




# Developing a Qualitative Framework for Sharing Managerial Experiences Using a Phenomenological Approach (Case Study: Islamic Azad University)

Saba. Asri<sup>1</sup>, Narges. Shariatmadari<sup>1\*</sup>, Maryam. AfzalKhani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Governance and Human Resources, Ga.C, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran



\* Corresponding author email address: Narges.shariatmadari@iau.ac.ir

---

## Editor

Davood Feiz<sup>1</sup>  
Affiliation: Professor of  
Management Department, Semnan  
University, Iran  
feiz1353@semnan.ac.ir

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Marco Yamba-Yugsi<sup>1</sup>  
Unidad Académica de Posgrado, Universidad Católica de Cuenca, Azuay 010101,  
Ecuador  
Email: marco.yamba@ucacue.edu.ec  
**Reviewer 2:** Abbas Monavarian<sup>1</sup>  
Professor, Management Department, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.  
Email: amonavar@ut.ac.ir

---

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning “The importance of sharing managerial experiences has been increasingly emphasized...”, the claim that experience sharing “reduces the repetition of costly errors” is not empirically substantiated within the manuscript; the authors should either provide stronger empirical citations or moderate the causal claim.

In the paragraph discussing individual, organizational, and cultural factors, the structure is descriptive but lacks analytical integration; the authors should explicitly model the interaction between these levels (e.g., through a multilevel framework) rather than listing them sequentially.

In the paragraph “Recent studies have highlighted that one of the primary challenges...”, the discussion of tacit knowledge transfer mechanisms (storytelling, mentoring) is insightful but underdeveloped; the authors should compare these mechanisms in terms of effectiveness, boundary conditions, and scalability.

In the paragraph on Islamic Azad University context, the sentence “empirical evidence suggests that... mechanisms remain underdeveloped” would benefit from clearer methodological grounding; the cited studies should be briefly characterized (sample, method) to justify this contextual claim.

In the Findings section, the transition from 128 codes to 27 sub-themes and 7 themes is presented descriptively but lacks methodological rigor; a visual coding tree or hierarchical diagram would improve clarity and traceability.

In Table 2 (Thematic Clustering), some sub-themes appear conceptually overlapping—for instance, “Managers’ Attitudes and Beliefs” and “Managers’ Understanding and Meaning-Making”; the authors should justify the conceptual boundaries or consider merging them.

In the thematic explanation paragraph “Nature and characteristics of managerial experience...”, the concept of “practical wisdom” is introduced without theoretical grounding; referencing Aristotelian *phronesis* or contemporary management literature would strengthen this interpretation.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, although the research gap is stated, the novelty remains implicit; the authors should explicitly articulate what differentiates their framework from prior phenomenological or knowledge-sharing models.

In the Methods section, the sentence “Sampling was conducted purposively...” lacks sufficient justification for sample adequacy; the authors should elaborate on why 17 participants are sufficient beyond stating “data saturation,” possibly referencing saturation criteria or methodological literature.

In the description of participants, there is no demographic table or detailed breakdown (e.g., gender, years of experience, institutional size); this omission weakens transferability and should be corrected.

In the paragraph describing the interview instrument, the domains are listed but no example questions are provided; including at least 2–3 sample questions would significantly improve transparency and replicability.

In the explanation of Colaizzi’s method, the authors describe the steps accurately, but the operationalization is vague; for example, how many significant statements were extracted per interview, and how were disagreements resolved? This should be clarified.

In Table 1 (“Relationship Between Significant Statements and Formulated Meanings”), while the quotations are rich, the coding logic is not fully transparent; the authors should explain whether coding was inductive, deductive, or hybrid, and whether inter-coder reliability was assessed.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.