

The Relationship of Classroom Emotion, Self-Compassion, and Tolerance of Ambiguity with Academic Anxiety among Female Senior High School Students in District 9 of Karaj

Maryam. Mohamadbeiki Khortabi¹, Morteza. Tarkhan^{2*}

¹ Department of Psychology, Ayandegan University, Tonekabon, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University (PNU), P.o.box .19395-4697, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Mttmaster20@yahoo.com

Editor

Anela Hasanagic
Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mehdi Rostami
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca
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 first paragraph of the abstract, the sentence “This study aimed to examine the relationship between classroom emotion, self-compassion, and tolerance of ambiguity with academic anxiety” is appropriate, but the abstract should report the non-significant role of tolerance of ambiguity more explicitly. Since tolerance of ambiguity is included in the title and research model but did not correlate significantly with academic anxiety or enter the regression model, the abstract should state this finding directly to prevent overgeneralization.

In the introduction paragraph where academic anxiety is described as a broad educational and psychological problem, the discussion would benefit from a clearer distinction among academic anxiety, test anxiety, school-related stress, and achievement emotions. These constructs overlap but are not identical; therefore, the authors should define academic anxiety operationally and theoretically before introducing classroom emotion, self-compassion, and tolerance of ambiguity as predictors.

In the data collection procedure paragraph, the authors mention that informed consent was obtained from students, but the participants were high school students and may include minors. The manuscript should clarify whether parental consent, student

assent, school approval, and ethics committee approval were obtained. This is essential for studies involving adolescent participants in school settings.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the introduction paragraph discussing control-value theory, the manuscript states that students' academic emotions are shaped by perceived control and task value. This theoretical framework is relevant, but the authors should more clearly connect it to the selected predictor "classroom emotion." Specifically, they should explain how emotional support, emotional struggle, and emotional capacity in the Classroom Emotion Scale map onto control-value theory mechanisms such as perceived control, subjective value, and threat appraisal.

In the introduction paragraph on classroom emotion, the sentence "Students do not learn in emotionally neutral spaces" is conceptually strong, but it should be followed by a more specific rationale for why classroom emotion may be especially predictive among female senior high school students in Karaj. The manuscript would be improved by adding context about senior high school academic pressure, examination culture, gender-related educational expectations, or classroom interaction patterns in the Iranian school system.

In the introduction paragraph on self-compassion, the manuscript appropriately describes self-compassion as self-kindness, mindfulness, and common humanity; however, the authors should strengthen the causal logic by explaining how self-compassion may reduce academic anxiety through lower self-criticism, reduced fear of failure, improved emotion regulation, and less catastrophic interpretation of academic mistakes. This would create a stronger conceptual bridge between the predictor and the outcome.

In the introduction paragraph on tolerance of ambiguity, the rationale is theoretically plausible, but the manuscript should acknowledge that tolerance of ambiguity may not have a direct relationship with academic anxiety in structured school contexts. Since the actual findings showed no significant correlation between tolerance of ambiguity and academic anxiety, the introduction should be balanced enough to allow for the possibility of indirect, conditional, or context-dependent effects.

In the methods section, the sentence "The present study was applied in terms of its objective, quantitative in terms of data type, descriptive in terms of nature, and correlational in terms of research method" is acceptable but somewhat formulaic. The authors should revise this paragraph to state the research design more scientifically as a cross-sectional descriptive-correlational study and clarify that no intervention, manipulation, or temporal follow-up was conducted.

In the sampling paragraph, the sample size justification requires further clarification. The manuscript states that G*Power estimated a base sample size of approximately 77 participants, but the final sample was increased to 210 after considering cluster structure, ICC = 0.05, design effect, and 15% attrition. The authors should provide the exact design effect formula, assumed average cluster size, and calculation steps, because the increase from 77 to 210 is substantial and cannot be evaluated without these details.

In the participant selection paragraph, the manuscript states that schools were selected through multistage cluster sampling and students were finally selected through convenience sampling. This creates a methodological inconsistency because the final stage introduces non-probability sampling. The authors should explicitly describe this as multistage cluster sampling with convenience selection at the student level, and they should acknowledge that this limits the representativeness and generalizability of the findings.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.