

Predicting Parenting Self-Efficacy from Parental Mindfulness and Perceived Social Support: The Moderating Role of Parenting Stress

Wakil. Asekun¹, Valentina. Rincón^{2*}

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Lagos, Lagos, Nigeria

² Department of Organizational Psychology, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia

* Corresponding author email address: v.rincon@uniandes.edu.co

Editor

Habib Hadianfard
Affiliation: Professor, Department
of Psychology, Shiraz University,
Iran
hadianfd@shirazu.ac.ir

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Abolghasem Khoshkanesh
Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran,
Iran.
Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Sara Nejatifar
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The Introduction makes the moderation argument in the paragraph beginning “This possibility provides a strong rationale for examining parenting stress as a moderator,” but the hypothesized direction should be stated more explicitly. The manuscript predicts that higher parenting stress weakens the positive relationships of mindfulness and social support with parenting self-efficacy, but this is only implied. The authors should formulate explicit hypotheses for the direct effects and both interaction effects. This would make the study confirmatory rather than merely exploratory and would allow readers to evaluate whether the reported interaction directions correspond to a priori expectations.

The Colombian context is introduced relatively late in the Introduction in the sentence “The need for an integrated model is particularly relevant in diverse sociocultural settings such as Colombia...,” yet the discussion remains general. Because the study is explicitly framed as a Colombian investigation, the manuscript should provide stronger empirical or contextual justification for conducting the research in Colombia. The authors should discuss relevant features such as family interdependence, extended-family support, socioeconomic heterogeneity, regional differences, caregiving norms, or access to

parenting and mental-health services, while avoiding unsupported cultural generalizations. The present formulation risks treating Colombia merely as the location of data collection rather than as a theoretically meaningful context.

The Data Analysis section states that “variables demonstrating meaningful theoretical or empirical associations with the dependent variable were considered for inclusion as covariates.” This approach may introduce data-dependent covariate selection and should be revised or justified. Covariates should ideally be selected a priori based on theory and prior evidence rather than significance in the current dataset, because significance-based covariate selection can produce unstable estimates and inflate researcher degrees of freedom. The authors should specify which variables were prespecified and why. If age, gender, education, and child age were selected after preliminary tests, that decision should be transparently reported and sensitivity analyses with and without covariates should be considered.

The Findings section reports that “preliminary comparisons indicated that parenting self-efficacy did not differ substantially according to participant gender or target-child gender, whereas modest associations were observed with parental education and parental age.” The phrase “did not differ substantially” is too vague for a quantitative manuscript. The relevant statistics, degrees of freedom, effect sizes, and p values should either be reported or the preliminary-testing statement should be removed. More importantly, the manuscript reports that gender was nevertheless retained as a covariate despite being nonsignificant, while child gender was not. The covariate-selection rationale should therefore be made consistent across the Methods and Findings.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Study Design and Participants section, the sentence “A total of 412 parents participated in the study” should be supplemented by a transparent sample-size justification. The manuscript states later that the sample was “adequate” for multiple regression and moderation analysis, but no a priori power analysis is reported. The authors should specify the assumed effect size for the interaction term, alpha level, desired statistical power, number of predictors/covariates, and software or formula used. Moderation effects are often substantially smaller than main effects, so an explicit power calculation is necessary to establish that the study was sufficiently powered to detect the reported ΔR^2 associated with the interaction terms.

The recruitment description states that participants were drawn from “Bogotá, Medellín, Cali, and Barranquilla through public and private educational institutions, parent associations, community organizations, and online parent networks.” This requires substantially greater methodological detail. The authors should report the approximate recruitment period, numbers approached or accessing the survey, exclusions, incomplete responses, duplicate-response prevention procedures, and the derivation of the final $N = 412$. A participant-flow description would be helpful even if no formal CONSORT diagram is needed. Without this information, it is difficult to assess potential selection bias and the extent to which the final analytic sample represents the intended parent population.

In the Study Design and Participants section, the instruction that parents with multiple eligible children should respond regarding “the child whose birthday was closest to the date on which the questionnaire was completed” is methodologically useful, but the authors should justify this procedure and clarify whether it was implemented prospectively. This detail also has implications for measurement because several instruments may ask respondents about general parenting rather than parenting toward one specific child. The authors should explain whether all parenting self-efficacy, mindfulness, and stress items were explicitly anchored to the selected target child and whether the wording of validated instruments was modified accordingly. Any modification to standardized questionnaire instructions should be reported because it may affect validity.

The Data Collection Tools section should provide substantially more precise psychometric and bibliographic information for every instrument. For example, the paragraph beginning “Parenting self-efficacy, the dependent variable of the study, was assessed using the Parenting Sense of Competence Scale” does not identify the version, original number of items, exact number of items used, response anchors, scoring direction, subscale composition, or validated Spanish adaptation. The same issue

applies to the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting Scale and Parenting Stress Index–Short Form. The authors should cite the original instrument-development studies and the exact Spanish-language validation studies used for Colombian or Spanish-speaking populations. Reliability coefficients obtained in the current sample are useful but cannot substitute for evidence of construct validity and linguistic equivalence.

The operationalization of parenting self-efficacy requires clarification. The manuscript states, “For the objectives of the present study, particular emphasis was placed on the efficacy component,” but then refers to a “total parenting self-efficacy score.” The Parenting Sense of Competence Scale conventionally contains efficacy and satisfaction dimensions, and these should not be conflated without justification. The authors must specify exactly which items were included in the dependent variable, the theoretical score range for those items, whether any items were reverse-scored, and whether the factor structure of the efficacy subscale was confirmed in the Colombian sample. A confirmatory factor analysis or at least dimensionality assessment would considerably strengthen the measurement validity of the outcome variable.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.