

The Effect of Dogmatic Thinking on Emotional Creativity: The Mediating Role of Self-Compassion in University Students

Fatemeh. Nikzad Tehrani¹, Fatemeh Soghra Sina^{1*}



¹ Department of Educational Management, Nek.C., Islamic Azad University, Neka, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fa.sina@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Izet Pehlić¹
Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
izet.pehlic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mahdi Khanjani¹
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.
Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mohammadreza ZARBAKHSH BAHRI¹
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbaksh@Toniau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning “University students constitute a population that is especially vulnerable...”, several outcomes (academic vitality, well-being, coping) are cited. However, the logical transition from vulnerability to emotional creativity as an outcome variable could be strengthened by explicitly stating why emotional creativity, rather than general well-being, is the most theoretically relevant dependent variable.

The definition of dogmatic thinking is well articulated; however, the sentence “Dogmatic thinking refers to a rigid cognitive style characterized by absolute judgments...” would benefit from a brief clarification of whether dogmatic thinking is treated here as a trait-like disposition or a modifiable cognitive style, as this has implications for interpretation and intervention.

The manuscript mentions CFA prior to SEM, but factor loadings, AVE, or CR values are not reported. Please either include these indices in a table or explicitly justify why they are omitted.

In Table 1, minimum and maximum observed scores are reported. Please briefly comment in the text on whether these observed ranges align with the theoretical score ranges of each instrument.

The explanation following Table 2 redundantly explains null hypothesis testing. Consider shortening this section and instead briefly justify why SEM with maximum likelihood estimation was appropriate given the K–S results.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

When stating “From a cognitive–emotional perspective, dogmatic thinking constrains emotional creativity...”, the manuscript would benefit from a short integrative mechanism (e.g., appraisal rigidity, emotional avoidance) rather than listing consequences alone. This would strengthen theoretical coherence.

The paragraph introducing self-compassion is conceptually strong, but the sentence “Rigid and absolutist thinking patterns are fundamentally incompatible with self-compassion” is presented as a strong claim. Consider tempering the wording or supporting it with a brief mechanistic explanation to avoid overgeneralization.

The stated research gap is appropriate; however, the sentence “there remains a notable gap in the literature regarding the integrative examination of these variables” would be stronger if accompanied by one explicit example of a closely related study that did not test mediation, thereby concretely demonstrating the gap.

The phrase “The present study was applied in terms of purpose” is ambiguous for an international audience. Please consider rephrasing using more conventional terminology (e.g., “applied research design” or “non-experimental explanatory design”).

While stratified random sampling is mentioned, the manuscript does not specify the strata used beyond academic level. Please clarify how many strata were formed and how proportional allocation was ensured.

There is an inconsistency between Younesi and Mirafzal (2007) and Younesi and Mirafzal (2008) being cited as the developers. Please standardize the citation and clarify whether 2007 refers to development and 2008 to validation.

The sentence “Because the questionnaires used in this study are standardized, their face validity was confirmed...” reflects a conceptual misunderstanding: standardization does not guarantee face validity. Please revise this statement and clarify the actual process used (e.g., expert review).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.