

The Role of Parental Mindfulness and Parenting Stress in Predicting Everyday Parent–Child Conflicts Among Elementary School Children in Shiraz

Kimia. Ghanbarian¹, Zahra. Azari^{2*}

¹ M.A. Student in Child and Adolescent Clinical Psychology, Department of Psychology, Shi.C., Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

² Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Shi.C., Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: 2296754856@iau.ir

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Seyed Hamid Atashpour ^{id} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran hamidatashpour@gmail.com	Reviewer 1: Hajar Torkan ^{id} Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan Branch (Khorasgan), Isfahan, Iran. h.torkan@khuisf.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Farhad Namjoo ^{id} Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: farhadnamjoo@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The participant-selection description in the Methodology is unclear in the sentence “First, one district was randomly selected from the four educational districts of Shiraz. Subsequently, participants were selected through convenience sampling from one girls’ elementary school and one boys’ elementary school.” The authors should explain how the two schools were identified, whether they were randomly selected or chosen based on accessibility, how mothers were invited, how many were approached, and how many declined or returned incomplete questionnaires. A participant-flow statement should be added to clarify recruitment, eligibility assessment, exclusions, and the final analytic sample.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not reported in the Methodology section. The manuscript should specify the criteria used to determine eligibility, such as being the biological, adoptive, or primary caregiving mother of a child aged 7–12 years, residing in Shiraz, having a child enrolled in an elementary school, possessing adequate literacy to complete the questionnaires, and providing informed consent. Exclusion criteria should also be reported, including incomplete questionnaires, withdrawal, duplicate participation, or the presence of severe psychiatric or cognitive conditions that could affect questionnaire completion. This information is necessary for replication and interpretation of the sample characteristics.

The manuscript repeatedly refers to “all mothers of children aged 7–12 years” but does not provide any demographic characteristics of the participants or their children. A separate demographic table should report maternal age, educational level, employment status, marital status, socioeconomic status, number of children, and family structure, as well as child age, sex, school grade, and type of school. These variables may be associated with parenting stress and parent–child conflict and are essential for evaluating the representativeness of the sample and the generalizability of the findings.

In the ethical considerations paragraph, the sentence “The research ethics approval code was IR.IAU.SHIRAZ.REC.1405.009” contains a potential chronological inconsistency because the study is described as occurring during the 2025–2026 academic year, whereas the ethics code appears to use the Iranian year 1405. The authors should verify the date of ethical approval and ensure that approval was obtained before recruitment and data collection. The Gregorian approval date should also be reported, in accordance with the manuscript’s stated use of the Gregorian calendar.

Table 2 reports a Pearson correlation matrix but does not clearly identify the exact significance level of each coefficient. The note states that all correlations were significant at “ $p \leq .01$,” yet the original table note contains both one and two asterisks with the same threshold, suggesting a typographical error. The authors should recalculate and report the exact significance levels or use a conventional notation such as $p < .05$ and $p < .01$. It is also important to verify whether the correlation of .209 between dysfunctional parent–child interaction and being in the moment with the child is statistically significant at the .01 level with a sample of 180.

In Table 3, the model statistics appear mathematically inconsistent. With $R = .435$, $R^2 = .189$, two predictors, and approximately 180 participants, the reported F value of 39.663 should be checked because the corresponding value derived from the standard regression formula may differ. The authors should reproduce the regression output directly from SPSS and report R , R^2 , adjusted R^2 , the standard error of the estimate, F , degrees of freedom, and exact p value. Similar verification is required for Table 4, where $R = .498$, $R^2 = .248$, and $F = 41.663$ may also be inconsistent with a model containing three predictors.

The manuscript interprets $R^2 = .189$ as “approximately 18%” and $R^2 = .248$ as “approximately 24%.” Although rounding is acceptable, the manuscript should consistently report either 18.9% and 24.8% or rounded values of 19% and 25%. More importantly, adjusted R^2 should be presented because it provides a less biased estimate of explained variance when multiple predictors are included. The discussion should also avoid implying that the models explain most of the phenomenon, as the majority of variance in everyday parent–child conflict remains unexplained.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the description of the McCaffrey Mindfulness in Parenting Questionnaire, the statement that “the two-factor structure of the instrument explains 42.3% and 43.4% of the variance in the mindful discipline and being in the moment with the child dimensions, respectively” is psychometrically unclear. Variance explained is generally reported for the total factor solution or for individual factors within exploratory factor analysis, not as separate percentages for dimensions without additional explanation. The authors should verify these values against the original validation study, identify whether they refer to eigenvalues, factor-specific variance, or separate analyses, and cite the original source appropriately.

The psychometric description of the Mindfulness in Parenting Questionnaire states that “significant positive correlations were reported between scores on this questionnaire and scores on the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale and the revised Parental Authority Questionnaire, indicating adequate convergent and discriminant validity.” Positive correlations with related constructs may support convergent validity, but they do not by themselves demonstrate discriminant validity. The authors should revise this statement and report evidence of discriminant validity only if the original validation study included correlations with theoretically distinct constructs, factor comparisons, or other appropriate tests.

The description of the Abidin Parenting Stress Index requires greater precision regarding the version used. The manuscript states that the instrument has a 120-item full version and a 36-item short form and then appears to use the short form, but it does not explicitly name it as the Parenting Stress Index–Short Form. The authors should provide the full instrument name, edition, scoring range, direction of scoring, subscale item allocation, and whether any defensive-response or validity indicators were included. The translation and validation source for the Persian version should also be fully documented.

The description of the Straus Parent–Child Conflict Questionnaire contains several conceptual and technical ambiguities. The sentence “This questionnaire consists of 15 items that measure three dimensions—reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression—across two sections concerning the respondent and the mother” does not clearly identify the exact instrument, its original title, or whether it is an adaptation of the Conflict Tactics Scale. The authors should provide the formal English name of the measure, clarify who completes each section, explain why only the mother section was used, and report whether the wording was adapted for mothers of elementary-school children. The construct being assessed should also be clarified because reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression may represent conflict-resolution tactics rather than “everyday conflict” as a unitary construct.

The scoring procedure for the parent–child conflict instrument is internally inconsistent. The manuscript refers to a “five-point Likert scale,” but the scoring options range from 0 to 5, which constitutes six response categories. The authors should correct the scale description, specify the possible total and subscale score ranges, indicate whether all items are summed directly, and explain whether reasoning items are reverse-scored or interpreted separately. The treatment of the reasoning dimension is particularly important because higher reasoning scores may not indicate greater conflict in the same way as verbal or physical aggression scores.

The reliability discussion for the conflict questionnaire contains an apparent textual or numerical error in the phrase “Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from .62 to .88 for verbal aggression and from .42 to .96 for physical aggression,” preceded in the Persian source by an unexplained reference to “12 alpha coefficients.” The authors should verify the original reliability values and remove any typographical corruption. In addition, because some reported alpha coefficients are very low, particularly values near .42 or .49, the manuscript should acknowledge concerns about internal consistency and justify the use of the total score in the present study.

The statistical analysis section states that “Pearson’s correlation coefficient and regression analysis were used,” but no information is provided regarding the assumptions required for these analyses. The authors should report tests or diagnostic procedures for normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, independence of errors, influential observations, and multicollinearity. For the regression models, tolerance and variance inflation factor values should be presented, and the Durbin–Watson statistic should be reported. Scatterplots or residual diagnostics should be examined to establish that the assumptions of simultaneous multiple regression were reasonably satisfied.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.