





The Effect of Organizational Happiness on Organizational Reputation among Employees of Selected Martial Arts Federations: The Mediating Role of Resilience

Ali. Seifi¹, Mohammad. Nasiri^{2*}, Masoud. Imanzadeh³, Mehrdad. Moharramzadeh⁴

¹ Ph.D Student, Department of Sport Management, Ard.C., Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran


² Assistant Professor, Department of Physical Education, Khoy.C., Islamic Azad University, Khoy, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Sport Management, Ard.C., Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran



⁴ Professor of Sport Management, University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mnasiri@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r

Sennur Tutarel Kışlak
Department of Psychology/Faculty
of Language, History and
Geography, University of Ankara,
Ankara, Turkey
kislak@ankara.edu.tr

R e v i e w e r s

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 second paragraph, the sentence “happy and vital employees are more likely to exhibit proactive behaviors, adapt to change, and contribute constructively...” would benefit from additional empirical citations or theoretical justification. Currently, only two references are provided, but the claim is broader than the evidence presented.

In the Study Design and Participants section, the manuscript states: “a sample of 175 employees... was selected using proportional stratified random sampling.” The authors should detail the strata used (e.g., federation type, job category) and how proportionality was determined.

Figures 1 and 2 are referenced, but the manuscript does not describe their contents in sufficient detail. For example, standardized coefficients or significance thresholds should be narrated for readers who cannot view figures clearly.

In the paragraph interpreting Table 4, the statement “The R^2 value is 8.76%, indicating that 8.76% of the variance in organizational reputation is explained by resilience” should be corrected: resilience explains variance in organizational

reputation, not vice-versa. Also, consider discussing whether the R^2 values meet accepted thresholds for “weak,” “moderate,” or “substantial” effects in SEM frameworks.

The Discussion largely affirms the findings through supportive literature (e.g., paragraph beginning “The results also demonstrated that organizational happiness...”). However, the manuscript does not examine literature where happiness does not predict adaptive behavior or where resilience fails to buffer outcomes. Balanced discussion is needed.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The transition between paragraph four (discussion of organizational resilience) and paragraph five (organizational reputation) is abrupt. A bridging sentence is needed to explain how resilience theoretically connects to reputation formation.

In the paragraph beginning with “Organizational happiness and vitality have been proposed as key antecedents of organizational reputation...”, the manuscript claims strong empirical support for this relationship but does not acknowledge contradictory or mixed findings in the literature. Including opposing perspectives would strengthen the theoretical justification.

The final sentence of the Introduction—“The aim of this study is to examine the effect of organizational happiness on organizational reputation with the mediating role of resilience among employees.”—is appropriate, but the paragraph preceding it contains too many ideas. Consider presenting the aim in a separate, concise paragraph for increased clarity.

Table 5 shows both direct and indirect effects, but the paragraph following it does not explain the discrepancy between the initial direct effect ($\beta = 0.529$) and the reduced direct effect ($\beta = 0.031$) in the mediation model. This inconsistency warrants explicit discussion.

Nowhere in the Results are measurement model indices (factor loadings, composite reliability, AVE, HTMT) reported. PLS-SEM standards require reporting these before structural relationships can be interpreted. This is a major methodological omission.

In the second paragraph of the Discussion, the sentence “Such employees tend to interact more positively with clients, partners, and the broader public...” overextends the findings. The study did not measure client or partner interactions; therefore, claims should be restricted to employee perceptions.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.