

The Effectiveness of Dynamic Mindset Training on Students' Buoyancy and Academic Self-Efficacy

Shahrzad. Abdiyeh¹, Mohammadagha. Delavarpour^{2*}, Seyed Mosa. Tabatabaee³, Shahab. Moradi⁴

¹ PhD Student, Department of Educational Psychology, Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Cognitive Science, Faculty of Psychology and Education, Semnan University, Semnan, Iran

⁴ Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: mdelavarpour@semnan.ac.ir

Editor

Stefano Vinaccia¹
Profesor de psicología Universidad
del SINU, Montería, Colombia
Vinalpi47@hotmail.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar 
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.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 sentence “Given that student success in school is the fundamental goal of any educational system...” would benefit from specifying what constitutes success (e.g., grades, socio-emotional development, or future occupational success) to avoid overly broad generalization.

While psychometric properties are described well, the sentence “In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha for this instrument was found to be 0.88” could be accompanied by the exact sample size used in this reliability estimate.

The authors mention the use of “Shapiro-Wilk test, Levene’s test, Box’s M test, and Mauchly’s test,” but no test results are presented. Please report test statistics and p-values to support the assumptions for repeated measures ANOVA.

The sentence “However, there was no substantial difference between post-test and follow-up scores...” implies stability. However, given a one-point increase in academic buoyancy and 0.45 in self-efficacy, please clarify whether this change is statistically nonsignificant or not meaningful.

The authors claim “critical thinking training has been shown to enhance academic self-efficacy...” Please ensure this aligns with your own intervention, as critical thinking was not a component of the described mindset training.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Academic buoyancy is an internal sense that ensures students' mental well-being...” oversimplifies the construct. Please clarify this claim with empirical support and distinguish buoyancy from general resilience or well-being.

The phrase “Research on the dynamic mindset has shown that it predicts lower anxiety, reduced helplessness...” could be strengthened by specifying whether these outcomes are directly linked to interventions or cross-sectional correlations.

The authors state, “dynamic mindset training could play a crucial role in enhancing the quality of education,” but this claim is not operationalized. Please clarify what is meant by “quality of education” in measurable terms.

In Session 6, “Real-life examples are provided to illustrate how attributions shape individuals' responses to challenges.” It would strengthen the rigor to indicate whether these examples were culturally adapted for Iranian students.

Wilks' Lambda is used, yet multivariate analyses typically require justification regarding covariance assumptions. Please justify the use of Wilks' Lambda and clarify whether univariate follow-ups were conducted.

The sentence “no significant difference was found between post-test and follow-up scores...” needs to specify exact p-values, confidence intervals, and effect sizes for clarity, especially for future meta-analyses.

The sentence “post-test and follow-up scores for self-defeating behaviors...” includes a variable (self-defeating behaviors) that was not mentioned in methods or measures. Please clarify if this is a reporting error or an unreported measure.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.