




Comparison of the Effectiveness of Moral Cognitive Education and Moral Action Education on the Responsibility of Female Students with a Positive Attitude Towards Academic Cheating

Maryam. Fallahpour¹, Ramezan. Hassanzadeh^{2*}, Seyedeh Olia. Emadian³


¹ PhD student, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

² Professor, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran



³ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: rhassanzadehd@yahoo.com

Editor

Maryam Fatehizade
Professor of Counseling
Department, Faculty of Educational
Sciences and Psychology, Isfahan
University, Iran
m.fatehizade@edu.ui.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Hassan Ghanifar
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Birjand Branch, Islamic Azad
University, Birjand, Iran. Email: ghanifar@iaubir.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Abotaleb Saadati Shamir
Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, University of Science and
Research, Tehran, Iran. Email: psychology@iau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The definition of academic cheating and its significance is well established, but consider providing more current references (e.g., studies from the last 5 years) to reflect recent developments in this field.

The relationship between responsibility and academic identity is introduced, but the connection could be strengthened with a clearer explanation of how these variables interact. Including an example or a brief discussion on the underlying mechanisms may help.

The research gap is well articulated, but the rationale for choosing moral cognitive and action education specifically for the Iranian context could be expanded. Why are these methods particularly relevant?

The explanation of the quasi-experimental design is clear, but it would be beneficial to elaborate on how the design ensures the reliability and validity of the findings, particularly considering the sample size limitations.

The Namati Responsibility Questionnaire is well explained, but consider adding a discussion on its cross-cultural validity since the study is conducted in Iran, and the tool was developed elsewhere.

The explanation of reverse scoring is necessary but somewhat technical. Simplify the language or provide an example for clarity.

The use of repeated measures ANOVA is appropriate, but it would be helpful to discuss why this method was chosen over others and how it addresses potential confounders or biases in the data.

The reported effect sizes are valuable, but consider elaborating on the practical significance of these findings. For instance, what does an effect size of 0.642 imply for educational settings?

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement "increasing responsibility leads to a reduction in academic dishonesty" is compelling but lacks direct citation from empirical studies. Adding references to support this claim will enhance the argument's credibility.

The multistage cluster sampling method is briefly described, but the steps could be clearer. Include more detail on how clusters were selected and the justification for the sample size.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are comprehensive, but consider providing a rationale for each criterion, especially for "not using drugs or psychiatric medications" and "not participating in psychotherapy."

The ethical considerations section briefly mentions the Helsinki Declaration, but more details on how confidentiality and data protection were handled would strengthen this section.

The statement that "no significant difference was observed between the moral cognitive education group and the moral action education group" requires more interpretation. What does this imply about the interventions' relative effectiveness?

The interpretation of findings is comprehensive, but consider discussing potential biases that may have influenced the results, such as the Hawthorne effect or selection bias.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.