

Modeling Family Quality of Life Based on Economic Pressure, Family Adaptability, Hope, and Emotional Support: The Mediating Role of Psychological Well-Being

Mikko. Salonen¹, Liam. Desrosiers^{2*}, Stefan. Leitner³


¹ Department of Psychology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

² Department of Behavioral Neuroscience, Laval University, Quebec City, Canada



³ Department of Cognitive Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

* Corresponding author email address: liam.desrosiers@ulaval.ca

Editor

Shahram Vahedi¹
Professor, Department of
Educational Psychology, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and
Psychology, Tabriz University,
Tabriz, Iran
vahedi117@yahoo.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Thseen Nazir¹
Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University,
Istanbul, Turkey.
Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr
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:

The paragraph discussing economic pressure includes the statement “These findings suggest that economic pressure may represent a significant risk factor for family quality of life by limiting resources, increasing psychological burden, and reducing adaptive coping capacities.” While theoretically plausible, the manuscript does not adequately explain why psychological well-being was selected as the mediator instead of alternative mechanisms such as resilience, perceived stress, family cohesion, or coping strategies. A stronger theoretical justification for mediator selection is needed.

In the paragraph beginning with “Although economic pressure constitutes a major source of family stress, families differ considerably in their ability to respond effectively to adverse circumstances,” the construct of family adaptability is discussed extensively, yet the manuscript does not clearly differentiate adaptability from family resilience. Since both constructs are conceptually overlapping in the literature, the authors should clarify their distinctions and justify why adaptability was chosen as the predictor variable.

The paragraph introducing hope states that “Hope contributes to resilience, perseverance, emotional stability, and adaptive coping.” However, the manuscript lacks a discussion of Snyder’s Hope Theory and its agency and pathways components despite later employing the Adult Hope Scale. The theoretical foundation would be substantially strengthened by explicitly linking the operationalization of hope to the proposed SEM pathways.

Table 1 reports a very strong correlation between psychological well-being and family quality of life ($r = .78$). Such a high correlation raises potential concerns regarding conceptual overlap and discriminant validity. The authors should conduct and report additional analyses demonstrating that these constructs are empirically distinct and not measuring substantially overlapping dimensions.

In the paragraph interpreting Table 2, the authors conclude that “These findings confirmed the construct validity of the measurement model.” However, construct validity cannot be established solely through global fit indices. Evidence of convergent validity (AVE), composite reliability, and discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion or HTMT ratios) should be reported before making this conclusion.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning with “In addition to hope, emotional support constitutes a central component of family and social functioning,” emotional support is conceptualized primarily from a social support perspective. Nevertheless, the manuscript does not explain whether emotional support originates from family members, spouses, friends, or broader social networks. Given the family-centered nature of the study, clarification regarding the source of emotional support is necessary.

The paragraph introducing psychological well-being contains the sentence “Psychological well-being encompasses positive functioning across multiple domains, including self-acceptance, personal growth, environmental mastery, positive interpersonal relationships, autonomy, and purpose in life.” Considering that Ryff’s multidimensional model was used, the authors should explain whether psychological well-being was modeled as a higher-order latent construct or whether its six dimensions were incorporated separately within the CFA and SEM analyses.

In the final Introduction paragraph, the authors state “Third, limited research has simultaneously considered both risk factors and protective resources while examining the mediating role of psychological well-being.” This claim requires stronger empirical support. A more systematic synthesis of prior studies should be presented to demonstrate precisely how the current model differs from existing family quality-of-life models and what specific knowledge gap it addresses.

In the Methods section, the sentence “Participants were recruited through community centers, family support organizations, social media platforms, and online survey distribution networks” lacks sufficient methodological detail. The authors should specify the exact recruitment procedures, response rates, geographical distribution of respondents, duration of data collection, and strategies employed to minimize sampling bias associated with online recruitment.

The paragraph reporting that “A total of 612 participants were initially recruited. After screening for missing data, response inconsistencies, and multivariate outliers, 587 participants met the inclusion criteria” requires substantially greater transparency. The authors should report the exact number of cases removed for each exclusion criterion, the method used to identify multivariate outliers (e.g., Mahalanobis distance), and the thresholds applied during data screening.

In the Measures section, the paragraph describing the Family Quality of Life Scale notes that “Previous studies have demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties.” However, no reliability or validity indices from the present sample are reported. Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and factor loadings for the current dataset should be provided rather than relying solely on previous studies.

The paragraph “All instruments used in the study have demonstrated satisfactory validity and reliability in previous empirical investigations” is insufficient for SEM research. The manuscript should include a separate measurement validation subsection

presenting convergent validity, discriminant validity, common method bias diagnostics, and inter-construct correlations to demonstrate the adequacy of the latent measurement model.

In the Data Analysis section, the authors state “assumptions of normality, multicollinearity, linearity, and absence of significant outliers were assessed.” However, no empirical results are reported. The manuscript should provide skewness and kurtosis statistics, variance inflation factors (VIFs), tolerance values, Mahalanobis distance criteria, and normality diagnostics to verify compliance with SEM assumptions.

In the Findings section, the paragraph beginning with “The final sample consisted of 587 married adults residing in Canada” provides demographic information but lacks sufficient diversity indicators. Given the multicultural Canadian context, it would be valuable to report ethnicity, immigration status, language spoken at home, and province-level representation, as these variables may influence family quality of life and psychological well-being.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.