

Building Psychological Strengths: A Study on the Effectiveness of Psychological Capital Workshops in Improving Adaptive Behavior Among Patients with Physical Disabilities

Saeed Abdullah. Al-Dossary¹, Irmak. Atak², Neda. Atapour^{3*}

¹ Psychology Department, College of Education, University of Ha'il, Ha'il, Saudi Arabi

² Department of Social Work, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Istanbul, Turkey

³ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: nedaatapour@kmanresce.ca

Editor

Mehdi Rostami
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada.
Email: mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Arusyak Gevorgyan
Armenian State Pedagogical University after Khachatur Abovian, Yerevan, Armenia.
Email: gevorgyanarusyak-6@aspu.am
Reviewer 2: Muhammad Rizwan
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paper is well-organized, with clear sections dedicated to the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. However, the transition between sections could be smoother to enhance the overall flow of the manuscript. Consider providing brief summaries at the end of each section to better connect the readers with the next part of the discussion.

While the manuscript references relevant literature, it would benefit from a more comprehensive review, especially focusing on previous studies that have directly assessed the impact of psychological capital on adaptive behavior. This would help situate the study within the broader research context and highlight its unique contributions.

The methodology is adequately detailed, providing insight into the study design, participant selection, and intervention process. However, more information on the selection criteria and the characteristics of the participants (beyond demographic details) could provide valuable context for the findings. Additionally, detailing any ethical considerations or potential biases in participant selection and data analysis would strengthen this section.

The results are clearly presented with supporting statistical analysis. However, the inclusion of more detailed tables or graphs summarizing the key findings would enhance readability and allow for quicker comprehension of the study's outcomes.

The discussion effectively ties the results back to the research question and integrates findings from the literature review. It would be beneficial to expand on the theoretical implications of the study, specifically how the findings contribute to our understanding of psychological capital in the context of physical disabilities. Moreover, discussing potential practical applications in rehabilitation settings in more detail could offer valuable insights for practitioners.

The section on limitations and suggestions for future research is well-addressed. Expanding on how future studies might explore the long-term effects of psychological capital interventions or their applicability to different populations could provide a useful direction for subsequent research endeavors.

The manuscript is generally well-written, but minor grammatical and typographical errors are present. A thorough proofreading session is recommended to enhance the professionalism and readability of the final manuscript.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The selection of Academic Self-Efficacy Scale (ASES) for measuring academic self-efficacy is well-justified, given its established validity and reliability. However, incorporating additional measures of academic performance could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the workshop's impact.

The detailed description of the time management workshop sessions is commendable, providing clear insight into the intervention's content. For future replications, including materials or specific exercises used could further enhance the reproducibility of the study.

The use of SPSS-27 for conducting repeated measures ANOVA is appropriate and well-executed. The report clearly communicates significant findings, including time, group, and interaction effects, which substantiate the workshop's effectiveness.

The manuscript is well-written and organized, with clear sections that guide the reader through the study. Minor suggestions for improvement include tightening the introduction to more directly state the research gap and refining the conclusion to more succinctly summarize key findings and implications.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.