

## Exploring the Role of Peer Collaboration in Enhancing Adolescent Motivation to Learn

Ye. Mu<sup>1</sup>, Pei-Yin. Shin<sup>\*1</sup>, Qi. Shen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences and Liberal Arts, UCSI University, Malaysia

\* Corresponding author email address: [yinshin@ucsiuniversity.edu.my](mailto:yinshin@ucsiuniversity.edu.my)

---

### Editor

### Reviewers

Eduin ALEXANDER Prada  
Rodriguez  
Department of Psychology,  
Universidad de Investigación y  
Desarrollo (UDI), Bucaramanga,  
Santander, Colombia  
[eprada1@udi.edu.co](mailto:eprada1@udi.edu.co)

**Reviewer 1:** Ali Khodaei  
Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam  
Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: [alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir](mailto:alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir)  
**Reviewer 2:** Hajar Torkan  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan  
Branch (Khorasgan), Isfahan, Iran. [h.torkan@khuif.ac.ir](mailto:h.torkan@khuif.ac.ir)

---

### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The claim “Peer collaboration is rooted in social interaction theories that highlight learning as a co-constructed process” should explicitly reference Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory or related theoretical frameworks to strengthen the conceptual grounding.

The authors state “Despite extensive scholarship, gaps remain regarding the nuanced mechanisms through which peer collaboration enhances motivation in diverse cultural contexts such as Malaysia.” This is a good justification, but the gap should be defined more precisely—e.g., lack of qualitative, context-sensitive evidence.

The table presents themes, subcategories, and open codes, but lacks illustrative quotes. Including direct participant quotations in the table (or in supplementary materials) would add richness to the qualitative analysis.

The authors mention “29 participants... limits generalizability.” While valid, it should also be acknowledged that transferability, not generalizability, is the aim in qualitative research. Reframing this limitation will improve methodological rigor.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Knickenberg (2025) showed that adolescents’ real-time motivation levels fluctuate depending on the nature and quality of peer interactions in classrooms.” could benefit from elaboration—how did the study measure real-time fluctuations? Including this detail will help readers understand the methodological relevance.

The statement “Rachmawati (2024) further confirmed that academic motivation is both a direct outcome of peer relationships and a mediator between self-efficacy and student achievement.” is strong but would benefit from a short sentence linking how this supports the rationale for conducting qualitative work in Malaysia.

The participant remark “Our school gave us a study corner, and it makes group work easier.” suggests a link between structural conditions and motivation. This should be more explicitly connected to ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner), which is not currently cited.

The authors write “Peer collaboration practices formed a central theme in this study...” but the discussion largely summarizes findings instead of offering theoretical interpretation. Consider integrating frameworks such as Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to explain how collaboration meets needs for relatedness, competence, and autonomy.

The authors conclude “These results reinforce earlier studies that positioned peer support as a protective factor against disengagement.” While this is accurate, the discussion could benefit from highlighting unique contributions of this Malaysian dataset compared to Western-focused literature.

Authors revised and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.