

Role Ambiguity, Psychological Capital, and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Analysis

Sharmin. Nasrin¹ 

¹ Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000, Bangladesh

* Corresponding author email address: sharminnasrin@du.ac.bd

Editor

Anela Hasanagic 
Full Professor, Department of
Psychology, Faculty of Islamic
Education, University of Zenica,
Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Hassan Ghanifar 
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Birjand, Iran. Email: ghanifar@iaubir.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh 
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The abstract lacks clarity in the statement of results. Consider revising the sentence: "Data analysis included Pearson correlation to examine the relationships between variables and linear regression to identify the predictors of job satisfaction" to specify the key findings directly. For example, "Pearson correlation showed a significant negative relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction ($r = -0.52$, $p < 0.001$), and a significant positive relationship between psychological capital and job satisfaction ($r = 0.67$, $p < 0.001$)."

In the "Study Design and Participants" section, clarify the demographic characteristics more thoroughly. Include details on how participants were recruited and any potential biases this recruitment method may have introduced.

The justification for using specific measurement instruments, such as the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Scale, is insufficient. Provide more context on why these instruments were chosen over others and their relevance to the study's objectives.

The data analysis section mentions checking assumptions of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity. Include more detail on how these assumptions were checked and the specific statistical tests used, such as specific graphical methods or test statistics.

In the results section, the presentation of demographic data could be more effectively visualized using tables or charts. For example, convert the age distribution and education levels into a bar graph for clearer representation.

The correlation results should include a brief discussion on the strength and direction of the relationships. For instance, explain what the negative correlation between role ambiguity and job satisfaction ($r = -0.52$, $p < 0.001$) means in practical terms.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the introduction, the sentence "Higher job satisfaction is associated with better job performance, lower turnover intentions, and enhanced overall life satisfaction (Fakunmoju 2020; Negri et al. 2021)" could benefit from additional examples or citations that illustrate these associations in different organizational contexts. This would enhance the reader's understanding of the broad applicability of job satisfaction.

The hypotheses stated in the introduction need more explicit articulation. Instead of simply listing them, provide a brief rationale for each hypothesis. For instance, explain why psychological capital is expected to moderate the relationship between role ambiguity and job satisfaction.

The regression analysis section should provide a more detailed interpretation of the regression coefficients. Discuss the implications of the coefficients ($B = -0.34$, $\beta = -0.31$ for role ambiguity and $B = 0.59$, $\beta = 0.53$ for psychological capital) in the context of the study.

The discussion section needs a more in-depth comparison with existing literature. Expand on how your findings align or contrast with previous studies, such as those by Κουστέλιος et al. (2004) and Ibrahim et al. (2019).

The limitations section mentions the cross-sectional design and self-reported measures. Include a discussion on potential specific biases (e.g., social desirability bias) and how they might have impacted the findings. Additionally, suggest specific longitudinal designs or mixed-method approaches for future research.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.