

Article history:
Received 15 June 2025
Revised 10 September 2025
Accepted 18 September 2025
Initial Published 20 September 2025
Final Publication 10 October 2025

Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies

Open peer-review report



E-ISSN: 2981-2526

Presenting a Structural Model of the Effect of E-learning on Academic Self-concept with the Mediating Role of Self-regulation Strategies in Lower Secondary School Students in Miandoroud

Samaneh. Raofifar¹, Fatemeh Soghra. Sina^{2*}

¹ Department of Curriculum, Nek.C. Islamic Azad University, Neka, Iran
² Department of Educational Management, Nek.C. Islamic Azad University, Neka, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fa.sina@iau.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Trevor Archer®	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar 🗓
Professor Department of	Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of
Psychology University of	Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
Gothenburg, Sweden	Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir
trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com	Reviewer 2: Zahra Yousefi 👨
	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad
	University, Isfahan, Iran.
	Email: yousefi1393@khuisf.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The opening paragraph extensively describes the evolution of digital technologies but lacks a clear problem statement. It would strengthen the article to explicitly state the research gap—for example, "despite the rise of e-learning, its mechanism of influence on academic self-concept remains underexplored."

The sentence "E-learning environments demand a high degree of learner autonomy..." introduces self-regulation but does not provide an operational definition. Including a concise definition early would help readers unfamiliar with the construct.

The claim that "weak academic self-concept may undermine motivation and lead to disengagement" is valid but would benefit from citing empirical evidence or meta-analyses to enhance credibility.

The instruments listed (Social Responsibility, Organizational Work Trust, Job Attitudes questionnaires) are unrelated to the study constructs of e-learning, self-regulation, and academic self-concept. The methods section must accurately reflect the tools actually used (e.g., Watkins et al., 1990; Yesen Chen, 2006; Pintrich & De Groot, 1990 as mentioned in the abstract).

The paragraph reports Cronbach's alpha for the unrelated instruments, but not for the actual questionnaires mentioned in the abstract. Please include reliability coefficients (e.g., α values) for the e-learning, self-regulation, and academic self-concept scales used in the study.

The authors state "self-regulation significantly predicted academic self-concept" but do not discuss possible bidirectionality. Include a note that self-concept may also influence self-regulation, as suggested by reciprocal models.

The section referencing "Shariati (2024)... educational equity" is strong but could connect back to study implications by suggesting how equity scaffolds might be embedded in e-learning systems to support self-regulation development.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The discussion of equity (e.g., "Shariati (2024) argued that the design of virtual education systems must consider principles of educational equity") feels tangential and could be more explicitly linked to the mediating mechanism of self-regulation to maintain thematic coherence.

This paragraph states: "The statistical population of this study consisted of all 525 primary school teachers in Neka" which contradicts the title and abstract stating the sample was lower secondary school students in Miandoroud. This major inconsistency requires immediate correction.

The text states: "SEM based on the Partial Least Squares (PLS) approach through SmartPLS3" but later mentions "AMOS software". Clarify which software and SEM method were actually used (PLS-SEM vs CB-SEM), as this affects the interpretation of fit indices.

The description claims "students reported relatively high levels of e-learning" yet the means (M = 3.84, 3.67, 3.92) are not contextualized. Specify the scale range (e.g., 1-5) and provide interpretation guidelines to support this claim.

While linking findings to Lai (2021) and Kordi (2021), the discussion would benefit from explicitly explaining why elearning enhances self-concept (e.g., through autonomy, immediate feedback) instead of only stating it does.

The claim "digital learning environments inherently promote self-directed learning behaviors" may be overstated. Consider tempering this statement and acknowledging that contextual factors (e.g., teacher support, platform design) can moderate this effect.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

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

