

Cultural Orientation and Marital Quality: The Mediating Role of Gender Role Attitudes

Kamdin. Parsakia¹, Nadereh. Saadati^{1*}

¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: nsaadati@kmanresce.ca

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Sergii Boltivets ^{id} Chief Researcher of the Department of Scientific Support of Social Formation of Youth. Mykhailo Drahomanov University, Ukraine sboltivets@ukr.net	Reviewer 1: Fahime Bahonar ^{id} Department of counseling, Universty of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: Fahime.bahonar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Mansour Abdi ^{id} Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Arak University, Iran. m.abdi@arak.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The definition of marital quality would be strengthened by citing a classic or foundational source alongside Jeon (2020) and McDonald et al. (2020), such as Spanier (1976), who developed the DAS used in this study.

The statement is well-placed but could be nuanced by acknowledging cultural relativism—hierarchy may be perceived positively in some sociocultural systems. A brief parenthetical note or citation would be helpful here.

While the research objective is clear, consider stating the hypotheses explicitly at the end of the introduction to provide a stronger transition into the methods section.

This intention is commendable, but a demographic breakdown (e.g., percentages for ethnicity and gender) would better support the claim of representativeness.

Consider clarifying whether the COS subscale scores were aggregated or analyzed separately. This is crucial given the multidimensionality (horizontal vs. vertical, individualism vs. collectivism) of the scale.

The scoring explanation suggests that higher scores indicate more traditional beliefs, which contradicts common use of GRBS where higher scores often reflect egalitarianism. Please confirm scoring direction and interpretation.

Add detail on the multivariate normality testing method (e.g., Mardia's coefficient) to enhance transparency for SEM assumptions.

It would be helpful to include possible score ranges for each scale in the table caption or footnote to allow readers to interpret the means meaningfully.

While the RMSEA is within acceptable limits, including the 90% confidence interval for RMSEA would improve the technical reporting and model fit interpretation.

You report both standardized (β) and unstandardized (b) coefficients, which is excellent. However, it would help to specify whether bootstrapping was used for the mediation analysis, and if so, report the confidence intervals for the indirect effect.

You mention participants adopting “pluralistic views.” Consider clarifying how this was measured or inferred from the data, as this concept was not operationalized earlier.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The argument about bidirectionality would benefit from citation of empirical work that demonstrates this interaction (e.g., longitudinal or dyadic studies on gender role negotiations).

This section discusses older adults but does not directly link back to the study’s Canadian context. A brief sentence acknowledging differences in demographic focus between cited studies and your sample would strengthen the positioning.

While international examples are informative, the accumulation of region-specific studies (India, Iran, etc.) could overshadow the Canadian context. Consider balancing by referencing studies conducted among Canadian populations.

This statement could be strengthened by explicitly addressing whether your results support full or partial mediation and comparing this with mediation levels in cited studies.

This comparative interpretation is insightful. However, the mechanism by which traditional roles foster quality in collectivist contexts could be unpacked further—perhaps with reference to role clarity or identity salience theory.

Response: Revised and uploaded the new document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.