

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report

[Journal Website](#)




Strengths, Weaknesses, Threats, and Opportunities of Curriculum Liberalization in Elementary Education at Farhangian University

Sadegh. Ahmadi¹, Davoud. Tahmaseb Zadeh Sheykhlar*² & Yousef. Adib³

1. MA, Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

2. *Corresponding Author: Associate Professor, Department of Education, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Tabriz, Iran (Email: d.tahmaseb@tabrizu.ac.ir)

3. Professor, Department of Education, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Tabriz, Iran

Editor	Reviewers
Abolfazl Karami  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran abolfazlkarami1@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Kamdin. Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca Reviewer 2: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

Abstract Clarity: In the abstract, the sentence "The results indicated that from the professors' perspective ambiguity in the concept of curriculum liberalization and the selection of an incorrect path for liberalization..." is somewhat lengthy and complex. Consider breaking it into shorter sentences to enhance readability (Abstract, lines 15-20).

Threats Section: The list of threats is detailed, but some terms are vague. For instance, what is meant by "promotional nature of liberalization"? Clarify this term to ensure readers understand the specific threat being described (Results, Threats section, paragraph 1).

Practical Implications: The conclusion mentions that curriculum liberalization has both positive and negative outcomes. Expand on the practical implications of these findings for policymakers and educators at Farhangian University (Conclusion, paragraph 1).

Ethical Considerations: The study involves human participants. Include a section on ethical considerations, detailing how informed consent was obtained and any measures taken to protect participant confidentiality (Methods, new paragraph).

Limitation Discussion: Discuss the limitations of using a descriptive-survey method and how these limitations might impact the study's findings. This will provide a more balanced view of the research (Conclusion, new paragraph).

Generalization of Results: Clarify the extent to which the results can be generalized to other universities in Iran or similar educational contexts. Discuss any limitations related to the specific setting of Farhangian University (Discussion, new paragraph).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Research Methodology: The methodology section should provide more detail on the "researcher-made questionnaire." Specifically, what steps were taken to ensure the questionnaire's validity and reliability beyond face and content validity? (Methods, paragraph 3).

Statistical Analysis: In the methods section, you mention using the SWOT method and Hosseini et al.'s method for data analysis. Provide a brief explanation or citation for Hosseini et al.'s method for readers unfamiliar with it (Methods, paragraph 5).

Detailed Results: The results section would benefit from more detailed explanations of the statistical findings. For example, provide confidence intervals or p-values where applicable to support the reported means and relative means (Results, paragraph 1).

Integration of Literature: Throughout the introduction, there are numerous references to past studies. Ensure that the relevance of each cited work is clear and directly related to the current study's context (Introduction, paragraph 3).

Tables and Figures: Tables 1 and 3 present crucial data, but their captions could be more descriptive. Include explanations of what the data represent and any abbreviations used in the tables (Tables 1 and 3).

Comparative Analysis: In the conclusion, you compare your findings to those of other studies (e.g., Karimi et al., 2023). Discuss any significant differences or similarities in more detail to highlight the unique contributions of your study (Conclusion, paragraph 1).

Theoretical Framework: The introduction lacks a clear theoretical framework for curriculum liberalization. Include a brief section outlining the theoretical basis for liberalization and decentralization in curriculum design (Introduction, paragraph 4).

Questionnaire Development: Provide more detail on the development process of the questionnaire, including any pilot testing and revisions based on feedback (Methods, paragraph 4).

Literature Review Depth: The literature review should include more recent studies on curriculum liberalization and decentralization to ensure the research is up-to-date (Introduction, paragraph 2).

Subheadings in Results: Use subheadings in the results section to organize the findings more clearly, making it easier for readers to follow the discussion of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (Results, throughout).

Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the paper. For example, "liberalization" and "decentralization" are used interchangeably at times. Define each term clearly and use consistently (Introduction, paragraph 5).

SWOT Matrix Explanation: Provide a more detailed explanation of the SWOT matrix and how the findings were integrated into this framework. This will help readers understand the analytical process (Methods, paragraph 5).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.