding “data obtained from 15 in-depth interviews” and label participants P1–P15. This discrepancy is methodologically significant and must be resolved. The authors should explain whether 25 participants were interviewed but only 15 interviews were used for the displayed open-coding examples, whether the remaining 10 participants contributed during theoretical sampling or validation, or whether the sample size changed during manuscript development. The participant flow should be fully transparent because theoretical saturation and the credibility of the model depend directly on the actual analytic sample.

Several labels in Table 1 require conceptual review because their English translation or theoretical meaning may be misleading. For example, the item translated as “Organizational ownership behavior” should be checked against the original Persian expression, and terms such as “exceptional customer respect,” “leader shielding,” “learned withdrawal,” and “organizational-family metaphor” require clearer conceptual justification. In qualitative theorization, coding labels should remain close enough to the empirical meaning to avoid overinterpretation while also being analytically useful. The authors should systematically review the English coding terminology for semantic accuracy and consistency with established organizational-behavior constructs.

In Table 2, the refined concept “Citizenship self-concept” is defined as “an intrinsic tendency to perform beneficial discretionary activities because personal values are aligned with the occupational role and the individual experiences a shared identity with the organization.” This is theoretically interesting, but the derivation from the empirical data needs to be demonstrated more explicitly. The manuscript should explain how this construct differs from organizational identification, affective commitment, prosocial motivation, calling, and citizenship-role identity. Since this concept becomes central in the final model, it should not appear merely as a newly coined label; its properties, dimensions, boundaries, and empirical indicators should be presented.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The claim in Study Design and Participants that “sufficient conceptual density was achieved after 25 in-depth interviews” needs stronger methodological documentation. The authors should specify how theoretical saturation was assessed, which categories saturated first, whether later interviews were used to test category properties and relationships, and what operational criterion indicated that no substantively new properties emerged. Simply stating that new interviews no longer produced new concepts is insufficient for a study that places theoretical saturation at the center of its sampling logic. A brief saturation audit or narrative showing how the final interviews contributed only confirmatory or relational information would improve methodological credibility.

The Data Collection Tools section provides useful examples of interview questions, but the manuscript should explain how the interview guide evolved during theoretical sampling. The sentence, “The evolving interview guide was modified during the research process in accordance with theoretical sampling and the emergence of new categories,” is appropriate but too general. The authors should identify at least two or three concrete examples of modifications—for example, when questions on compulsory extra-role behavior, hidden role burden, perceived exploitation, or reward inequity were introduced—and explain which emerging categories prompted these changes. This would demonstrate the iterative relationship between data collection and analysis required by grounded-theory methodology.

The treatment of non-participant observation requires greater specificity. The manuscript states that “The researcher observed everyday interactions among employees, managers, colleagues, and customers,” but does not indicate the number of branches observed, duration and frequency of observations, total observational hours, selection of observation periods, or whether peak and non-peak work periods were included. These details are necessary to judge the substantive contribution of observational data to triangulation. The authors should also distinguish descriptive field notes from interpretive memos and explain how observational events were coded and integrated with interview categories.

The description of organizational document analysis is similarly underdeveloped. The manuscript reports examination of “organizational guidelines, selected performance reports, internal regulations, procedural documents, and available materials concerning organizational culture,” but readers need to know the approximate number and types of documents, their date range, criteria for inclusion, and how confidentiality was handled. More importantly, the authors should explain what unique analytic contribution these documents made. For example, did documents reveal discrepancies between formally defined duties and employees’ perceived extra-role behavior, or were they used primarily to contextualize regulatory constraints? Explicitly demonstrating this contribution would strengthen the claim of methodological triangulation.

In the Data Analysis section, the manuscript reports that “Approximately 200 to 300 initial codes were generated,” while the Findings present exactly 210 codes. The methods should report the final analytic number consistently rather than using an approximate range if the coding process has been completed. More importantly, the authors should clarify whether the 210 entries represent all unique initial codes, selected illustrative codes, or meaning units. Several items in Table 1 appear conceptually similar, and some are more accurately descriptions of incidents than abstract codes. The manuscript should distinguish raw meaning units, initial labels, refined concepts, subcategories, and final categories to make the analytic abstraction process auditable.

Table 1 is exceptionally large and presents all 210 open codes in the main manuscript. While the detail demonstrates analytic breadth, this presentation may obscure rather than clarify the substantive findings. The authors should consider moving the complete open-code inventory to supplementary material and retaining a strategically selected set of illustrative codes in the main text, organized by emerging category. More importantly, the manuscript should show how representative data extracts support key codes. At present, phrases such as “feeling exploited because of being regarded as a ‘good worker’” and “peer pressure discouraging additional effort” are paraphrased code descriptions rather than direct participant quotations. Including carefully selected verbatim quotations would provide stronger empirical grounding.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.