

# The Effectiveness of an Integrated Educational Package of Growth Mindset and Time Perspective on Personal Growth Initiative and Social–Emotional Competence of Students

Zeinab. Azadikhah<sup>1</sup>, Fatemeh. Dadvand<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M.A. in Educational Psychology, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Shiraz University, Fars, Iran

<sup>2</sup> PhD Student, Department of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: fdadvand945@gmail.com

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
John S. Carlson  Distinguished Professor of the Department of Educational Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United carlosoj@msu.edu	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Fahime Bahonar  Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mahdi Khanjani  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening paragraph states that “rapid social change, heightened academic competition, and growing emotional demands” necessitate attention to psychological resources. While conceptually sound, this paragraph would benefit from a more precise contextualization of adolescence (e.g., neurodevelopmental, social transition, or educational system pressures) to better justify why upper secondary students are a particularly relevant population.

In the sentence “PGI emphasizes agency, planning, and purposeful action toward growth goals,” the authors may strengthen conceptual clarity by briefly distinguishing PGI from related constructs such as self-efficacy, grit, or proactive personality, thereby preventing construct overlap.

The aim is clearly stated, but it would be strengthened by explicitly mentioning the hypothesized direction of effects and whether maintenance over time is a central hypothesis or an exploratory objective.

The description of randomization states that “simple random allocation” was used. Please clarify how randomization was implemented in practice (e.g., random number generator, sealed envelopes) to enhance methodological transparency.

Given the small sample size ( $n = 30$ ), it would be appropriate to include a brief justification or power consideration, even if post-hoc, to address concerns regarding statistical power.

While psychometric properties are described in general terms, the manuscript should report Cronbach’s alpha coefficients obtained in the current sample, rather than relying solely on previous studies.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The paragraph discussing growth mindset heavily emphasizes positive outcomes. Consider adding one or two sentences acknowledging mixed or conditional findings in the literature (e.g., context dependency, dosage effects), which would improve theoretical balance.

The claim that growth mindset “facilitates intentional personal development” is compelling, but the manuscript would benefit from a clearer causal or process-oriented explanation (e.g., belief → effort → planning → PGI) to strengthen theoretical coherence.

When introducing time perspective, the authors focus primarily on future orientation. Please clarify whether the intervention adopts a balanced time perspective framework or selectively emphasizes future orientation, as this has implications for interpretation.

The paragraph cites several intervention studies but does not clearly specify effect sizes or duration of effects. Adding a brief synthesis of how strong and lasting these effects are would better justify the present study’s design and follow-up period.

The sentence “school-based interventions targeting psychological beliefs... indirectly enhance social–emotional functioning” would benefit from explicitly stating the hypothesized mediating mechanism (e.g., emotion regulation, self-reflection, interpersonal awareness).

The manuscript suggests PGI as a linking mechanism but does not clearly state whether it is treated as a theoretical mediator or simply a parallel outcome. Clarifying this point would strengthen the conceptual model.

The research gap is clearly articulated; however, the authors could improve rigor by explicitly contrasting their study with the most methodologically similar prior studies, highlighting what is novel beyond integration alone (e.g., follow-up duration, dual outcomes).

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.