Review of: "Developing and Evaluating the Marriage Education Program: The Example of the Turkish Cypriot Community"

Essa Alibraheim[1]

1 Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University

Dear authors,

It is my pleasure to read your manuscript, and to see the effort made to produce the manuscript in its final form.

General comments:

The "Developing and Evaluating the Marriage Education Program: The Example of the Turkish Cypriot Community" presents a one-factorial study about needs of individuals living in Northern Cyprus were determined, developing a marriage education program (EEP), and evaluating the effectiveness of the program. Results reveal a significant improve in the marriage attitudes and beliefs of married individuals from a pre to a post test.

The paper is in most parts nice to read and presents an interesting piece of work. Nevertheless, there are some obstacles to publication in its present form. The foremost reason here is the missing of a theoretical rationale for research questions and hypotheses. Why should the approach here be more effective than other approaches?

Introduction:

There are many information that need citations. For example, the authors wrote, "The rapid increase in divorce in the country and the fact that it has become a social problem reveals that the sensitivity of the society on this issue should be increased." Who said that? Why were the official state sources not cited? Also, the authors wrote, "Treatment and counseling activities are aimed at preventing divorces and solving problems. In preventive and improving activities aimed at helping the family to be formed and maintained in a healthy way before it is established, the main purpose is to prevent situations that cause divorce." Where is the citation?

I recommend writing a headline called 'Literature Review', and having all previous studies under it.

I also recommend moving paragraphs 10-12 of the introduction before the title 'Literature Review', naming it, for example, "The Research Problem and its Questions."

Some parts of the paper need term modification. For example, change 'Model' to 'Methodology', 'Working Group' to 'Sample', and 'Data Collection Agents' to 'Instruments'.

Method:

With regard to the method, the paper lacks a detailed description of what the intervention really looked like. It does not become clear how the EEP was operationalized. In addition, the design just shows that there is an improvement from pre to post test. This does not allow any conclusion whether EEP is more or less effective.

Authors need give justification why use one-group pretest-posttest design. In quasi-experimental designs, it is possible to conduct a one-group t-test without a control group. However, this type of analysis may not provide strong evidence for causality or allow for comparisons between different groups or conditions. Without a control group, it may be difficult to rule out alternative explanations for any observed effects or changes in the outcome variable.

Findings:

There is a similarity in subheadings "Findings Related to Sub-Problem". It is necessary to distinguish between each title and another.

What do you mean by "child" in Figures 1, 2, and 3?

Presenting Figures only without clarification and explanation in the paper is not acceptable in scientific papers.

Qualitative data do not provide the reader with evidence to support the authors' claim. For example, the participants' response to question "What are the important contributions of this program to you?" does not indicate that they have benefited from the program, but rather it indicates praise from the participants for the authors. Please provide clearer evidence of the validity of the authors' claim from the interviews conducted with the participants.

Taken together, I think that the manuscript lacks a clear theoretical rationale and does not really bring new insights into the use of EEP. Thus, I do not recommend publishing the paper in its current form.