Parental Digital Literacy and Involvement in Blended Learning: A Mixed-Methods Psychological Analysis

Roghayeh. Poursaberi[1]*, Nahid. Yousefpour[2], Noushin. Derakhshan[2], Arezoo. Ahmadabadi[3]

[1] Assistant professor, Department of Educational Sciences, Payame Noor University,Tehran, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor,Department of Educational Sciences And Psychology, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran
[3] Department of Educational Administration, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: rpoursaberi17@pnu.ac.ir

Editor	Reviewers
Monika Szczygieł Department of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland monika.szczygiel@uj.edu.pl	**Reviewer 1:** Thseen Nazir Professor of Psychology and Counseling Department, Ibn Haldun University, Istanbul, Turkey. Email: thseen.nazir@ihu.edu.tr **Reviewer 2:** Abolghasem Khoshkanesh Assistant Professor, Counseling Department, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran. Email: akhoshkonesh@sbu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In paragraph 1 of the introduction, after the sentence "Parents… now serve as co-facilitators of digital learning…" the manuscript should articulate exactly what previous studies have not explained. Currently, the gap is implied but not explicitly stated.

In paragraph 3, the discussion beginning with "International scholarship also highlights significant disparities…" reads like a list of country-specific findings. Consider synthesizing these studies into conceptual themes rather than enumerating contexts.

In the description "…parents were recruited through stratified random sampling proportional to grade level and socioeconomic status…", the manuscript does not report the distribution of these strata. Adding numerical representation would allow readers to judge representativeness.

In Measures, the scale descriptions are strong, but after the sentence "Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale…", providing one sample item from each instrument would improve transparency of construct operationalization.

The sentence "The interview guide explored parents' narratives regarding digital challenges…" is too general. The paper should briefly list core guiding questions to enable evaluation of alignment between interview prompts and study objectives.

In the quantitative data analysis section, the manuscript states "Preliminary analyses included screening for missing data…" but does not mention testing for multicollinearity, linearity, or homoscedasticity in the regression model. These should be reported.

The structural model shows many significant paths. However, the line "This suggests that parents who feel capable…" could be expanded by testing or discussing potential mediators, such as parental self-efficacy or perceived workload.

Paragraph 3 of the Discussion, beginning with "The qualitative findings deepened this understanding…", repeats descriptive findings without expanding them theoretically. This section should link results more explicitly to psychological theory (e.g., cognitive load, ecological systems).

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2.   Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The sentence "… as a preventive strategy against emerging risks such as digital overuse and digital autism…" introduces "digital autism," a controversial term, without defining it. A short clarification or justification is needed to avoid conceptual ambiguity.

In the final paragraph of the introduction, the sentence "A mixed-methods study therefore offers a timely and nuanced lens…" should more clearly state why a convergent design (simultaneous collection) was preferable to sequential designs.

Under Study Design and Participants, the line "A multistage sampling strategy was used…" needs clarification regarding how each stage operated and why this approach optimally captured the population of interest.

The description "Measurement models were evaluated through indicator reliability…" is technically correct, but the manuscript does not explain why PLS-SEM (variance-based) was preferred over covariance-based SEM, given the relatively large sample (N=384).

In Table 1, the manuscript identifies themes and subthemes, but the narrative following the table should more clearly explain how themes were derived, e.g., whether they emerged inductively or were guided by a specific psychological framework.

In Table 2, the statement "This pattern suggests that parents feel relatively comfortable using communication tools…" could be strengthened by comparing observed means to theoretical midpoints or normative benchmarks rather than interpreting raw values.

In Table 3, the text states that correlations "support the notion that they represent related facets…". Some correlations (e.g., $r \approx .50$) may indicate potential redundancy between constructs. Consider discussing scale independence or overlap.

After Table 4, the manuscript reports R^2 but does not provide effect-size classification (small, medium, large). Interpreting the practical importance of predictors would significantly strengthen this section.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2.   Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.
Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.