

The Moderating Role of Resilience and Emotion Regulation in the Relationship Between Parenting and Academic Burnout Among Gifted Students in Iraq

Fadia. Aboud Ramdan Jalaawi¹, Seyed Hamid. Atashpour^{2*}, Rasheed Nassir. Kalifa Al-Hashmy³, Mohsen. Golparvar⁴

¹ PhD Student in Educational Psychology, Research Center for Behavioral and Psychological Science, Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

² Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

³ Professor, Department of Educational and Psychological Sciences, College of Education, Wasit University, Wasit, Iraq

⁴ Professor, Research Center for Behavioral and Psychological Science, Department of Psychology, Isf.C., Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: hamid.atashpour@iau.ac.ir

Editor

Majid Mahmoud Alilou
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran
alilou_647@yahoo.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Asghar Jafari
Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Kashan University, Iran. Email: as_jafari@sbu.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Mojtaba Tamadoni
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran. m_tamadoni@azad.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the same Method paragraph, the statement that “216 students were selected through convenience sampling” based on the Krejcie and Morgan table is methodologically problematic. The Krejcie and Morgan approach is generally used to estimate sample size under probability-based assumptions, whereas convenience sampling is a nonprobability procedure that does not ensure representativeness. The authors should explain why a probability-derived sample-size table was used with convenience sampling and should distinguish clearly between the target sample size and the actual sampling method. Preferably, the sample-size rationale should be replaced or supplemented by an a priori power analysis for hierarchical multiple regression, particularly because the primary hypotheses concern interaction effects, which typically require greater statistical power than simple main effects.

In the Method paragraph describing inclusion criteria, the sentence “The inclusion criteria were willingness to participate in the study, enrollment at the upper-secondary school level, and being classified as an outstanding student according to the educational regulations of Iraq” is insufficiently operationalized. The manuscript should define exactly how “gifted” or “outstanding” status was established, including whether classification was based on intelligence testing, academic achievement, school nomination, standardized examinations, admission to gifted schools, or Ministry of Education criteria. Because the manuscript repeatedly refers to the participants as “gifted students,” the construct must be operationally defensible; otherwise, the sample may more accurately represent academically high-achieving students rather than gifted students.

In the final Method paragraph, the authors state that normality was assessed using the Shapiro–Wilk test and linearity through scatterplots “along with the other assumptions of regression analysis,” but no results for these diagnostic procedures are subsequently reported. The Results section should explicitly document the assumptions relevant to hierarchical regression, including normality of residuals, linearity, homoscedasticity, independence of errors, absence of influential outliers, and multicollinearity. Tolerance and variance inflation factor values should be presented, especially because the three parenting dimensions are highly intercorrelated in Table 1 (e.g., $|r| = .62-.69$), which may produce unstable regression coefficients and suppressor effects. Residual plots, Cook’s distance, standardized residuals, and the Durbin–Watson statistic should also be reported where appropriate.

In Table 1 and the paragraph immediately following it, the interpretation of the correlations is internally contradictory. The table shows academic burnout to be negatively correlated with resilience ($r = -.23$) and adaptive emotion regulation ($r = -.21$), and positively correlated with maladaptive emotion regulation ($r = .21$). However, the text states that academic burnout had “a significant positive relationship with resilience and adaptive emotion regulation, whereas a significant negative relationship was obtained between academic burnout and maladaptive emotion regulation.” The verbal interpretation is therefore exactly opposite to the coefficients shown in Table 1. The authors must correct this paragraph and carefully audit all narrative descriptions against the numerical results throughout the manuscript.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The manuscript does not provide basic demographic characteristics of the sample before presenting the correlational results. A dedicated participant-characteristics paragraph should be added at the beginning of the Findings section reporting, at minimum, age range and mean age, sex distribution, grade level, school type, geographical distribution, and any relevant indicators of socioeconomic or family background. These variables are especially important in a parenting and burnout study because parenting perceptions and academic burnout may differ according to sex, age, educational stage, and family context. If such characteristics were collected, the authors should also report whether they were examined as potential covariates or whether the groups differed meaningfully across these characteristics.

In the paragraph describing Baumrind’s Parenting Styles Questionnaire, the manuscript reports mean scores of 40.08 for permissive parenting, 41.06 for authoritarian parenting, and 40.58 for authoritative parenting in Table 1, while simultaneously stating that each subscale contains 10 items scored from 0 to 4 and therefore has a theoretical range of 0–40. Means exceeding the stated maximum possible score are mathematically impossible. This is a major data-reporting problem that must be corrected before the manuscript can be evaluated further. The authors should recheck the scoring method, item allocation, response scale, data entry, and descriptive statistics and provide corrected means, standard deviations, and any analyses that depend on these scores.

A comparable scoring inconsistency appears in the paragraph describing the Cognitive Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. The manuscript states that adaptive emotion regulation has a possible score range of 10–50 and maladaptive emotion regulation a range of 8–40, but Table 1 reports means of 54.79 and 66.88, respectively, both of which exceed the stated theoretical maxima. In addition, the text states that 16 items assess adaptive strategies and 20 items assess maladaptive strategies, which does not correspond to the subsequently reported score ranges. The authors must carefully revisit the CERQ scoring structure, identify

which items and subscales were included in each composite, specify the correct number of items and possible ranges, and then recompute the descriptive and inferential analyses if necessary. At present, these discrepancies raise serious concerns regarding the validity of the statistical results.

In the paragraph describing the Academic Burnout Questionnaire, the manuscript states that the instrument consists of 15 items rated from 0 to 6, yielding a possible total score of 0–90, and that Items 10–15 are reverse-scored. The authors should provide stronger justification for deriving a single total burnout score because the questionnaire is described as covering emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and academic efficacy, which are theoretically distinct dimensions. It should be explained whether the validated Persian version supports aggregation into a total score and whether academic efficacy items were reverse-coded before summation. Reporting internal consistency for only the total score (.85) is also insufficient; Cronbach's alpha or preferably omega coefficients should be reported for each subscale if these dimensions are part of the theoretical structure of the instrument.

In the instrument paragraphs, the repeated statement that each questionnaire “was translated into Arabic, and its validity was confirmed by five university faculty members” does not provide adequate evidence of cross-cultural adaptation. The authors should describe the translation procedure in detail, including forward translation, back-translation, reconciliation, expert review, pilot testing, and assessment of linguistic equivalence. The academic credentials and relevant expertise of the five faculty members should also be specified. For a study conducted in Iraq using instruments originally developed in other languages, evidence of measurement equivalence is particularly important. Ideally, the authors should report construct validity for the Arabic versions in the present sample, for example through confirmatory factor analysis, rather than relying solely on expert judgment.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.