

Parental Rejection and Child Emotion Dysregulation: The Mediating Role of Shame

Giulia. Romano¹ Oriana. Piskorz-Ryn² Juan. Camilo Ríos^{3*}


¹ Department of Developmental Psychology, University of Rome La Sapienza, Rome, Italy

² Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Caldas, Street 6623b-03, Manizales 170004, Caldas, Colombia



³ Department of Educational Sciences, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá, Colombia

* Corresponding author email address: juan.rios@javeriana.edu.co

Editor

Manijeh Daneshpour
Department of Couple and Family
therapy, Alliant International
University, California, United
States of America
mdaneshpour@alliant.edu

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Mohammad Salehi
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Management, Sari Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Sari, Iran. Email: drsalehi@iausari.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Sadegh Maleki Avarsin
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Tabriz Branch, Islamic
Azad University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: s.maleki@iaut.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the Introduction (paragraph 2), the phrase “These outcomes are not only immediate but may also extend into adolescence and adulthood...” would benefit from a clearer temporal framework. Consider specifying whether longitudinal evidence supports this developmental continuity.

In the Measures section (Emotion Regulation), although the DERS is described in detail, the exact version used (e.g., full 36-item or short version) should be specified, as both are commonly used in adolescent samples.

In the Measures section (Shame), the authors state, “Higher total scores reflect greater levels of experienced shame” without reporting a cut-off or mean interpretation scale. Including normative or clinical cut-offs would aid interpretability.

In Table 1, the emotion dysregulation mean score of 104.83 appears relatively high. Please contextualize this mean by referencing typical values in normative or clinical samples using the DERS.

In Table 2, correlation coefficients between shame and emotion dysregulation ($r = .65$) are very high. Please address potential concerns of multicollinearity or overlapping constructs in the Discussion section.

In the Discussion (paragraph 5), the sentence “These schemas may manifest in patterns of rumination, avoidance, and hyper-reactivity...” introduces new psychological mechanisms that were not measured in the study. Consider rephrasing or marking these as theoretical implications.

In the Discussion (paragraph 7), the statement “shame becomes embedded in children’s self-perception...” is speculative. Consider adding “may become” or citing studies using qualitative or longitudinal methods to support this claim.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the Introduction (paragraph 4), the sentence “Shame is a self-conscious emotion that arises from the perception of being fundamentally flawed...” would benefit from citing a foundational theoretical source on self-conscious emotions (e.g., Tangney & Dearing).

In the Introduction (final paragraph), the statement “few studies have simultaneously examined all three variables—parental rejection, shame, and emotion dysregulation...” should be supported by a literature review reference indicating the novelty or scarcity of such integrated models.

In the Methods (Study Design and Participants), the authors mention “stratified random sampling” but do not clarify what strata were used (e.g., age, gender, socioeconomic status). Please specify the stratification criteria used during sampling.

In the Measures section (Parental Rejection), the quote “Items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (almost never true) to 4 (almost always true)” lacks information about whether maternal and paternal scores were analyzed separately or combined. Please clarify.

In the Data Analysis section, the sentence “Multicollinearity was assessed using variance inflation factors (VIF), with all values below 2.10...” should be supplemented with a table or appendix listing the VIF values for transparency.

In the Findings section, the demographic paragraph reports percentages of participants by education level, but inconsistencies arise (e.g., “elementary school” for ages 10–17). Please align age categories with appropriate school levels in Colombia or clarify the labeling.

In the paragraph following Table 3, the statement “All indices fell within the acceptable or good range...” should be expanded to discuss the slight deviation of RMSEA (0.055) from perfect model fit and implications for structural interpretation.

In the Discussion (paragraph 1), the authors write “the results supported all three proposed hypotheses.” However, these hypotheses are not explicitly outlined in the introduction. Please list them clearly to improve alignment between objectives and findings.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.