




The Effectiveness of Islamic Spirituality Training on Academic Well-Being, Achievement Motivation, and Academic Affect




Moslem. Bamari¹, Zeynab. Rashidizadeh², Mohammad. Elahi^{3*}

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of General and Islamic Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Saravan, Saravan, Iran

² Master of Educational Psychology, Payam Noor University, Yasuj, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies Yasuj University of Medical Sciences, Yasuj, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Mohammad.amirabad@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
<p>Izet Pehlić Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina izet.pehlic@unze.ba</p>	<p>Reviewer 1: Farhad Namjoo Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca</p> <p>Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir</p>

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the paragraph discussing psychological distress and academic pressure among adolescents, the statement “Students today face multiple stressors related to academic competition...” is overly generalized and insufficiently contextualized within the Iranian educational system. The manuscript would be strengthened by including national or regional statistics regarding adolescent stress, academic burnout, or mental health trends in Tehran or Iran to justify the practical necessity of the intervention.

The paragraph introducing Islamic spirituality provides a broad conceptual overview but lacks operational clarity regarding the intervention’s underlying dimensions. Specifically, the sentence “Islamic spirituality emphasizes the relationship between the individual and God through practices such as prayer...” would benefit from specifying which components were translated into measurable training activities. Without a clearer operational definition, replication of the intervention becomes difficult.

The description of the Academic Well-Being Questionnaire lacks sufficient psychometric detail. The paragraph beginning “Academic well-being was assessed using the Academic Well-Being Questionnaire...” should report Cronbach’s alpha

coefficients, validity indices, and evidence from Iranian validation studies rather than only stating that “appropriate reliability and validity” were confirmed. Such information is essential for evaluating measurement quality.

The intervention section states that “Group discussions, guided reflection, recitation and interpretation of selected religious texts...” were used during training sessions; however, no session-by-session protocol is provided. Given that this is an intervention study, the manuscript should include a detailed intervention table or appendix specifying session objectives, techniques, homework assignments, and spiritual themes to allow replication and evaluation of treatment fidelity.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The literature review section contains numerous supportive citations; however, it remains predominantly descriptive rather than analytical. For example, the paragraph beginning “Recent studies have highlighted the positive relationship between spirituality and psychological well-being...” summarizes findings without critically evaluating inconsistencies, methodological limitations, or cultural variability in prior research. A more critical synthesis is needed to demonstrate the originality of the present study.

The paragraph discussing Islamic educational approaches states that “Holistic educational models within Islamic contexts seek to develop not only academic competence but also ethical awareness...”; however, the manuscript does not clarify whether the intervention was grounded in a particular Islamic educational philosophy, theological school, or culturally localized framework. Clarifying the doctrinal or pedagogical orientation would enhance conceptual precision and cultural validity.

The rationale for focusing specifically on adolescents aged 15–18 remains underdeveloped. In the paragraph discussing academic motivation and spirituality, the authors should explain why adolescence constitutes a particularly appropriate developmental period for spirituality-based interventions, potentially referencing identity development, emotional regulation maturation, or existential meaning formation.

The statement “Despite the growing body of research concerning spirituality and psychological well-being, relatively limited attention has been devoted to the direct effectiveness...” appropriately identifies a research gap, but the manuscript does not adequately specify how the current study advances beyond prior studies methodologically or conceptually. The novelty section should explicitly clarify whether the innovation lies in the intervention structure, combined dependent variables, adolescent sample, Iranian context, or longitudinal follow-up design.

In the “Study Design and Participants” section, the use of purposive sampling combined with random assignment requires further methodological clarification. Specifically, the authors should explain how participants were screened for “lower than average scores” on academic well-being and achievement motivation and whether predetermined cutoff scores or normative data were used. The absence of these details raises concerns regarding sampling transparency and reproducibility.

The inclusion criteria mention the “absence of severe psychological disorders according to school counseling records,” yet no information is provided regarding diagnostic procedures, counselor qualifications, or standardized screening instruments. This omission may weaken internal validity because unmeasured psychological conditions could influence responsiveness to the intervention.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.