





## Gendered Experiences of Workplace Discrimination: A Qualitative Analysis of Women in Leadership Positions

Nahid. Yousefpour<sup>1</sup>, Hossein. Bayani<sup>2\*</sup>, Fatemeh. Mohammadifard<sup>2</sup>, Seyed Mohammadjavad. Momeni Fini<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, St.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran



<sup>3</sup> Department of Pharmacy Programme, Altinbas Branch, T.C., University, Istanbul, Türkiye

\* Corresponding author email address: Hoseinbayani88@gmail.com

### Editor

Izet Pehlić<sup>1</sup>  
Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
izet.pehlic@unze.ba

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Mohammad Masoud Dayarian<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Komeinishar/Isfahan, Iran. dayariyan@iaukhsh.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Masoud Asadi<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, Arak University, Arak, Iran.  
Email: m-asadi@araku.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the second paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence “The struggle for acceptance and recognition is not confined to any single professional domain” is overly general and descriptive; it would benefit from empirical substantiation or comparative examples across sectors to avoid appearing as an unsupported generalization.

The paragraph discussing Muslim women leaders (Introduction, paragraph 2) introduces a culturally specific case (“Muslim women leaders in higher education face specific barriers”) but does not integrate this example into the study’s broader analytical lens, leaving unclear whether cultural specificity is central to the study or merely illustrative.

Under “Measures,” the description “The interview guide was developed based on a preliminary review of literature” is insufficiently detailed; the manuscript should specify which frameworks or prior instruments informed the guide and whether any pilot reliability or validity checks were conducted.

In the “Data Analysis” subsection, the statement “Initial codes were generated by carefully reading the transcriptions” lacks methodological specificity; the manuscript should clarify whether coding was inductive or deductive, whether multiple coders were involved, and how inter-coder reliability was assessed.

The claim “Theoretical saturation was reached when no new themes emerged” requires methodological justification; the manuscript should specify how saturation was operationalized (e.g., after how many interviews) and whether saturation was formally tracked.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the third paragraph of the Introduction, the use of the “labyrinth” metaphor (Carli & Eagly, 2016) is appropriate, but the manuscript does not extend this metaphor into the study design or analysis; a stronger alignment between metaphor and thematic findings would improve theoretical coherence.

The final paragraph of the Introduction states, “This study aims to explore the gendered experiences of workplace discrimination among women in leadership positions,” but this aim is not sufficiently differentiated from prior literature; the manuscript should explicitly articulate its unique contribution (e.g., methodological, contextual, or theoretical novelty).

In the Methods section under “Study Design and Participants,” the phrase “a rich diversity of experiences and perspectives” is used without specifying sampling criteria thresholds; more explicit inclusion parameters (e.g., minimum years of leadership experience, organizational level) would enhance methodological rigor.

In the same section, the sentence “Efforts were made to include participants from a range of ages, ethnic backgrounds, and career stages” lacks transparency; the manuscript should report actual demographic distributions (e.g., percentages or counts) to substantiate claims of diversity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.