




Article history:  
Received 07 January 2026  
Revised 05 April 2026  
Accepted 09 April 2026  
Published 12 April 2026

# Comparison of the Effectiveness of Self-Esteem Training and Self-Control Skills Training on Academic Emotions and Academic Buoyancy among Sixth-Grade Male Elementary School Students in Falavarjan

Iman. Esmaili Souderjani<sup>1</sup>, Ahmad. Ghazanfari<sup>2\*</sup>, Tayebeh. Sharifi<sup>3</sup>


<sup>1</sup> PhD Student in Educational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Shk.C., Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Shk.C., Islamic, Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran



<sup>3</sup> Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Shk.C., Islamic, Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: a.ghazanfari@iaushk.ac.ir

### 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:** 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 opening paragraph beginning with “Academic functioning in contemporary educational psychology has increasingly been conceptualized...”, the authors provide a broad conceptualization but do not explicitly anchor the discussion in a specific theoretical framework (e.g., control-value theory or self-determination theory). Strengthening this section with a clearly articulated theoretical lens would enhance coherence and analytical depth.

The definition “Academic emotions refer to the range of affective experiences...” is appropriate but lacks distinction between trait vs. state emotions and domain-specific vs. generalized emotions. Clarifying these distinctions would improve conceptual precision and align with contemporary literature.

The inclusion criterion “had no acute or chronic physical or psychological disorders” is vague and raises concerns about how this was assessed (self-report, medical records, screening tools). Clarification is necessary to ensure reproducibility.

In the Measures section, combining hope, curiosity, and empathy under “academic emotions” may raise construct validity issues, as empathy is not typically classified as an academic emotion in standard frameworks. The authors should justify this conceptual decision or reconsider the construct labeling.

The manuscript reports Cronbach’s alpha values from previous studies (e.g., “Litman et al. (2010) reported...”), but does not provide reliability coefficients for the current sample. This omission weakens methodological transparency and should be addressed.

The description of interventions (e.g., “eight 90-minute weekly group sessions”) is detailed but lacks information on treatment fidelity, facilitator training, or adherence checks. Including these elements would strengthen internal validity.

The sentence “assumptions of covariance analysis were examined” is inconsistent with the later use of repeated measures ANOVA. This suggests either a conceptual confusion or a reporting error that should be corrected.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph discussing self-esteem (“Self-esteem, defined as an individual’s overall evaluation...”), multiple citations are presented, but the synthesis remains largely descriptive. The authors should engage in critical integration, highlighting inconsistencies or debates in the literature rather than listing supportive findings only.

The paragraph beginning “Parallel to self-esteem, self-control has been identified...” partially repeats arguments already made regarding academic outcomes and emotional regulation. This redundancy could be reduced by condensing overlapping statements and focusing on unique contributions of self-control.

The claim “there remains a need for comparative studies...” is valid but insufficiently substantiated. The authors should explicitly cite studies that failed to compare these interventions or demonstrate gaps in prior comparative designs to strengthen the research justification.

The statement “90 students were selected using purposive sampling” introduces a potential selection bias, which is not adequately discussed. The authors should justify this sampling strategy and explain how it may affect internal and external validity.

The sentence “75 participants were randomly assigned...” lacks detail regarding the randomization procedure (e.g., simple randomization, block randomization). Providing this information is essential for evaluating methodological rigor.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.