

# Comparison of the Effectiveness of Self-Efficacy Training and Mindfulness Training on Academic Motivation and Anxiety of Students




Zahra. Azimi<sup>1</sup>, Mohsen. Ahmadi Tahour Soltani<sup>2\*</sup>, Fateme. Khoeini<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Psychology, NT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor of Psychology, School of Medicine, Behavioral Sciences Research Center, Life Style Institute, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Department of Psychology, Fi.C., Islamic Azad University, Firuzkuh , Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: m.ahmaditahour@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Muhammad Rizwan  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Haripur University, Islamabad, Pakistan muhammad.rizwan@uoh.edu.pk	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor (Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Seyed Ali Darbani  Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology and Counseling, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. Email: Ali.darbani@iau.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the statement “Academic motivation and anxiety constitute two of the most influential psychological determinants...”, the authors should briefly justify why these two constructs were prioritized over other psychological variables (e.g., depression or stress) to strengthen conceptual framing.

The paragraph beginning with “From a theoretical perspective, contemporary learning theories...” defines self-efficacy clearly; however, a parallel theoretical definition of academic anxiety is needed to ensure conceptual balance.

The claim that comparative research is limited (“comparative research examining their relative effectiveness remains limited”) should be strengthened by referencing the scope of prior studies more explicitly to justify the stated research gap.

The aim sentence is clear, but it should also specify the quasi-experimental design used in the study for methodological transparency.

The noticeable difference in extrinsic motivation effect sizes between interventions should be theoretically interpreted, as it has important implications for mechanisms of change.

There is an internal inconsistency in table numbering (“Table 6” vs. earlier “Table 4”). This must be corrected for accuracy and clarity.

The absence of differences between experimental groups should be accompanied by a brief discussion of statistical power to confirm that the null finding is meaningful.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Although convenience sampling is reported, the manuscript does not explain how schools and students were recruited. Clarification of the recruitment pathway is necessary for evaluating selection bias.

The description lists item numbers and subscales but does not specify how intrinsic and extrinsic scores were computed (sum vs. mean). This information is essential for replication.

The manuscript reports a total score range of 0–64. Because scoring procedures for DASS-21 vary, the authors should clarify whether raw or adjusted scores were used.

The intervention description is rich but would benefit from a session-by-session summary (e.g., objectives and activities per session), possibly in table form.

The authors describe multiple mindfulness techniques but do not indicate how treatment fidelity and consistency were monitored across sessions and facilitators.

Large posttest differences are reported, but the manuscript does not present effect sizes for pre-post changes. Including these would improve interpretability of practical impact.

The statement that normality and homogeneity assumptions were met would be more informative if the authors reported exact test statistics and p-values.

The extremely large effect size reported warrants a brief discussion of educational significance and potential inflation due to sample size or design.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.