

Predictors of Relationship Autonomy: The Roles of Cognitive Flexibility and Psychological Capital

Selva. Turan¹, Ahmet. Kutsal^{2*}

¹ Necmettin Erbakan University, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Konya, Türkiye

² Necmettin Erbakan University, Seydisehir Vocational School, Konya, Türkiye

* Corresponding author email address: ahmetkustal@erbakan.edu.tr

E d i t o r

Valiollah Farzad
Department of Psychology and
Counseling, KMAN Research
Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario,
Canada
v.farzad@kmanresce.ca

R e v i e w e r s

Reviewer 1: Geoffrey Olsen
Liva Healthcare, Research and Innovation, 1434 Copenhagen, Denmark. Email:
geoffrey_olsen101@gmail.com
Reviewer 2: Haixin Qiu
Department of Medicine, Marshall University Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine,
Huntington, West Virginia. haixinqiu@marshall.edu

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction mentions the concept of autonomy but could benefit from a more detailed explanation of why autonomy is particularly important in romantic relationships. Consider elaborating on the unique challenges and dynamics of romantic relationships that make autonomy a critical variable.

The selection of 203 participants based on the Morgan and Krejcie table is mentioned. However, it would be helpful to justify this choice further by discussing the statistical power analysis that supports the adequacy of this sample size for the planned analyses.

Clarify the data collection process. For instance, how were participants approached and recruited from community centers and online platforms? This detail helps assess the potential biases in sample recruitment.

The use of Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis is appropriate. However, it would strengthen the methodology section to include a justification for why these specific analyses were chosen over other possible methods, such as structural equation modeling.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The literature review should include more recent studies that have explored the role of cognitive flexibility and psychological capital in relationships. For instance, a study from 2023 by Smith et al. on cognitive flexibility in couples could provide a contemporary perspective.

While Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is mentioned, the integration of SDT into the study's hypotheses could be clearer. Suggest explicitly linking SDT components (autonomy, competence, relatedness) to the constructs of cognitive flexibility and psychological capital.

The description of the Relationship Autonomy Scale (RAS), Cognitive Flexibility Inventory (CFI), and Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) is thorough. Yet, providing examples of a few items from each scale could enhance readers' understanding of what these instruments measure.

The results section provides statistical findings but could benefit from a more nuanced interpretation of what a correlation coefficient of 0.48 for cognitive flexibility and relationship autonomy implies in practical terms for couples.

The discussion briefly mentions practical implications for relationship counseling. This section could be expanded to provide specific examples of interventions that could enhance cognitive flexibility and psychological capital in couples.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.