







Comparison of The Effectiveness of Training in Effective Teaching Strategies and A Behavior Management Program on The Self-Concept of Students with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Mozhgan. Rahmani¹, Shaban. Heydari^{1*}, Seyedeh Hamideh. Salim Bahrani¹

¹ Department of Educational Psychology, Sar.C., Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Shabanheydari@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Anela Hasanagic  Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina anela.hasanagic@unze.ba	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani  Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mohammadreza Zarbakhsh Bahri  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.Zarbakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph of the Introduction, the manuscript describes ADHD broadly but does not clearly operationalize how ADHD is conceptualized in the study (e.g., behavioral symptoms vs. cognitive deficits). Adding a concise definition tailored to the study's variables would strengthen conceptual alignment.

In paragraph 3 of the Introduction, the sentence "Students with ADHD often internalize repeated academic failures..." is accurate but too generalized. Please add nuance, as the manuscript evaluates self-concept, not necessarily academic performance alone.

The transition between the paragraphs discussing self-regulation and educational environments feels abrupt. The paragraph beginning "Educational environments... significantly influence the academic and psychological outcomes of students with ADHD" should explicitly connect how instructional quality influences self-concept, the study's main variable.

Some Introduction sections, especially the long paragraph on attachment styles, extend beyond the core variables. For instance, the paragraph beginning "Another domain highly relevant to the formation of self-concept and emotional functioning is attachment" introduces constructs not measured in this study, which could reduce focus. Consider shortening or linking more directly to intervention relevance.

In the Methods section, the paragraph describing the selection of 45 students from 5 randomly selected schools lacks detail on how ADHD diagnoses were verified beyond teacher ratings. Clarify whether clinical confirmation or medical documentation was required.

Several Discussion paragraphs (e.g., the one beginning “Comparisons with previous studies on resilience...”) make strong claims unrelated to measured variables such as resilience or anxiety. Consider narrowing interpretations to measured outcomes.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Using variance as the dispersion criterion for the estimator, a sample size of 45 students was obtained” is vague. Specify the exact test family (ANOVA repeated-measures? between factors?) and the parameters used (effect size, α , power).

In the paragraph beginning “The Conners Teacher Rating Scale (ADHD in children) was completed by teachers...”, relying solely on teacher report may introduce bias. Consider acknowledging this limitation or discussing why teacher-only assessment was chosen.

The description of the interventions is rich, but the paper does not describe how fidelity was checked. For example, in the Behavior Management Program paragraph that begins “Week 1 focused on parent training...”, indicate whether session checklists or observer ratings were used.

The Methods section states “the control group received no intervention”, but does not specify whether they had regular classroom activities only. Clarify whether they received business-as-usual instruction and whether any contact effects could influence outcomes.

In the Measures section, the description of the Piers–Harris scale explains subscales, but the manuscript does not indicate which subscales were analyzed. Yet, the Results present “positive direction,” “negative direction,” and “self-evaluation,” which do not directly match the six Piers–Harris domains. Define how these composite indices were constructed.

Table 1 reports behavior management posttest mean = 33.15, which is drastically lower than the pretest (52.40), contradicting later claims that both interventions improved self-concept. Re-examine or clarify this discrepancy, as it appears to indicate a large decrease in self-concept.

The paragraph beginning “For both the self-concept pretest... the obtained p-values were greater than 0.05” interprets normality correctly but does not report which test was used (e.g., Shapiro–Wilk). Please specify.

The statement “the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was violated... it was still possible to proceed” should include justification, such as robustness of MANOVA under equal group sizes, rather than simply stating sensitivity to sample size.

In Table 2 and Table 3, effect sizes (η^2) are reported, but confidence intervals are not provided. Consider reporting CIs or partial η^2 if appropriate for repeated-measures designs.

In Table 5, the mean differences for some comparisons are repeated verbatim (e.g., “17.48 *” appears twice under different I/J configurations). Adjust the table to avoid redundant entries and ensure each row represents a unique comparison.

In the Discussion, the opening paragraph states “both interventions produced significant improvements in students’ self-concept”, which contradicts the sharp mean reduction in Table 1 for the behavior management group. This inconsistency requires reconciliation.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.