




Paradigmatic Model of Tacit Knowledge Sharing from the Perspective of Psychology Experts in Iranian Universities: A Grounded Theory Approach

Gholamali. Roudi¹, Fateme. Momeni^{2*}, Elham. Mostafavi¹, Fateme. Sagha¹

¹ Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, Non-Governmental and Non-Profit University of the North, Amol, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, Non-Governmental and Non-Profit University of the North, Amol, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: f.momeni@shomal.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic  Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Kamdin Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinparsakia@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph of the Introduction (“In the contemporary knowledge-based societies...”), the argument would benefit from a clear problem statement at the end of the paragraph, explicitly identifying the unresolved theoretical or empirical gap that motivates the study.

The paragraph beginning “Tacit knowledge refers to deeply embedded, experience-based...” provides a solid definition, but it would be strengthened by explicitly contrasting psychological tacit knowledge (e.g., clinical judgment, intuition) with organizational or managerial tacit knowledge discussed in prior studies.

In the paragraph citing Fan & Beh (2024) and Shahzad et al. (2024), the literature review is comprehensive but largely descriptive. I suggest adding a short critical synthesis highlighting inconsistencies or limitations in prior findings to justify the need for a grounded theory approach.

In the paragraph describing open, axial, and selective coding, please clarify how decisions were made to merge or discard codes, possibly with a short illustrative example from the data.

While credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability are mentioned, the explanation is uneven. The paragraph would benefit from explicit linkage between each criterion and concrete actions taken (e.g., how transferability was addressed beyond description).

Several tables are labeled as Table 4, which creates confusion (e.g., Tables on Research Questions Four, Five, Six, and Seven). Please renumber tables consistently and ensure alignment between in-text references and table titles.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph starting with “Despite the growing body of international research...” effectively introduces the Iranian context. However, it would benefit from one concrete example of a structural or cultural feature of Iranian universities that may uniquely shape tacit knowledge sharing.

The final sentence of the Introduction (“The aim of this study is to develop a paradigmatic model...”) is clear. Consider adding one clause specifying the expected theoretical or practical contribution (e.g., theory development, policy implications).

In the Methods section, the sentence “Purposeful sampling was used to select participants...” would benefit from further detail. Please specify inclusion criteria (e.g., minimum years of experience, academic rank, clinical involvement) to enhance transparency.

The statement “In total, 12 in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted” should be accompanied by a brief justification of adequacy, referencing theoretical saturation more explicitly (e.g., how saturation was determined).

The description of the semi-structured interview guide is informative, but I recommend including one or two sample interview questions to improve replicability.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.