




# Analysis of the Dimensions of Gender Justice in the Process of Appointing Managers: A Case Study in the Welfare Organization of Fars Province

Ali. Jamshidi<sup>1</sup>, Abdolkhalegh. Gholami Chenarestan Olya<sup>2\*</sup>, Ali. Pirzad<sup>3</sup>



1. PhD Student, Department of Management, Yas.C., Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran
2. Associate Professor, Department of Management, Yas.C., Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran
3. Associate Professor, Department of Management, Yas.C., Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Aa1405@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:** Manijeh Haghhighinasab<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran  
Email: haghhighinasab@srbiau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction paragraph that begins with “The Welfare Organization of Fars Province represents an important institutional context,” the rationale for selecting this organization remains underdeveloped. Please explain why the Welfare Organization is a theoretically and practically significant case for studying gender justice, for example because of its social welfare mission, gender-sensitive service recipients, administrative structure, or possible relevance of women’s leadership to welfare policy implementation.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the manuscript states that “there remains a need for context-specific qualitative studies,” but the research gap should be sharpened. Please specify whether the gap is empirical, contextual, methodological, or theoretical; for example, clarify whether prior studies have neglected Iranian welfare organizations, qualitative modeling of appointment processes, or the interaction between gender justice and organizational justice in public-sector appointments.

In the Methods paragraph under “Study Design and Participants,” the manuscript states that the study used “a qualitative research design based on the grounded theory approach,” but the specific grounded theory tradition is not identified. Please clarify whether the study follows classical Glaserian grounded theory, Straussian grounded theory, or constructivist grounded theory, because this affects sampling logic, coding procedures, theoretical saturation, and the interpretation of the final model.

In the same Data Analysis section, the manuscript also refers to “thematic analysis” alongside grounded theory procedures. This creates methodological ambiguity because thematic analysis and grounded theory have different purposes and analytic logics. Please either remove thematic analysis or explain clearly how it was used in a way that is compatible with grounded theory, without suggesting that two separate qualitative methods were mixed without justification.

In the Findings section, the initial paragraph states that “managerial competencies were identified as the central phenomenon,” but the title of the article emphasizes gender justice. Please justify theoretically and empirically why managerial competency, rather than gender justice or justice-oriented appointment, emerged as the central phenomenon, and show how this decision was grounded in participants’ narratives.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the participant description paragraph, the manuscript states that “15 managers, experts, and informed organizational actors” participated, but this is insufficient for evaluating sample adequacy. Please report participants’ gender, age range, educational background, organizational position, years of work experience, managerial experience, and relation to appointment or promotion processes, while preserving confidentiality.

In the sampling paragraph, the manuscript states that “participants were selected through purposive sampling,” but it does not specify the type of purposive sampling. Please clarify whether maximum variation, criterion-based, snowball, expert, or theoretical sampling was used, and explain how participants were identified, contacted, invited, and selected.

In the Methods paragraph that states “data collection continued until theoretical saturation was achieved,” the claim needs methodological support. Please explain how saturation was determined, at which interview saturation was reached, whether additional interviews were conducted to confirm saturation, and what criteria were used to conclude that no new categories were emerging.

In the Data Collection Tools paragraph, the manuscript describes the use of semi-structured interviews but does not provide enough procedural detail. Please add the interview setting, approximate duration of interviews, whether interviews were conducted in person or online, whether they were audio-recorded, how field notes were used, and whether the interview guide was reviewed by experts or piloted before the main interviews.

In the interview questions paragraph, the manuscript includes broad questions such as “what should be the main criteria for appointing and promoting managers?” Please refine the interview protocol by indicating how questions progressed from general to specific topics and how probing questions were used to elicit examples of gender discrimination, informal barriers, organizational support, and perceived fairness in actual appointment experiences.

In the Data Analysis paragraph, the manuscript states that analysis was conducted through “open, axial, and selective coding,” but the description remains procedural rather than analytical. Please explain how many initial codes were extracted, how codes were merged, how subcategories were developed, how disagreements were resolved, and how the central category was selected from the data.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the new document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.