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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript makes an important contribution to the field of educational psychology by addressing the underexplored link between cognitive-emotional appraisals and classroom learning. The development and testing of a diagnostic tool for assessing students’ self-perceptions provides both theoretical and practical value. Its findings are relevant for advancing adaptive teaching approaches and may support teachers in better understanding and responding to students’ emotional and cognitive states. By focusing on 13-year-old learners, the study also adds valuable empirical evidence for this critical developmental stage. |  |
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