

Presenting a Model for Understanding the Dark Aspects of Organizational Myth Phenomenon at Yazd University of Medical Sciences

Ali. Sheyda¹, Saeid. Saeida Ardekani^{2*}, Mehdi. Sabkro³

¹ PhD Student, Faculty of Economics, Management & Accounting, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

² Professor, Faculty of Economics, Management & Accounting, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics, Management & Accounting, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: dr.saeida@yazd.ac.ir

Editor

Rezvan Hosseingholizadeh^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management and Human Resource Development, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran
rhgholizadeh@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Hamid Rezaiefar^{id}
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Birjand, Iran.
Email: h.rezaiefar@iaubir.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:

The manuscript is generally well-structured, following a clear trajectory from introduction to conclusion. However, the transition between sections can be improved for smoother flow. Specifically, the transition from the methodology to findings sections appears abrupt. Providing a brief summary or overview at the end of each section could guide the reader through the paper more effectively.

The methodology section is detailed, explaining the selection of participants and the data analysis process comprehensively. To strengthen this section, the authors could briefly discuss the rationale behind choosing grounded theory over other qualitative methods, given the study's objectives.

The findings are rich and informative, but the presentation of these findings, particularly in the tables and the model, could be enhanced for better readability. For instance, visual enhancements or simplification of the model illustrated in Figure 1 could aid in understanding at a glance.

The discussion provides valuable insights into the implications of the study's findings. It would be beneficial to include a more explicit comparison with existing literature, highlighting what this study adds to the current understanding of organizational myths.

While the manuscript is generally well-written, there are minor typographical and grammatical errors that need addressing. A thorough proofreading and language editing will polish the manuscript for publication readiness.

The manuscript mentions adhering to ethical considerations, which is commendable. Expanding this section to describe how confidentiality and participant consent were handled could enhance the manuscript's ethical transparency.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The conceptual framework needs further development to illustrate how this research builds upon and diverges from existing theories and models of diversity management. A more thorough comparison with the theoretical foundation could significantly strengthen the manuscript.

The methodology section, while comprehensive, lacks depth in explaining the rationale behind the chosen methods and the process of integrating qualitative and quantitative findings. Expanding on the justification for the mixed-methods approach and detailing how these methods complement each other would enhance the paper's methodological rigor.

The analysis section presents the findings but falls short in critically examining the implications of these results within the broader context of diversity management research. A more detailed discussion on the significance of the findings and their potential impact on theory and practice is needed.

While the paper hints at the practical implications of the research, it does not provide a detailed discussion on how public organizations can operationalize the diversity management model. Concrete examples, case studies, or implementation guidelines would greatly benefit practitioners reading this research.

The discussion on limitations and directions for future research is vague. Elaborating on the specific limitations of the study, including potential biases and constraints, and offering detailed suggestions for future research avenues would make this section more informative.

The literature review should be updated to include the latest studies on diversity management. Additionally, a more critical review of the literature that identifies gaps this study seeks to fill would better position the paper within the existing body of knowledge.

Several figures and tables are not clearly presented, and their quality detracts from the overall readability of the manuscript. Improving the resolution and presentation of these visual aids will enhance the reader's ability to understand and interpret the findings.

Authors revised the manuscripts.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.