

# The Effectiveness of Choice Theory Training on Adolescent Crisis Management and Academic Motivation

Sara. Arbabi<sup>1</sup>, Hamidreza. Abbasi<sup>2\*</sup>, Mohammad Ali. Fardin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, Zah.C., Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology and Counseling, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

\* Corresponding author email address: hr.abbasi@cfu.ac.ir

| E d i t o r                                                                                                                                                    | R e v i e w e r s                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Izet Pehlić<br>Full professor for Educational sciences, Islamic pedagogical faculty of the University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina<br>izet.pehlic@unze.ba | <b>Reviewer 1:</b> Fahime Bahonar<br>Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.<br>Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir<br><b>Reviewer 2:</b> Zahra Yousefi<br>Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Z.yousefi1393@khuif.ac.ir |

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The description of the Crisis Management Questionnaire requires conceptual reconsideration. The manuscript states that the instrument “was originally developed to assess crisis management using an analytic network process and multicriteria decision-making framework” and that it measures pre-crisis, during-crisis, and post-crisis management. However, it is unclear whether the original instrument was developed and validated for adolescents or for organizational crisis-management contexts. This is a potentially serious measurement-validity issue because an organizational crisis-management scale may not validly represent adolescents’ personal crisis-management capacities. The authors should provide evidence that the wording, factor structure, and content are developmentally appropriate for secondary school students. If the questionnaire was adapted from an organizational instrument, the adaptation process, expert review, pilot testing, construct validity, and age-appropriate modifications must be described in detail.

In the Data Collection Tools section, the statement that the crisis-management questionnaire “consists of 18 items covering three major dimensions” conflicts with the Persian description that refers to “4 components” but then lists only three domains. The authors should verify the original instrument and correct this inconsistency. Moreover, psychometric information should go beyond the statement that “Cronbach’s alpha coefficient [was] greater than .70.” The manuscript should report reliability

estimates for the total score and each subscale in the current sample, preferably with exact coefficients rather than thresholds. If available, evidence of factorial validity should also be reported, because internal consistency alone does not establish construct validity.

Intervention fidelity and therapist-related variables should be addressed. The sentence “the choice theory training program was implemented for the experimental group by the researcher” raises the possibility of allegiance and implementation bias. The authors should report the interventionist’s professional qualifications, training in choice theory, experience working with adolescents, and whether a structured treatment manual was followed. It would also strengthen the study to describe how treatment fidelity was assessed, for example through session checklists, supervision, independent observation, or adherence ratings. Without such information, it is difficult to determine whether the intervention was delivered consistently across sessions and participants.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The description of Harter’s Academic Motivation Questionnaire requires more precise treatment of its scoring and construct interpretation. The manuscript states that “the questionnaire contains 33 items and assesses academic motivation along the dimensions of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation,” but it does not explain the possible score range, method for calculating subscale scores, interpretation of higher scores, or whether intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are treated as independent subscales or opposite poles of a single continuum. Because the original Harter instrument has a specific conceptual and scoring structure, the authors should verify that the Persian adaptation corresponds to the original instrument and explain any modifications. The scoring of reverse-keyed items should also be described in relation to the final interpretation of the two motivational dimensions.

The manuscript should report psychometric characteristics of the Academic Motivation Questionnaire in the present sample rather than relying primarily on previous Iranian studies. The paragraph currently cites historical reliability coefficients ranging from .74 to .92, but the abstract reports Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for academic motivation in the current study. This value should be incorporated into the Methods section and, ideally, separate reliability estimates should be provided for intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and the total score. Because repeated assessments were conducted, the authors may also consider reporting reliability at each measurement occasion if these estimates are available.

The intervention protocol is incomplete relative to the stated 12-session program. The manuscript describes the content of Sessions 1 through 8 in detail and then states that “the remaining sessions continued the consolidation and practical application of these choice theory principles.” This is insufficient for intervention reproducibility. The content, objectives, activities, homework assignments, and theoretical focus of Sessions 9–12 should be explicitly reported. A reader should be able to reconstruct the complete intervention from the manuscript or from a sufficiently detailed supplementary protocol. The authors should also indicate whether the intervention followed a published manual without modification or whether specific adaptations were made for adolescent participants.

In the intervention paragraph, the statement that “the content validity and appropriateness of the training protocol were reviewed by three specialists in psychology” is too vague. The manuscript should describe the qualifications and areas of expertise of these reviewers, the criteria used to assess intervention content, whether a formal content validity index or qualitative expert assessment was employed, and what modifications resulted from their review. Furthermore, the intervention is attributed to Gharizadeh et al. (2024) and theoretically grounded in Glasser’s choice theory, but the authors should clearly distinguish between the original theoretical framework and the particular intervention package used in the current study.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.