



Predicting Parenting Styles in Parents of Children with Intellectual Disabilities Based on Emotional Self-Regulation, Integrative Self-Knowledge, and Resilience


Sadaf. Bakhti¹, Jahangir Karami^{2*}

¹ M.A, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran



² Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: j.karami@razi.ac.ir

Editor

Sefa Bulut¹
Associate Professor, Head of
Counseling Psychology and
Guidance Department, Ibn Haldun
University, Turkey
sefa.bulut@ihu.edu.tr

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mehdi Rostami¹
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada.
Email: dr.mrostami@kmanresce.ca
Reviewer 2: Mahdi Khanjani¹
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University,
Tehran, Iran.
Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the introduction paragraph beginning with “Parenting a child with an intellectual disability is a complex psychological, emotional, and relational experience...”, the authors provide a strong descriptive overview; however, the paragraph would benefit from integrating a theoretical framework (e.g., family stress model or transactional model) rather than remaining purely narrative, to anchor the study within an established conceptual structure.

In the paragraph stating “Parenting style is one of the most important dimensions of family functioning...”, the classification into three styles is presented without acknowledging contemporary expansions (e.g., neglectful/uninvolved style); this omission may limit conceptual completeness and should be addressed or justified explicitly.

The sentence “Studies on families of children with disabilities show that this caregiving context may expose parents to chronic stress...” relies on multiple citations but lacks synthesis; the authors should explicitly compare findings across cited studies rather than listing them, to demonstrate critical engagement with the literature.

In the paragraph beginning “Emotional self-regulation is one of the central psychological capacities...”, the construct is well defined, but the authors do not distinguish between trait-level and state-level regulation; this conceptual ambiguity should be resolved because it has implications for measurement and interpretation.

The sentence “Recent theoretical and empirical developments have emphasized that parental self-regulation must be understood as a dynamic process...” introduces a dynamic systems perspective; however, the study’s methodology (cross-sectional correlational design) does not align with this dynamic framing, and this inconsistency should be acknowledged in the limitations.

In the paragraph discussing integrative self-knowledge (“Another important psychological variable in this field is integrative self-knowledge...”), the authors introduce the construct but do not clearly differentiate it from related constructs such as self-concept clarity or metacognition; clearer conceptual boundaries are needed.

In Table 3 interpretation, the phrase “emotional self-regulation is the strongest predictor ($\beta = -0.485...$)” is accurate statistically, but the authors should also report confidence intervals and standardized effect size interpretation for greater rigor.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence “Resilience may influence parenting style through several pathways” outlines mechanisms, yet these pathways are not operationalized in the study design; the authors should clarify whether mediation or moderation was tested or if these claims remain purely theoretical.

In the “Study Design and Participants” section, the statement “following the researcher’s announcement, parents who were willing to participate... were selected using convenience sampling” introduces a clear selection bias; the authors should discuss how this may affect representativeness and internal validity.

The sentence “To determine the sample size, the method proposed by Schumacher and Lomax (2004)... was used” is appropriate, but the authors do not report the number of estimated parameters; this omission makes it difficult to verify the adequacy of the sample size calculation.

In the Measures section, the description of the Parenting Styles Questionnaire includes the phrase “The questionnaire is scored dichotomously (0 and 1)”; this is inconsistent with standard Likert-based scoring of the PPQ, and the authors must clarify whether a modified version was used.

The sentence “In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha for the questionnaire was calculated as 0.85” is reported for multiple instruments, but the authors do not provide subscale reliabilities; given the multidimensional nature of the constructs, subscale reliability should be reported.

In the Data Analysis section, the statement “Data analysis was conducted using Pearson correlation and multiple regression...” is overly brief; the authors should specify whether assumptions (normality, homoscedasticity, linearity) were tested prior to regression, although partially addressed later, integration here would improve clarity.

In the findings paragraph “In the present study, 147 fathers (47.9%) and 160 mothers (52.1%) participated”, the authors provide demographic distribution but do not analyze gender differences; given known gender effects in parenting, this is a missed analytical opportunity.

The interpretation following Table 2 includes the sentence “Overall, the correlation pattern underscores the importance of parenting styles...” which overstates correlational findings; causal language should be avoided and replaced with associative phrasing.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.