School Engagement as Predicted by Future Orientation and Academic Self-Efficacy

Jennifer. Torres[1], Daniel. Chen[2*], Beatriz. Peixoto[3]

[1] Department of Educational Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, USA
[2] Department of Psychology and Consulting, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
[3] Department of Family Counseling, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: daniel.chen@psych.ubc.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The definition of future orientation in paragraph two—"an individual's thoughts, plans, motivations, and feelings about the future"—is somewhat broad. It would enhance clarity to specify the theoretical framework underpinning this definition (e.g., socio-cognitive or developmental perspective).

The sentence "Academic self-efficacy, on the other hand, refers to students' beliefs in their capability to successfully perform academic tasks" (third paragraph of Introduction) should be expanded by explicitly linking it to Bandura's triadic reciprocal determinism model to situate the concept theoretically.

In the description of the Future Orientation Scale, the article notes that it assesses "planning ahead, motivation toward future goals, and consideration of future consequences." These subdimensions should be briefly defined to improve transparency regarding what each entails.

Under Academic Self-Efficacy, the authors mention that Cronbach's alpha values are "generally above 0.80" without providing the actual alpha for the present study. Please report the Cronbach's alpha obtained in this sample to support the scale's reliability.

The mean scores in Table 1 are informative, but the article lacks interpretation regarding whether these values represent high, moderate, or low levels relative to established norms. Consider contextualizing these scores.

The sentence "Normality of the data was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test…" could be strengthened by also including skewness and kurtosis values, which are common in educational psychology.

In Table 2, Pearson correlation coefficients are provided, but no confidence intervals are reported. Including 95% CIs would provide additional insight into the precision of the estimates.

The Discussion paragraph stating, "Students who believe in their capabilities are more likely to embrace learning opportunities…" would benefit from a more nuanced analysis. For instance, are certain domains of self-efficacy (e.g., verbal vs. quantitative) more predictive of engagement?

The statement, "These findings are aligned with the growing body of literature that highlights the central role of future orientation…" is general. Consider discussing whether future orientation plays a more prominent role in specific cultural or socioeconomic subgroups within the Canadian context.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the final paragraph of the Introduction, the authors write, "Thus, the present study aims to examine…" but do not clearly state a hypothesis. Adding a precise, testable hypothesis would improve the study's conceptual clarity.

The Measures section describing the School Engagement Scale lacks detail on cultural adaptation. Since the study is conducted in Canada, clarify whether the scale was validated for the Canadian adolescent population or adapted accordingly.

In the Data Analysis paragraph, the article claims that all assumptions were tested and met. However, no values for VIF or tolerance are reported. Please include these statistics to support the absence of multicollinearity.

The sample description in the Findings section (first paragraph) is comprehensive, but the ethnic or linguistic composition of the Canadian sample is omitted. This information is essential to evaluate generalizability, especially given the multicultural nature of Canadian society.

The Results section interpretation of Table 3 lacks a clear explanation of how the F value and R^2 interact. Consider elaborating on the model's effect size (e.g., Cohen's f^2) to contextualize the strength of the predictors.

The beta coefficients in Table 4 are well-reported, but the article should address potential overlap or redundancy between future orientation and self-efficacy as predictors. A semi-partial correlation or hierarchical regression could better delineate their unique contributions.

In the Discussion, the authors mention "goal-setting theory" but do not provide a reference or detailed integration. Strengthen this section by citing foundational work (e.g., Locke & Latham) and clearly linking it to the current findings.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.