

Development of a “Power of Yet” Educational Package for Underachieving Gifted Students

Narjes. Amanimovahed¹, Mansoureh. Bahramipour Esfahani^{2*}, Zahra. Yousefi^{3, 4}

¹ Ph.D. Student of Educational Psychology, Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

³ Associate Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

⁴ Research Center for Behavioral and Psychological Science, Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: bahramipourisfahani@iau.ac.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Christian Wiesner ^{id} Professor at University College of Teacher Education in Lower Austria christian.wiesner@ph-noe.ac.at	Reviewer 1: Stephen C. L. Lau ^{id} Professor (Assistant) at Washington University in St. Louis, United States. Email: lauc@wustl.edu Reviewer 2: Mohsen Kachooei ^{id} Assistant Professor of Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, Humanities Faculty, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran. kachooei.m@usc.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The manuscript should provide a more rigorous conceptual definition of the central construct. The sentence “One of the most practical expressions of growth mindset theory is the concept of the ‘Power of Yet’” currently positions the construct as an application of growth mindset, but the manuscript does not clearly specify whether “Power of Yet” is being treated as an independent psychological construct, a pedagogical technique, a linguistic reframing strategy, or a multidimensional intervention framework developed by the authors. This distinction is fundamental because the thematic analysis ultimately assigns five broad domains to the construct. A formal operational definition should therefore be provided before the Methods section, together with a justification for why these domains constitute the “Power of Yet” rather than growth mindset more generally.

The statement in the Methods that the research employed “a deductive and literature-driven approach” requires greater procedural specificity. In deductive thematic analysis, the coding framework is normally informed by an explicit theoretical structure before or during coding. The authors should explain which constructs from Dweck’s intelligence-beliefs theory and the “Power of Yet” literature formed the initial coding framework, whether any codes emerged inductively despite the deductive

orientation, how theoretically anticipated codes were differentiated from data-derived codes, and how disagreements about code assignment were resolved. Without this information, it is difficult to assess how strongly the final thematic structure was determined by theory versus the reviewed texts.

The paragraph stating that “Attride-Stirling’s (2001) thematic analysis method was used” should be revised to demonstrate closer methodological fidelity to thematic network analysis. Attride-Stirling’s framework is not merely a generic sequence of coding and theme identification; it specifically involves the construction of basic, organizing, and global themes and the development, description, exploration, summarization, and interpretation of thematic networks. The authors should explicitly map each analytical stage used in this study onto the original framework and explain how basic themes were clustered into organizing themes and how organizing themes were subsequently integrated into global themes. A thematic network figure would significantly strengthen methodological transparency.

The sequencing of Sessions 1 and 8 deserves reconsideration. Session 1 combines “administration of the pretest” with introduction to the “Power of Yet,” growth mindset, positive self-attitudes, self-determination, and growth-oriented capacities, whereas Session 8 combines “training in resilience and risk-taking” with review, consolidation, and administration of the posttest. If the package is subsequently evaluated experimentally, administering outcome measures immediately after substantive instructional content in the same session could introduce short-term priming, fatigue, or testing effects. It would be methodologically preferable to distinguish assessment sessions from intervention sessions or, at minimum, explain why this structure was chosen.

The content-validation procedure should be reported with greater statistical precision. The manuscript states that “all five principal themes and all 22 basic themes were rated as essential by all six experts” and therefore “a CVR of 1.00 was obtained.” The authors should report CVR values at the item/component level rather than presenting only a single aggregate statement. Moreover, because content validity involves more than essentiality, the authors should consider whether a Content Validity Index (CVI) for relevance, clarity, and simplicity was also assessed or should be added. A CVR of 1.00 establishes unanimity regarding necessity among six experts, but it does not by itself demonstrate clarity, comprehensibility, appropriateness for gifted adolescents, or feasibility of delivery.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

There appears to be a numerical inconsistency between the reported thematic structure and Table 1. The manuscript states that “22 basic themes, 12 organizing themes, and five global themes” were identified; however, Table 1 appears to present substantially more than 12 organizing themes, including goal setting and learning management, challenges as opportunities for growth, progress along the path of intellectual growth, courage and persistence, acceptance of errors and failure, errors and failures as opportunities, optimal use of verbal feedback, self-determination, growth-oriented views of capacities, desire for success, modeling successful individuals, persistence, flexibility, risk-taking, and several others. The authors should recount all thematic levels and reconcile the numerical claims in the Abstract, Findings, Discussion, and tables. This is a major issue because the thematic hierarchy constitutes the principal result of the study.

Table 1 also requires conceptual and terminological clarification regarding the first column labeled “Intermediate Organizing Theme.” The five entries in this column—learning challenges, acceptance of errors and mistakes, insight and attitudes toward the self, determination and enthusiasm for success, and resilience and risk-taking—are described elsewhere in the manuscript as “global themes” or “principal dimensions.” The terminology should be standardized throughout the manuscript. If these are global themes in the Attride-Stirling framework, they should be labeled “Global Theme,” not “Intermediate Organizing Theme.” Similarly, the subsequent columns should correspond precisely to organizing and basic themes as defined by the selected analytic method.

The description of theoretical saturation should be strengthened. The Methods section states that “theoretical saturation was considered to have occurred when examination of three consecutive sources yielded no new codes or concepts.” This is a

relatively mechanical saturation rule, and the manuscript does not explain its methodological basis. The authors should justify why three consecutive sources were considered sufficient, explain whether saturation was assessed separately for each major thematic domain, and report approximately when saturation began to occur. It would also be useful to distinguish between “theoretical saturation,” a concept more traditionally associated with grounded theory, and informational or thematic saturation in a document-based thematic analysis.

The trustworthiness paragraph requires conceptual revision. The sentence “To ensure the credibility and dependability of the findings, the criteria proposed by Noble and Smith (2015), including utility, contextual completeness, researcher positioning, reporting method, and researcher triangulation, were observed” should be checked carefully against the cited methodological source and standard qualitative terminology. The authors should define each criterion accurately and explain concretely how it was implemented rather than merely asserting that it was satisfied. For example, “researcher positioning” should include a reflexive account of the researchers’ theoretical commitments, while “triangulation” should describe whether coding was conducted independently and subsequently compared, rather than simply indicating that multiple individuals participated.

The coding procedure should include an explicit assessment of coder agreement or a more detailed consensus process. The manuscript states that “the researcher, the academic supervisor, and a qualitative research specialist” participated in coding, but it is unclear whether all three independently coded the same texts, whether only a subset was double-coded, or whether the supervisor merely reviewed the researcher’s coding. The authors should report the exact procedure used to establish coding dependability. If an inter-coder coefficient was not calculated, the manuscript should describe how discrepancies were discussed, how final coding decisions were reached, and whether an audit trail or codebook was maintained.

The manuscript should provide substantially more information about the 35 included sources. At present, the reader cannot determine the distribution of books, journal articles, theses, and dissertations, the languages of publication, populations studied, methodological designs, or the proportion of sources specifically involving gifted students. Because the intervention is intended for underachieving gifted students, it is particularly important to demonstrate how much of the evidence base directly addressed this population rather than general growth-mindset research. A supplementary table listing author, year, source type, sample or population, principal construct, and contribution to the thematic framework would greatly improve transparency.

The transition from thematic analysis to intervention development is currently underexplained. The paragraph beginning “Following theme extraction, the six-stage method proposed by Yousefi and Golparvar (2023) was used” identifies the stages of package development, but it does not show how individual themes were translated into specific therapeutic or educational techniques. The authors should present an explicit theme-to-intervention mapping. For example, the theme “errors and failures as opportunities” should be linked to specific exercises, discussion prompts, behavioral activities, homework tasks, or cognitive-reframing procedures. Such mapping would demonstrate content fidelity and make the package reproducible for other researchers.

Table 2 is too abbreviated to constitute a reproducible intervention protocol. For instance, Session 2 is described only as “training in goal setting and learning management; learning challenges as opportunities for growth.” A scientifically usable intervention description should specify the duration of each session, session objectives, materials, instructional procedures, therapist/educator activities, student exercises, homework assignments, and methods for reviewing previous homework. The manuscript itself states that “behavioral definitions, objectives, strategies, and techniques” were developed for each session; therefore, at least a condensed version of these elements should be presented in the article or supplementary materials.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.