

# The Relationship of Responsibility, Self-Esteem, and Peer Interaction with Perceived Social Competence in Gifted Students


Majid. Baradaran<sup>1</sup>, Malihah Fallah Abadi<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran



<sup>2</sup> M.A. in General Psychology, Payame Noor University, Astaneh-ye Ashrafieh Branch, Astaneh-ye Ashrafieh, Gilan, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: Farhad.tyam71@gmail.com

### E d i t o r

Shahrooz Nemati<sup>1</sup>  
Professor, Department of  
Educational Sciences, Faculty of  
Educational Science and  
Psychology, University of Tabriz,  
Iran  
Sh.Nemati@Tabrizu.ac.ir

### R e v i e w e r s

**Reviewer 1:** Hooman Namvar<sup>1</sup>  
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Saveh Branch, Islamic Azad  
University, Saveh, Iran. Email: hnamvar@iau-saveh.ac.ir  
**Reviewer 2:** Thseen Nazir<sup>1</sup>  
Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University,  
Istanbul, Turkey.  
Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph stating “Perceived social competence refers to an individual’s evaluation of their ability...” would benefit from clearer operational differentiation between perceived social competence and actual social competence. The manuscript currently conflates self-perceived social functioning with objectively observable social skills. The authors should discuss whether the construct measured reflects subjective self-appraisal or actual behavioral competence and explain the implications of relying solely on self-report data for this distinction.

The literature review contains numerous references to psychosocial vulnerabilities among gifted students; however, the manuscript does not sufficiently acknowledge contradictory evidence indicating that many gifted adolescents demonstrate normative or even superior social adjustment. For example, the paragraph beginning with “The social-emotional functioning of gifted students has become a major area of interest...” emphasizes maladjustment narratives without adequately balancing strengths-based findings. The authors should provide a more nuanced and balanced synthesis of the literature.

The rationale for selecting only male gifted students is not adequately justified. In the “Study Design and Participants” section, the sentence “The statistical population of this study consisted of all gifted male students in Rasht...” raises concerns regarding gender bias and limited generalizability. The authors should either provide a strong theoretical or practical justification for excluding female students or explicitly discuss how gender-related psychosocial differences may limit interpretation of the findings.

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics that appear problematic in terms of scale interpretation. Specifically, the mean score for self-esteem is reported as 8.09 despite the use of a 10-item scale with a 5-point response structure. This value appears implausibly low and raises questions regarding scoring procedures, reverse coding, or reporting accuracy. The authors should clarify whether raw, averaged, or transformed scores were used.

In Table 2, the correlation matrix formatting is incomplete and statistically inconsistent. The numbering of variables is inaccurate because “7. Peer Interaction” appears outside the original six-variable structure. Additionally, the manuscript does not report confidence intervals for correlation coefficients or address possible multicollinearity among predictors. The authors should revise the table formatting and provide more comprehensive statistical reporting.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sampling procedure requires substantial clarification. The manuscript states that purposive sampling was used and simultaneously mentions selection based on the Morgan Table. These approaches represent conceptually different sampling strategies. The authors should clarify whether the sample was census-based, purposive, convenience-based, or statistically determined through power analysis. In addition, the criteria used for identifying students as “gifted” should be explicitly reported, including IQ thresholds, admission procedures, or institutional criteria used by SAMPAD schools.

The ethical procedures described in the paragraph beginning “After coordination with the Guilan Province Department of Education...” are insufficient for publication in an international scientific journal. The manuscript mentions informed consent from students but does not specify whether parental consent was obtained for minors, whether ethical approval was granted by an institutional review board, or whether an ethics approval code exists. These omissions should be corrected.

The measurement section lacks psychometric validation for the current sample. For example, in the paragraph describing the “Mergler and Shield Responsibility Questionnaire,” the authors report Cronbach’s alpha values from previous studies but fail to provide reliability coefficients obtained in the present sample. Internal consistency coefficients, confirmatory factor analysis indices, or at minimum Cronbach’s alpha values for each scale in the current dataset should be reported.

The description of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale contains a methodological inconsistency. The manuscript states that the questionnaire uses a “5-point scale ranging from ‘Strongly Agree’ to ‘Strongly Disagree,’” whereas the original Rosenberg scale traditionally employs a 4-point Likert structure. The authors should verify whether a modified version was used and, if so, explain the adaptation process and its psychometric implications.

The manuscript repeatedly cites “Rosenberg and Lane (1991)” and “Hudson et al. (1993)” in the psychometric descriptions, but these references are absent from the reference list. This discrepancy raises concerns regarding citation accuracy and scholarly rigor. All cited works must appear in the reference section and conform to APA formatting standards.

The “Data Analysis” section is underdeveloped and insufficiently detailed for reproducibility. The sentence “The data were analyzed using correlation analysis and regression analysis with SPSS-23 software” is overly simplistic. The authors should specify assumption testing procedures, effect size interpretation criteria, multicollinearity diagnostics, normality indices, and rationale for using stepwise regression, which is widely criticized for capitalizing on chance variance.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.