

Design and Effectiveness of a Choice Theory Educational Package on Academic Integration among Male High School Students in District Two of Kerman City

Mohsen. Bonyadi¹, Alireza. Manzari Tavakoli^{1*}, Zahra. Zeinaddiny Meymand¹, Amanallah. Soltani¹

¹ Department of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Ke.C., Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: a.manzari1336@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Seyed Hamid Atashpour ¹  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran hamidatashpour@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani ¹  Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Ali Khodaei ¹  Department of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: alikhodaei@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction's first paragraph, academic integration is defined broadly, but the manuscript later measures only academic progress and goal commitment in the tables. Please reconcile this mismatch by explaining why the five original dimensions of the questionnaire were reduced to two components.

The introduction states, "Male adolescents are especially vulnerable to motivational decline..." This claim requires stronger empirical support and should avoid overgeneralization unless evidence specific to male secondary students is cited.

In the paragraph beginning "Despite the growing body of evidence..." the research gap is relevant but underdeveloped. Please specify exactly what is novel: package design, target population, Iranian context, academic integration outcome, or follow-up evaluation.

In Methods, the first phase is described as "qualitative content analysis," but no details are provided about coding units, coders, coding procedure, agreement, or extracted themes. Please either fully report the qualitative method or describe it more accurately as a literature-based package development process.

In Data Analysis, only repeated-measures ANOVA is mentioned. Please report whether assumptions of independence, normality of residuals, equality of covariance matrices, and sphericity were checked for each dependent variable.

Table 1 includes only Academic Progress, Goal Commitment, and Academic Integration, while the questionnaire reportedly has five dimensions. Please explain why peer-group interaction, interaction with faculty members, and faculty concern were omitted.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The content validation process states that the package was reviewed by eight faculty members, but no quantitative validity indices are reported. Please add CVR, CVI, expert agreement percentage, or another recognized index.

In the sampling paragraph, the manuscript reports selecting 240 students, then choosing 60 students below the mean who were willing to participate. This creates a selected low-integration sample rather than a general student sample. Please explicitly acknowledge this and revise generalization claims.

The sentence “students who obtained scores below the mean were identified” is unclear. Please specify whether this mean refers to the total 240 screened students, questionnaire normative mean, or school-level mean.

Randomization is described, but allocation concealment and implementation are not reported. Please clarify who generated the random sequence, who assigned students to groups, and whether the assessor was blinded.

The control group “received no intervention,” which may introduce expectancy and attention bias. Please discuss this limitation and consider describing the control condition as waitlist control consistently.

The measure was originally developed for higher education contexts, including “interaction with faculty members.” Since the sample includes high school students, please justify the adaptation of “faculty members” to teachers and report any pilot testing or linguistic/contextual modification.

The Persian validation coefficients include subscale alphas as low as .60 and .61. Please discuss whether these reliability levels are acceptable for the current study and report Cronbach’s alpha for the present sample.

The intervention section mentions “behavior cards, competency cards, and ‘Little Bears’ World’ cards,” but their theoretical basis and usage are not sufficiently explained. Please add a table or appendix summarizing each session’s objectives, techniques, homework, and materials.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.