

Effectiveness of an Academic Motivation Training Model on Cognitive Flexibility, Academic Resilience, and Academic Motivation among Female Lower Secondary School Students in Tehran

Faezeh. Shokri Javan², Faezeh. Jahan^{2*}, Noormohammad. Rezaei², Dariush. Mehrafzoon³

¹ Department of Educational and Psychological Services, Se.C., Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology Education and Counseling, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

³ Department of Clinical and Educational Psychology, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: faezeh.jahan@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Sergii Boltivets
Chief Researcher of the Department of Scientific Support of Social Formation of Youth. Mykhailo Drahomanov University, Ukraine
sboltivets@ukr.net

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:

In the introduction, the opening sentence “Academic functioning in contemporary educational systems is increasingly conceptualized as a multidimensional construct...” is theoretically sound but overly broad. It would benefit from a more focused lead-in that directly situates the study within adolescent educational psychology.

In the paragraph discussing academic motivation, the claim “A decline in motivation...has been associated with disengagement” is supported by citations, but the authors do not distinguish between intrinsic and extrinsic motivational decline. A more nuanced differentiation would strengthen theoretical rigor.

In the section on cognitive flexibility, the phrase “enables students to reinterpret challenges” is conceptually appropriate; however, the authors should clarify whether they are referring to executive functioning, metacognition, or cognitive reappraisal, as these constructs are distinct in the literature.

In the methods section, the sentence “the sample size was estimated using G*Power software” is appropriate; however, the authors incorrectly state that an independent samples t-test was selected, while the actual analysis uses ANCOVA. This inconsistency must be corrected.

In the inclusion criteria paragraph, the phrase “having an average intelligence quotient (IQ between 85 and 115)” raises ethical and methodological concerns. The authors should clarify how IQ was assessed and justify its necessity in the study design.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph introducing ACT, the sentence “Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT)...enhancing goal-directed behavior” is accurate but lacks linkage to educational outcomes. The authors should explicitly connect ACT mechanisms to academic performance or classroom behavior.

In the schema therapy section, the statement “early maladaptive schemas are pervasive cognitive-emotional structures...” is well-presented; however, the authors do not explain how these schemas manifest specifically in academic settings. Providing concrete school-related examples would improve applied relevance.

In the compassion-focused therapy paragraph, the sentence “Self-compassion...has been linked to reduced psychopathology” is appropriate, but the authors should clarify whether self-compassion was explicitly targeted in the intervention or only conceptually referenced.

In the mindfulness section, the phrase “mindfulness-based cognitive therapy can improve emotional regulation” would benefit from specifying effect sizes or empirical magnitude to strengthen the evidentiary weight of the argument.

In the paragraph identifying the research gap, the statement “there remains a critical gap in translating these insights into structured educational models” is important but underdeveloped. The authors should cite specific studies that attempted such translation and explain their limitations.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.