

Article history: Received 25 March 2024 Revised 12 June 2024 Accepted 02 July 2024 Published online 10 August 2024

# Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

## The Impact of Citizenship Education on Students' Behavior

Afifeh. Hamedi<sup>1\*</sup>, Farangis. Afrasyabi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Bushehr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran
<sup>2</sup> Master of Educational Sciences, Bushehr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: hamedi.a2010@gmail.com

Editor	Reviewers
Stefano Vinaccia®	Reviewer 1: Mohammad Salehi ©
Profesor de psicología Universidad del SINU, Montería, Colombia Vinalpi47@hotmail.com	Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic
	Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir
	Reviewer 2: Keivan Kakabraee <sup>10</sup>
	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad
	University, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: keivan@iauksh.ac.ir

#### 1. Round 1

#### 1.1. Reviewer 1

#### Reviewer:

The abstract states, "The objective of this study was to evaluate the impact of a Citizenship Education Program on seventh-grade female students' aggression levels and problem-solving skills in Gachsaran." This sentence would benefit from a clearer indication of the hypothesized outcomes and key findings. Consider revising to: "This study evaluates the hypothesized reduction in aggression levels and improvement in problem-solving skills among seventh-grade female students in Gachsaran following a Citizenship Education Program."

In the introduction, the sentence "Citizenship education plays a crucial role in shaping the moral and ethical framework of young individuals" would benefit from specific examples or citations of studies that support this claim to strengthen the argument.

In the Methods section, under "Participant Selection and Randomization," provide more detail on the randomization process to ensure replicability. For example, specify the method used for random assignment (e.g., computer-generated random numbers).

In the Results section, Table 1, it is stated, "For aggression, the intervention group showed a notable decrease from a mean of 45.67 (SD = 5.21) pre-intervention to 32.45 (SD = 4.78) post-intervention." Ensure that this decrease is visually emphasized in the accompanying figures or tables for better clarity.

The section on checking assumptions of normality, homogeneity, and sphericity (Results) is well done. However, consider including the specific values from the Shapiro-Wilk, Levene's, and Mauchly's tests directly in the text for full transparency.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

#### 1.2. Reviewer 2

#### Reviewer:

The section discussing the role of digital citizenship (Introduction) references Azis Maftuhin and Nugraha (2021). Consider expanding this section with more detailed findings from their study to provide a deeper context for the relevance of digital citizenship in modern education.

The introduction mentions both social learning theory and the theory of planned behavior. It would be beneficial to include a more detailed explanation of how these theories specifically relate to the interventions used in the Citizenship Education Program (Introduction).

When describing the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ), include information about its validity and reliability in previous studies involving similar populations to underscore its appropriateness for this study (Methods and Materials).

The detailed session descriptions (Methods and Materials) are excellent. However, consider adding more information on the qualifications of the instructors and the fidelity checks used to ensure consistent delivery of the program.

In the Data Analysis section, it would be helpful to explain why ANOVA with repeated measures and Bonferroni post-hoc tests were chosen over other statistical methods. This could include a brief comparison to highlight their suitability.

The Discussion section references various studies supporting the findings. For a stronger argument, explicitly compare your results to specific data points from these studies, such as effect sizes or specific statistical outcomes (Discussion).

The Limitations section notes the small sample size. It would be beneficial to discuss any potential impact this may have had on the study's statistical power and the generalizability of the findings (Limitations & Suggestions).

Future research suggestions are included in the Limitations section. Expand on these suggestions by proposing specific methodologies or populations that future studies should consider to build on your findings (Limitations & Suggestions).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

### 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.

