

# Designing a Positive Psychological Self-Care Educational Package for Male Adolescents with High-Risk Behaviors

Mohsen. Khakrand<sup>1</sup>, Afsaneh. Ghanbari Panah<sup>2\*</sup>, Zohreh. Sadeghi Afjeh<sup>3</sup>, Mandana. Niknam<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. Student in Counseling, Department of Counseling and Education, Faculty of Psychology and Educational sciences, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Counseling, Faculty of Psychology and Education, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, VaP.C., Islamic Azad University, Varamin, Iran



<sup>4</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Khatam University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: afsanehghanbari@iau.ac.ir

## Editor

John S. Carlson<sup>1</sup>  
Distinguished Professor of the  
Department of Educational  
Psychology, Michigan State  
University, East Lansing, MI,  
United  
carlsoj@msu.edu

## Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Parvaneh Mohammadkhani<sup>1</sup>  
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences  
and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Seyed Ali Darbani<sup>1</sup>  
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 Introduction, the paragraph beginning with “Adolescence is a developmental period in which rapid biological, cognitive, emotional, and social changes...” provides a broad overview of adolescent vulnerability, but it lacks a clear conceptual definition of “positive psychological self-care.” The manuscript repeatedly uses this central construct without adequately distinguishing it from related constructs such as resilience training, coping skills training, emotional self-regulation, psychological well-being promotion, or positive youth development. A dedicated conceptual paragraph defining the construct and identifying its theoretical boundaries is necessary.

The paragraph beginning “High-risk behavior among adolescents has become an important concern...” overgeneralizes high-risk behavior without adequately differentiating between externalizing behaviors (e.g., aggression, delinquency) and internalizing manifestations associated with self-harm or suicidal ideation. The authors should clarify whether the educational

package is intended to target heterogeneous risk profiles simultaneously or whether it is primarily suited for adolescents displaying externalizing behavioral patterns.

The paragraph discussing “Emotion regulation is one of the central mechanisms linking adolescent vulnerability to risk behavior” appropriately identifies emotional dysregulation as a core factor; however, the manuscript does not sufficiently explain why male adolescents specifically were selected as the exclusive target group. The rationale should include gender-based developmental, sociocultural, or psychological evidence explaining why male adolescents may require a distinct intervention framework compared to females.

The statement “Positive psychological self-care can provide a useful framework for designing such a package” introduces the intervention orientation but does not adequately explain the theoretical foundations informing session development. The authors should explicitly identify whether the package draws primarily from Positive Psychology Theory, Self-Determination Theory, Cognitive-Behavioral Theory, Positive Youth Development models, resilience frameworks, or integrative psychotherapy principles. Currently, the intervention appears theoretically eclectic without sufficient justification.

In the Methods section, the sentence “Grounded theory was selected because the purpose of the study was not to test a pre-existing intervention” is insufficient as a methodological justification. Grounded theory is intended to generate explanatory models or theoretical frameworks rather than merely develop educational content. The authors should explain which grounded theory tradition was adopted (Straussian, Glaserian, or Constructivist), how theoretical sensitivity was maintained, and how theory generation occurred beyond thematic categorization.

The paragraph describing participants states that “Sampling continued until theoretical saturation was reached, and finally 22 psychologists were interviewed.” The manuscript does not explain how theoretical saturation was operationally determined. The authors should specify the indicators used to identify saturation, whether saturation grids or coding redundancy procedures were employed, and at which interview no new conceptual categories emerged.

The description of literature review procedures in the Methods section lacks sufficient methodological transparency. The sentence “374 domestic and international sources... were initially reviewed” requires additional detail regarding databases searched, inclusion and exclusion criteria, keyword combinations, language restrictions, and screening procedures. Without a reproducible search strategy, the rigor of the literature integration process remains unclear.

Table 3 reports that all components achieved a content validity value of 1.00. While theoretically possible, unanimous agreement across all 12 components raises concerns regarding potential confirmation bias or insufficient heterogeneity among expert evaluators. The authors should provide additional information about the experts’ disciplinary backgrounds, years of experience, and independence from the research team.

Similarly, Table 4 reports an overall expert agreement of 94.50%, with several items approaching ceiling effects. The manuscript should discuss whether experts were blinded to the study aims or whether social desirability and collegial bias may have influenced evaluations. Furthermore, the use of a simple percentage agreement metric may be statistically insufficient; stronger indices such as Cohen’s Kappa or ICC could improve rigor.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The Measures section states that “approximately 1015 minutes of interviews were recorded.” While this demonstrates substantial qualitative engagement, the manuscript fails to provide example interview questions or thematic prompts. The inclusion of sample interview questions in either the main text or supplementary material would improve transparency and allow readers to assess alignment between research questions and data collection procedures.

The researcher-made content validity form requires further methodological clarification. The manuscript states that experts evaluated components as “essential, relatively necessary, unnecessary, or should be removed,” but the scoring framework for CVR calculation is not described. The authors should explicitly identify whether Lawshe’s CVR formula was used and report the minimum acceptable threshold for six experts.

The paragraph describing data analysis notes that “the analysis process began with the extraction of meaningful statements and initial concepts.” However, the manuscript does not discuss trustworthiness criteria in qualitative research. There is no mention of member checking, peer debriefing, audit trails, reflexive memoing, triangulation, or intercoder reliability during coding. The absence of these procedures weakens the credibility and dependability of the findings.

Table 1 presents the “Coding Results of the Qualitative Analysis,” but the categories appear highly predetermined and theoretically expected rather than emergent from grounded qualitative inquiry. Concepts such as gratitude, spirituality, optimism, and meaning in life seem directly imported from positive psychology literature. The authors should clarify which categories emerged inductively from participant interviews and which were theoretically derived from prior literature.

The paragraph following Table 1 states that “the extracted categories moved from basic readiness for participation and emotional self-awareness toward higher-level skills.” This developmental sequencing is interesting but insufficiently theorized. The manuscript would benefit from a conceptual diagram illustrating the progression from emotional awareness to resilience and meaning-making within the package structure.

Table 2 describing the 12-session protocol is comprehensive; however, the intervention content appears highly ambitious for adolescents with severe high-risk behaviors. For example, the combination of emotional regulation, gratitude, spirituality, assertiveness, coping self-efficacy, meaning-making, and resilience within only 12 sessions may create excessive cognitive and emotional load. The authors should justify session duration, pacing, and developmental appropriateness.

The Fourth Session objective includes “imagining life five years later in education, occupation, relationships, and personal interests.” While future-oriented exercises are useful, the authors should discuss the potential emotional impact of such exercises on adolescents with trauma histories, severe hopelessness, or unstable family contexts. Some adolescents may experience increased distress when confronted with idealized future imagery.

The Eleventh Session includes spirituality and moral values but states that “spirituality is not necessarily identical to religion.” Given the sociocultural context of the study, the authors should more carefully explain how spirituality was operationalized and how ideological neutrality was maintained during intervention design. The distinction between spirituality, religiosity, and moral education requires clearer conceptual treatment.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.