

Cultural Management Strategies in the Merger of Government Organizations: The Experience of 8 Merged Governmental Organizations in Iran

Katayoun. Hosseini Shad¹, Abdolhamid. Shams^{2*}, Feerooz. Raznahan³, Mehdi. Rasouli Ghahroudi⁴

¹ PhD Student in Public Administration, Higher Institute of Management and Planning Education and Research, Tehran, Iran


² Associate Professor, Department of Public Administration and Business, Higher Institute of Management and Planning Education and Research, Tehran, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Higher Institute of Management and Planning Education and Research, Tehran, Iran



⁴ Associate Professor, Department of Management, Higher Institute of Management and Planning Education and Research, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: a.shams@imps.ac.ir

Editor

Arpana Rai¹
Assistant Professor, Indian Institute
of Management, Udaipur, Mumbai,
India
arpana.raii@iimu.ac.in

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mojtaba Tamadoni¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Tehran, Iran. m_tamadoni@azad.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mehrdad Bayat¹
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Payam Noor University, Tehran,
Iran .Email: bayatmehrdad60@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, the paragraph discussing gaps in literature (e.g., "In reviewing the literature...") could benefit from a more cohesive structure. I recommend reordering it to first address global literature, followed by domestic gaps, to enhance logical flow.

In the Methods and Materials section, the sentence "Around 12 experts, heads, and managers from the 8 studied organizations were analyzed using PLS software" would be more informative if you specify the criteria for selecting these experts and the variables considered in the PLS model.

Table 1, presenting the case studies, could benefit from additional detail in the "Overall Merger Goal" column. Providing specific organizational goals for each case (e.g., improving efficiency vs. achieving synergy) could clarify the context for the mergers.

The use of "cultural integration" and "socio-cultural integration" in the Findings section is slightly inconsistent. Define these terms clearly and ensure consistent usage throughout the paper to avoid confusion.

In the Discussion section, where actions like "Selecting a Merger Strategy" are mentioned, consider outlining specific examples of each action type (e.g., assimilation vs. integration strategies) to illustrate their practical application.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the sentence "Some view cultural differences between merging organizations as a factor for merger failure..." there is a need for an analysis or explanation of why such contradictions exist. This could enhance understanding and provide insights into factors that may influence differing results in literature.

For Hypothesis 1, stating "Mergers of organizations with high cultural differences will have a negative impact on merger performance," provide a justification or theoretical background explaining why cultural differences generally harm performance, with references to relevant literature.

The finding that "Cultural differences alone explain 29.4% of the variance in task integration" in the Findings section would benefit from further interpretation. For instance, explain what specific aspects of cultural differences impact task integration most.

In the Findings section, where structural equation modeling results are reported (e.g., "Perceived Organizational Justice -> Merger Performance"), clarify the significance level or confidence intervals used. This will aid in assessing the robustness of the findings.

In the "Discussion and Conclusion" section, the statement "The more cultural differences are perceived in organizations..." would be strengthened by referencing specific theories, such as Social Identity Theory, to explain why perceived differences affect outcomes.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.