

The Relationship Between Gender Schema and Dysfunctional Sexual Beliefs with the Mediating Role of Psychological Hardiness in Women

Soodabeh. Sarkhosh¹, Naser. Amini^{2*}, Moloud. Keykhosrovani²

¹ Department of Psychology, Bu.C., Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Bu.C., Islamic Azad University, Bushehr, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: Amini.n@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Anela Hasanagic^{id}
Full Professor, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Islamic Education, University of Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina
anela.hasanagic@unze.ba

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Parvaneh Mohammadkhani^{id}
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Rehabilitation Sciences and Social Health, Tehran, Iran. Email: Pa.mohammadkhani@uswr.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mohammadreza ZARBakhsh Bahri^{id}
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran. Email: M.ZARBakhsh@Toniau.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, paragraph 1 (“Dysfunctional sexual beliefs are often rooted in culturally transmitted norms...”), the authors provide a general conceptualization but fail to operationally define “dysfunctional sexual beliefs” in measurable terms consistent with the SDBQ used later. It is recommended to explicitly connect the conceptual definition to the subscales of the instrument to enhance construct validity and theoretical coherence.

In the Introduction, paragraph 2 (“Gender schema theory posits that individuals internalize societal definitions...”), the discussion remains largely theoretical and lacks critical engagement with competing models (e.g., social role theory or intersectionality perspectives). The authors should expand this paragraph to justify why gender schema theory is the most appropriate framework for this study.

In the Introduction, paragraph 3 (“In many societies, women are socialized to adopt passive or restrictive roles...”), the argument would benefit from contextualization within the Iranian or Bushehr cultural setting. The current wording is overly generalized and does not sufficiently justify the cultural specificity of the sample.

In the Introduction, paragraph 4 (“Psychological hardiness is characterized by a combination of commitment, control, and challenge...”), although the construct is well introduced, there is no explanation of why hardiness is hypothesized as a mediator rather than a moderator. The authors should provide a theoretical rationale for selecting mediation over alternative models.

In the Data Analysis section (“Model fit indices and path coefficients were examined...”), the authors do not report which fit indices were used (e.g., CFI, RMSEA, TLI). This omission is critical, as SEM evaluation requires explicit reporting of model fit criteria.

In the Findings section, Table 1 (“Descriptive Statistics...”), although skewness and kurtosis are reported, the authors do not specify acceptable thresholds or cite criteria. Providing references or thresholds (e.g., ± 2 or ± 3) would strengthen the justification for normality.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Introduction, paragraph 6 (“Recent studies have also emphasized the role of cognitive and metacognitive processes...”), the integration of metacognition appears tangential, as it is not included in the study model. This paragraph weakens conceptual focus and should either be directly tied to the variables studied or removed to maintain theoretical parsimony.

In the final paragraph of the Introduction (“Despite the growing body of literature...”), the research gap is described in broad terms. However, the authors should explicitly state what is novel about combining gender schema, psychological hardiness, and dysfunctional sexual beliefs within an SEM framework, beyond simply noting a lack of integrative models.

In the Methods section, Study Design and Participants (“A convenience sampling method was used...”), the reliance on convenience sampling introduces potential selection bias. The authors should discuss how this may affect external validity and whether any steps were taken to mitigate sampling bias.

In the same section (“The sample size was determined using Cochran’s formula...”), the authors mention parameters (confidence level, proportion, margin of error) but do not provide the formula or calculation steps. Including these details would enhance methodological transparency.

In the Measures section, paragraph on SDBQ (“Previous research has confirmed the reliability...”), the authors report that reliability was “above acceptable thresholds” but do not provide exact Cronbach’s alpha values for the current sample. Reporting these coefficients is essential for evaluating measurement reliability.

In the BSRI description (“Scores for each subscale are obtained by summing...”), the transformation into percentages is mentioned but not justified. The authors should clarify why this transformation was necessary and whether it aligns with standard BSRI scoring procedures.

In the APHI description (“Total scores range from 0 to 81...”), the categorization into levels of hardiness is mentioned but not used in analysis. The authors should clarify whether hardiness was treated as a continuous variable or categorized, and justify this decision.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.