

Exploring Organizational Democracy from the Perspective of Public Managers: A Phenomenological Approach

Ehsan. Bahari¹, Kumars. Ahmadi^{2*}, Adel. Salavati³


¹ PhD student, Department of Management, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Management, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Sanandaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sanandaj, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: ahmadi.kumars@gmail.com

Editor

Aliakbar Aminbeidokhti¹
Educational Administration, Faculty
of Psychology and Educational
Sciences, Semnan University,
Semnan, Iran
kafashpor@um.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Hamid Rezaiefar¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Birjand, Iran.
Email: h.rezaiefar@iaubir.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mohammad Esmaeil Fadaeinejad¹
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 introduction states, "Organizational democracy within public sector organizations is a critical aspect of modern governance." It would be beneficial to define key terms such as "organizational democracy" and "modern governance" to ensure clarity for readers who may not be familiar with these concepts.

The sentence "Studies have shown that public participation can significantly enhance the performance of government projects" references several studies (He et al., 2020; Manirojana, 2022; Mohamed & Kiruthu, 2019; Zhao, 2018). These references could be more effectively integrated into the discussion to show how they specifically relate to the current study.

In the methodology section, it is mentioned, "A non-random snowball sampling method was used to select 15 public managers." It would strengthen the methodology if the authors could provide a rationale for choosing this sampling method over others and discuss any potential biases introduced by this method.

The discussion touches on practical implications briefly. It would be useful to expand on this by providing concrete recommendations for public managers and policymakers based on the study's findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paper states, "The process of data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved." Please elaborate on the criteria used to determine when saturation was reached, as this is crucial for validating the robustness of the qualitative study.

The data collection section mentions semi-structured interviews but does not provide the interview protocol. Including the key questions or themes explored during the interviews would enhance the transparency and reproducibility of the study.

In the data analysis section, "Key phrases and significant statements relevant to organizational democracy were identified and coded." Please describe the specific coding process used, including any software tools employed and how inter-coder reliability was ensured.

The findings state, "All participants were male, holding high-level positions such as Director General, Governor, and Hospital President." This gender homogeneity is a significant limitation. Discuss how this might affect the generalizability of the findings and suggest ways to address this in future research.

The results are presented as themes and subthemes. It would be helpful to provide more detailed quotes from participants for each subtheme to illustrate the findings more vividly.

In the discussion, the authors mention that the findings align with existing literature but could benefit from a more critical comparison. Highlight both the consistencies and any discrepancies with previous studies.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.