




# The Effect of Parental Monitoring and Moral Identity on Youth Delinquency

Selva. Turan<sup>1</sup>, Farhana. Rahman<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Konya, Türkiye

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh

\* Corresponding author email address: farhana.rahman@du.ac.bd

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
John S. Carlson  Distinguished Professor of the Department of Educational Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, United carlsoj@msu.edu	<b>Reviewer 1:</b> Fahime Bahonar  Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir <b>Reviewer 2:</b> Mahdi Khanjani  Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran. Email: khanjani_m@atu.ac.ir

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The term "delinquency refers to a wide spectrum of antisocial and rule-breaking behaviors..." could benefit from a clearer operational definition of delinquency in the Bangladeshi context. Cultural variations in what constitutes "delinquent" behavior should be addressed.

The rationale for selecting the Bangladeshi context is sound, but the phrase "empirical research... remains scarce" would be more convincing if accompanied by a brief review or enumeration of existing studies and their limitations.

While the use of the Morgan and Krejcie table is appropriate, the authors should provide justification for stratified random sampling by specifying the strata (e.g., school type, region, socioeconomic status).

The statement "normality of the data was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test..." is appropriate, but it would be beneficial to also mention skewness and kurtosis values for further robustness.

In reporting the mean for delinquency (42.76), the authors should contextualize this score (e.g., what is the possible range?), to help readers understand whether this score indicates high or low delinquency.

The moderate positive correlation between parental monitoring and moral identity ( $r = .44$ ) is interesting but under-discussed. The authors should elaborate on whether this suggests a bidirectional relationship or shared variance due to a third factor (e.g., family warmth).

The reported adjusted  $R^2$  of .38 is solid, but the absence of a discussion on residual diagnostics (e.g., normality of residuals, influential points) weakens the robustness of the regression interpretation.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The authors mention that "monitoring is effective across cultures..." without specifying if or how this has been previously validated in Bangladesh. Consider citing regional studies or clarifying why this assumption is appropriate for the Bangladeshi adolescent population.

The sentence "Harsh, inconsistent, or neglectful parenting may foster resentment..." introduces parenting style but does not clearly define how it will be treated methodologically in the study. Consider clarifying whether parenting style is controlled for or measured.

In the sentence "These studies collectively suggest that adolescents require both internal (moral identity) and external (monitoring) safeguards...", the interaction effect between the two variables is implied but not examined. A moderation or interaction term could be statistically tested to enrich the findings.

The authors state that the SRDS includes "status offenses, property offenses, and person offenses", but they do not provide an example of how this classification was culturally adapted or validated for Bangladeshi youth. Cultural adaptation processes should be explained.

The scale by Stattin and Kerr is well-established, but the authors should specify whether the subscales (e.g., child disclosure vs. parental control) were analyzed separately or combined, as this influences interpretation.

The authors describe the subscales (internalization and symbolization), but their respective contributions are not reported in the results. Consider analyzing and reporting each subscale separately to provide a nuanced view.

The unstandardized coefficient for parental monitoring ( $-0.84$ ) and moral identity ( $-0.59$ ) indicate different strengths, but this distinction is not explicitly explored in the discussion. Authors should elaborate on the practical implications of these differences.

The claim that "monitoring remains effective in the Bangladeshi cultural context" is somewhat overstated without qualitative or comparative data. The authors should temper this claim or provide supporting cross-cultural findings.

The statement "view honesty, compassion, and fairness as central..." seems interpretive unless these traits were specifically measured. The authors should avoid overgeneralizing unless supported by item-level analysis of the moral identity scale.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.