


# Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing on Participation and Emotional Skills in Learning Disabled Adults

Sara. Nejatifar<sup>1</sup>, Ahmad. Abedi<sup>1\*</sup>



<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

\* Corresponding author email address: a.abedi@edu.ui.ac.ir

### Editor

Zahra Yousefi   
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran.  
Email: yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Shahrokh Makvand Hoseini   
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Semnan University, Iran.  
Email: shmakvand@semnan.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Keivan Kakabraee   
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran. Email: keivan@iauksh.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction, you mention "Emotional self-efficacy refers to one's belief in their ability to manage emotions effectively" (p. 1). It would strengthen the argument to include a brief explanation of how emotional self-efficacy directly impacts learning outcomes in individuals with disabilities.

The intervention section outlines the structure of the MI sessions (p. 4). Adding a table summarizing each session's main activities and goals could enhance clarity and make it easier for readers to follow the intervention protocol.

The description of the SEAS and ESES scales is informative, but including their reliability coefficients (e.g., Cronbach's alpha) from this study or past research would add rigor (p. 4).

While you mention that participants were assessed at baseline, post-intervention, and at a five-month follow-up, the specific time intervals between these assessments should be explicitly stated (p. 4).

The statistical methods section describes using repeated measures ANOVA and Bonferroni post-hoc tests (p. 4). Consider explaining why these particular statistical tests were chosen over other potential methods.

In Table 1, the presentation of means and standard deviations for both groups at all time points is clear (p. 5). However, adding effect sizes (e.g., Cohen's d) for the differences observed would provide additional insight into the magnitude of the intervention's impact.

The ANOVA results indicate significant main effects and interactions (p. 5). Including a graphical representation (e.g., line graphs) of the mean scores over time for both groups could visually enhance the presentation of your findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The statement "Motivational Interviewing (MI) has shown promise in various contexts and could be particularly beneficial for this population" (p. 1) would benefit from a specific citation or two from recent meta-analyses or systematic reviews that highlight its effectiveness in similar populations.

You describe MI's principles briefly. Including a more detailed explanation of how these principles (expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance, and supporting self-efficacy) are applied in practice would provide clearer context for readers unfamiliar with MI (p. 1).

The inclusion criteria state that participants must "express willingness to engage in extracurricular activities" (p. 3). Please clarify how willingness was assessed and whether any baseline measures of motivation or engagement were used.

The Bonferroni post-hoc test results are well-presented (p. 6). To further strengthen this section, discuss any potential implications of the non-significant differences observed between post-intervention and follow-up scores.

The discussion would benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the practical significance of your findings. For example, what specific changes in behavior or skills might practitioners expect to see in learning-disabled adults who undergo MI? (p. 7)

The comparison to previous studies is thorough (p. 7). However, providing a brief summary of the limitations and strengths of these prior studies in relation to yours could better contextualize your contributions.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.