




Understanding the Role of Role Clarity in Mediating the Relationship Between Workload and Burnout

Jiaowei. Gong¹, Andreea. Popescu^{2*}

¹ VNU University of Education, 144 Xuan Thuy, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam

² Department of Health Psychology, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

* Corresponding author email address: a.popescu@unibuc.ro

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Izet Pehlić  Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Zahra Yousefi  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: yousefi1393@khuif.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement “Workload itself is multifaceted...” in the third paragraph of the introduction should be followed by citations that distinguish between quantitative workload, emotional workload, and cognitive workload, as this article focuses solely on quantitative measures.

The introduction ends with the sentence “To address this gap, the current study aims...” but does not provide a specific hypothesis. Including a clear and testable hypothesis would enhance the scientific clarity of the research objective.

In the methods section under “Study Design and Participants,” the phrase “convenience sampling” contradicts the implication of representativeness based on the Morgan and Krejcie table. Please reconcile the use of a random sampling table with a non-random sampling method.

Under “Measures: Role Clarity,” the article references the 1970 scale by Rizzo et al. but does not indicate whether any reverse-coded items were used or how they were treated in the analysis, which is essential for transparency in measurement.

The fit indices in Table 3 are reported comprehensively; however, the authors should explain why indices such as SRMR or AIC/BIC were not included, as these could offer complementary information on model parsimony and residual fit.

Table 4 reports direct and indirect paths, but the discussion of the standardized coefficients (β) should be enhanced by stating the proportion of variance in burnout explained by the model (e.g., R^2), which would indicate practical significance.

The paragraph starting with “The present study’s identification of role clarity...” in the discussion would benefit from explicitly stating whether role clarity acts as a full or partial mediator, as this distinction is crucial for theoretical implications.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The claim “Similarly, workplace violence and pressure to perform have been shown to erode psychological resources...” in the fourth paragraph of the introduction would benefit from elaboration on how these external stressors interact with role clarity, particularly since role clarity is being presented as a mediator.

The sentence “The mediation model involving role clarity offers a nuanced understanding...” in the fifth paragraph of the introduction needs clearer distinction between full and partial mediation, which is relevant to interpreting the model’s contribution to theory.

Under “Measures: Burnout,” the use of the MBI-GS is appropriate; however, the authors should clarify whether the subscale scores were aggregated into a total burnout score, or whether all three dimensions were modeled separately or as a latent construct in SEM.

The normality assessment in the data analysis section states “All skewness values ranged between -0.81 and $+0.67$...” but does not mention whether Mardia’s coefficient was used to assess multivariate normality, which is especially relevant for SEM.

The statement in the findings section “Table 1 shows a relatively higher mean of 4.62 for role clarity...” would be more meaningful if contextualized against the scale midpoint (i.e., 4.00 on a 7-point scale), to clarify that this value reflects a moderate—not high—perception.

In Table 2, the correlation coefficients are well-reported, but the text following the table does not discuss the potential implications of multicollinearity between workload and burnout ($r = .53$), which may impact SEM path estimations.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.