

# Investigating the Relationship Between Coping Styles, Alexithymia, and Management Styles with Job Satisfaction (Case Study: The Employees of the Maad Group)


Samira Sadat. Miri<sup>1</sup>, Hoshang. Zahiri<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.A., Department of Psychology, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran



<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Social Sciences, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Mirisamira6565@gmail.com

## Editor

Gholamreza Rajabi<sup>1</sup>  
Professor of Counseling  
Department, Shahid Chamran  
University, Ahvaz, Iran  
Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Shadi Jazini<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Counseling, Khomeinishahr Branch, Islamic Azad University,  
Khomeinishahr, Isfahan, Iran. Email: shadi.jazini@iaukhsh.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Farzaneh Mardani<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond  
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: Farzanehmardani@kmanresce.ca

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction outlines the significance of coping styles, alexithymia, and management styles on job satisfaction but lacks a detailed theoretical foundation explaining why these variables were chosen and how they interrelate. Expanding the theoretical framework would provide clearer guidance on the study's hypothesis and its contribution to the existing literature.

While the manuscript provides an overview of the sampling technique and instruments used, it lacks depth in methodological justification. For instance, the choice of convenience sampling and its potential biases could be more thoroughly discussed. Further, elaboration on the psychometric properties of the instruments in the context of the current study's population could strengthen the validity of the findings.

The paper employs Pearson's correlation coefficient for data analysis, which is appropriate for examining relationships between variables. However, considering the complex relationships explored, integrating more sophisticated statistical methods, such as regression analysis or structural equation modeling, could offer deeper insights into the predictive power and the nature of these relationships.

The discussion provides a comparison with previous literature; however, it lacks a critical analysis of how the findings extend or challenge existing knowledge. Additionally, incorporating a discussion on the implications of these findings for organizational policy and practice, as well as suggestions for managers in similar organizations, would enhance the manuscript's practical relevance.

The manuscript briefly mentions limitations and future research directions, yet this section could be greatly expanded. A more detailed discussion on the limitations related to the sample's generalizability, the cross-sectional design, and the reliance on self-report measures would contextualize the findings. Moreover, outlining specific future research questions, particularly those involving longitudinal designs or experimental interventions, could pave the way for subsequent inquiries.

The manuscript states adherence to ethical guidelines but does not detail the ethical review process or how participant consent was obtained and confidentiality ensured. Expanding on these aspects would align with best practices in research ethics.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion effectively relates the findings to existing literature but could further benefit from a more detailed exploration of the practical implications for organizational management and employee well-being strategies.

The literature review is comprehensive but could be refined to draw more direct connections between the reviewed studies and the current research's objectives. Highlighting gaps the study aims to fill would strengthen its positioning within the broader research context.

While the statistical analysis is appropriate, providing additional details on the choice of statistical tests and a brief rationale for their use would improve the methodological transparency.

The manuscript briefly mentions the sampling method but could benefit from a more thorough discussion on the potential impact of convenience sampling on the study's findings and how these biases were mitigated.

The manuscript would benefit from a careful review to correct minor typographical errors and ensure consistency in terminology and formatting, enhancing its overall readability.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.