

## VALIDATING THE INTERPERSONAL MINDFULNESS IN PARENTING (IM-P) SCALE FOR PARENTS IN INDONESIA

Khairunnisa Fahira Dumbi<sup>\*)</sup>, Carrenina Prilly Juaninda, Luh Surini Yulia Savitri

Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia,  
Jl. Prof. Dr. R. Slamet Iman Santoso, Depok, 16424, Indonesia

<sup>\*)</sup>E-mail: [dumbifahira@gmail.com](mailto:dumbifahira@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

The concept of mindful parenting, derived from the broader framework of mindfulness, has gained increasing recognition in Indonesian parenting practices over recent years. However, the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting (IM-P) instrument, which possesses strong psychometric properties, has not yet been available in Bahasa. The purpose of this study is to adapt the IM-P instrument into a valid and reliable Indonesian version. The IM-P was translated and adapted into Indonesian, involving a sample of 735 parents ( $M = 36.63$ ;  $SD = 7.354$ ) with children aged 3 to 17 years. Using a random sampling procedure, the first sample ( $n = 367$ ) was used for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), while the second sample ( $n = 368$ ) was used for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). The study revealed that the Indonesian version of the IM-P consists of 20 items and 4 dimensions: Emotional Awareness of Self and Child, Self-Regulation in Parenting, Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child, and Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self. Overall, the IM-P Indonesia demonstrated good reliability. Additionally, the IM-P Indonesia showed a significant negative correlation with parenting stress, except for the dimension of Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self. These findings suggest that the IM-P is a valid and reliable measure for use within the Indonesian population.

Keywords: mindful parenting, parenting instrument, psychometric, reliability, validity

### Validasi Alat Ukur *Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting* (IM-P) pada Orang Tua di Indonesia

#### Abstract

Konsep *mindful parenting*, yang berasal dari perluasan prinsip *mindfulness*, telah semakin dikenal dalam praktik pengasuhan di Indonesia selama beberapa tahun terakhir. Namun, alat ukur *The Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting* (IM-P) dengan properti psikometrik yang baik belum tersedia dalam Bahasa Indonesia. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengadaptasi alat ukur IM-P ke dalam versi Bahasa Indonesia yang valid dan reliabel. IM-P diadaptasi ke dalam Bahasa Indonesia dengan melibatkan 735 orang tua ( $M = 36,63$ ;  $SD = 7,354$ ) yang memiliki anak berusia 3 hingga 17 tahun. Melalui prosedur random sampling, sampel pertama ( $n = 367$ ) digunakan untuk *Exploratory Factor Analysis* (EFA), sedangkan sampel kedua ( $n = 368$ ) digunakan untuk *Confirmatory Factor Analysis* (CFA). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa IM-P versi Indonesia terdiri dari 20 item dan 4 dimensi, yaitu *Emotional Awareness of Self and Child*, *Self-Regulation in Parenting*, *Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child*, serta *Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self*. Secara umum, IM-P Indonesia memiliki reliabilitas yang baik. Selain itu, IM-P Indonesia ditemukan berkorelasi negatif secara signifikan dengan stres pengasuhan, kecuali pada dimensi *Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self*. Temuan dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa IM-P adalah alat ukur yang valid dan reliabel untuk digunakan pada populasi Indonesia.

Kata kunci: alat ukur pengasuhan, pengasuhan berkesadaran, psikometri, reliabilitas, validitas

---

### INTRODUCTION

The concept of mindful parenting has emerged over the last two decades, drawing its foundation from mindfulness principles. Mindful parenting, as defined by Kabat-Zinn and Kabat-Zinn (2014), involves parents engaging with their

child and parenting practices in a deliberate manner, characterized by intentionality, present-moment awareness, and the absence of spontaneous judgment. Unlike other forms of parenting, mindful parenting focuses on the internal experience of parenting (Kabat-Zinn & Kabat-Zinn, 2014). Parents who adopt mindful

Article history:

Received July 24, 2024

Received in revised November 13, 2024

Accepted November 18, 2024

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons  
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.



parenting practices tend to: 1) develop a better understanding of their child's unique personality, needs, and feelings; (2) be fully present and listen attentively; (3) accept each moment as it is, whether positive or negative; (4) observe their own reactions and learn to respond more calmly, clearly, and kindly (Kabat-Zinn & Kabat-Zinn, 2021). Mindful parenting does not eliminate judgment but postpones it, giving parents the opportunity to better perceive and understand situations from various perspectives (Kabat-Zinn & Kabat-Zinn, 2014). This approach helps parents process information more effectively, resulting in more accurate perceptions and thoughtful responses (Duncan et al., 2009). Additionally, it enhances communication skills and supports consistent disciplinary strategies (Duncan et al., 2015).

According to Kabat-Zinn and Kabat-Zinn (2014), mindful parenting is characterized by 3 key foundations: 1) sovereignty (parents' recognition and support of their true selves and their children); 2) empathy (parents' attempts to understand their children's thoughts and emotions); and 3) acceptance (parents fully accept their feelings and thoughts, also their children's feelings and thoughts). Expanding on this framework, Duncan et al. (2009) proposed five dimensions of mindful parenting. The first dimension, listening with full attention (LFA), refers to parents' ability to actively listen and recognize both verbal and non-verbal cues from their child. The second, non-judgmental acceptance of self and child (NJASC), involves accepting both positive and negative aspects of parenting without judgment, helping parents set clearer expectations. The third, emotional awareness of self and child (EASC), is about recognizing emotions to respond thoughtfully rather than reactively. The fourth, self-regulation in the parenting relationship (SRPR), is the ability to pause and respond adaptively, especially during conflicts. The fifth, compassion for self and child (CSC), emphasizes understanding that mistakes are common and fostering forgiveness and love for both oneself and the child. These five dimensions frequently serve as the theoretical foundation for research on mindful parenting.

Extensive studies have examined the impact of mindful parenting on family functioning. Parents who engage in mindful parenting report reduced levels of parenting stress (Bögels et al., 2014; Chaplin et al., 2021), as well as lower symptoms of depression and anxiety (Corthorn & Milicic, 2016; Pan et al., 2019). Mindful parenting has also been linked to decreased aggressive behavior (Potharst et al., 2017), improved

adaptability and self-control (Lengua et al., 2021), and enhanced self-esteem, warmth, compassion, and responsiveness as caregivers (Potharst et al., 2017). Additionally, it fosters greater emotional expression (Turpyn & Chaplin, 2016). For parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), practicing mindful parenting has been shown to reduce stress levels and symptoms of depression and anxiety (Beer et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2014). In children, mindful parenting has been associated with reduced problem behaviors (Brown et al., 2021; Potharst et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2021), decreased externalizing and internalizing symptoms (Bögels et al., 2014; Han et al., 2021), increased well-being (Potharst et al., 2017), and greater self-compassion (Moreira et al., 2018). One explanation is that parents practicing mindful parenting are less likely to mistreat their children (Brown et al., 2021). Specific dimensions of mindful parenting also show unique benefits. For instance, NJASC has been found to reduce anxiety and depression symptoms in adolescents (Geurtzen et al., 2015). Among infants, mindful parenting promotes greater comfort and joy (Potharst et al., 2017) and lowers cortisol levels, which are closely associated with stress (Laurent et al., 2017).

Despite the significant advancements in research and the numerous benefits associated with mindful parenting, challenges remain in developing reliable measurement tools. Several scales have been introduced, with the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting (IM-P) scale by Duncan being the most widely used. This 31-item scale assesses mindful parenting across five dimensions (de Bruin et al., 2012) and serves as a key tool in this field.

According to our literature reviews, there is no information about the psychometric qualities of the original English version of the IM-P. However, there are several results from IM-P adaptations in different languages, with varying numbers of dimensions. De Bruin et al. (2012), in collaboration with Duncan, translated the IM-P into Dutch and discovered 29 items that form six factors, dividing the dimensions pertaining to parents and children. De Bruin et al. (2012) concluded that parents' behavior toward themselves does not always translate to their children, and vice versa, as several variables can impact the dynamics, including the parents' traumatic experiences or the challenging behavior of the child. Therefore, the CSC and EASC dimensions were separated into different dimensions for parents and children.

Moreira and Canavarro (2017) tested the IM-P in Portuguese, while Kim et al. (2019) tested the IM-P in Korean and discovered a model that was similar to that of de Bruin et al. (2012). Nevertheless, Moreira and Canavarro (2017) merged the dimensions associated with emotional reactivity and emotional awareness into a single construct of self-regulation, as both dimensions pertain to parents' ability to manage their own responses. Meanwhile, Lo et al. (2018) tested the IM-P in Chinese parents and found four factors with 23 items that were again similar to the dimensions of de Bruin et al. (2012). On the other hand, Lo et al. (2018) found that the occurrence of separate factors between parents and children only occurred in dimensions related to compassion. Moreover, elements of Emotional Awareness of Self and Emotional Awareness of Child appeared to be combined into a single dimension called Emotional Awareness in Parenting (Lo et al., 2018). Chen et al. (2005) identified a unique characteristic in Chinese parents, in which they typically use rumination and suppression as emotional coping strategies. This means that instead of recognizing and identifying their feelings, Chinese parents tend to suppress and ignore them. These emotional coping strategies are then taught to their children (Lo et al., 2018).

In Indonesian studies, the IM-P instrument is typically applied after undergoing an adaptation process that includes translation, expert judgment, readability testing, and basic psychometric assessments, such as Cronbach's alpha to examine reliability and CrIT to evaluate item validity (Dumbi, 2022b; Mubarok, 2016; Saraswati, 2020). Findings suggest that the total IM-P score demonstrates strong reliability, as evidenced by Cronbach's alpha values ranging from  $\alpha = 0.74$  (Saraswati, 2020) to  $\alpha = 0.791$  (Dumbi, 2022b). However, reliability testing for each dimension tends to be lower, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from  $\alpha = 0.342$  to  $\alpha = 0.682$  (Dumbi, 2022b) or even from  $\alpha = -0.348$  to  $\alpha = 0.640$  (Dumbi, 2022a). As a result, the IM-P is generally assessed using only its total score. Additionally, several items exhibited  $\text{CrIT} < 0.2$ , which were neither removed nor revised (Dumbi, 2022a; Dumbi, 2022b; Saraswati, 2020). These results suggest that the adaptation process has not yet advanced to the point of confirming the IM-P's structural components, highlighting the need for further refinement and adaptation.

The Mindfulness in Parenting Questionnaire (MIPQ) (McCaffrey et al., 2017), the Bangor Mindful Parenting Scale (BMPS) (Jones et al., 2014), and the Mindful Parenting Scale (MPS)

(Prihandini et al., 2019) are three additional scales available for measuring mindful parenting besides the IM-P. However, the majority of these instruments lack theoretical foundations. The MIPQ (McCaffrey et al., 2017) was developed without referring to any particular theory but rather based on the results of exploratory interviews with mindfulness experts and parents (McCaffrey et al., 2017). The BMPS (Jones et al., 2014) was created by modifying items from general mindfulness scales so that it focuses on the relationship between parents and children without also emphasizing the parents' intrapersonal conditions, which are also included in mindful parenting. Meanwhile, the mindful parenting scale developed by Prihandini et al. (2019) in Indonesian contains items that do not fit the definition of mindful parenting, such as those related to the ability to find solutions (parents are able to find solutions to the issues they encounter) and to see the positive intention behind children's behavior (parents are able to see the positive intention behind every behavior displayed by their children).

Several studies in Indonesia have utilized measurement tools other than the IM-P to assess mindful parenting, with some developing their own instruments based on the framework proposed by Duncan et al. (2009). However, the details regarding the development process and the psychometric properties of these tools are not comprehensively reported, limiting the ability to thoroughly evaluate their quality. For instance, Agustin et al. (2021) used an 18-item scale, Monalisa et al. (2023) employed a 17-item scale with  $\alpha = .900$ , and Burmansah et al. (2023) used a 15-item scale with  $\alpha = 0.737$ , although information regarding the development and validation of these tools is not provided. These examples suggest that, while alternative instruments to the IM-P are being used, there remains a scarcity of tools with well-documented psychometric validation for measuring mindful parenting within the Indonesian population.

Based on our literature reviews, the IM-P is currently the most popular instrument used to measure mindful parenting. However, the results of IM-P psychometric testing in various languages show inconsistent outcomes. This reflects the possibility that mindful parenting may have different and unique structures across cultures. Regarding the unique and varying factors, previous research has not reached a consensus on the separation or combination of parent and child dimensions, especially for compassion and emotional awareness-related factors. In the Chinese population, for example, the dimensions of Emotional Awareness of Self

and Emotional Awareness of Child are not separated as in the Dutch version of the IM-P, which suggests that there is unique emotional coping among Chinese parents (Lo et al., 2018). Duncan et al. (2009) state that these two factors can be combined in the same dimension, but many previous studies have proven that they should be included in separate dimensions (de Bruin et al., 2012; McCaffrey et al., 2017; Moreira & Canavarro, 2017; Lo et al., 2018). Therefore, further research is needed to clarify the structure underlying mindful parenting.

Currently, few studies have explored the adaptation of the IM-P among Indonesian parents. Given the numerous positive impacts of mindful parenting, recent scientific advancements, and the need to understand the structure of mindful parenting, it is crucial to develop a valid and reliable instrument for measuring mindful parenting among Indonesian parents. Considering the differences in structure in each adaptation of the IM-P across various cultures (de Bruin et al., 2012; McCaffrey et al., 2017; Moreira & Canavarro, 2017; Lo et al., 2018), we hypothesize that the results of the adaptation of the IM-P for Indonesian parents to measure mindful parenting could also have a different structure compared to the original five-dimensional mindful parenting theory developed by Duncan et al. (2009). As a result, this research aims to evaluate the psychometric properties of the IM-P within the Indonesian population. The findings of this study are anticipated to provide a psychometrically robust measurement instrument, aiding researchers in the development and exploration of the mindful parenting construct, as well as assisting practitioners in devising interventions pertinent to mindful parenting, especially in Indonesian contexts.

## METHODS

### Research Design

This research began with a comprehensive ethical review to ensure adherence to stringent ethical standards and minimize potential risks for participants. The review involved a detailed assessment of the study's methodology, including sampling techniques, privacy protection procedures, and data management protocols. Following this review, the Konsorsium Psikologi Ilmiah Nusantara (KPIN) granted ethical approval for the study, with approval reference number 073/2023 Ethics/KPIN, issued on August 8th, 2023. Data collection was conducted both online and offline between

September 2023 and July 2024, employing a quantitative research design to obtain reliable and generalizable data. Participants were fully informed about the study's goals, procedures, their rights, and the voluntary nature of participation, including their right to withdraw at any time before agreeing to complete the questionnaire.

### Sampling Technique

Data collection for this study was carried out through convenience or accidental sampling, specifically targeting parents who met the predetermined inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria were parents with children aged 3-17 years old living with them. This specific age range was chosen to capture a broad spectrum of parenting experiences during childhood and adolescence. Initially, data were collected from a total of 742 participants. Entries containing unrealistic or inconsistent demographic information were then excluded, such as participants who reported having more children aged 3 to 17 than their total number of children or provided ages for their children that fell outside the specified 3 to 17 age range. The final sample comprised 735 participants ( $M = 36.63$ ,  $SD = 7.354$ ). The sample was subsequently randomly split into two groups: Sample 1 was used for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and Sample 2 was used for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). In both samples, over half of the participants had a university degree and were primarily from Java Island, the most populous island in Indonesia. Details about participants' demographics can be found in Table 1.

### Data Acquisition Procedure

The instrument adaptation process followed the stages outlined by Beaton et al. (2000). First, the original instrument was translated into the target language by two translators: one familiar with the instrument's concepts and one unfamiliar. Second, the researcher synthesized these two translations into a single version. Third, this version was back-translated into English by two English speakers who were unaware of the original concepts. Fourth, an expert committee reviewed all translations and resolved inconsistencies through consensus. Fifth, a pre-final version was tested on participants from the target population, with interviews conducted to assess their understanding of each item and their chosen responses. Finally, psychometric testing was performed to evaluate the instrument's reliability and validity.

Table 1 Participants' demographic (EFA n = 367, CFA n = 368)

Variables	EFA			CFA		
	n	%	M	n	%	M
Age			35.98			37.29
Gender						
Woman	267	72.8		296	80.4	
Man	100	27.2		72	19.6	
Educational Level						
Elementary School	6	1.6		14	3.8	
Junior High School	6	1.6		19	5.2	
Senior High School	92	25.1		108	29.3	
Diploma Degree	23	6.3		20	5.4	
Bachelor Degree	192	52.3		164	44.6	
Master Degree	45	12.3		42	11.4	
Doctoral Degree	3	0.8		1	0.3	
Residence						
Java	257	70.0		277	75.3	
Sumatera	46	12.5		35	9.5	
Kalimantan	14	3.8		17	4.6	
Bali	4	1.1		1	0.3	
Nusa Tenggara	14	3.8		14	3.8	
Sulawesi	31	8.4		21	5.7	
Papua	1	0.3		3	0.8	

Note. EFA=Exploratory Factor Analysis, CFA=Confirmatory Factor Analysis, M=mean

Data acquisition was carried out using an online assessment tool administered through Google Forms, complemented by offline interviews. The offline interviews served as a readability test to ensure that participants understood the translated instructions and items in Indonesian, thereby enhancing the instrument's validity. In contrast, participant recruitment for the psychometric test was conducted online, utilizing digital platforms to reach a wide and diverse pool of participants through official advertisements on the researcher's personal Instagram account. Prior to accessing the questionnaire, participants received informed consent, outlining the study's purpose and their rights. Those who opted out could proceed to the end of the form without further interaction.

### Measurement and Assessment of Variables

The IM-P Indonesia version is a self-report instrument comprising 31 items across 5

subscales, as detailed in Table 1. Each item is answered using a 5-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 1 (never true) to 5 (always true) to assess behavior frequency. The IM-P was translated into Indonesian and back into English by three master's students in Psychology and Biomedical Engineering, along with an English lecturer. The translation results were reviewed by two lecturers specializing in mindfulness for expert judgment. A readability test was then conducted by interviewing four individuals who met the inclusion criteria. The final version of the instrument was used for psychometric and qualitative analysis, which included discussions about item retention and combinations based on theoretical definitions and prior research findings. Qualitative analysis also identified redundant or overly similar items. Examples of the original items are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting (IM-P) Subscales &amp; Item Sample

Dimensions	Number of Item	Item Sample
Listening with full attention to the child	1, 9, 13, 19, 24	1. Not listening to child with full attention.
Non-judgmental acceptance of the self and the child	4, 7, 10, 18, 21, 23, 28	4. Nonjudgmental listening to child.
Emotional awareness of the self and the child	3, 6, 11, 12, 22, 30	3. Aware of impact of child mood on own mood.
Self-regulation in the parenting relationship	2, 5, 8, 14, 16, 29	2. When upset with child, notice feelings before acting.
Compassion for the self as a parent and for the child	15, 17, 20, 25, 26, 27, 31	15. Self-critical of parenting mistakes.

Table 3 Factor loadings for Indonesian IM-P after EFA

Factor 1		Factor 2	
Item	$\lambda$	Item	$\lambda$
IMP31	0.714	IMP13	0.335
IMP16	0.606	IMP20	0.264
IMP25	0.585	IMP15	0.745
IMP22	0.570	IMP17	0.729
IMP4	0.564	IMP26	0.702
IMP18	0.563		
IMP30	0.562		
IMP7	0.555		
IMP27	0.546		
IMP28	0.523		
IMP8	0.516		
IMP2	0.439		
IMP19	0.420		
IMP12	0.415		
IMP3	0.387		

Note. IM-P=Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting, EFA=Exploratory Factor Analysis

The Indonesian version of the Parental Stress Scale (PSS) is a self-report instrument consisting of 15 items, divided into two subscales: pleasure and strain. An example item from the pleasure subscale is: "I am happy in my role as a parent," while an example item from the strain subscale is: "Having children leaves little time and flexibility in my life." Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The pleasure subscale reflects the positive aspects of parenting, while the strain subscale captures the more challenging and stressful aspects.

To assess overall parental stress, scores from the pleasure subscale must be reversed and then combined with the scores from the strain subscale. This adjustment ensures that higher total scores indicate higher levels of stress, considering both the pleasurable and stressful components of parenting. The Indonesian version of the PSS, adapted by Kumalasari et al. (2022), demonstrated a high level of internal consistency ( $\alpha = .82$ ). Validity testing, including Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), confirmed the two-factor structure of pleasure and strain, with good discriminant validity.

### Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS and JASP software. Descriptive statistics were first employed to analyze participant demographics. To assess internal consistency, a reliability test was conducted using both Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) and composite reliability (CR) (Hair et al., 2019). Next, construct validity was examined through discriminant validity and factor analysis. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was

performed using an oblique rotation with the Oblimin method. This was followed by Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to validate the model identified through EFA and qualitative analysis. The model fit was evaluated using the following criteria: TLI, CFI, GFI, RMSEA, and SRMR. After the CFA, internal consistency was re-evaluated to assess the final reliability of the model. Finally, discriminant validity was tested by correlating the total and dimensional scores of the Parental Stress Scale (PSS).

## RESULTS

### Factor Structure of the Indonesian Version of the IM-P

Initial reliability results revealed that Cronbach's alpha for the 31-item IM-P was  $\alpha = 0.771$ . Several items (5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 21, 23, and 29) had CrIT values below 0.2, prompting further qualitative analysis to assess their comprehension in the context of Indonesian parents and their alignment with the definition of mindful parenting. As a result of this analysis, item 9 was removed, as being in a rush does not necessarily imply a lack of mindfulness. Item 24 was also deleted, as it seemed to describe monitoring or evaluating the child's actions, rather than fostering a deeper understanding of the child. Additionally, item 1 (CrIT = 0.306) was excluded because its meaning was already adequately captured by item 19 (CrIT = 0.383), which had a higher CrIT value. Following these adjustments, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was 0.830, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded a significant result ( $X^2 = 2093.018$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), confirming the appropriateness of the sample and correlations

Table 4 Factor loadings for Indonesian IM-P after CFA

EASC		SRP		NJCC		NJCS	
Item	$\lambda$	Item	$\lambda$	Item	$\lambda$	Item	$\lambda$
IMP3	0.368	IMP2	0.239	IMP4	0.496	IMP15	0.914
IMP12	0.383	IMP8	0.575	IMP7	0.471	IMP17	1.384
IMP30	0.520	IMP13	0.358	IMP18	0.403	IMP20	0.496
IMP22	0.440	IMP16	0.434	IMP27	0.333	IMP26	0.950
		IMP19	0.307	IMP28	0.412		
		IMP25	0.611				
		IMP31	0.553				

*Note.* IM-P=Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting, CFA=Confirmatory Factor Analysis, EASC=Emotional Awareness of Self and Child, SRP= Self-Regulation in Parenting, NJCC=Non-judgmental and Self-Compassion, NJCS=Non-Judgmental and Self-Compassion

for factor analysis on the 20-item IM-P. Factor analysis revealed two distinct factors: The first second factor comprised five items from the LFA and CSC subscales. All factor loadings were above 0.3, with the highest loading observed for item 15 (0.745) in Factor 2. The detailed factor loadings can be seen in Table 3.

After assessing the initial factor structure, we found that Factor 1 exhibited excessive diversity and contained too many items compared to Factor 2, making it difficult to extract coherent shared elements within the factor. Consequently, we restructured Factor 1 based on the dimensional composition and adaptation results from various prior studies. This led to the division of Factor 1 into three new factors: (1) Emotional Awareness of Self and Child (EASC, 4 items: 3, 12, 22, 30), (2) Self-Regulation in Parenting (SRP, 7 items: 2, 8, 13, 16, 19, 25, 31), and (3) Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child (NJCC, 5 items: 4, 7, 18, 27, 28). On the other hand, Factor 2 was retained from the EFA results but was redefined as Non-Judgmental and Self-Compassion (NJCS), consisting of 4 items. Additionally, item 13, originally the only item under Listening with Full Attention in Factor 2, was moved to the SRP factor, as it better aligned with the meaning and concept of self-regulation in parenting.

Following this restructuring, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to evaluate the psychometric properties of the revised IM-P scale in a sample of Indonesian parents. The initial CFA model, which included 20 items and 4 factors (Model 1), showed a suboptimal fit to the data:  $X^2 = 1993.248$ ,  $df = 190$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $CFI = 0.894$ ,  $TLI = 0.878$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.056$ ,  $SRMR = 0.060$ , and  $GFI = 0.992$ . Modification indices (MI) suggested that covariances between the residuals of the following item pairs should be allowed: 2 and 16,

factor included 15 items from the LFA, EASC, SRP, NASC, and CSC subscales, while the 4 and 7, 8 and 2, 8 and 16, 13 and 19, 20 and 26, and 22 and 30. The revised model, Model 2, which included these residual covariances, provided a better fit:  $X^2 = 1993.248$ ,  $df = 190$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $CFI = 0.920$ ,  $TLI = 0.903$ ,  $RMSEA = 0.050$ ,  $SRMR = 0.057$ , and  $GFI = 0.993$ . Comparing the two models indicated that Model 2 was superior to Model 1. Most of the factor loadings were above the 0.3 threshold (Field, 2024), except for item 2 (0.23), which was retained due to its value being close to the minimum threshold and its alignment with the indicator's definition. The final factor structure includes the following labels for the factors: EASC for the first, SRP for the second, NJCC for the third, and NJCS for the fourth. The factor loadings can be seen in Table 4.

### Discriminant Validity

To facilitate the analysis, the scores on the pleasure dimension of the Parental Stress Scale (PSS) were reversed, meaning that higher scores on both the PSS and its individual dimensions now reflect greater levels of parenting stress. The results of the discriminant validity analysis revealed that the overall IM-P score and the three factors (EASC, SRP, NJCC) exhibited a negative correlation with the total PSS score, as well as the pleasure and strain dimensions of the PSS. This suggests that higher scores on the IM-P, as well as higher scores in EASC, SRP, and NJCC, are generally associated with lower levels of parenting stress. Conversely, NJCS showed a positive correlation with the total PSS score, as well as both the pleasure and strain dimensions. This indicates that higher scores in NJCS are associated with a slight increase in perceived parenting stress. For further details, refer to Table 5.

Table 5 Correlation between Indonesian IM-P and PSS

	EASC	SRP	NJCC	NJCS
PSS Total	-0.335**	-0.350**	-0.468**	0.249**
Pleasure	-0.463**	-0.488**	-0.599**	0.226**
Strain	-0.170**	-0.174**	-0.272**	0.213**

*Note.* \*\* $p < 0.01$ ; PSS=Parental Stress Scale, EASC=Emotional Awareness of Self and Child; SRP= Self-Regulation in Parenting; NJCC=Non-judgmental and Self-Compassion; NJCS=Non-Judgmental and Self-Compassion

### Internal Consistency of IM-P Indonesia 20 Items

The internal consistency of the 20-item IM-P scale was found to be high, with a Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.89 for the overall scale. The internal consistencies for each individual dimension were as follows:  $\alpha = .581$  for Emotional Awareness of Self and Child (EASC),  $\alpha = .681$  for Self-Regulation in Parenting (SRP),  $\alpha = 0.684$  for Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child (NJCC),  $\alpha = 0.780$  for Non-judgmental and Self-Compassion (NJCS). In terms of composite reliability (CR), the values for each dimension were as follows: 0.46 for EASC, 0.63 for SRP, 0.52 for NJCC, 0.97 for NJCS. These results suggest that while the overall scale demonstrates strong reliability, some dimensions, particularly EASC, SRP, and NJCC, may benefit from further refinement to enhance their internal consistency.

### DISCUSSION

This research aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Indonesian adaptation of the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting (IM-P) scale. The methodology involved examining CrIT, factor analysis using EFA and CFA, evaluating reliability, and testing validity using the PSS. The findings revealed that the second-order, four-factor model—comprising free residual covariances between items 2 and 16, items 4 and 7, items 8 and 2, items 8 and 16, items 13 and 19, items 20 and 26, and items 22 and 30—demonstrated a good fit with good reliability. The four factors identified in this study are Emotional Awareness of Self and Child (EASC), Self-Regulation in Parenting (SRP), Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child (NJCC), and Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self (NJCS). These results align with the research hypothesis that the IM-P in Indonesian is likely to exhibit a different structure compared to the five-dimensional model proposed by Duncan et al. (2009), similar to findings from adaptations of the IM-P in other languages (de Bruin et al., 2012; Lo et al., 2018; McCaffrey et al., 2017; Moreira & Canavarro, 2017).

The Indonesian version of the IM-P closely resembles the English and Dutch versions (de Bruin et al., 2012). However, like other adaptations, it distinguishes between parental and child compassion, acknowledging that parental compassion does not necessarily reflect self-compassion (de Bruin et al., 2012). One hypothesis for this differentiation is parental trauma; individuals from traumatic backgrounds may show greater compassion toward their children than themselves, while those from permissive environments may be more self-compassionate toward their children (de Bruin et al., 2012). The compensatory hypothesis supports this, suggesting that dissatisfied parents may find fulfillment in their relationships with their children (Erel & Burman, 1995). Such parents might channel their unmet needs into parenting, fostering deeper connections with their children. Thus, the IM-P's distinct dimensions of compassion offer insights into how parental experiences and internal dynamics influence mindful parenting practices.

Meanwhile, the Emotional Awareness of Self and Child dimension in the Indonesian IM-P remains combined, following the approach of Duncan et al. (2009). This contrasts with adaptations in Dutch (de Bruin et al., 2012) and Portuguese (Moreira & Canavarro, 2017), which separate emotional awareness into distinct dimensions. This seems to be the case with the Indonesian IM-P version, as two items that specifically refer to the ability to be aware of one's own emotions were not included in the factor analysis due to having CrIT values  $< 0.2$ . Concurrently, the four retained items included three (items 11, 12, and 22) that specifically address parents' capacity to recognize their child's emotions, while item 3 pertains to the ability to recognize one's own emotions. The composition of these retained items, particularly the dominance of items related to recognizing the child's emotions, suggested that the dimension was not adequately represented by a split into separate categories. As a result, the integration of self and child emotional awareness into a single dimension was deemed more appropriate for reflecting the overall construct in the Indonesian context.



Another noteworthy dimension for discussion is Self-Regulation in Parenting, which encompasses items from various original dimensions. In comparison to the original and Dutch versions of IM-P, the Self-Regulation in Parenting dimension in the Indonesian IM-P includes items related to compassion, attentive listening, emotional awareness, and self-regulation. Consistent with other IM-P versions, researchers agree that emotional awareness is integral to self-regulation. Moreover, the conscious regulation of responses was also represented in the behavior of listening and paying attention to the child (referring to the LFA dimension) as well as determining the appropriate response to the child, even when experiencing unpleasant emotions (referring to the CSC dimension). As a result, these items in the Indonesian IM-P were integrated into a unified dimension referred to as Self-Regulation in Parenting.

Relative to other IM-P versions, the Indonesian IM-P is shorter, resembling the Korean version in total item count (Kim et al., 2019). Consequently, the correlation values are anticipated to be lower due to the relationship between Cronbach's alpha and the number of items (Peterson, 1994). Conversely, construct validation through correlation with the PSS demonstrated that the overall IM-P score showed a significant negative correlation with parenting stress, thereby supporting our hypothesis. This pattern was replicated in three other dimensions, which also showed significant negative correlations with parenting stress. These results align with Potharst et al. (2017), who asserted that mindful parenting enhances parents' ability to cope with stress more adaptively by increasing self-reflection skills. Naziah et al. (2023) also elucidated that for effective parenting under stressful conditions, it is essential for parents to regulate their emotions and maintain psychological composure, a practice encompassed within mindful parenting.

However, the study found that the dimension of Non-Judgmental and Compassion for Self was positively and significantly correlated with parenting stress, which is contrary to theoretical expectations. This unexpected result deviates from what was observed in previous research and suggests that the concept of self-compassion in the context of mindful parenting may be influenced by cultural factors. In some cultures, including the Indonesian context, self-compassion might be interpreted as condoning or excusing parenting errors rather than as a supportive practice. This interpretation aligns with similar findings reported among Chinese

parents, where self-compassion was perceived as a form of self-exoneration that could inadvertently increase parenting stress (Pan et al., 2019). Furthermore, parents who are prone to self-criticism or who face external criticism may experience heightened feelings of guilt or selfishness when they attempt to practice self-acceptance and forgiveness. Such parents might hold the belief that forgiving themselves or overlooking their mistakes is inappropriate or counterproductive, which can intensify their stress related to parenting.

Considering that most participants in this study were mothers who lived on Java Island, the permissive nature of Javanese culture (Mulder, 1992, as cited in Riany et al., 2017) could be an additional point of concern. These mothers often emphasize the importance of cultivating a loving and secure home environment for their children (Jankowiak, 1992). As a result, if they make mistakes that negatively affect their children and attempt to forgive themselves for those mistakes, it might intensify feelings of stress and guilt. Additionally, within Indonesian parenting norms, parents are traditionally viewed as authoritative figures deserving of respect (Febiyanti & Yulindrasari, 2021), which places significant pressure on them to be consistently correct and dependable. This societal expectation may create pressure for parents to maintain an image of infallibility, which can make self-compassion and self-forgiveness seem inappropriate or contradictory to their perceived role. This phenomenon suggests that the practice of self-compassion in parenting could be fraught with complexities and paradoxes in certain cultural contexts. This unique and counterintuitive result underscores the necessity for additional research to investigate the explanations for this correlation and to understand how self-compassion interacts with parenting stress across different cultural and psychological contexts.

The study indicates that mindful parenting may vary across cultures. If this hypothesis is valid, the Indonesian IM-P should resemble versions from China and Korea due to their similar Eastern cultural backgrounds related to parenting. However, the adaptation of the IM-P for Indonesia reveals notable differences, indicating that the concept of mindful parenting may be influenced by unique cultural factors specific to Indonesia. Kim et al. (2019) noted that these discrepancies may also stem from linguistic differences or semantic shifts during translation, as well as potential psychometric issues with certain items in the original IM-P, which could affect how the concept is

understood and applied in different cultural contexts. This underscores the importance of exploring these variations in greater detail to ensure that adaptations of the IM-P are culturally relevant and accurately reflect the diverse ways in which mindful parenting is practiced and perceived around the world.

Despite the valuable insights this study provides for the advancement of mindful parenting, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the sample exhibited an imbalance between mothers and fathers. Given the increasing involvement of fathers in parenting practices alongside mothers, their role should not be undervalued. This disparity might skew the findings and limit their applicability across different parental roles. Second, the sample distribution was predominantly concentrated in urban areas, particularly on the island of Java, limiting the generalizability of results. Mindful parenting, as a relatively new psychological construct, may not be as widely acknowledged or understood in rural areas or among individuals with lower educational levels, potentially leading to different interpretations and practices. This aligns with Dewanggi et al. (2015), who noted that maladaptive parenting is more common in rural areas due to cultural differences and limited access to parenting resources. Lastly, reliance on self-report questionnaires introduces potential bias, particularly from social desirability effects, which could affect data accuracy.

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The adaptation of the IM-P Indonesia involved a multi-step process to ensure its relevance and accuracy within the Indonesian context. This process began with translating the original IM-P into Indonesian, followed by a synthesis phase to evaluate and refine the translated items. Expert evaluation ensured that the items maintained conceptual integrity and cultural appropriateness. Finally, a readability test and psychometric testing, including reliability testing, factor analysis, and discriminant validity, were conducted. The final results of this adaptation process revealed notable differences between IM-P Indonesia and the original theory proposed by Duncan et al. (2009). The IM-P Indonesia consists of 20 items divided into 4 second-order dimensions: Emotional Awareness of Self and Child (EASC), Self-Regulation in Parenting (SRP), Non-judgmental and Compassion for Child (NJCC), and Non-judgmental and Compassion for Self (NJCS).

The IM-P Indonesia provides an opportunity to explore mindful parenting within the Indonesian context, given the significance of mindful parenting in helping parents manage parenting stress and foster positive relationships with their children. Additionally, research on mindful parenting can assist various stakeholders, including policymakers, educators, and mental health professionals, in developing and implementing programs designed to support and enhance parenting practices in Indonesia. Future studies should focus on several key areas. A balanced representation of both mothers and fathers will provide a more comprehensive view of mindful parenting practices. Expanding demographics to include participants from rural areas and various educational backgrounds will offer broader insights. Finally, using alternative measurement methods, such as direct observations and input from other family members, can enrich findings and reduce biases associated with self-report measures.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to thank Adriana Soekandar Ginanjar for being our expert judge; Rischa Indira Sabrina, Fitria Nugraha, Josh Frederich, Martriwati, and Aufa Miladya Izzah for being our translators; Khairunnisa Syafira Dumbi for being our proofreader; Abdurrahman Rosid and Afiya Eka Nurilla for being our statistics consultants. We also thank our enumerators who helped us collect the data, and our participants who were very humble and committed in contributing to our research.

### REFERENCES

- Agustin, A., Mardiyanti, R., Safitri, R. A., & Faizin, M. N. (2021). Psikoedukasi mindful parenting dalam meningkatkan parenting skill ibu balita di era digital. In *Prosiding Seminar Abdimas Indonesia (SAI)*, 1(1), 21–29.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine*, 25(24), 3186–3191. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014>
- Beer, M., Ward, L., & Moar, K. (2013). The relationship between mindful parenting and distress in parents of children with an autism spectrum disorder. *Mindfulness*, 4, 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0192-4>

- Bögels, S. M., Hellemans, J., van Deursen, S., Römer, M., & van der Meulen, R. (2014). Mindful parenting in mental health care: Effects on parental and child psychopathology, parental stress, parenting, coparenting, and marital functioning. *Mindfulness*, 5(5), 536–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-010-0014-5>
- Brown, S. M., Bender, K. A., Bellamy, J. L., Garland, E. L., Dmitrieva, J., & Jenson, J. M. (2021). A pilot randomized trial of a mindfulness-informed intervention for child welfare-involved families. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 420–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-1001-5>
- Burmansah, Andriyaningsih, A., Sutawan, K., Rapiadi, & Sumarwan, E. (2023). The influence of silent sitting and mindful parenting on interest in learning the students of STIAB Jinarakhita Lampung. *Journal of Education, Religious, and Instructions (JoERI)*, 1(2), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.60046/joeri.v1i2.82>
- Chaplin, T. M., Turpyn, C. C., Fischer, S., Martelli, A. M., Ross, C. E., Leichtweis, R. N., ... & Sinha, R. (2021). Parenting-focused mindfulness intervention reduces stress and improves parenting in highly stressed mothers of adolescents. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-1026-9>
- Chen, S. X., Cheung, F. M., Bond, M. H., & Leung, J. P. (2005). Decomposing the construct of ambivalence over emotional expression in a Chinese cultural context. *European Journal of Personality*, 19(3), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.538>
- Corthorn, C., & Milicic, N. (2016). Mindfulness and parenting: A correlational study of non-meditating mothers of preschool children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25(5), 1672–1683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-015-0319-z>
- de Bruin, E. I., Zijlstra, B. J. H., Geurtzen, N., van Zundert, R. M. P., van de Weijer-Bergsma, E., Hartman, E. E., Nieuwesteeg, A. M., Duncan, L. G., & Bögels, S. M. (2012). Mindful parenting assessed further: Psychometric properties of the dutch version of the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting Scale (IM-P). *Mindfulness*, 5(2), 200–212. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0168-4>
- Dewanggi, M., Hastuti, D., & Herawati, T. (2015). The influence of attachment and quality of parenting and parenting environment on children's character in rural and urban areas of Bogor. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga dan Konsumen*, 8(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2015.8.1.20>
- Dumbi, K. S. (2022a). *Contribution of mindful parenting toward parenting self-efficacy in working mothers with primary school age children during covid-19 pandemic* [Bachelor's thesis, Universitas Indonesia]. Universitas Indonesia Library. <https://lib.ui.ac.id/detail?id=20525890&lokasi=lokal>
- Dumbi, K. F. (2022b). *The relationship between mindful parenting and marital satisfaction among mothers with elementary school age children* [Bachelor's thesis, Universitas Indonesia]. Universitas Indonesia Library. <https://lib.ui.ac.id/detail?id=20525892&lokasi=lokal>
- Duncan, L. G., Coatsworth, J. D., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). A model of mindful parenting: Implications for parent–child relationships and prevention research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 12(3), 255–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-009-0046-3>
- Duncan, L. G., Coatsworth, J. D., Gayles, J. G., Geier, M. H., & Greenberg, M. T. (2015). Can mindful parenting be observed? Relations between observational ratings of mother–youth interactions and mothers' self-report of mindful parenting. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(2), 276–282. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038857>
- Erel, O., & Burman, B. (1995). Interrelatedness of marital relations and parent-child relations: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin*, 118(1), 108–132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.118.1.108>
- Febiyanti, A., & Yulindrasari, H. (2021, March). Cultural hybridity in parenting in Indonesia. In *5th International Conference on Early Childhood Education (ICECE 2020)* (pp. 163-167). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210322.035>
- Field, A. (2024). *Discovering statistics using ibm statistics* (6th ed.). Sage.

- Geurtzen, N., Scholte, R. H., Engels, R. C., Tak, Y. R., & van Zundert, R. M. (2015). Association between mindful parenting and adolescents' internalizing problems: Non-judgmental acceptance of parenting as core element. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24, 1117–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-014-9920-9>
- Han, Z. R., Ahemaitijiang, N., Yan, J., Hu, X., Parent, J., Dale, C., ... & Singh, N. N. (2021). Parent mindfulness, parenting, and child psychopathology in China. *Mindfulness*, 12, 334–343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01111-z>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Jankowiak, W. (1992). Father–child relations in urban China. In B. S. Hewlett (Ed.), *Father–child relations: Cultural and biosocial contexts* (pp. 345–363). Aldine de Gruyter.
- Jones, L., Hastings, R. P., Totsika, V., Keane, L., & Rhule, N. (2014). *Bangor Mindful Parenting Scale (BMPS)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t46514-000>
- Kabat-Zinn, M., & Kabat-Zinn, J. (2014). *Everyday blessings: The inner work of mindful parenting* (2nd ed.). Hyperion.
- Kabat-Zinn, J., & Kabat-Zinn, M. (2021). Mindful parenting: Perspectives on the heart of the matter. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 266–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01564-7>
- Kim, E., Krägeloh, C. U., Medvedev, O. N., Duncan, L. G., & Singh, N. N. (2019). Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting Scale: Testing the psychometric properties of a Korean version. *Mindfulness*, 10(3), 516–528. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-0993-1>
- Kumalasari, D., Gani, I. A. A., & Fourianalistyawati, E. (2022). Adaptation and psychometric properties of the Indonesian version of Parental Stress Scale. *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat*, 9(2), 332–353. <https://doi.org/10.24854/jpu527>
- Laurent, H. K., Duncan, L. G., Lightcap, A., & Khan, F. (2017). Mindful parenting predicts mothers' and infants' hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal activity during a dyadic stressor. *Developmental Psychology*, 53(3), 417–424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000258>
- Lengua, L. J., Ruberry, E. J., McEntire, C., Klein, M., & Jones, B. (2021). Preliminary evaluation of an innovative, brief parenting program designed to promote self-regulation in parents and children. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 438–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-023-02096-6>
- Lo H. H. M., Yeung J. W. K., Duncan L. G., Ma Y., Siu A. F. Y., Chan S. K. C., Choi C. W., Szeto M. O., Chow K. K. W., Ng S. M. (2018). Validating of the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting Scale in Hong Kong Chinese. *Mindfulness*, 9, 1390–1401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0879-7>
- McCaffrey, Stacey., Reitman, David., & Black, Ryan. (2017). Mindfulness In Parenting Questionnaire (MIPQ): Development and validation of a measure of mindful parenting. *Journal Mindfulness*, 8(1), 232–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0596-7>
- Monalisa, M., Nomiko, D., & Ekawati, F. (2023). Pengaruh modifikasi positive parenting program terhadap keterampilan mindful orang tua dalam pengasuhan anak usia dini. *Murhum: Jurnal Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, 4(2), 285–296. <https://doi.org/10.37985/murhum.v4i2.316>
- Moreira, H., & Canavarro, M. C. (2017). Psychometric properties of the interpersonal mindfulness in parenting scale in a sample of Portuguese mothers. *Mindfulness*, 8(3), 691–706. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0647-0>
- Moreira, H., Gouveia, M. J., & Canavarro, M. C. (2018). Is mindful parenting associated with adolescents' well-being in early and middle/late adolescence? The mediating role of adolescents' attachment representations, self-compassion and mindfulness. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47, 1771–1788. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0808-7>
- Mubarok, P. P. (2016). Program pengasuhan positif untuk meningkatkan keterampilan mindful parenting orangtua remaja. *Psymphatic: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 3(1),

- 35–50.  
<https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v3i1.1095>
- Naziah, H. R., Sunarti, E., & Riany, Y. E. (2023). Pengaruh manajemen stres dan status pekerjaan ibu terhadap pengasuhan anak usia sekolah saat pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga & Konsumen*, 16(1), 23–36.  
<https://doi.org/10.24156/jikk.2023.16.1.23>
- Pan, J., Liang, Y., Zhou, H., & Wang, Y. (2019). Mindful parenting assessed in Mainland China: Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the Interpersonal Mindfulness in Parenting Scale. *Mindfulness*, 10, 1629–1641.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-019-01122-w>
- Peterson, R. A. (1994). A meta-analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(2), 381–391.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/209405>
- Potharst, E. S., Aktar, E., Rexwinkel, M., Rigterink, M., & Bögels, S. M. (2017). Mindful with your baby: Feasibility, acceptability, and effects of a mindful parenting group training for mothers and their babies in a mental health context. *Mindfulness*, 8(5), 1236–1250.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0699-9>
- Prihandini, G. R., Boediman, L. M., Azizah, L. N., Kristiyani, V., FH, G. (2019). pengembangan alat ukur mindful parenting untuk orang tua dari remaja di Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikogenesis*, 7(2), 215–227.  
<https://doi.org/10.24854/jps.v7i2.783>
- Riany, Y. E., Meredith, P., & Cuskelly, M. (2017). Understanding the influence of traditional cultural values on Indonesian parenting. *Marriage & Family Review*, 53(3), 207–226.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2016.1157561>
- Saraswati, F (2020). *Correlation between mindful parenting and mother's emotion socialization of 3-6 years old children* [Bachelor's thesis, Universitas Indonesia]. Universitas Indonesia Library.  
<https://lib.ui.ac.id/detail?id=20506134&lokasi=lokal>
- Singh, N. N., Lancioni, G. E., Medvedev, O. N., Hwang, Y. S., & Myers, R. E. (2021). A component analysis of the Mindfulness-Based Positive Behavior Support (MBPBS) program for mindful parenting by mothers of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Mindfulness*, 12(2), 463–475.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-020-01376-9>
- Turpyn, C. C., & Chaplin, T. M. (2016). Mindful parenting and parents' emotion expression: Effects on adolescent risk behaviors. *Mindfulness*, 7(1), 246–254.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-015-0440-5>