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The outcomes of marriage preparation on three variables, a) willingness to seek help with marriage, b) attitude towards the church and c) relationship beliefs were investigated in a field setting. Decisions regarding outcomes were made by juxtaposing findings from a recurrent institutional cycle design, and the pre-posttest design. In addition, post-program interviews were employed to determine the impact of the programs. The sample consisted of 288 participants, with 96 in each of three well-established, regularly offered marriage preparation programs (Anglican, Roman Catholic and Couples' Workshop). Pre-posttest measures were collected on 48 subjects in each program, and then on 48 of their cohorts at the next offering of the program. There were no differences found between the three leadership conditions within each program. Statistical results indicated a significant effect for the entire sample after marriage preparation on the Willingness To Seek Help With Marriage and Relationship Beliefs Inventories. There were no significant differences on the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory. Changes in willingness to seek help with marriage and relationship beliefs were found in the Couples' Workshop sample, but not in the Roman Catholic or Anglican samples. Differential comparison indicated statistically significant differences between participants in the Couples' Workshop and the other two programs on measures of willingness to seek help with marriage and relationship beliefs. Qualitative reports based on 30 post-program interviews pointed to the importance of experiential and skill training methods in explaining the measured differences between the programs.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Is it not obvious that marriage is failing today on a huge scale, not because it is unworkable, but because its complexity has greatly increased, and we have failed to make this clear to those who enter it...? (Mace, 1984 p. 57)

When the Berger Commission on the Family met in the 1970’s it found that 20,000 couples were married annually in British Columbia (Assimakos, 1974). In 1984, 23,000 couples were married in B.C. (Statistics Canada, personal communication, January, 1986). Despite rising divorce rates, marriage has continued to be a desired status for many couples.

Few marriage partners forget the time prior to marriage. The time and events surrounding courtship are memorable and determining (Sullaway and Christensen, 1983). Courtship is a time when the foundations for the future of marriage are laid. Role assignments and relationship patterns are established (Bader & Sinclair, 1983). The premarital period is considered in Western Society to be a time of excitement, romance and a coming of age. It is one of life’s significant markers. Its significance as a preparation for future marital experience has led some to call for compulsory marriage preparation programs as a prerequisite to obtaining a marriage licence (Turner, 1980; Dave Barrett, personal communication, September 9, 1985; Franco, 1974). Legislatures, such as that of the state of California, have experimented with compulsory marriage preparation for those under the age of majority (Shonick, 1975, Elkin, 1977).

Although divorce rates continue to rise with the
urbanization of society (Makabe, 1980), divorce statistics do not paint the complete picture of marital unhappiness. Divorce rates do not tell of the impact of intrapsychic pain caused by unhappy marital relationships and the consequent challenge to mental health and social performance (Bloom, Asher & White, 1978). Aside from the individual pain felt throughout relationship systems as a result of failed marriages ending in divorce, there is the quiet disappointment of those who remain in unsatisfactory marriages. The marital couple has been considered the key to all familial relationships (Mace, 1984) and the family therapy literature has related many dysfunctional mental and behavioural symptoms in children to weak parental alliances (Haley, 1981; Hoffman, 1981). Parents are the chief architects of their families.

Marriage preparation is usually the first conjoint relationship helping experience available to couples. As such, it holds the potential to significantly influence relationship partners at a pivotal point in their relationship formation (Bader & Sinclair, 1983; Bagarozzi, 1981) and consequently it has broad ranging effects on familial and social systems generally. Marriage preparation also stands like a doorway to the field of family life education, marriage enrichment, marriage therapy, and family therapy. It also has the potential to raise awareness regarding the merits of other relationship programs and therapies and to influence couple attitudes towards these programs (Olson, 1983). Marriage preparation has an important role to play in society generally, and it has
a significant impact on the development of the helping professions such as marriage and family therapy.

The Nature of the Programs

The term "marriage preparation" refers to a wide range of activities conducted with couples prior to marriage. In British Columbia, most marriage preparation programs are offered through the religious community (personal survey, 1984). For example, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Vancouver instructs about 2,000 people a year in its marriage preparation program (C. Luttrell, personal communication, November 9, 1985) and the Anglican Church instructs about 1,000 persons per year in Greater Vancouver (R. Barnes, personal communication, October, 1985). These programs are available on an ongoing and repetitive basis similar to school classes. In contrast to church related programs, when community colleges and community agencies have offered marriage preparation programs, they have often been met with a lack of or limited registration. Consequently the programs are usually offered only once a season by these agencies. Non-church related programs have usually been associated with university campuses and so have drawn more readily on the resources of the fields of marital and family studies (Martin, Gawinski & Medler, 1982).

Schumm and Denton (1979) classified marriage preparation activities into three categories: a) therapeutic counselling, b) instructional counselling, and c) enrichment approaches. Marriage preparation programs offered by the religious community
have been primarily lecture oriented and information giving (Mace, 1984; McRae, 1976). Such methods have been thought to have limited effectiveness (Olson, 1983). Marriage preparation programs offered in institutions of higher learning have more readily incorporated insights from the social sciences. Methods used within the university contexts have been more experiential and skill development oriented. Examples of such programs include the Minnesota Couple Communication Program (Miller, Nunnally & Wackmann, 1977) and the Conjugal Relationship Enhancement Program (Rappaport, 1976). They have involved brief talks, pairwise discussion, structured activities and group discussion (Rolfe, 1977; Stahmann & Hiebert, 1980). In general these programs have reflected what Schumm called the enrichment focus.

When compared to marital therapy, marriage preparation programs lend themselves to empirical study because there is sufficient structure to enable replication of the independent variable (L'Abate & O'Callaghan, 1977). The programs often follow pre-established leader manuals and protocols which reduce the impact of the leadership differences. L'Abate and O'Callaghan have further suggested that pre-marital couples are less resistant to study because they are usually not in crisis.

Unlike the persons involved in marital counselling and marriage enrichment, marriage preparation programs involve people who may attend the program out of a sense of being compelled to do so by societal organizations. A survey of marriage preparation in B.C. in 1983 (conducted by this
researcher) revealed that most religious organizations require couples anticipating marriage to participate in a marriage preparation course prior to solemnizing marriage. While some marriage preparation programs may work primarily with volunteer participants, many programs have participants attending who may experience some sense of compulsion from the religious body involved in conducting the marriage.

Nature of the Problem

Research is an important component in the growth of an emerging field such as in marriage preparation (Smith, Shoffner, Scott, 1980; Mace, 1979). However, there has been limited effective research of this field (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977; Schumm & Denton, 1979; Stahmann & Hiebert, 1980). There are many reports of marriage preparation programs (Messinger, 1976; Shonick, 1975; Glendening & Wilson, 1972; Westmoreland, 1981; Van Zoost, 1973; Gleason & Prescott, 1977) but not with empirical evidence to support their efficacy. The empirical studies that have been conducted have largely focussed on skill training (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977; Miller, 1971; Wampler, 1982). Typically, studies have been conducted on programs developed specifically for the research project without adequate field trial or staff leadership training (Zodrow, 1981; Horton, 1982). Sampling is usually restricted to university populations (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977; O'Leary & Turkewitz, 1978). Beck (1976), in a review of marital intervention outcome studies, called for more studies in
agencies and in the field. Attempts to obtain field samples in the past (Bader, Microys, Sinclair, Willet & Conway, 1980; Zodrow, 1981; Horton, 1982) have relied either on university subjects, or have not included subjects who are under some compulsion to attend the marriage preparation program. Consequently, their samples have not been accurate representations of the overall population of persons attending marriage preparation.

Furthermore, general hypotheses regarding the efficacy of marriage preparation have been studied in relation to only one particular program (Bader et al, 1980). In order to make general claims for the entire field of marriage preparation it is necessary to provide opportunity for the replication of the findings, and a meta-analysis of the outcomes. Although some comparative studies have been conducted in order to contrast programs (McRae, 1976) or methodologies (Horton, 1982), there are not enough well designed studies in the literature to draw general conclusions for the entire field. Studies that reflect the diversity of practice within marriage preparation are needed for comparative purposes and also to substantiate general knowledge claims regarding the effectiveness of the programs.

In regard to research methodology, Gurman and Kniskern (1981) advocated the use of multiple criteria and multiple perspectives of change in family therapy outcome research. In this regard studies of marriage preparation have used multiple criteria, but there has often been only one method of data collection. A dichotomy has existed between qualitative and
quantitative reporting (Woolsey, 1985). Empirical studies have not sought to understand the subjective experience of course participants or to consider the impact of such programs on a participant's relationship to the sponsoring body of the course. Although cognitive variables are important in relationship development (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981; Geiss & O'Leary, 1981; Beavers, 1985), these have not been a focus of study in marriage preparation. Although many theorists advocate that marriage preparation should alter attitudes toward seeking help with marriage (Stahmann & Hiebert, 1980; Mace, 1984) there has been only one study of this variable (Bader et al., 1980) and no standardized measures are reported in the literature.

**Purpose of the Study**

In this investigation the outcomes of three marriage preparation programs were studied under field conditions by testing three criteria with quantitative and qualitative methods. There were several purposes to the investigation. The research design of the study sought to test several efficacy claims for marriage preparation in a field setting. The field setting included participants not only from universities, but also from a heterogeneous background. Some of the subjects were compelled to attend the marriage preparation program in order to be married by the church.

More specifically, the study sought first to test whether or not beliefs about important dimensions of marital relationships are changed during a marriage preparation program.
Second, the influence of marriage preparation on a subject's attitude towards the church was explored. Third, the research tested the effect of marriage preparation on a participant's willingness to seek help with their marriage in the future through marriage growth programs or through marriage counselling. The study by Bader et al. (1980) had indicated that increased willingness to seek help with marriage may be an important effect of marriage preparation. Since no standardized instrument designed to measure this variable was available, the researcher developed the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory.

The use of three different marriage preparation program methodologies permitted testing of the differential effects between the Couples' Workshop, the Anglican Marriage Preparation Program and the Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program. The qualitative dimension of the study was designed to complement the quantitative findings. Qualitative methods added an exploratory and descriptive element to the study. They allowed for the gathering of a broader range of outcome information than can be discovered in the analysis of group means. It was hoped that this methodology would provide something of the insider's perspective (Olson, 1977) on marriage preparation.

There are times when interventions designed to help have inadvertently produced negative effects. Becvar (1982) has suggested that, above all else, marriage interventions should first do no harm. The gathering of qualitative data was seen as a method of discerning any negative effects.
Theoretical Underpinnings

Marriage preparation is one of a host of family learning activities (Levant, 1983). Some theorists believe that the teachable moment for couples is six months following their wedding (Guldner, 1971). However, as with pre-natal counselling, marriage preparation affords opportunity for intervention prior to an important change, rather than after. It is a "spot" intervention (Belsky, 1982) among a lifetime of family learnings. Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) have suggested that the major focus of marriage preparation is to encourage participants to seek post marital counselling. The importance of marriage preparation is not in terms of its ability to alter overt behaviour, but in terms of its ability to foster a change in attitudes regarding marital expectations and help-seeking in marriage.

As a first conjoint learning activity intent upon modifying attitudes, marriage preparation must first, according to the taxonomy of affective educational objectives (Krathwohl, Bloom & Masia, 1964) create an awareness of and a receptiveness to new information. Vincent (1973) and Mace (1984) have written of privatism in marriage in Western Society. This privatism has fostered a sense of individual isolation and independence in all matters concerning marriage. Mace has articulated the need for interpersonal competence as the basis for a sound marriage. He has also indicated obstacles to the achievement of interpersonal competence in marriage. Many myths surround marriage. Among
these are the following; a) that no special knowledge or skill is required to make a marriage work, b) that most marriages are free of problems, c) that marriage does not require people to change and that it is unlikely that people will change, and d) that conflict is abnormal. From these beliefs about marriage have developed the myths of naturalism and a privatism that Mace has called the "inter-marital taboo". It is these beliefs which prevent partners from obtaining the knowledge, information and skills they need in order to achieve the intimacy they desire. If marriage preparation can change a participant's attitude towards seeking help with marriage, it will facilitate lifelong learning that can be responsive to human needs at the various stages of the life cycle.

The work of Epstein and Eidelson (1981) has isolated five realistic relationship beliefs that are important in marital satisfaction. Realistic relationship beliefs are in opposition to the romantic notions which Mace (1984) considered to be impediments to interpersonal competence. Unrealistic relationship beliefs are considered an important problem in marriage (Geiss et al., 1981; Beavers, 1985; Norem et al., 1979). The foundation of realistic relationship beliefs is rational thinking, which Ball (1981) has called the antibiotic of love relationships. Three of the five dimensions of Epstein and Eidelson's Relationship Belief Inventory relate directly to the myth of naturalism, namely; a) that partners cannot change, b) that conflict is destructive, and c) that understanding one's partner's thoughts, without speaking, is important in love
relationships. This latter behaviour is called "mindreading" and often results in misunderstanding in marriage.

Marriage preparation is designed to create new awareness that will disrupt the myth of naturalism, and the inter-marital taboo which keeps partners from achieving interpersonal competence. Although there is evidence that skill training of adequate duration and design can increase communication skills (D'Augelli, Deyss, Guerney, Hershenberg & Sborofsky, 1974; Nunnally, 1971) there is little solid support for the durability of skill gains. Skill training represents higher order learning, the first step towards which is awareness. Marriage preparation is designed to introduce participants to helpful and realistic relationship beliefs and to a more favourable attitude towards seeking help with their relationship growth.

Operational Definitions

Anglican Program: Refers to the marriage preparation program operated by the Anglican churches of Greater Vancouver and described in Chapter 3.

Attitude Toward the Church: Refers to the favourableness with which a subject regards the social value of the church.

Between-subjects: Refers to comparisons of posttest scores of one group with the pretest scores of their cohorts.

Cohort: Denotes groups of respondents who follow each other through formal institutions or informal institutions (Cook & Campbell, 1979 p 127). In this case, subjects attending the same marriage preparation program are cohorts to each other.
The Couples' Workshop: Refers to a marriage preparation program co-developed by the researcher and described in a protocol for leaders (Lees & Simonsen, 1983).

Field Conditions: Refer to those conditions where: a) subjects participating in the research would have been in their respective marriage preparation program regardless of the study, b) groups are studied intact without self-selection for the study, c) leaders of the respective marriage preparation programs had taught the program on at least one previous occasion, and d) the marriage preparation program was offered regularly, regardless of the intrusion of this study.

Notable Incidents: Refers to recollections of the marriage preparation program by subjects during an interview several months after that program. These incidents make reference to new learnings, course content, course methodology, other participants, or leaders. These particulars are "notable" in that they come to the mind of the participant at follow-up when asked what they recall about the program that had personal significance.

Relationship Beliefs: Refers to assumptions individuals hold about the way that they expect marital interaction to proceed.

Roman Catholic Program: Refers to the marriage preparation program operated by the Catholic Center, Archdiocese of Vancouver and described in Chapter 3.

Seeking Help With Marriage: Refers to a willingness to attend marriage enrichment, marriage education or marriage skill development programs and to be open to seeking marriage therapy.
Structured Group Program Refers to marriage preparation programs with an established curriculum. The leadership of the program has control over this pre-established content and process which can be repeated at different places and times in a similar fashion.

Within-subjects Refers to comparisons of group scores pretest to posttest.

Research Questions

Marriage preparation is an important field of activity lacking in comparative field studies. The characteristics of the population attending marriage preparation programs are largely unknown, as are the outcomes of marriage preparation interventions operated in field contexts. Given this lack of research, several questions arose which guided this investigation.

1. Given the wide variety of marriage preparation programs available, can general efficacy claims be made in support of the programs in regard to their influence on the development of rational and realistic expectations of marriage relationships?

2. As marriage preparation is usually a first experience with couples enrichment, will participants change their reported willingness to seek further help as a result of attending the program?
3. Since the religious community is the largest provider of marriage preparation programs, do the programs have an influence on the participant's perspective of the social relevance of the church?

4. What are the descriptive characteristics of subjects who attend marriage preparation in the field setting? In particular, what age are they, how long have they been going together, how many are cohabiting, and how willing are they to attend the marriage preparation program?

5. What is important in marriage preparation programs to those who participate? What do the participants of marriage preparation consider to be notable about the marriage preparation program they attend? Are there any negative outcomes or contraindications?
CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

Introduction

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the historical influences and client characteristics in marriage preparation. Three major emphases in marriage preparation are then considered, namely: a) the preventative, b) the developmental, and c) the enrichment perspectives. A review of fourteen outcome studies of marriage group preparation is then followed by a discussion of some issues and gaps that arise from the literature. This chapter closes with a statement of the hypotheses of the study.

History

Structured group marriage preparation is a field of educational activity still in its infancy (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977). Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) outline two major antecedents of this emerging field. First it has been influenced by the rise of modern psychology at the turn of the century. Stahmann and Hiebert claim that modern psychology, because of its link with medicine, had a primary concern for the alleviation of illness and remediation of pathology. This tributary influenced mental health workers, medical doctors, and clergy who were preparing couples for marriage. Stahmann and Hiebert note that this remedial focus emerged in marriage preparation in efforts to assure readiness for marriage. The clergy, as gatekeepers of marriage, were the logical professionals to assess readiness for
marriage. This function is still continued among clergy who require couples to attend marriage preparation programs before being willing to perform the marriage ceremony.

Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) note that the second major antecedent to structured group marriage preparation programs was the family life education movement. Family life education brought developmental and adult education perspectives to marriage preparation. Family life courses emerged on campuses and these became the forerunners of marriage preparation classes. In the 1970s, empirical research began on programs designed to build skills considered important in preventing future marital problems (Horton, 1983).

A third major tributary of marriage preparation programs has been the human potential movement (Otto, 1976; Smith et al., 1979). The human potential movement has brought to marriage preparation a concern for growth and enrichment. This emphasis has been concerned with building on the strengths in relationships and making good marriages better. Smith notes that an important contribution of the enrichment focus in marriage programs has been the use of experiential exercises.

In summary, three antecedents to marriage preparation programs can be identified. These have been described by Schumm and Denton (1979) as: a) therapeutic counselling, b) instructional counselling, and c) enrichment approaches.

Clients

Most marriage preparation programs are carried out with participants who are seeking weddings within the framework of the
church and with the support of religious traditions (Olson, 1983; Horton, 1983; Mace, 1984). Courses have been developed on university campuses, but the notion of widespread, voluntary marriage preparation in non-church settings has failed to become a reality (Olson). Statistics Canada figures (personal communication, January, 1986) indicate that approximately 60 percent of weddings are church related. According to Olson it is only this group who are likely to have some form of marriage preparation which could range from a talk with the minister to some type of structured program.

Olson (1983) has entitled a section of an article on marriage preparation, "Why are premarital couples so hard to teach?" (p.62). Gurman (1980) cites "idealization" as one of the major problems in designing relationship programs for the engaged. Guldner (1971) has suggested that premarital couples are not ready to learn about family relationships and suggests that post-wedding is the optimum time for intervention. Horton (1983) speaks about the tendency of premarital couples to "romanticize" relationship concerns, and to cover up undesirable elements in their relationship. Olson claims that premarital couples deny relationship issues for fear that differences will threaten the relationship. Olson believes that marriage preparation should motivate participants to overcome the fear of working on their relationship. Other theorists suggest that couples in the premarital period are at the peak of relationship satisfaction awaiting a plunge into decreasing levels of satisfaction (Beier & Sternberg, 1977b; Markman & Floyd, 1980;
These descriptions of premarital couples do not completely fit this researcher's experience as a clergyman officiating at approximately seventy weddings per year. I have found that premarital couples represent a wide spectrum of society, and are at diverse levels of readiness to explore relationship issues. Some already have children, many have been cohabiting for a period of from two to ten years, and some are seriously conflicted and distressed and want some resolution of the conflict prior to marriage. Some premarital couples are very eager to explore relationships while, for others, marriage preparation will be a less voluntary experience (Zodrow, 1981). A factor contributing to this diversity in client population could be the rise in the rate of divorce and remarriage. Rolfe (1985) claims that one in every four marriages is a marriage in which one partner has been previously married. Gurman (1980) thinks that partners in remarriage may be much less influenced by "idealization." Certainly the growth of divorce and remarriage has changed the characteristics of the premarital population. Bader et al. (1980) found that couples who had not attended marriage preparation decreased in their help seeking after marriage. Thus it may be that many couples are at a greater state of readiness for premarital intervention in the 1980's than was the case when Guldner wrote in 1971. There seems to be evidence that clients of marriage preparation are not uniform in "idealization", in willingness to seek help with their relationship, or in demographic
characteristics. Consequently, research conducted in field settings may provide more complete descriptions of the characteristics of premarital couples today.

**Theory of Marriage Preparation Programs**

**Prevention and Remediation**

Marriage preparation has been concerned with the prevention of future marital difficulties, and the remediation of relationship dynamics which may evolve into future marital problems (Olson, 1983). Heller and Monahan (1977) suggests that the etiology of marital problems may never be fully understood, but that certain "risk factors" can be identified and addressed. Many of these "risk factors" affecting marital satisfaction have been considered in the design of marriage preparation programs. For example, an ineffective communication system has been considered to be an issue in marital distress and so most marriage preparation programs contain content on methods of effective communication. In the following sections, research into marital distress risk factors will be discussed in regard to their implication for marriage preparation.

**Communication.**

Theorists have suggested links between premarital patterns of communication and later marital problems. Markman (1979) conducted longitudinal research and found a strong correlation between perception of positiveness of the other's communication
and marital satisfaction. Markman and Floyd (1980) developed a marriage preparation program based on the behavioral skills differentiating distressed from non-distressed couples. Other researchers have found a positive linear relationship between self-disclosure and marital satisfaction (Jorgensen & Gaudy, 1980; Tolsteldt & Stokes, 1983). Learning positive self-disclosure has been an important component of well established programs used in marriage preparation (Avery, Ridley, Leslie & Milholland, 1980; Miller, Nunnally & Wackman, 1977; Rappaport, 1976).

Conflict Resolution.

Other researchers have looked beyond communication skills to patterns in relationship and methods of conflict resolution. Sullaway and Christensen (1983) discovered three patterns negatively related to relationship satisfaction. These three patterns were; a) when one partner is emotional and the other rationalizes, b) when one person seeks attention and the other appears preoccupied, and c) when one partner approaches and the other avoids. Further research by Christensen, Sullaway and King (1984) suggested two other patterns negatively related to marital satisfaction. These are; a) where one partner is flirtatious and the other jealous, and b) where one partner is critical and the other hurt. Beier and Sternberg (1977-A) in a study of newlyweds found subtle interactional clues that correlated with marital discord. Couples with less reported discord sat closer, touched more often, and talked more openly.
Rands (1981), in a study of marital conflict patterns, found that expressive spouses who confronted relationship issues had the highest relationship satisfaction. Koren, Carlton and Shaw (1980) found that distressed couples were more likely to use criticism in communication, whereas non-distressed couples were more affirming.

Marriage preparation programs have been designed to deal specifically with learning helpful methods of conflict resolution (Ridley, Avery, Harrell, Leslie & Dent, 1981). Programs, such as the Minnesota Couples' Communication Program (Miller, Nunnally, Wackman, 1976), that have begun as communication courses have developed conflict resolution modules to complement communication training. This researcher's review of marriage preparation programs offered in Vancouver revealed that most have course content which includes conflict resolution.

**Relationship Adjustment.**

Olson (1983) has pointed to the importance of marriage preparation enabling premarital couples to examine relationship issues. Fowers (1983) studied the predictive ability of Prepare (Olson, Fournier & Druckman, 1979). Prepare is a 125 item instrument designed to measure couple congruence on 11 dimensions of relationship adjustment. Prepare provides computerized results of relationship agreement and work areas. Work areas are considered to be those where there is considerable disagreement between partners. Fowers found that Prepare is able to predict those couples who will divorce and those who will
be happily married. Prepare is meant to provide opportunity for helping professionals to alert couples to major disagreement areas. As such it is clearly an example of efforts to prevent marital problems and perhaps also to assess readiness for marriage. Olson (1983) reports that Prepare has been used in conjunction with marriage preparation group programs.

Sexuality is another area of relationship adjustment that is often incorporated into marriage preparation curriculums. Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) report that couples who have premarital sexual behaviour consistent with their own value system will have higher marital quality. Vogel (1983) found a significant correlation between sexual communication and marital satisfaction. Marriage preparation curriculums involving content on sexuality promote open communication and thus perhaps greater choice and couple agreement on sexual expression.

Cognition and Marriage.

Ellis (1977) postulated that dissatisfaction in marriage resulted from unrealistic expectations spouses held of each other. These unrealistic expectations led to unhelpful interpersonal behaviour. Unrealistic relationship beliefs have been empirically associated with relationship dissatisfaction (Grafton, 1980). Eisenberg and Zingle (1975) found that distressed couples scored higher on irrational beliefs. Epstein, Finnegan and Bythall (1979) found that observers who scored high on irrational beliefs reported more negative impressions of disagreement than did those with lower irrational
belief scores. This indicates that differing perceptions towards conflict exists among distressed and non-distressed couples. Jacobson, Waggoner-McDonald, Follette and Berley (1984) found that distressed couples were more likely to attribute spouses' negative behaviour to internal causation. Thus distressed spouses assume that they understand the motives of their spouses. Herein lie the roots of two unrealistic relationship beliefs (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981), the first being that conflict is destructive and the second that spouses can "mindread" (or understand each other's intentions without fully communicating).

Unrealistic expectations can lead to anger, nagging, and complaining (Epstein & Williams, 1981). Spouses may hold the unrealistic relationship belief that partners cannot change. This static notion of relationships leads to feelings of being trapped when relationships are not satisfying. Doherty (1981) reports that an essential question for dissatisfied couples is whether or not they have the capacity to alter their symptoms. If spouses do not have a belief in their ability to change, in combination with a knowledge of some helping resources, they may lose hope for their relationship.

In regard to premarital couples and unrealistic relationship beliefs, Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) assert that many premarital couples hold false ideas of what marital relationships are like. Gingras, Adam and Chagnon (1983) found that marital satisfaction could be predicted by the satisfaction of expectations. If couples enter marriage with relationship beliefs that are irrational or unrealistic, it is likely that
their expectations will not be met. Geiss and O'Leary (1981) found that marital therapists rated unrealistic expectations as a common problem in marital distress, but also as one of the easiest problems to solve. Fostering more helpful cognitive perceptions and structures in the client is an important role of the marital and family counsellor. For example, Paul Watzlawick (1984) writes, "The 'real' world of families likewise reveals itself only when the families' own constructions break down. The task of therapy then is to replace that construction with one that fits better" (p.518).

Adam and Gingras (1982) developed a marriage program based on Sager's (1981) theory of marriage contracts. However this program has not been reported in the literature to be in use with premarital couples. Pety (1983) developed a marriage program designed to alter marital expectations, but this program has also not been reported to be in use with premarital couples. Markman and Floyd's (1980) program for the prevention of marital discord was based on restructuring and reframing marital experiences, as well as learning new relationship skills. Many marriage preparation programs include modules on role expectations in marriage. For example, the programs developed by Bader et al. (1980) and by the B.C. Council for the Family (1980) have modules on marriage expectations. Rolfe (1985) has suggested that aside from providing couples with knowledge of helping resources, an important function of marriage preparation is to help partners deal with marital expectations and beliefs about marriage.
Realistic relationship beliefs have been considered important to marital outcomes, and have been incorporated into marriage preparation programs. However, there has been no empirical investigation of this variable in relation to the outcome of marriage preparation programs.

**Developmental Perspectives in Marriage Preparation**

Bagarozzi & Raven, (1981) in his review of the marriage preparation literature, has suggested two goals for the field: a) that couples should be made aware of the developmental tasks facing them and b) that they should be taught behavioural skills with which to solve their difficulties. Skills training has received considerable attention in the empirical study of marriage preparation, but equipping couples with an understanding of developmental concerns has not.

Bader and Sinclair (1983) have suggested that the developmental tasks before premarital couples are a) to establish sex roles and b) to re-align relationships with their respective families of origin. Rolfe (1985) has stated that resolving conflicts with the family of origin is an important premarital concern with the newly married and the remarried couple. Boszormenzi-Nagy and Spark (1973) claim that the task of marriage is to commit oneself anew. They report, "We postulate that the deepest relational determinants of marriage are based on a conflict between each spouse's unresolved loyalty to the family of origin, and his loyalty to the nuclear family" (p. 103).

Mallouk (1983) studied family of origin influences in marriage
and reported that marriage is a new canvas on which old family maps are drawn. Unless family of origin influences are consciously explored they tend to guide behaviour either through resistance to what has been (I'll never be like my parents!) or through an attempt to recreate relationship patterns that are familiar. Daccardi and Baum (1982) found a statistically significant relationship between marital satisfaction and individuation from family of origin.

Several marriage preparation programs have been developed with modules designed to enable participants to explore family of origin influences (Lees & Simonsen, 1983; Stahmann & Hiebert, 1980). Keith (1981) has suggested that parents of premarital partners be involved in premarital counselling. The increasing regard for the importance of family of origin influences can be seen in the design of a marriage preparation program for Canada's largest protestant denomination. The new United Church of Canada Marriage Preparation Course will begin with a session on family of origin (Robin Smith, Family Ministries, The United Church of Canada, personal communication, October, 1983).

The second important developmental task of the premarital couple is to establish sex roles. (Bader & Sinclair, 1983). The developmental perspective suggests that individual and relational needs change throughout the life cycle (Waldman, 1983). This suggests that spouses require the ability to re-negotiate their role choices at various points throughout the life cycle. The work of Sager (1981) suggests that marital
contracts are made at several levels. Programs, like that of Adam and Gingras (1982), are designed to enable partners to make implicit relationship contracts overt and negotiable. Marriage contracts are closely linked to relationship expectations, and the skills of communication and conflict resolution. If couples have adequate relationship skills and the opportunity for reflection, they can work out new contracts to suit changing needs. Marriage programs can provide a disciplined, structured context for relationship contracting. Marriage preparation programs with a developmental perspective will stress the changing needs of spouses and relationships, and will promote a dynamic rather than a static notion of relationships. Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) developed a marriage preparation module designed to help premarital couples explore their "dynamic relationship history". This intervention has been adapted and included in a larger learning module for premarital couples entitled "understanding relationship systems" (Lees & Simonsen, 1983).

Although marriage is a significant developmental marker, there has been little in the literature regarding the interaction between this field and the fields of deliberate psychological education and adult education. Such a dialogue may be fruitful in the design of marriage preparation programs. For example, interventions intended to promote psychological growth have employed methods similar to those of many marriage preparation programs. Role taking, introduction of stage higher reasoning and disequilibrium are considered to be some methods of
deliberate psychological education (Erickson & Whiteley, 1980). Marriage preparation programs that teach communication skills often encourage role taking. For example, in the "active listening model", partners are asked to take the perspective of their partner and feedback the meaning of their partner's communication (Lees & Simonsen, 1983). Disequilibrium is often used in marriage preparation through the use of examples or models demonstrating common relationship problems which may have relevance to the premarital couple. Couples that are optimistic and confident about their relationships then are led to see the need for deeper relationship exploration and skill acquisition. Higher reasoning can be introduced in marriage preparation through peer counselling. For example, in the Minnesota Couple Communication Program (Miller, Nunnally & Wackman, 1977) participants observe other couples in dialogue and are invited to give feedback on the use of skills. In the program developed by Bader et al. (1980) couples watch a video tape interview with a young couple at an impasse in their ability to understand each other. Course participants are then asked to discuss about the impasse.

Although there is little outside of the writing of Bader and Sinclair (1983) to suggest a closer tie between marriage preparation and developmental theories, closer ties between the fields could strengthen the theoretical and practical base of marriage preparation. Levant (1983) has suggested that marriage preparation be considered as one of many family life interventions. In line with this reasoning, the role of
marriage preparation in promoting a favourable attitude towards seeking further help with marriage should be an important goal for marriage preparation programmers (Olson 1983).

Enrichment Theory and Marriage Preparation

The third important focus of marriage preparation has come from the related field of marriage enrichment (Schumm & Denton, 1979; Mace, 1984). Rather than examining problems in marriage, the enrichment focus is concerned with those factors that are associated with relationship strengths. Strengths, rather than deficits, become the reference point for the development of marriage preparation interventions (McKeon, 1981).

Far from being "culture free", the enrichment model is based on the notion of the "companionship marriage" which Mace (1984) claims is a new ideal of marriage in Western industrial society. The companionship marriage is based on love, equality and intimacy. In contrast to the companionship marriage, "traditional marriages" are based on parental values, economic role assignments, or societal roles. Mace asserts that the three elements of a companionship marriage are; a) effective communication, b) a system for successful resolution of conflict, and c) a belief in intentional relationship growth. That the companionship notion of marriage is widely accepted as an important marriage model can be seen in the number of marital studies interested in relationship satisfaction. Mace's idea that equality is integral to love in companionship marriages is supported by research by Gray-Little and Burks (1983). In a
meta-analysis of studies of power in marital relationships, Gray-Little and Burks concluded that the model of equality between spouses was associated with the highest levels of relationship satisfaction.

Many of the marriage enrichment and marriage preparation studies of the 1970s focused on the first two of Mace's (1984) requirements for a companionship marriage, namely communication and conflict resolution. Hof and Miller (1981), in a review of the literature, found 36 of 40 marriage program outcomes studies focused on communication training. Pety (1983) reviewed 99 studies and found 50 dealing with communication. Pety found that marriage programs could be categorized in three ways: a) communication, b) conflict resolution, or c) programs dealing with specific concerns like sexual enhancement or alternative generation. No studies focused on the development of the third in Mace's catalog of essential elements in a companionship marriage, the belief in growth.

Ammons and Stinnett (1980), in a study of vital marriage, found that couples described as having vital marriages "viewed developing and sustaining a vital relationship as one of their most important life goals" (p.40). Beavers (1976), in a study of family health, found that healthy families tended to be more conscious and responsive to developmental life changes. In contrast, Beavers described unhealthy families as denying and resisting change. Marriage preparation programs, as first conjugal relationship experiences, may enrich marriages through encouraging an acceptance of developmental changes and a belief
in intentional marriage growth. Accepting the need for marriage enrichment experiences is seen by Mace (1984) as an important element in the belief in growth. Several theorists have indicated that if marriage preparation does nothing else, it should make premarital couples amenable to further enrichment and counselling (Clinebell, 1972; Elkin, 1977; Stahmann & Hiebert, 1980; Horton, 1982).

Mace (1975) has called for research on the obstacles to participation in the enrichment movement. Mace concluded that there are powerful forces in our society which mitigate against spouses seeking help with marriage, or attending enrichment programs. Otto (1976) cites some of these obstacles to participation in marriage enrichment events as: a) deeply ingrained habits supported by inertia, b) fear of acknowledging problems, c) fear of anger that may threaten the relationship, d) insecurity caused by societal changes, and e) peer pressure.

Marriage preparation can lessen fears about discussing marriage with others, and through the teaching of appropriate conflict resolution skills, heighten confidence about one's ability to deal safely with anger and differences. Marriage preparation group programs can also create group norms that counter societal norms regarding "privatism" about marriage. Thus marriage preparation can enable couples to be more willing to seek help through counselling or enrichment.

Bader et al. (1980) have completed the only reported outcome study of help seeking in marriage. They found that couples in this sample did increase their help seeking after marriage. This
supports the anecdotal finding of Shonick (1975) who reported that couples attending mandatory marriage preparation in California tended to return to their premarital counsellor when problems arose.

The enrichment focus has brought an emphasis on experiential learning to marriage programs (Mace, 1984). Mace contends that marriage education programs can be categorized by three levels of methodology; a) information giving, b) demonstration, and c) participation. He maintains that participation is essential in enrichment learning. Mace is supported by Olson (1983) in the claim that lecture-based, information giving programs are ineffective, and may in fact decrease a participant's willingness to seek another marriage enrichment experience.

Two examples of the use of all three levels of methodology are The Couples' Workshop (Lees & Simonsen, 1983) and The Minnesota Couples Communication Program (Miller, Nunnally & Wackman, 1977). In both of these programs, new information is given, followed by demonstration, and finally participants are required to apply the knowledge to their own relationship. Mace (1984) believes that it is the participation component that gives relevance and renewal to relationships.

Mace (1984) has articulated the belief that companionship marriage requires a commitment to growth. The marriage enrichment movement has developed networks for continued couple growth. For example, Mace has established an organization called A.C.M.E (Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment), and the Marriage Encounter Movement publishes a newsletter.
holds monthly meetings for "encountered couples" called "circles", and hosts follow-up marriage encounter weekends. Belonging to such a network establishes group support for challenging the idea of privatism in marriage.

Churches offering marriage preparation and marriage workshops have had a parallel concern for the ongoing support of marriage growth. Clinebell (1972) has said that one role of marriage preparation is to build up a relationship between the couple and the church. A spokesman for the Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program in Vancouver has said that one function of their marriage preparation program is to "bond" couples to the church (Chuck Luttrell, personal communication, November, 1985). Thus, marriage preparation is an opportunity for sponsoring churches to demonstrate their concern for marriage and the potential relevance of that concern for the future growth of marriage. Couples who attend marriage preparation in church sponsored contexts may develop a deeper perception of the church's social relevance. A deeper appreciation for the relevance of the church may in turn lead to an openness to further church sponsored enrichment programs. A helpful relationship between church and premarital couple may lead to the couple returning to church resources for counselling or marriage growth opportunities. No previous empirical investigation has been made regarding the effect of marriage preparation on a participant's perception of the church.
Empirical Studies of Marriage Preparation

Among the first empirical studies of marriage preparation were those of Miller (1971) and Nunnally (1971) conducted on the Minnesota Couple Communication Program (Miller et al., 1977). Miller examined the effect of premarital couple communication training on self-disclosure and openness in communication, and Nunnally examined the effect of the same program on interaction awareness and empathic accuracy. Both studies were described as field studies.

Since then, over 20 empirical studies have been carried out with the Minnesota Couple Communication Program (Wampler, 1982). Many of these studies have been conducted with married couples although the Miller (1971) and Nunnally (1971) studies were carried out with dating couples. Wampler claimed that most studies of MCCP had been with samples of middle class subjects, that the program had demonstrated its efficacy with that sample group, and that investigations were needed with other subject samples. Wampler's meta-analysis of this program reported that changes of communication behaviour were generally durable at follow-up, but that there was a decrease in relationship satisfaction at follow-up.

Wampler and Sprenkle (1980) conducted a study of the MCCP incorporating the research design improvements suggested by Gurman and Kniskern (1977). The sample of 43 couples was randomly assigned to MCCP, a contrast control group, or a no treatment control group. More than one set of instructors were
used in order to control for leadership influences. Couples were tested after the program and at four to six month follow-up. Wampler and Sprenkle found that MCCP subjects used a more open style of communication than either control groups, and improved significantly on relationship satisfaction. Follow-up testing, hampered by attrition due to the end of the university term, indicated that the behavioural change was not maintained, but the relationship satisfaction was still significantly different.

Studies of the MCCP seem to make it clear that communication training can lead to more open styles of communication in premarital couples (Miller, 1971; Wampler, 1982). Meta-analysis findings are strengthened by the detailed documentation for implementation of the MCCP. This documentation provides some assurance that the independent variable was consistent across studies, and less susceptible to leadership effects.

McRae (1976) compared an experimental marriage preparation program developed from behavioural theory with a lecture-discussion program offered through the Pastoral Institute of British Columbia. Twenty-seven volunteer couples participated in the McRae study. McRae found no significant difference between the groups at posttest, although subjects in the experimental program rated their program more favourably. McRae attributed this to leadership effects. The experimental program was lead by the researcher and the comparison program had consecutive speakers on various themes. The consistent attention and relationship with one leader may have been the important factors.
The weaknesses of the McRae (1976) study are common to the field, namely; a) the use of a volunteer sample that may have had greater motivation than under usual field conditions b) the lack of multiple leadership conditions within programs to minimize the confounding effect of leadership influences, and c) a poor linking of theory to the experimental protocol. McRae was studying a behavioural program but did not have a behavioural-observation outcome measurement.

Boike (1977) conducted a field study of the Roman Catholic program known as Pre-Cana Premarital Preparation Program. His sample included 238 couples ranging in age from 18 to 29 years. Boike's study was a pretest-posttest with wait list controls. After 10 hours of treatment over four sessions, he found no change in communication, relationship satisfaction, or partners' perception of each other.

Boike's (1977) findings of no change on any outcome measures with such a large sample suggest that there was no change, or the instruments chosen were not appropriate to reflect what changes there were. The lack of change on partners' perception of each other could have to do with the "idealization" of relationships as discussed above under "client characteristics".

Olson (1983) reports on an unpublished study by Norem, Schaefer, Springer, and Olson (1980) which contrasted five different premarital education programs. These programs, six to eight weeks in duration, one night a week, all used the lecture method. Olson (1983) reports,
Although these programs were well conceived and the lectures well presented, no attitudinal change was produced as a result... one of the negative outcomes... was that it discouraged most couples from considering future marriage enrichment programs. It also decreased couples' willingness to go to marriage counseling if problems occurred in their relationship (p.69).

Bader et al. (1980) studied the effect of a marriage preparation program on the professional help seeking of premarital couples. Bader's study included pretest, posttest and follow-up at one year. Five year follow-up was also conducted (Bader et al., 1983). The pretest-posttest design included 94 couples: 60 experimental and 34 control. At follow-up, 63 couples remained in the study, 41 experimental and 22 control. Bader (1983) reports that 57 couples took part in the five year follow-up.

The premarital program used in the Bader et al. (1980) program study was split between pre-wedding and post wedding components, eight sessions in all. Film segments presented dilemmas related to family of origin influences, sex roles and communication conflicts. Couples interacted with material presented in the program. The Bader et al. research examined the effect of the program on conflict resolution, the impact of major disagreement areas, and help seeking patterns. The Bader et al. study demonstrated change on the ability of the experimental couples to resolve conflicts, and the main areas of couple conflict did not become as negative for the experimental
couples. The experimental subjects also demonstrated an increase in help seeking, whereas the control subjects decreased on this variable.

Bader et al. (1980) cite the limitations of their study as the loss of non-verbal assessment in the use of audio tape rather than video tape of couple interactions, and the possible effect of testing interaction with treatment. Sampling and assignment to treatment or no treatment may limit the validity of the findings. The researchers approached couples to be married asking them to participate in a premarital study, or premarital study and premarital program. Bader et al. report,

The couples were contacted on a random basis until the desired number of experimental and control couples were reached. From a list of six couples, one, three, four and five were invited to take the marriage preparation program. Couples two and six were asked to grant an interview with no reference being made to the program. The acceptance rate was 41% for the experimental group and 37% for the control group (p.173).

Thus the control sample may have differed significantly in their willingness to seek help with marriage, or on other important motivational variables.

Avery, Ridley, Leslie and Milholland (1980) and Ridley, Jorgensen, Morgan and Avery (1980) studied the Relationship Enhancement Program (Rappaport, 1976). Relationship Enhancement is a 24 hour communication training program which teaches participants to monitor each other in the use of certain
relationship skills. The Avery et al. portion of the study involved 37 university couples randomly assigned to treatment or no treatment control. Testing involved pretest, posttest and six month follow-up. In the Avery et al. portion of the analysis, statistically significant differences were found at posttest and follow-up. The treatment group was found to be improved on self-feeling awareness and acceptance of others. The Ridley et al. portion of the study found significant effects of the program on relationship quality. These studies clearly demonstrate the efficacy of Relationship Enhancement with premarital couples. However, the gains from the programs must be considered in light of the length of intervention. For example, Relationship Enhancement is double the instructional time of the Minnesota Couples Communication Program. Length of intervention may be a significant factor in determining program effects.

In contrast to the length of the Relationship Enhancement Program, Zodrow (1981) conducted a study of a one day communication workshop with a sample of twenty subjects randomly assigned to experimental or no treatment control. Program methods included lecture, discussion, modeling, behavioural rehearsal and feedback. Subjects were pretested and posttested on self-report measures of relationship adjustment, and communication problem solving. Audio tapes of couple dialogue were rated using the Marital Interaction Coding System (Weiss, 1979). No significant difference was found between the groups on any of the three outcome measures.

Problems in Zodrow's (1981) methodology included brief
training of leaders, lack of pilot testing of the experimental program, possible reactivity to pretesting, small sample size and the possibility of ceiling effects on relationship adjustment. Zodrow states that he had hoped the study would include a more heterogeneous sample, but that the volunteer subjects were primarily university students.

Determining the efficacy of communication training in a condensed format is important in premarital programs. It is likely that voluntary participation in marriage preparation will increase if programs are less time consuming. Warmbrod (1982) studied the effect of six hours of training in alternative generation and found significant differences between treatment and control subjects. Although Warmbrod's study was with married couples, her findings add a balance to the lack of change found in Zodrow's (1981) study, and suggest that short programs aimed at specific goals can be effective.

Blew and Morgan (1982) developed the Premarital Skills Workshop from the theory of behavioural psychology. Blew and Morgan's sample of 20 non-distressed premarital couples was recruited from a university setting. Couples were randomly assigned to no treatment control, or to treatment. Blew and Morgan incorporated a study of baseline behaviour by pretesting the experimental couples, providing them with three 2 hour sessions of relationship discussion and then retesting. The experimental treatment was administered after the retesting and was equal in length to the relationship discussion. At posttest, experimental subjects improved on relationship
adjustment, on ratings of the positiveness of their partners' communication and on reported fewer desired relationship changes. In contrast, controls decreased on the communication measures. Blew and Morgan's research had a small sample, mainly from the university, and Blew himself led the experimental program.

The Blew et al. (1982) and Wambrod (1982) studies indicate, contrary to Zodrow (1981), that a brief intervention can have a significant effect. A major difference in these brief interventions was that Zodrow's program took place in one day whereas the experimental treatment in both the Blew and the Warmbrod studies took place in two sessions. Learning in the Zodrow study may have decreased because of an information overload.

Markman and Floyd (1980) also developed a marriage preparation intervention from a behavioural perspective. Markman and Floyd's program, involving six 3 hour sessions, taught communication, conflict resolution and problem solving. The Markman and Floyd sample included 10 couples randomly assigned to wait list controls or the experimental program. Testing pre and post lasted four hours, with video tape of couple interaction and self-report measures of relationship satisfaction. Non-significant differences were found on both the behavioural and self-report measures. Limitations of this study included small sample size and the length of testing which may have interacted with treatment.

Ridley, Avery, Harrell, Leslie and Dent (1981) also studied a program meant to teach communication and conflict resolution
skills to premarital couples. These researchers used a 24 hour experimental treatment, with eight 3 hour sessions. The sample for this study was 54 dating couples at a university who were assigned to treatment or no treatment control on the basis of class schedules. Assessment of twenty minute video tapes of couple dialogue were used to measure communication and conflict resolution. Couples were asked to resolve one supplied conflict, and a conflict of their own. Treatment couples were significantly different from controls at posttest and at six month follow-up on the use of communication and conflict resolution skills taught in the program. Length of program and sample size may be two important characteristics accounting for the difference in results between this study, and those by Zodrow (1981) and Markman and Floyd (1980).

Schaden (1982) and Horton (1983) studied the effect of different methods of presentation in marriage preparation work. Schaden used a posttest only, randomized design with sixty three couples assigned to a no treatment control, a treatment where video tapes of couples demonstrating self-disclosure were used, or a treatment where there were live demonstrations of self-disclosure between leadership couples. Schaden found no difference between the two treatment modalities. However, the treatment groups were significantly different than controls in marriage role expectations, but not in terms of improved communication. Schaden concluded that the use of models demonstrating self-disclosure, live or taped, could help premarital partners to develop realistic expectations of
Horton (1983) researched differences between a facilitated group program and a self study program. Thirty couples were assigned to an independent relationship study, a group premarital program or to a no treatment control group. The five session experimental treatment did not result in statistically significant differences in the way that premarital couples perceived each other. Horton thought that a longer program, and larger sample size, may have produced a significant result.

A weakness of the Horton (1983) study was the investigation of a program created for the study. New programs often need refinement through pilot-testing. Horton himself led the premarital program, and the sample size in each condition was limited to 20 subjects. Subjects in the no.treatment group were tested prior to the commencement of the treatment of the others, and these scores were compared with the testing of the treatment groups after treatment. Thus, there was the possibility of an effect attributable to historical influences.

Summary of Empirical Studies.

Nine of the 14 premarital program studied reported change on various outcome variables. Five studies found no statistically significant differences. The two well established programs, the Minnesota Couple Communication Program and the Relationship Enhancement Program, produced change in all experiments. Those reporting no change, except for the Boike (1977) study, had small sample sizes and programs developed primarily for the
research. Those programs with no evidence of change may have lacked pilot-testing and experienced leadership. Results from several studies suggest that, given adequate programs and experienced leadership, communication and conflict resolution skills can be improved in premarital couples. There is equivocal evidence for the durability of behavioural improvements a year after attending a premarital program. Avery et al. (1980) and Wampler and Sprenkle (1980) found a waning of skill improvements at follow-up. Others like Bader et al. (1980) found skills to be maintained. Joanning (1982), in a long term study of the Minnesota Couples Communication Program, found that couples reported a decrease in the use of skills months after the course. Joanning recommends "booster" programs as the remedy.

The study of relationship help seeking after marriage preparation by Bader et al. (1980) and the study by Schaden (1982) of the effects of modeling on expectations of marriage, provide initial evidence for the effectiveness of marriage preparation with non-skill training outcomes. Multiple studies of communication skill training with dating couples are required to build a confident knowledge claim. In the same way further experimentation may strengthen the initial knowledge claims made by Bader and Schaden.

Issues Arising from the Literature

Sampling.

O'Leary and Turkewitz, 1978) found two sampling problems in
marital treatment research that are relevant in the marriage preparation context, namely small sample sizes and homogeneous samples. O'Leary et al. refer to "YAVIS" samples, meaning young, attractive, verbal, intelligent, and successful. Wampler (1982) has indicated that samples used in studies of the premarital and marital couples with the Minnesota Couples Communication Program have been white and middle class. Of the studies reviewed above, only two studies did not have samples comprised primarily of university students or university personnel (Bader et al., 1980; Boike, 1977). Gurman et al (1977) found that 75% of enrichment studies were conducted with university samples. In the studies reviewed by this researcher, only the Horton (1983) and the Boike (1977) studies were of church sponsored programs.

Several studies reviewed had small sample sizes, with several under 20 subjects in the experimental condition (Markman and Floyd, 1980; Blew & Morgan, 1982). Several researchers stated their belief that their studies were approaching significant findings, but that these were limited by small sample sizes (Horton, 1983; Markman and Floyd, 1980).

The volunteerism of subjects in premarital studies was an issue addressed by Zodrow (1981). He suggested that subjects in his sample may have possessed characteristics quite different from non-volunteers in marriage preparation. "Non-volunteers" refers to subjects who attend marriage preparation as a mandatory requirement of the authority who will officiate at their wedding. The issue of volunteerism arose in the Bader et al.
Control subjects in that study were asked to participate in a marriage preparation program and so may have had different levels of willingness to seek help with their relationship than the experimental subjects. Levels of motivation may be an important variable concomitant with achievement on outcome measures in marriage preparation. However, the literature has given scant treatment to the issue of volunteerism.

The Independent Variable.

Mahoney (1978), writing about "culprits" in outcome research, cites poor specification of the independent variable and inadequate standardization. Structured group marriage preparation is a field particularly conducive to empirical study because of the potential control over the implementation of the independent variable (L'Abate & O'Callahan, 1977). Research in marriage preparation has been mixed in its treatment of this variable. Studies of the Minnesota Couple Communication Program and the Relationship Enhancement Program have had detailed leadership protocols to ensure standardization. Other studies have been conducted on programs developed specifically for the research (McRae, 1976, Zodrow, 1981, Horton, 1983). Many studies lack evidence that a standardized format has been followed (Pety, 1983) making replication virtually impossible.

Documented leadership protocols provide some control for contamination of the independent variable by leadership effects. The use of multiple leadership conditions, and leaders free from
extra inducements for their participation in the research can provide further control for leadership contamination on program effects (O'Leary & Turkewitz, 1978).

A further limitation regarding the independent variable has been that most empirical studies have been conducted on non-church sponsored programs. Gurman & Kniskern (1977) report that 86% of enrichment studies have been with non-church sponsored programs. In contrast, Olson (1983) claims that programs such as those considered in this review of the empirical literature, account for approximately 1% of marriage preparation. Olson claims that if it were not for clergy, "most couples would have no premarital preparation whatsoever" (pp. 67-68). Gurman et al.'s and Olson's remarks indicate that the empirical literature studied programs that are not widely practised in the field. There is a dearth of empirical study of church sponsored marriage preparation. Studies of well documented programs operated under conditions of everyday practice with seasoned multiple leadership conditions are required to address this problem.

**Testing.**

The choice of measurement instruments, and the conditions of data collection have varied widely throughout the studies reviewed. Problems in measurement have included poor conceptual linkage between program goals and the dependent variables, such as in the Boike (1977) study. Ceiling effects (Dillard, 1981; Horton, 1983), the obtrusiveness of testing, and the
interaction of testing with treatment, have also been issues.
Rubin and Mitchell (1976) have suggested that couples research is
sometimes couples counselling. Bader et al. (1980) referred to
this possibility in the collection of a behaviour measurement of
communication. Markman and Floyd (1980) report that one couple
in their study sample resolved an important relationship conflict
during testing. Logic suggests that the more intensive and
obtrusive measurement becomes, the more likely it is that there
will be interaction effects and sampling bias. In order to
avoid these problems, testing is required that is brief,
uncomplicated, and lacking in performance demands. These
actions may enable a greater heterogeneity in sampling, and
less attrition in follow-up studies. Brief, uncomplicated
measurement may encourage more empirical examination of the many
church sponsored programs now offered in marriage preparation.

Much of the instrumentation designed for marital studies
has been developed in clinical settings where interest has been
on changing couple dynamics from maladjustment to satisfactory
adjustment (Dillard, 1981, Hof and Miller, 1981). Instrumentation has been developed to differentiate distressed
from non-distressed couples. Dillard claims that enrichment
research will be prone to findings of non-significance until
adequate instrumentation is designed that is capable of measuring
outcomes from satisfactory to higher levels of satisfaction.

Relationship adjustment measures are particularly susceptible to
ceiling effects when used with premarital couples. Although
behavioural measurement has been more sensitive to change (Gurman
& Kniskern, 1977), it tends to be costly, time consuming and obtrusive.

Instrumentation is required that can differentiate enrichment oriented couples from non-enrichment oriented couples. Dillard (1981) has suggested that new constructs may be needed. For example, she has speculated that although relationship adjustment may not be changed during an enrichment-oriented relationship program, enthusiasm toward marriage may be altered. Although premarital couples may not show a change on some measure of potential relationship distress, they may change in terms of attitudes that will have a prophylactic value. For example, if after a marriage preparation program participants are more willing to seek further help with their growth in marriage, then this may lead them to resources they need to effectively cope with future stage-specific demands.

Research Design.

The equivocal results from outcome studies of marriage preparation may have to do with the choice of measurement modality as much as the particular instruments chosen within modalities. Gurman & Kniskern, (1977) suggested the use of multiple indices and multiple perspectives in marital studies. This remedy opens a broader perspective on change. Where there may be no change on one construct, there may be change on another. Concerns regarding the obtrusiveness and length of
testing must be balanced with a concern for multiple dimensions of change. This is particularly true in a young field with a limited empirical base. Gurman and Kniskern (1981) called for discovery as well as verification research. This suggests that researchers have an open-endedness, and that exploratory data, as well as data to assess hypotheses, be collected.

Olson (1977) has spoken of the insider's and outsider's perspectives in family research. Verification researchers act as outsiders who ask questions and set limited frameworks for answers. What is known through this process is more objective, and replicable. However, the insider's perspective is subjective, may be instructive, and may have heuristic value (Kazdin, 1981). For example, Fisher (1982) found that families and therapists had differing views of health. Fisher reports that families defined health in terms of cohesion, whereas therapists defined health in terms of separation and individuation. These two perspectives may lead to different research questions. What marriage preparation course leaders and marriage preparation theorists may think are important premarital course outcomes may have little immediate relevance to participants. Discovery research allows findings of this kind to emerge.

Qualitative research in concert with quantitative research may provide an added explanatory depth to statistical outcomes. Standardized measurements do not permit the broadness of findings which may accrue from qualitative research. For example, Joanning (1982) investigated a marriage enrichment program using
standardized measures but also included a structured interview along with the other measures at follow-up. This structured interview cast light on the meaning of test results. The qualitative data revealed that couples who had participated in the marriage enrichment event experienced a heightened sense of intimacy, however this finding would have been missed in the choice of quantitative measures.

None of the marriage preparation studies reviewed collected qualitative data which allowed the participants to interpret the outcome of the marriage preparation program in their own idiom. Qualitative exploratory research may complement and add a richness to quantitative designs. Qualitative reports also hold the potential to alert researchers to elements within programs which may be detrimental to some, if not all, subjects. De Young's (1979) report on the Marriage Encounter Movement represents the kind of critical perspective that might otherwise be unknown if group mean scores alone were used. Qualitative research can provide insights on questions regarding the critical elements of program design and may also throw light on the question "What program for what subject?".
Hypotheses

The hypotheses for the present study emerged from the literature, as well as from the practice of the researcher in the field of marriage preparation. The hypotheses are organized according to the two major directions of the study, a) the overall effect of marriage preparation group programs, and b) the differential effect of marriage preparation programs.

Overall Program Effects.

1. If subjects are combined from three marriage preparation programs, The Couples' Workshop, The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program and The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program, they will show a statistically significant improvement in:

   A) their attitude towards help with marriage, as measured by the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory,

   B) their attitude towards the church, as measured by the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory and

   C) relationship beliefs, as measured by the Relationship Belief Inventory

as compared to their own pretest scores and to the scores of cohort controls.

This first hypothesis addresses the efficacy of marriage preparation as a general field of activity. Bader et al. (1980) posed the question "Do Marriage Preparation Programs Really Work?". This hypothesis investigates this question in relation to multiple indices with three programs. Decisions on the hypothesis may then be made from a collaboration regarding two experimental outcomes, namely; the cohort control phase of study, and the within-subjects pretest-posttest one group design.
Effects of Each Program.

2. If subjects are provided with either The Couples' Workshop, or the Anglican Marriage Preparation Program or the Roman Catholic Program, they will show a statistically significant difference in:

A) their willingness to seek help with marriage, as measured by the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory,

B) their attitude towards the church, as measured by the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory and

C) relationship beliefs as measured by the Relationship Belief Inventory

as compared to their own pretest scores and to the scores of cohort controls.

Hypothesis two investigates the same outcome variables as the first hypothesis but in relation to each of three marriage preparation programs. The first hypothesis addresses the question of marriage preparation as a general field of practice. This hypothesis investigates the efficacy of different marriage preparation programs. The decision on this hypothesis is made from a collaboration regarding two experimental outcomes, namely; the cohort control phase of study, and the within-subjects pretest-posttest group design.
Differential Effects.

3. If subjects from three marriage preparation programs, The Couples' Workshop, The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program and The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program are compared post-test on:

A) a canonical variate (a composite variable) defined primarily by willingness to seek help with marriage,

B) a canonical variate defined primarily by attitude towards the church and

C) a canonical variate defined primarily by relationship beliefs

there will be no statistically significant difference by program.

The differential effect hypothesis examines whether one marriage preparation program is more effective than any other. All three marriage preparation programs are well developed, and have experienced multiple leadership who operate from documented, standardized procedures. Any differences found could, in collaboration with findings from hypothesis number two, be related to program content and design.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the subjects of the study, the programs of study which comprised the independent variable, the instruments used as dependent variables, and a description of the procedures followed in conducting the study and in the analysis of the data.

Subjects

Subjects for this study were engaged couples registered for one of the three programs at one of the three sites in which each program was offered. One half of the sample attended programs in January and February, and the other half at the next offering of the respective programs in March and April. A total of 288 individuals were included in the study.

Each class at each center of instruction was requested to take part in the study. Instructional time was provided for the completion of questionnaires. Whole intact classes completed the pretest and posttest measures. There were some dropouts from the Roman Catholic program, and in both the Roman Catholic and Anglican Programs there were some instances where only one partner completed the program. These subjects were not included in the study. Also, in the case of the Roman Catholic program where registration was often higher than the required 16 subjects from each location, subjects were randomly chosen from those who completed the program.

Subjects represented a heterogeneous group. The common
denominator was that they were and engaged and planned to be married in 1985. The average age was 25 years for women and 26 years for men, with ranges from 18 years to an extreme of 45 years. For most subjects, program attendance was a requirement for a church wedding. Thus there was a certain degree of compulsion regarding attendance. The mean score of all subjects on the scale "willingness to attend" was 6.7 on a scale of 1 to 10. There was considerable variability on "willingness to attend" with a standard deviation of 2.5. Many subjects indicated that they did not want to attend the program at all. One third of the subjects rated their willingness to attend as 5 or less on the scale of 1 to 10 (Table 1). These ratings indicate a rather unique sample in that their attendance could not be said to be entirely voluntary in the same way that samples in previous studies have been. Clearly there were subjects in each program who attended with some degree of reluctance and perhaps resistance.

Subjects reported going together with their fiance(e) from a brief courtship of 2 months up to 156 months. Average length of relationship was 37 months. Average length of relationship varied between 28 months and 42 months depending on the occasion and location of the program. The average educational level was two years of post-secondary education however, there was considerable variability in education levels. The modal educational level indicated an academic standing of grade 12 or less. There were 109 subjects who described themselves in this category (Table 2). This also confirms the difference in this sample from
many others reported in the literature (Beck, 1976).

Listing of occupations reflects a great diversity of employment such as dental surgeons, doctors, nurses, health care workers, policemen, labourers, the unemployed, and students. A listing of occupations from one location and time gives a perspective on the diversity of backgrounds, namely: clerical supervisor, gardener/landscaper, health care worker, pipeline operator, computer technician, heavy duty mechanic, teller, B.C. Telephone construction worker, geriatric recreation therapist, camera salesperson, cashier, software/technical support worker, medical office assistant, carpenter, food services worker, and auto mechanic. In the total sample, 118 of 288 individuals reported cohabitation. More subjects in the Couples' Workshop and Anglican programs reported cohabitation than did subjects in the Roman Catholic program. Subjects were asked to place their own home phone number and that of their fiance(e) on the test forms. Some discrepancy was revealed between cohabitation status and the phone numbers in the Roman Catholic group. This suggested to the researcher that social desirability may have operated to lessen reported cohabitation in the Roman Catholic sample.

The subjects from the Roman Catholic Program also reported greater parental involvement in church attendance. Only 5 of the total sample reported attending any other course on how to get along in marriage, and 21 reported having been for counselling with their fiancee or some intimate other.
TABLE 1
Description of the sample by reported willingness to attend.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't want to attend</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Very much want to attend</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 288

* A breakdown of this table by program is reported in Appendix C.

TABLE 2
Description of the sample by reported educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gr.10 or less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gr.12 or less</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2 yr. Community College</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Community College Program Completed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University Degree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Graduate Program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ph.D or Equivalent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 288
The Programs

The Couples' Workshop

This program, co-authored by the researcher, is described in the leaders' manual entitled "The Couples' Workshop: Leader's Protocol" (Lees & Simonsen, 1983). It is a five session program including topics such as Communication Skills, Conflict Resolution Skills, The Couple Life Cycle, Family of Origin, Dynamic Relationship History, Sexuality, and Resources for Marriage. The program does not refer to Christian theology, except a few brief remarks in the presentation on sexuality. This program is designed for use within non-religious as well as religious institutions.

The methods used in the Couples' Workshop include lecturette, demonstration, skill training, pairwise discussion and group problem solving. The program employs the three methods of marriage programs described by Mace (1984), namely: a) information giving, b) demonstration, and c) participation. The communication content of the program is adapted from the Minnesota Couple Communication Program (Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1977). The content on family of origin and on relationship development were adapted from Stahmann and Hiebert (1980). The content on sexuality is based on the writings and films of Dr. Noam and Beryl Cherniak (1977). The content on conflict resolution, developmental stages, and resources for marriage growth were developed from the authors' general reading in the field of marriage and family therapy.
The Couples' Workshop is normally offered five times a year in the Chilliwack District. It is sponsored by two United Churches of Chilliwack, as well as by the Anglican Church and the Protestant Chapel of the Canadian Forces Base Chilliwack. This program was also substituted for the purposes of this study for programs offered at the New Westminster Marriage Preparation Course and at Ryerson United Church in Vancouver. Referrals to these programs were made not only by United Churches, but also by Lutheran, Presbyterian and Anglican churches.

The registration fee for The Couples' Workshop was $20 in Chilliwack, $15 in New Westminster, and was included in the wedding fee of the participants at Ryerson United Church in Vancouver.

A program outline for the Couples' Workshop can be found under Appendix E.

**The Anglican Program**

The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program is conducted regularly at five different centers in the lower mainland of British Columbia. Together these centers instruct an estimated 500 people a year. Sites participating in this study were the Surrey, Vancouver, and Burnaby locations.

The general format for the program is described in the manual "Marriage Preparation: A Practical Christian Program" and was developed by Fr. Ron Barnes (Barnes, 1981). The Anglican Program is conducted in four sessions which include communication skills, the intentional marriage model, resolving conflict, managing money, sexuality, roles and expectations,
developmental stages and the meaning of marriage vows.

The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program was designed for use in church sponsored contexts. Although none of the sessions deal entirely with Christian doctrine, the program incorporates Christian theology of marriage in several of the presentations. One leader of the program said that they attempt to "slip the gospel" into the content (Fr. M. Deck, personal communication, January, 1985). The current brochure description for this program includes "Bringing Christ into your marriage" as a part of the last session.

The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program uses lectures with overhead projection, demonstration, pairwise discussion, group discussion and films. The leadership protocol (Barnes, 1981) indicates that a substantial amount of the program relies on lecture or film. For example, under the topic of conflict resolution, various styles of conflict resolution are described and then couples are given five minutes to discuss which style they use.

The content of the Anglican Marriage Preparation appears to be an eclectic blending of material. The content on communication stresses self awareness, active listening, and feedback. The "intentional marriage model" described by Barnes (1981) encourages premarital couples to use "I" messages in a non-blaming fashion. For example, partners are encouraged to say, "I appreciate..." or "I need..." in conversation with their partners. The content on developmental stages is taken from the book Passages by Gail Sheehy (1976). At the end of each
session, couples are provided with further reading material.

Cost of the program is $40 per couple, and referrals are received not only from Anglican Churches, but also from others such as the United and Lutheran Churches.

A program outline may be found under Appendix D.

**Roman Catholic Program**

The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program is called "Preparing for Life Together" and is operated in five centers throughout the lower mainland under the direction of The Catholic Center, Archdiocese of Vancouver. The operation of all the programs is overseen by an advisory board composed of clergy, educators, counsellors, and lay couples. The advisory board establishes a standardized curriculum to be used at all centers. This curriculum has recently been documented by the Archdiocese of Vancouver (1986).

This program contains the greatest amount of material related to spiritual concerns and is lecture oriented. The format is similar to the control program described in McRae's study (1976) which he called a lecture program. Each program is overseen by a priest who is helped by lay leadership couples and various resource personnel. For example, the content on communication may be taught by a counsellor from Catholic Community Services, and be demonstrated or reinforced through testimonies given by lay leadership couples.

In the course of seven evenings, the Roman Catholic
Marriage Preparation Program covers topics such as the goals of marriage, communication, conflict resolution, family life, family planning, finances and resources for marriage. Participants are taught the importance of open dialogue for understanding in marriage and the importance of facing conflicts and differences. Participants are encouraged to believe that through dialogue and confronting differences, partners can achieve harmony and intimacy. The teaching of the Roman Catholic church on the meaning of marriage is included in the program curriculum. Sexuality is taught as a wonderful gift involving responsibility and choices for both partners. At the end of each session participants are provided further reading material based on the course content.

The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program is considered an important part of the church's ministry to families and attendance is mandatory for all couples being married within the Catholic Church. This program is well established and co-ordinated, instructing over 2,000 people a year. Sites participating in the study were the Vancouver, Burnaby and North Vancouver locations. Cost for the program is $20 per couple.

A program outline for the Roman Catholic program may be found under Appendix F.

Representativeness of Programs

A survey by this researcher of marriage preparation programs offered in British Columbia revealed that these three programs
are considered as representative of the kind of marriage preparation program currently offered in British Columbia. All the programs follow a prescribed protocol and are offered at regular intervals.

The Anglican and the Roman Catholic programs are among the largest in British Columbia. All of the programs have been in operation for at least five years and are guided by steering committees composed of clergy, other helping professions and laity.

Leadership

Leadership may be understood as an integral part of marriage preparation programs. Leaders for each program are chosen and trained to meet the requirements of that particular program. Leaders cannot be expected to be impartial conduits of information. It is their values and personal attributes that make them acceptable for leadership within their respective programs. Criteria for program leadership are so well established that leadership may be considered a part of the package of each treatment. Leadership conditions were all approved by the sponsoring bodies, and were the regular conditions for the operation of the programs. All programs use a combination of professional and lay leaders.
Instruments

Four questionnaires comprised the instruments used in the collection of quantitative data. These instruments included a Demographic Data Questionnaire completed only at pre-test, and the three dependent measures of the study which were completed pre and post by all participants. Each questionnaire was 2 pages long, for a total pre-test battery of 8 pages. The average time for completion of this battery was 30 minutes. A description of each instrument follows.

The Demographic Questionnaire

Age.

Subjects were asked to indicate their age in years.

History of Help with Relationships.

Subjects were asked to report whether or not they had ever been for counselling with their fiance(e) or any other intimate other, and whether or not they had been in any other course on how to get along in relationships. Initial testing on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory revealed a difference between subjects who had been involved with counselling or marriage education, and those who had not. Thus it was important to know how biased the sample was in terms of their previous experience with marriage interventions.

Economic & Educational Level.

Most marriage enrichment and marriage preparation studies have been conducted with upper ends of the economic and educational levels. It is likely that those with higher education would be more at ease with educational counselling.
programs such as the programs of study employed in this investigation. Higher education may enhance growth potential in marriage preparation programs. Subjects were asked to indicate the category best describing their educational background, ranging from Grade 10 or less to Ph.D. or equivalent.

Subjects were asked to describe their income in relation to one of 6 categories, ranging from under $5,000 to over $25,000.

**Willingness To Attend The Program.**

It is commonplace in marriage enrichment work that one partner is more willing to attend the program than the other. In marriage preparation it is a fact that many subjects feel compelled to attend classes to satisfy requirements of the church so that they may have a church wedding. Some programs have a greater volunteerism than others, and it is possible that the "compelled" subject will be resistant to change. Subjects were asked to rate their willingness to attend the program on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 indicating that they did not want to attend, and 10 that they very much wanted to attend.

**Family Happiness & Family Constellation.**

Families are the first place in which attitudes regarding marital relationships are formed. The subject's perception of the happiness of early familial experiences and the stability of the family of origin are likely to affect a person's relationship beliefs. For example, Beavers (1976) noted that better adjusted, happier families were not threatened by conflict or differences. The attitudes of the "healthy"
families in Beavers' study are the expression of the rational, realistic relationship belief that conflict is acceptable and can produce growth. This relationship belief is measured by the D subscale (Conflict is Destructive) of the Relationship Belief Inventory (Epstein & Eidelson 1981). It is likely that subjects with perceived happier homes would hold attitudes towards conflict similar to those described by Beavers and different from subjects who perceived their home to be unhappy (Fine, 1983).

Subjects were asked to describe their home life in one of four categories, with 1 representing growing up in a home with both natural parents, 2 representing a one parent home, 3 being raised by one natural parent and a step parent and 4 being raised by someone other than one's natural parents.

Home happiness was rated from 1, indicating extremely unhappy to 10, extremely happy.

Length of Relationship & Cohabitation.

The newly "in love" couple has often been regarded as an unrealistic couple (Olson, 1983). It is the more experienced couples who see the need for communications and conflict resolution training (Guldner, 1971). This perceived need for training may determine the relevance of the marriage preparation program to the couples and their learning outcomes.

Subjects were asked to indicate whether or not they were cohabiting, and the length of their relationship in months. Both their own phone number and that of their fiance(e) were requested at the top of the form. This procedure provided some
check on the reporting of cohabiting.

**Church Attendance.**

Subjects were asked to describe their perception of their parents' church attendance and their own church attendance. Increased church involvement is a goal that many marriage preparation leaders have for their subjects and it may be an initial discriminating variable in terms of openness to learning from the program. Subjects were asked to rate church attendance on a four point scale from never, represented by 1, to regularly, represented by 4. The same rating was requested for their mother and father.

**Dependent Measures**

**Relationship Belief Inventory (RBI).**

This inventory was developed to measure the strength of unrealistic relationship beliefs (Eidelson & Epstein, 1982). This 40 item inventory with six categories is rated from "I strongly believe the statement is true" to "I strongly believe the statement is false". Five subscales of 8 items each are included and together yield a total relationship belief score. Lower scores are indicative of more realistic relationship beliefs.

The five dysfunctional relationship beliefs measured by the instrument are:

1. Disagreement is destructive D

2. Mindreading is expected M
3. Partners cannot change  
4. Sexual perfectionism  
5. The Sexes are different  

Each of the dysfunctional beliefs is related to the literature on marital distress. For example, the dysfunctional belief "the sexes are different" is related to role expectations and stereotyping, and may lead to attributions regarding interpersonal conflict that perpetuate "helpless" responses. If the sexes are fundamentally different, then real understanding may be that much harder to achieve. As well, a person could become resigned about some points of conflict by repeating statements such as "men are just like that, I guess". The cognitive rehearsal of such statements could presumably lead to resignation. An item from the M/F sub-scale is "You can't really understand someone of the opposite sex". This type of belief is based on the assumption that marital partners cannot come to a true and deep understanding of each other and that the emotional needs of men and women are different.

The subscales on "mindreading" (M) and "conflict" (D) are addressed in all marriage preparation programs within this study. Each program has a section on communication and conflict resolution; the stress is on constructive differences and on the importance of communication skills for true understanding. All the programs also offer content intended to develop realistic expectations of sexual behaviour. All of the programs intend to foster an attitude that partners can change and be responsible for the direction of their relationship. This attitude is
measured by subscale "C" of the Relationship Belief Inventory.

The Cronbach alpha coefficients for the five sub scales are given as .81, .75, .76, .72 and .72 respectively. Convergent validity was established by relating scores on the RBI to an established test of Irrational Beliefs, and construct validity was established by testing groups of clinical and non-clinical couples, finding a significant relationship between RBI scores and marital adjustment scores. As well, Epstein & Eidelson (1981) found that subjects' scores on this instrument correlated significantly with their expectation of success in their marital relationship and with their choice of individual or conjoint marital therapy. These correlations are important in that they are conceptually related to the goal of preparing couples for the use of enrichment resources in marriage. It is generally understood that if individuals see problems in marriage as being "relationship", compared to "individual" issues, conflicts generated are less damaging. Epstein and Eidelson (1981) also found a non-significant correlation of spousal scores on the R.B.I.

The Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory.

This instrument has been developed by the researcher to measure a subject's attitude towards marriage counselling and marriage enrichment. It is a 20 item instrument with a seven point Likert-type scale.

Finding no suitable instrument to measure attitudes toward help with marriage in the literature, items were developed from
related instruments on attitudes toward psychiatry (Gunn & Robertson, Dell & Way, 1978) and a counselling attitudes scale (Form, 1955). These items were submitted for scrutiny to professionals in the field of marriage therapy and enrichment for their consideration of the construct validity. An earlier draft was pilot tested with premarital couples to discover sources of ambiguity and to establish a testing time (which was found to be an average of 10 minutes for the 20 items).

Test-retest data was then established as .88 on a sample of 45 people, some tested at one week follow up, and others at two weeks. Item analysis was conducted finding a Hoyt Reliability Coefficient of .75.

Further construct validation has been established by testing groups who could be expected to hold attitudes towards help with marriage in different degrees. The test was administered to a sample of 31 subjects involved in the Marriage Encounter Movement, 23 people who had been in marriage counselling or who described themselves as unhappy with their marriage. It was expected that these subjects, having already demonstrated behaviour associated with the high end of the inventory, would have higher scores. Subjects beginning a marriage preparation class and a general group, who had not had personal involvement with marriage counselling or marriage enrichment, were also tested. Independent t-tests revealed significant differences between the Marriage Encounter Couples and the general group at the .001 level, and between the
Marriage Counselling couples and the general group at the .01 level. There was no significant difference between the marriage preparation couples and the general population. This demonstrates that the instrument is able to discriminate between subjects who have had exposure to some helping intervention in their relationship and those who have not had such an intervention.

All test statistics were established on an 18 item version of the scale (Table 3). Since then, two new items have been added. These last two items directly express David Mace's conviction (1979) that all marriages can benefit from periodic enrichment courses and professional intervention. Higher scores indicate a more favourable attitude towards seeking help with marriage.

Table 3
Means and Standard Deviations for different groups on the 18 item version of the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Encounter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.39</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Counselling</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97.43</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Preparation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92.06</td>
<td>9.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Group</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>89.53</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude Toward the Church Inventory.

This 45 item scale was developed by Thurstone & Chave (1929). It is free of items that could be biased by doctrine or creeds. It seeks to measure the respondent's attitude toward
the church from a social perspective. Items are written so that the inventory can be used with any major religious group. For example: item #17, "I believe the church is a powerful agency for promoting both individual and social righteousness", refers to no specific religious organization.

One would logically expect that a marriage preparation program endorsed and operated by the churches would have an effect upon a subject's attitude towards that particular church. Marriage preparation programs sponsored by churches are a significant learning experience and may have an effect on a participant's view on the relevance of the teaching of that institution. Items from the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory, such as item #5, "I think the teaching of the church is altogether too superficial to have much social significance", are designed to measure this change. If the program is relevant to the needs of participants then it can be expected that participants would respond favourably to this item. If the marriage preparation program seems outmoded and irrelevant to participants, then it can be expected that this would affect their belief about the teaching of the church.

This instrument has a reported split half reliability coefficient of .92. It has discriminated between groups on basis of church attendance. Shaw and Wright (1967) report this scale to have high convergent validity with a semantic differential measurement of attitude toward the church. Rating is based on scale values supplied with the instrument. Low scores indicate a more favourable attitude toward the church.
Research Procedures

Quantitative Data Collection

The cooperation of all the marriage preparation program leaders and appropriate advisory committees permitted the first and last half hour of the regular instructional time in all the marriage preparation programs to be given over to the collection of data for this study. Although initial plans were made to provide some kind of reward for participation in the study, pilot testing of instruments revealed the ready compliance of subjects with the request for participation. Subjects were motivated to participate in the study without inducements. The high rate of voluntary participation may be related to the use of instructional time for this activity.

Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data were generated through personal interviews with selected subjects at two to three month follow up. Flanagan, (1954) has suggested that the further in time one is from the incident of interest, less prominent occurrences recede and the most notable aspects remain. The delay time of two to three months allowed for the dissipation of extraneous information and any halo effects from the programs. In order to ensure greater compliance, brief interviews of only one/half hour were requested. Ten subjects from each of the three programs (a total of 30 subjects) participated in this phase of the study. This is slightly over 10% of the sample. Subjects were randomly chosen for interview until the required number was
obtained. The major difficulty in securing a complete sample was
that the only identifying data available to the researcher was a
telephone number. Premarital subjects are highly mobile, and, in some cases, they were away on honeymoons. In
one case, an interview was declined since the bride was
preparing for her wedding the following Saturday.

Aside from some interviews that could not be arranged
because of logistical problems such as schedules, only one
subject declined to be interviewed. Even in the case of a
subject who had not wanted to attend the program and still
resented the compulsion to attend the program, there was a great
deal of cooperation and willingness to debrief the marriage
preparation experience.

The interviews employed a variant of the critical incidence
technique. (Flanagan, 1954; Adler & Woolsey, 1984; James, 1984;
Woolsey, 1985) Subjects were asked to mention those things
about the program that stood out in their minds as being of
significance to them. As notable incidents were elicited the
interviewer used empathic listening and perception checking to
clarify meanings. As items were generated, the subjects were
asked to tell something of how this would make a difference in
their relationship. When interview responses were vague, the
interviewer would ask the subject to provide specific
examples. Interview notes were transcribed following the
interview (Appendix B).

The goal of the interview was to elicit in the subject's
own words their interpretation of the salient features of each
marriage preparation program. These were meant to complement the main findings of the study which were based on the a priori criteria of standardized instruments. The interviews sought a more intimate, personalized assessment of the program outcomes from the subject's perspective.
Research Design

A variant of the "Recurrent Institutional Cycle Design" (Campbell & Stanley, 1966) supported by the basic one group pretest-posttest design was used in this study. The recurrent institutional cycle design is quasi-experimental methodology which employs intact groups of cohorts. Thomas Cook and Donald Campbell (1979) report that "The crucial feature that makes cohort designs particularly useful for drawing causal inferences is that a 'quasi-comparability' can often be assumed between the cohorts that do and do not receive the treatment" (p. 127). Cohort designs can gain additional strength if data analysis shows that cohort groups do not differ significantly on important background and organizational variables. Cook & Campbell (1979) claim that the major threats to the internal validity with the recurrent institutional design are history and subject maturation. Since the turnaround time between cohorts is a maximum of two months, the threats of history and maturation were minimized. Cohorts and subjects shared common historical influences and there is limited time between their respective testing on the dependent measures. History could be a factor in educational research where semesters or summer breaks separate testing times; however, that was not the case in this study.

A cohort study was conducted combining subjects from all three marriage preparation programs, and then independent cohort studies were conducted within each program. The design for between-subjects phase of the research can be seen as depicted in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Depiction of the between-subjects design comparing cohorts who had just completed one of the marriage preparation programs with cohorts who were about to begin. The right side depicts this design for the overall combined sample (A-) and the left side depicts this design for comparison within programs (B, C, D).

\[
\begin{align*}
n_1 &= 48 \\
n_2 &= 48 \\
n_3 &= 48 \\
n_4 &= 48 \\
n_5 &= 48 \\
n_6 &= 48
\end{align*}
\]

A within-subjects, pretest-posttest analysis was also carried out with the entire sample, and then within each marriage preparation program. This within-subject design was meant to complement the cohort study. This design is depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Depiction of the within-subjects design comparing pretest scores with post-test scores for the overall combined sample (A), and within each program (B, C, D).

\[
\begin{align*}
n_1 &= 48 \\
n_2 &= 48 \\
n_3 &= 48
\end{align*}
\]

A control for history was included by collecting post-test measures on the second group of cohorts, checking to see if any
change would happen twice, thus expanding the design to appear as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Depicts the first within-subjects experiment, plus the repeat of the pretest-posttest design as a check for historical influences. A illustrates the combining of subjects from all three programs for an overall check for historical influences. B, C, D, depict within-subject historical checks within each program.

```
\begin{align*}
\text{n1} &= 48 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X1} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n2} &= 48 \quad \text{B COUPLES WORKSHOP} \\
\text{n3} &= 48 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X2} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n4} &= 48 \quad \text{C ANGLICAN PROGRAM} \\
\text{n5} &= 48 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X3} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n6} &= 48 \quad \text{D CATHOLIC PROGRAM}
\end{align*}
```

The second major question of the study, regarding differential change rates between programs, was answered by combining all cohorts in a particular marriage program and then comparing their mean scores with those of the other two programs. The design to assess differential effects is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4. Depiction of the differential effect phase of the study in which the results of the three programs were compared at posttest. Cohorts in each respective program were combined for this phase of the study.

```
\begin{align*}
\text{n1} &= 96 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X1} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n2} &= 96 \quad \text{Couples' Workshop} \\
\text{n3} &= 96 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X2} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n4} &= 96 \quad \text{ANGELICAN PROGRAM} \\
\text{n5} &= 96 \quad 0 \xleftarrow{} \text{X3} \xrightarrow{} 0 \\
\text{n6} &= 96 \quad \text{ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM}
\end{align*}
```
Quantitative Data Analysis

Computer programs used in this analysis were, S.P.S.-S.:X (SPSS Inc., 1983) for Analysis of Variance and Analysis of Covariance and BMDP6M for Canonical Analysis.

Preliminary Analyses.

Data analysis began with several preliminary investigations. These included canonical analysis with the entire sample and analysis of variance comparing cohort pretest scores. This latter procedure was conducted within each program and for the overall sample composed of subjects from each program. These procedures were conducted in order to enable the choice of the best covariates for further comparisons employing covariate analysis. Following is a description of these preliminary analyses.

A) Data analysis began with canonical analysis to assess the degree of linear relationship between two sets of variables, dependent and independent. Canonical analysis also provided a) information about the various scores on the variables used in the study in terms of skewness and kurtosis, b) transformed variables for use in the differential effects portion of the study, c) a weighted composite of independent variables which correlated maximally with a set of dependent variables. This latter provided helpful information the on choice of covariates. The relative independence of the outcome measures was demonstrated thus indicating their suitability for univariate analyses.
B) The second preliminary investigation began with analysis of variance comparing the two groups of cohorts combined across programs at pretest. This analysis was then repeated within each program. This analysis permitted determination of initial differences between the groups of cohorts. Information regarding initial group differences was used in collaboration with canonical analysis for establishing covariates used in further analyses. Initial group differences were also important in interpretation of posttest results.

Program Effects.

Hypotheses 1 was investigated through a series of analyses. These included a) analysis of covariance for comparisons of posttest scores of the first cohort groups with the pretest scores of the second group of cohorts (see Figure 1), b) analysis of variance for within-subject effects pre-post (see Figure 2), and c) a repeat of the within-subject investigation but with the second group of cohorts (see Figure 3.)

The first step in the investigation was analysis of covariance comparing the posttest scores of the first group of cohorts with the pretest scores of the second group of cohorts. (See Figure 1-A) This between-subjects analysis was carried out for the entire sample of 288 subjects, with the first 144 participants in the three marriage preparation programs compared with their 144 cohorts who began the programs the next time it was offered.
The second step was analysis of variance testing for within-subject effects (See Figure 2-B, C, D). Pretest scores of all participants in the first offering of the respective marriage preparation programs were compared with their posttest results. Combined across programs, the sample for this analysis was 144.

The third step was identical to the second step except in this case pretest and posttest data for the second groups of cohorts were analysed (See Figure 3-A). This was the check for historical and spurious effects. When the subjects from the three programs were combined for this analysis, there was again a sample of 144.

Hypothesis 2 was investigated following the same steps as articulated above for hypothesis 1. In this case however the steps were applied to individual experiments with samples restricted within each marriage preparation program, rather than combined across programs. The three steps were a) between-subjects analysis of covariance with two groups of 48 subjects b) within-subjects analysis of variance with the first 48 cohorts and c) within-subjects analysis of variance with the second group of 48 subjects. This latter step was the check for historical influences. These procedures were carried out for each of the three programs in turn, Couples' Workshop, the Anglican program and the Roman Catholic program.

Differential Effects. (See Figure 4)

The investigation of differential effects employed transformed data and canonical variables generated by canonical
analysis. The canonical variates used as covariates maximize the correlation between a linear composite of pretest scores and demographic variables with a linear composite of the dependent measures. Analysis of covariance was used to investigate a) differences between leadership groups within each program, b) differences between the cohort groups within each program, and c) differences between programs. When group differences were found, post-hoc analysis using the F test was employed.

Tests of Assumptions

In all analyses, the homogeneity of variance assumptions were checked at alpha level .05. Where lack of homogeneity of variance was found to be significant, because the n's were equal, the influence of this violation was considered to be small. For the same reasons the effects of non-normality on the nominal levels of significance of the F test were considered slight (Glass & Stanley, 1970). Olson (1974) claims that the univariate test for the homogeneity of variance "is overly sensitive to covariance heterogeneity in the sense that it detects heterogeneity so minor as to have inconsequential effects" (p.906). Although the reader is cautioned where violations of this assumption occur that ideal conditions did not always hold, the procedures may still be considered to be reasonable.

Tests for the homogeneity of the slopes of the regression lines were also conducted at the alpha level .05 for a comparisons using the transformed data generated by the canonical
analyses. No violations of this assumption were found.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Each notable incident collected from the post-program interviews was summarized by a panel. The panel's goal was to elicit from the idiom of each subject some universal implication of their remarks in relation to marriage preparation. From the 30 subjects, 133 summary remarks were generated. The establishment of notable incident categories was completed inductively by a second panel.

Flanagan (1954) notes that categorization is a task that requires insight and judgement. Woolsey (1985) has suggested that more than one person be involved in the development of categories. Although categorization is necessarily subjective, an effort towards objectivity was made through the employment of a panel who sorted summarized remarks into piles that seemed to go together. The panel discussed differences in categorization until consensus was reached. This discussion also gave the researcher a broader insight into the meaning of the categories. These were then read, referring to the original interview notes, in an attempt to discern the general theme, meaning, and weighting of the categories.

LIMITATIONS

The use of pretest scores raises the issue of pretest sensitization in the discussion of the first hypothesis, namely, the effect of marriage preparation. This could be a threat to internal validity within this design. However a
meta-analysis of pretest sensitization effects conducted by Willson & Putnam (1982) indicates that pretesting did elevate posttest scores, but this elevation was lower on attitudinal variables, and the effect size of pretesting is small after a duration of one month. Using measures with good test-retest reliability, and given the lapse of time between testing, pretesting should not be a serious threat to internal validity in this study.

The unit of analysis for the study was the individual. The dependent measures used in this investigation were developed to measure the individual's attitudes or beliefs. These measures were not intended for measuring dyads. For example, it is frequently the case in marriage enrichment that couples have divergent willingness to seek help with their relationship. It is often the heightened interest of one spouse that brings the couple to marriage counselling and marriage growth events. Thus, individual change is an important factor.

Dyadic scores, through averaging, lose a great deal of information unless measurement is designed specifically to assess dyadic responses (Hopkins, 1982). A study of reciprocal exchanges in a behavioural measurement would be a case in point. The dependent measures of this study were designed as indicators of individual measurement. Thompson & Walker (1982) have called for consistency regarding the unit of analysis throughout a research project. This clarity of focus was sought in collection, analysis, and interpretation of data in this study.
CHAPTER 4

Results

Introduction

The results of the study are reported in five major sections of this chapter, namely, a) preliminary statistical analyses, b) hypothesis testing of overall marriage preparation program effects (see Figures 1, 2, 3), c) hypothesis testing of program effects within each of three specific marriage preparation programs (see Figures 1, 2, 3), d) hypothesis testing of differential effects (see Figure 4.), and e) analysis of qualitative data. Statistical procedures included a) canonical analysis, b) analysis of variance, c) analysis of covariance, and d) an F test method of post-hoc comparisons.

Preliminary Statistical Analyses

Canonical Analysis

A canonical correlation analysis was performed between a set of dependent variables and a set of independent variables. The purpose of this analysis was a) to provide a general overview of the data and their characteristics, b) to maximize the relationship between the sets of data for more rigorous statistical control in subsequent analysis of differential effects, and c) to provide information on what pretest and demographic variables may be useful covariates in subsequent analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). No missing data was
discovered in 288 cases. Outliers were found in the demographic data. For example, scores on length of relationship, home structure and the age of the subjects all had extreme cases. Since this result can affect the underlying assumptions of normality, interpretations of the results were made with caution. Assumptions regarding lack of multicollinearity were met.

The first canonical correlation was .82 (67% of variance); the second was .71 (50% of variance); the third was .67 (45% of variance). Three canonical correlations then, accounted for the significant linkage between the two sets of variables.

Analyses of the three pairs of statistically significant (α = .05) canonical variates appear in Table 4. Shown are correlations between original variables and the canonical variates, standardized canonical variate coefficients, within-set variance accounted for by the canonical variates (percent of variance), redundancies, and canonical correlations. Total percent of variance and total redundancy indicate that the canonical analysis is more efficient for the first set of variables.

The researcher set .50 as the cutoff for interpretation of the structural coefficients. This cut off point was chosen as a more conservative measure than the .30 often used (Pedhazur, 1973; Marascuilo & Levin, 1983). In order of magnitude, the first set of the first canonical variate (Y1) was defined by Attitude Towards the Church (structure coefficient = .84). The second set of the first canonical variate (X1) was defined by the
Table 4
Correlations, standardized canonical coefficients, canonical correlations, percents of variance, and redundancies between outcome measures, pretest and demographic variables and their corresponding canonical variates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>First Corr</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>Second Corr</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>Third Corr</th>
<th>Coef</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreTest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church:Self</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months together</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Structure</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Happiness</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of variance</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical Corr.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Favourable polarities for R.B.I and Church differ from Attitude Towards Help With Marriage.
same variable, namely attitude towards the church (structure coefficient = .83) and by two demographic variables, namely church attendance (structure coefficient = .52) and willingness to attend (structure coefficient = -.50). The first canonical variate, then, shows that the two composite variables, dependent and independent, were highly correlated and that the first composite, having to do mostly with attitude towards the church, was highly correlated to a composite in which attitude towards the church (pretest), willingness to attend, and church attendance were most salient. It appeared that pretest measures on attitude towards the church and measures on willingness to attend and church attendance would make useful covariates.

The first set of the second canonical variate (Y2) was defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage (structure coefficient = .81). The second set of the second canonical variate (X2) was defined by the same variable as measured at pretest. None of the demographic variables were salient to this composite variable. As a pair, these canonical variates suggest that the pre-post scores on the attitude towards help with marriage inventory are strongly related. This result suggests that pretest scores would be useful covariates in further analyses.

The first set of the third canonical pair (Y3) was primarily defined by relationship beliefs (structure coefficient = .93). The corresponding canonical variate of this pair (X3) was defined by pretest influences of the Relationship Belief Inventory. None of the demographic variables was salient to this composite.
Overall, the canonical analysis pointed to possibly useful covariates on the basis of high correlation with the dependent variable set. The possibly useful covariates were pretest scores on attitude towards help with marriage, attitude towards the church, and the relationship beliefs. Two demographic variables, based on the same criteria, appeared useful as covariates, namely, willingness to attend, and church attendance.

**Pretest Comparisons**

**Cohort Pretest Comparisons: Overall Sample.**

Analysis of variance was conducted comparing the first 144 cohorts who attended marriage preparation in January/February with their cohorts who attended marriage preparation in March/April on all demographic and pretest measures. These univariate analyses revealed statistical differences between the groups on three out of thirteen variables. Differences were found on ratings of home happiness, the church attendance of the subject's mother and on the Relationship Belief Inventory. The groups were not different on the other two dependent variables, or on eight other demographic variables (See table 5).

On the basis of these findings, home happiness and mother's church attendance were chosen as a covariates to be used in further cohort analyses of the whole sample. The subject's own church attendance and willingness to attend the program were also chosen as covariates because of their strong loading on the dependent variables as indicated in canonical analysis.
Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, f ratios and probabilities for univariate analyses comparing the pretest scores of the first 144 cohorts with the second group on dependent and demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>First n=144</th>
<th>Second n=144</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>68.29</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>35.90</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>33.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Attend</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Structure</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Happiness</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Violations of univariate homogeneity of variance on R.B.I., length of relationship and home happiness.

* Significant at alpha level .05.
The Couples' Workshop: Cohort Pretest Comparisons.

Analysis of variance was conducted comparing the pretest and demographic scores of the subjects who attended the Couples' Workshop in the first session with their cohorts attending in the second session. There were 48 cohorts attending the Couples' Workshop at each of the respective times, for a sample of 96 subjects.

Table 6
Means, Standard Deviations, f ratios, and probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Couples' Workshop with the second group on dependent and demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>First n= 48 Cohorts</th>
<th>Second n= 48 Cohorts</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>99.65 11.52</td>
<td>97.52 11.35</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>43.10 13.32</td>
<td>46.02 13.33</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>63.04 16.62</td>
<td>66.35 14.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.27  .94</td>
<td>2.04  .87</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>1.67  .91</td>
<td>2.23  1.15</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.85  1.71</td>
<td>3.77  1.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.50  .51</td>
<td>1.33  .47</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24.96  3.66</td>
<td>24.77  4.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>38.86  32.20</td>
<td>35.02  20.66</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Attend</td>
<td>7.79  2.31</td>
<td>6.77  2.29</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Structure</td>
<td>1.65  1.06</td>
<td>1.44  .82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Happiness</td>
<td>7.75  2.23</td>
<td>7.25  2.25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.21  1.23</td>
<td>2.71  1.15</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Violations of univariate homogeneity of variance on R.B.I., length of relationship and home happiness.
* Significant at alpha level .05.
Significant univariate F ratios were found for mother's church attendance, willingness to attend the program, and educational level (see table 6). Willingness to attend and educational level were considered to be important substantive differences since they are related to motivation and past educational abilities. These three variables were chosen as covariates in further Couples' Workshop comparisons. Aside from the three dimensions where the groups differed, there were no significant differences between the cohorts on 8 other descriptive dimensions or on the pretest scores on the dependent measures.

Anglican Program: Cohort Pretest Comparisons.

Analysis of variance revealed significant differences when the two groups of Anglican cohorts were compared at pretest. Significant univariate differences were found between the two cohort groups in the Anglican Program on the Attitude Towards the Church Scale, and length of relationship. The groups were not different on either the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory or the Relationship Belief Inventory. There were no statistically significant differences on 9 other descriptive variables (see table 7).

Although there was only one statistically significant descriptive difference between the cohorts in the Anglican Program, standardized discriminant functions indicated that reported church attendance (.88) loaded even higher than
length of relationship (.72) on the outcome variables. Thus church attendance was chosen along with length of relationship as a covariate in further analysis of the Anglican program sample.

Table 7
Means, Standard Deviations, f ratios and probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Anglican Program with the second group on dependent and demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>First n= 48 Cohorts</th>
<th>Second n= 48 Cohorts</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean    SD</td>
<td>Mean    SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>97.46  13.22</td>
<td>96.23  13.84</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>47.81  14.82</td>
<td>40.66  14.39</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>59.94  18.44</td>
<td>65.56  15.02</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.10   .99</td>
<td>2.10   .95</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>2.13   1.10</td>
<td>2.29   1.21</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.90   1.68</td>
<td>3.98   1.56</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.58   .50</td>
<td>1.58   .50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25.60  4.57</td>
<td>25.08  4.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>46.38  31.72</td>
<td>28.00  19.67</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>6.50   2.66</td>
<td>6.91   2.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>1.31   .69</td>
<td>1.25   .70</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Happiness</td>
<td>7.92   1.88</td>
<td>7.54   2.44</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.92   1.16</td>
<td>3.33   1.34</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Violations of univariate homogeneity of variance on Length of Relationship (.00)

* Significant at alpha level .05.
Roman Catholic Program: Cohort Pretest Comparisons.

The univariate tests used to assess initial differences between the two cohort groups attending the Roman Catholic Program revealed differences on pre-test scores on the outcome measures, as well as on demographic variables. Univariate group differences were found on the church attendance, reported home happiness, and the Relationship Beliefs Inventory. There were Table 8.

Means, Standard Deviations, f ratios and probabilities for univariate analyses comparing of pretest scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Roman Catholic Program with the second group on dependent and demographic variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>First n= 48</th>
<th>Second n= 48</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>94.67</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>39.79</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>62.54</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>72.96</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Attendance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitation</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25.31</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Attend</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Structure</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Happiness</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Violations of univariate homogeneity of variance on Length of Relationship (.32), Age (.02) and R.B.I. (.01). n= 96 * Significant at alpha level .05.
no differences between the groups on the other two outcome measures or on eight other descriptive variables (see Table 8). Thus the subject's own reported church attendance and home happiness index were used as covariates in future comparison between these cohort groups.
Hypothesis Testing: Overall Program Effects

Hypothesis 1

If subjects are combined from three marriage preparation programs, The Couples' Workshop, The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program and The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program, they will show a statistically significant improvement in:

a) their attitude towards help with marriage, as measured by the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory,

b) their attitude towards the church, as measured by the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory, and

c) relationship beliefs, as measured by the Relationship Belief Inventory (R B.I.)

when compared pretest-posttest and with cohort controls.

Between-Subjects: Overall Sample. (See Figure 1-A)

Univariate analyses of covariance were conducted comparing the posttest scores of the combined group of 144 subjects who attended the first sessions of the marriage preparation programs with the pretest scores of their cohorts who began immediately following. Thus the second group of cohorts served as controls. Covariates used in this analysis were willingness to attend, home happiness, mother's church attendance and the subject's church attendance. A statistically significant F ratio was found on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory.

No conclusive result could be drawn from the statistically significant F ratio on the Relationship Belief Inventory since a significant difference was found on the pretest comparison of these groups on this variable. No comparison on the subscales of the Relationship Belief Inventory were conducted as a consequence.
of this lack of clarity. The statistically non-significant F ratio on the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory is indicative of no change (see table 9).

Table 9
Means, standard deviations, F ratios and their probabilities for univariate contrasts of first cohort posttest scores with second cohorts pretest scores with covariates willingness to attend, home happiness, church attendance and mother's church attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Measure</th>
<th>First n=144 Cohorts</th>
<th>Second n=144 Cohorts</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Adj Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>103.05</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>41.84</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>54.41</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 144
* Significant at alpha level .05.

Within-Subjects: Overall Sample. (See Figure 2-A)

Analyses of variance were conducted to compare differences within-subjects from pretest to posttest for the first cohort combined group of 144 subjects on all outcome measures. These univariate analyses of variance revealed occasion differences on The Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory and The Relationship Belief Inventory (see table 10). Three subscales of The Relationship Belief Inventory were also statistically significant, with only the Male/Female (M/F) and the Partners Can Change (C) having statistically non-significant differences.
There was a statistically non-significant F ratio for the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory.

Table 10
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate contrasts of pretest and posttest scores for the first combined group of subjects in marriage preparation (Jan/Feb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest n = 144</th>
<th>Posttest n = 144</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>102.82</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>54.28</td>
<td>19.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscales
D (Conflict)    | 10.50           | 5.44             | 9.08 | 5.16 | 5.14  | .02* |
M (Mindreading) | 13.92           | 5.38             | 10.56| 5.22 | 28.84 | .00* |
C (Change)      | 9.94            | 4.45             | 9.22 | 4.70 | 1.72  | .19  |
S (Sexuality)   | 13.94           | 5.23             | 12.56| 5.44 | 4.88  | .03* |
Male/Female     | 13.47           | 6.04             | 12.66| 7.27 | 1.05  | .31  |

* Significant at alpha level .05.

History: Overall Sample. (see Figure 3-A)

A check for historical influences was conducted by repeating the pre-post experiment. The results of these analyses of pre-post changes on the second group could then be compared with the results for the same comparison in the first cohort group. If similar changes were found, then change could not be attributed to immediate historical influences.

Univariate analyses of variance were conducted contrasting the pretest scores of the second combined group of 144 cohorts with their posttest scores on all outcome measures. These analyses of variance revealed statistically significant
differences similar to those found for the first combined cohorts (see table 11). Statistically significant differences were again found on the Attitude Towards Help with Marriage and the Relationship Belief Inventory, and on four subscales of the Relationship Belief Inventory. The C subscale (Partners Can Change) recorded a statistically significant difference, which

Table 11
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate contrasts of pretest and posttest scores for the first (Jan/Feb) and second groups (March/April) of cohorts combined across programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 144</td>
<td>97.11</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>102.82</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 144</td>
<td>96.13</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>102.22</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 144</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>41.47</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 144</td>
<td>41.61</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>40.82</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 144</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>54.28</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 144</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F (Male/Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level .05.
which did not occur in this comparison with the first cohorts. The M/F (Male/Female) subscale and the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory were statistically non-significant again (see Table 11).

Conclusions

Hypothesis 1A.

Statistically significant differences were found on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory between cohorts who had attended marriage preparation, and those who had not. These findings were collaborated by statistically significant within-subject differences found pretest to posttest and in a repeat trial of the within-subject experiment. The consistent results of these analyses support Hypotheses 1A.

Hypothesis 1B.

The consistent results of the analyses of the Attitude Towards The Church Inventory suggest that marriage preparation did not produce change in terms of a more favourable attitude towards the church. Statistically significant differences were not found between cohorts who had attended and those who had not. As well, no statistically significant difference was found on within-subject comparisons, or in a repeat trial of the within-subject experiment. Thus hypothesis 1B was not supported.

Hypothesis 1C.

No conclusive result could be drawn from the investigations of changes in relationship beliefs during marriage preparation.
programs. The two cohort groups were found to have statistically significant differences at pretest on the Relationship Belief Inventory. Thus the statistically significant result found in the cohort comparison was unclear. The within-subject phase of the study indicated statistically significant change on this variable in repeated trials of the experiment. These two significant F ratios are suggestive of support for hypothesis 1C.

**Hypothesis 2: Program Effects.**

If subjects are provided with either the Couples' Workshop, or the Anglican Marriage preparation Program or the Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program, they will show a statistically significant difference in:

a) their attitude towards help with marriage, as measured by the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory,

b) their attitude towards the church, as measured by the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory, and

c) relationship beliefs, as measured by the Relationship Belief Inventory (R.B.I.),

as compared their own pretest scores and cohort controls.

The decision on Hypothesis 2 was made on the basis of collaborative evidence from investigations within each program. These comparisons included a) a between-subjects cohort comparison (Figure 1, B,C,D), b) a within-subjects comparisons for the first cohorts (Figure 2, B,C,D), and c) a check for historical effects by repeating the within-subjects comparison with the second group of cohorts (Figure 3, B,C,D). The results of the all three investigations within each program are reported together in the following order a) The Couples' Workshop, b) The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program, and c) The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program.
Analyses of variance were conducted to compare the posttest scores of the first 48 subjects attending the Couples' Workshop and the pretest scores of their cohorts who attended the next session of that program on all outcome measures. Covariates used were the subject's willingness to attend and their educational level. These univariate analyses indicated statistically significant differences on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory and the Relationship Belief Inventory (see Table 12). All but the M/F (Male/Female) subscale of the Relationship Belief Inventory showed statistically significant difference. The Attitude Towards the Church Inventory showed no statistically significant group difference. Thus at posttest the first group of subjects attending the Couples' Workshop showed a statistically significant difference than cohort controls on two out of three main outcome measures, although their pretest scores did not show a statistically significant difference. (see Table 12). These two groups also showed a statistically significant differences on four out of five subscales of the Relationship Belief Inventory.
Table 12
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Square, Error, F ratios and significance of the F ratios for univariate analyses comparing between posttest scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Couples' Workshop with the Pretest scores of the second group of 48 cohorts with covariates Education and Willingness to Attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n=48</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Adj Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>111.23</td>
<td>110.72</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3536.87</td>
<td>87.58</td>
<td>40.39</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>97.52</td>
<td>98.03</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>339.48</td>
<td>156.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>40.64</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>339.48</td>
<td>156.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>44.57</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>339.48</td>
<td>156.54</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>50.11</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>5143.51</td>
<td>300.18</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>65.42</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>5143.51</td>
<td>300.18</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td>D (Conflict)</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>212.64</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>212.64</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>693.44</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>35.08</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>693.44</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>35.08</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>129.28</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>129.28</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>141.91</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>141.91</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M/F (Male/Female)</td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>77.87</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>77.87</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One violation of univariate assumptions of homogeneity of variance: M/F subscale, sig = .00*. n = 96

* Significant at alpha level .05.

Within Subjects: The Couples' Workshop. (See Figure 2-B)

Occasion differences were examined for the first 48 cohorts attending the Couples' Workshop. Univariate analyses showed
statistically significant differences on the Attitude Towards Help with Marriage Inventory, and on the Relationship Belief Inventory (see table 13). There was no statistically significant difference on the Attitude Towards the Church Scale. These analyses revealed the same differences as the contrast between the first cohorts at posttest and the second cohorts at pretest.

Statistically significant univariate F ratios were found for three of five Relationship Belief subscales (See Table 13). The results of these analyses were the same as the between-subject findings for this program, except in the C subscale (Partners Can Change), where the between-subjects analysis showed a statistically significant difference which did not occur in the within-subject analysis. There was no statistically significant difference on the M/F (Male/Female) subscale at either testing.

Table 13
Means, standard deviations, F ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first group of cohorts in the Couples' Workshop (Jan/Feb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest n = 48</th>
<th>Posttest 48</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td>99.65 11.35</td>
<td>111.23 10.52</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td>43.10 13.33</td>
<td>40.02 14.52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>63.04 16.62</td>
<td>49.17 20.17</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td>10.75 4.91</td>
<td>8.29 5.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td>13.48 5.39</td>
<td>8.48 5.03</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td>10.54 4.34</td>
<td>8.63 5.51</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td>14.23 4.00</td>
<td>11.90 4.90</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>14.23 6.24</td>
<td>11.85 7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level .05.
History: The Couples' Workshop. (See Figure 3-B)

The within-subjects design was repeated with the second group of cohorts. Univariate analyses indicated statistically significant differences on the same main outcome variables as in the first within-subject analyses and in the between-subjects analyses (see Table 14). Statistically significant differences were found on the Attitude Towards Help with Marriage and the Relationship Belief Inventory were. There was no statistically significant difference in this comparison of pretest scores and posttest scores on The Attitude Towards the Church Inventory.

Three of the five Relationship Belief Subscales showed statistically significant difference from pretest to posttest. Two of the subscales, namely the S (Sexuality) subscale and the M/F (Male/Female) subscale showed no statistically significant difference from pretest to posttest. The M/F subscales showed consistently non-significant statistical differences in all Couples' Workshop comparisons (between-subjects, and within-subjects). There was some ambiguity around the S (Sexual Perfectionism) subscale. This subscale showed a statistically significant difference in the first two comparisons, but not in this last within-subjects trial. The comparison of pretest scores with posttest scores on the C (Partners can change) subscale was statistically significant in this analysis and in the between-subjects analysis, but not in the first within-subjects analysis.
Table 14
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate contrasts of pretest and posttest scores for the first (Jan/Feb) and second groups (March/April) of cohorts in the Couples' Workshop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>99.65</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>111.23</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>97.52</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>108.98</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>40.02</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>45.19</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>63.04</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>55.42</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level .05
Analyses of covariance were conducted to compare the posttest scores of the first 48 subjects attending the Anglican Program with their cohort group pretest scores on all outcome measures. The subject's own church attendance and length of relationship were used as the two covariates. These univariate analyses revealed statistically significant F ratios on two main dependent measures: Attitude Towards The Church, and the Relationship Belief Inventory (see table 15). This is indicative of change in the first group of cohorts on the Relationship Belief Inventory. Since a statistically significant difference existed between these two groups at pretest on the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory, the statistically significant result found in this analysis was not clear. There was no statistically significant difference on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory.

Statistically significant differences were found on three of the five subscales of the Relationship Belief Inventory, M (mindreading), C (Partners Can Change), and S (Sexual Perfectionism) in the between-subject comparisons. No statistically significant differences were found on the D (Conflict Is Destructive) and the M/F (Male/Female) subscales (see Table 15).
Table 15
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Square, Error, F ratios and significance of the F ratios for univariate analyses comparing post-test scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Anglican Program with the Pre-test scores of the second group of 48 cohorts with covariates Length of Relationship and Church Attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n=48</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Adj Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>101.94</td>
<td>101.63</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>552.83</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>96.54</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>1061.80</td>
<td>106.85</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>3504.10</td>
<td>309.40</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>65.56</td>
<td>65.94</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>321.56</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>92.28</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>244.25</td>
<td>28.04</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M/F (Male/Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One violation of univariate assumptions of homogeneity of variance: Covariate "Length of Relationship" (.00*) n = 48

* Significant at alpha level .05.
Within-Subjects. Anglican Program. (See Figure 2-C)

Occasion differences (pretest to posttest) were examined for the first 48 cohorts who had taken the Anglican Program on all outcome measures. Analyses of variance were conducted within-subjects in order to provide data for comparison with the cohort "between-subjects" phase of this investigation within the Anglican sample. These univariate analyses revealed statistically significant differences on only one of eight outcome measures, the M (Mindreading) subscale of the Relationship Belief Inventory (see table 16).

These results concur with the finding of no statistically significant differences on the Attitude Towards Help With Marriage Inventory in the between-subjects investigation. The lack of statistically significant differences on the Relationship Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first group of cohorts in the Anglican Program (Jan/Feb).

Table 16
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first group of cohorts in the Anglican Program (Jan/Feb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest n=48</th>
<th>Posttest n=48</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td>97.46</td>
<td>101.94</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level .05.
Belief Inventory and the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory was different than in the between-subjects phase. Only one of the Relationship Belief Inventory Subscales showed a statistically significant difference when pretest and posttest scores were compared.

**History: Anglican Program (See Figure 3-C)**

The within-subjects design was repeated with the second group of Anglican cohorts. This also involved the comparison of pretest scores and posttest scores for the same subjects. The results of these analyses of variance were similar to those found in the first within-subjects investigation in the Anglican Program. Only one of the univariate F ratios was statistically significant, namely the M (mindreading) subscale of the Relationship Belief Inventory (see table 17). This was the only statistically significant univariate difference found in the first cohort group on the within-subject comparison. All other univariate comparisons were statistically non-significant, as was the case in the within-subjects phase with the first Anglican cohorts. This suggests a lack of historical threat to the validity of this portion of the study.
Table 17

Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first (Jan/Feb) and second groups (March/April) of cohorts in the Anglican Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>97.46</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>101.94</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>96.23</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>100.56</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First 48</td>
<td>59.94</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second 48</td>
<td>65.56</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at alpha level .05.
Roman Catholic Program

**Between-subjects.** (See Figure 1-D)

Posttest scores for the first group of 48 subjects were compared with the pretest scores of the second group of cohorts through analyses of covariance with covariates church attendance and home happiness. These analyses indicated statistically non-significant differences on Attitude Towards Help With Marriage, and the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory (see table 18). This finding suggested that there was no change on these variables. A statistically significant difference was found on the Relationship Belief Inventory, however, a statistically significant difference had been found between the pretest scores of the two cohort groups. Thus the statistically significant finding on the Relationship Belief Inventory in the comparison of the posttest scores of the first cohorts with the pretest scores of the second cohorts was considered to be unclear. No further analyses of subscales was conducted.
Table 18
Means, Standard Deviations, Mean Square, Error, F ratios and significance of the F ratios for univariate analyses comparing posttest scores of the first 48 cohorts in the Roman Catholic Program with the Pretest scores of the second group of 48 cohorts with covariates Home Happiness and Church Attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group n=48</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Adj Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>95.29 95.93</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>75.03 125.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>94.63 93.99</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>38.85 38.00</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>31.50 150.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>38.40 39.25</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Cohorts</td>
<td>60.17 60.33</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>3099.08 286.07</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Cohorts</td>
<td>72.92 72.92</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 96
* Significant at alpha level .05.

Within-Subjects: Roman Catholic Program. (See Figure 2-D)

Analyses of variance comparing the first 48 subjects in the Roman Catholic Program for occasion differences, pretest to posttest, were conducted on all outcome measures. All of these univariate comparisons (Table 19) showed statistically non-significant differences. As well, all of the univariate comparisons of the Relationship Belief Inventory subscales were statistically non-significant. The subscale M (mindreading) approached significance at .06. These findings are indicative of no change on any of the outcome measures following the Roman Catholic Program.
Table 19
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first group of cohorts in the Roman Catholic Program (Jan/Feb).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>95.29</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td>62.54</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R.B.I. Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td>14.38</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 48
* Significant at alpha level .05

History: Roman Catholic Program. (See Figure 3-D)

Analyses of variance were conducted on all outcome measures for pretest to posttest differences in the second Roman Catholic Cohort group of 48 subjects. These analyses were completed in order to compare with the results of the first cohort group on this same analyses.

These analyses generated consistently non-significant statistical differences on all variables of comparison (see table 20). These results are the same as those in the within-subject comparisons with the first group of Roman Catholic cohorts. The
similarity of the findings indicate a lack of historical threat to the validity of the results. The lack of statistically significant difference in any of the comparisons using samples from the Roman Catholic program indicates a lack of change on the variables of study during that program.

Table 20  
Means, standard deviations, f ratios and their probabilities for univariate analyses comparing pretest and posttest scores for the first (Jan/Feb) and second groups (March/April) of cohorts in the Roman Catholic Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help/Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>95.29</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>94.63</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>97.10</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>38.32</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>62.54</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>72.92</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.B.I. Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (conflict)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Mindreading)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (Sexuality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>16.48</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

**Hypothesis 2A.**

Hypothesis 2A purported that after any one of three marriage preparation programs a subjects' willingness to seek help with marriage, as measured by the Attitude Towards Help with Marriage Inventory, would show a statistically significant difference pretest to posttest and when compared with cohort controls. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings within the respective programs.

Statistically significant differences were found in the Attitude towards Help With Marriage Inventory in all phases of the investigation with the Couples' Workshop sample, pretest to posttest (within-subjects) and in cohort comparisons (between subjects). Uniformly non-significant statistical differences were found in the Roman Catholic groups on the Willingness To Seek Help With Marriage Inventory (within-subjects and between-subjects). This was also the case in the Anglican program sample. However, in the Anglican sample the results approached statistical significance. In this case a larger sample size may have led to a statistically significant difference.

**Hypothesis 2B.**

This hypothesis purported a statistically significant improvement in attitude towards the church as measured by the
Attitude Towards the Church Inventory after any one of three marriage preparation programs had been taken. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings. The consistent findings of non-significant statistical differences in all comparisons (between-subjects and within-subjects) in each of the three programs is indicative of no change on this variable.

**Hypothesis 2C.**

This hypothesis purported a statistically significant difference from pretest to posttest after any one of three marriage preparation programs in relationship beliefs as measured by the Relationship Belief Inventory. This hypothesis was not supported.

Consistent statistically significant differences on the Relationship Belief Inventory were evident in only one program, namely the Couples’ Workshop. The result in the Roman Catholic Program indicated no statistically significant difference on this variable in both trials of the within-subjects phase of study. The significant difference found in the between-subjects phase in the Roman Catholic group was considered uninterpretable since the cohort groups were found to have a statistically significant difference at pretest. The results from the Anglican sample were equivocal, with a statistically significant difference on the between-subjects comparison, but not on the two within-subject comparisons. The only consistent statistically significant difference in the Anglican program was on the M (Mindreading) scale of the Relationship Belief Inventory.
Hypothesis Testing: Differential Effects

Hypothesis 3.

If subjects from three marriage preparation programs, The Couples' Workshop, The Anglican Marriage Preparation Program, and The Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program are compared post program on:

a) a canonical variate defined primarily by Willingness to Seek Help With Marriage,

b) a canonical variate defined primarily by Attitude Towards The Church, and

c) a canonical variate defined primarily by Relationship Beliefs

there will be no statistically significant difference by program.
Preamble: Canonical Variables

The second major focus of the study was whether or not there would be differential program effects resulting from comparison of the three programs. In the cohort phase of the study, an assumption was made that the groups attending a particular program would be similar in background to those attending that same program two months later. This assumption of comparability was tested through analysis of variance. Where differences were found, analysis of covariance was employed as a method of statistical control.

The differential effect hypothesis called for comparison between three programs where cohort status could not be assumed. Each program attracted participants from differing referral networks and religious traditions. Thus the control of initial differences had heightened importance in this section of the study. Consequently, the optimal statistical control provided by the linear relationship of transformed variables from the canonical analysis was employed.

Canonical analysis had generated three canonical variates (See Table 4). This yielded three pairs of linear combinations of the original variables weighted to maximize the relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables. Composite scores on the dependent variables and the independent variables were obtained for each subject. Since the composites (X1, X2, X3) are the best expression of relationship between the Y composites (Y1, Y2, Y3) and the X composite, the X composite constitutes the best possible covarites for statistical control.
Each of the original dependent variables was highly correlated with one of the three canonical variates \( \hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3 \). Canonical variate \( \hat{Y}_1 \) can be defined largely in relation to attitude towards the church, with a loading of .83 of the original variable on the composite variable. Canonical variate \( \hat{Y}_2 \) was defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage, with that variable loading .74 on the canonical variable. The third canonical variate \( \hat{Y}_3 \) was defined primarily by relationship beliefs, with a loading of .94.

Before comparison across different marriage preparation programs was carried out, composite scores were used to test for differential leadership effects (see Figure 5, Part A).

**Figure 5** Univariate analysis of covariance comparisons by A) leadership \((n=16)\), B) cohorts within programs \((n=48)\), and C) programs \((n=96)\) on composite variables \( \hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3, \) with covariates \( X_1, X_2, X_3 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) LEADERSHIP ( n=16 )</th>
<th>B) COHORTS ( n=48 )</th>
<th>C) PROGRAM ( n=96 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>0 X 0 COUPLES' WORKSHOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>O X 0 ANGLICAN PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>0 X 0</td>
<td>O X 0 CATHOLIC PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test for differential effects between leadership conditions in each program involved comparisons on each of the composite...
variables $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3$, respectively. This made for comparisons of three groups, each with 16 subjects. Nine ancova analyses were carried out using $\hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2$ and $\hat{X}_3$ as the respective covariates. All comparisons were statistically non-significant at the .05 level. The results of these comparisons are reported under the heading "Leadership".

These leadership comparisons were followed by an examination of differences between cohort groups within each program on the composite variables (see Figure 5, part B). Three ancovas were completed for each of the three programs with n = 48. These compared the first group of cohorts (subsumed into one group after leadership comparisons) with the group who took their respective program in the subsequent session. Using the composite scores on $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3$ as dependent variables, cohorts within each program were compared using $\hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2, \hat{X}_3$ as the respective covariates. In all, 9 comparisons were made with no significant differences evident. These results are reported under the heading, "Cohorts".

Since no differences were found between any of the cohort groups within programs, all subjects attending each respective program were collapsed into a group of 96 subjects for purposes of comparison across programs (see Figure 5, part C). Again, ancova comparisons were made using composite variables $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3$ with covariates $\hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2, \hat{X}_3$ respectively. Results of these analyses are reported under the heading "Program".
Leadership

Since three different leadership conditions existed for each program, contrasts within these three conditions, with equal cell sizes of 16 subjects, were performed (see figure 5, part A). Composite data obtained from the canonical analysis was utilized since it provided a covariate which would be the optimal statistical control for initial differences between the groups.

Couples' Workshop.

Three Ancovas were conducted using in turn, composite scores \( \hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2, \hat{X}_3 \) as covariates and \( \hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3 \) as dependent variables. None of these were statistically significant and there were no violations of assumptions (see tables 21, 22, 23). These results indicate a lack of statistical difference by leadership condition.

Table 21
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Couples' Workshop on Canonical Variate Y1 with covariate X1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( n = 16 \), Groups (3).
Table 22
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Couples' Workshop on canonical variate Y2 with covariate X2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 16 , Groups (3).

Table 23
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Couples' Workshop on canonical variate Y3 with covariate X3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 16 , Groups (3).

Anglican Program.

Three ancovas were conducted using in turn, composite scores X1,X2,X3 as covariates and Y1,Y2,Y3 as dependent variables. None of these was statistically significant and there were no violations of assumptions (see tables 24,25,26). These findings are indicative of a lack of statistical difference by leadership condition in the Anglican Program.
Table 24
Ancova comparison of the three leadership conditions in the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_1$ with covariate $X_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3).

Table 25
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions of the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_2$ with covariate $X_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3).

Table 26
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_3$ with covariate $X_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3).
Roman Catholic Program.

Three Ancovas were conducted using in turn, composite scores $X_1, X_2, X_3$ as covariates and $Y_1, Y_2, Y_3$ as dependent variables. None of these ancovas showed statistically significant differences (see tables 27, 28, 29). There was a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variances in the comparisons using composite $Y_1$ (see table 27). These three comparisons indicate a lack of statistical difference by leadership condition in the Roman Catholic Program.

Table 27
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate $Y_1$ with covariate $X_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3). Violations of univariate assumptions of homogeneity of variances with $Y_1$ and $X_1$.

Table 28
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate $Y_2$ with covariate $X_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3).
Table 29
Ancova comparing the three leadership conditions in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate $\hat{Y}_3$ with covariate $\hat{X}_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 16$, Groups (3).

Cohorts

The Couples' Workshop.

Composite scores were used in the analysis of differences between the two cohort groups ($n = 48$) in the Couples' Workshop program on each of the canonical variates $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{Y}_3$ with covariates $\hat{X}_1, \hat{X}_2, \hat{X}_3$ respectively. Since there were no differences found in any of the three comparisons (see tables 30, 31, 32), the subjects were then combined to form one group of $n = 96$ for comparison between programs.

Table 30
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Couples' Workshop on canonical variate $\hat{Y}_1$ with covariate $\hat{X}_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2).
Table 31
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Couples' Workshop on canonical variate $Y_2$ with covariate $X_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>38.05</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2).

Table 32
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Couples' Workshop on canonical variate $Y_3$ with covariate $X_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>49.89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2). Violation of homogeneity of variance on covariate $X_3$.

Anglican Program.

Composite scores were used in the analysis of differences between the two cohort groups ($n = 48$) in the Anglican Program on each of the canonical variates $Y_1, Y_2, Y_3$ with covariates $X_1, X_2, X_3$, respectively. Since no differences were found in any of the three comparisons (see tables 33, 34, 35), the subjects were then combined to form one group of $n = 96$ for comparison.
between programs.

Table 33
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_1$ with covariate $X_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2).

Table 34
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_2$ with covariate $Y_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2).

Table 35
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Anglican Program on canonical variate $Y_3$ with covariate $X_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (1).
Roman Catholic Program.

Composite scores were used in the analysis of differences between the two cohort groups (n = 48) in the Roman Catholic Program on each of the canonical variates Y1, Y2, Y3 with covariates X1, X2, X3 respectively. Since there were no differences found in any of the three comparisons (see tables 36, 37, 38), the subjects were then combined to form one group of n = 96 for comparison between programs.

Table 36
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate Y1 with covariate X1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 48, Groups (2).

Table 37
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate Y2 with covariate X2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>37.49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 48, Groups (2).
Table 38
Ancova comparing the two cohort groups in the Roman Catholic Program on canonical variate $Y_3$ with covariate $X_3$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>51.10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 48$, Groups (2).

**Hypothesis 3B: Canonical Variate $Y_1$**

The ancova comparing the three programs on canonical variable $Y_1$, defined primarily by outcome scores on the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory, was statistically non-significant (see table 39). This indicated no statistically significant difference between the programs on this composite variable.

Table 39
Ancova comparing the three marriage preparation programs on canonical variate $Y_1$, defined primarily by Attitude Towards the Church, with covariate $X_1$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>92.13</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $n = 96$, Groups (3). Violation of homogeneity of variance assumptions on $Y_1$ and $X_1$.

This finding supported the hypothesis that there would be no statistically significant difference by program on the canonical variate defined primarily by the attitude towards the church.
This finding is in concert with the finding of non-significant statistical differences on the Attitude Towards the Church Inventory in examination of hypothesis 1B and 2B.

**Hypothesis 3A. Canonical Variate Y2**

The ancova comparing the three programs on the second canonical variate (Y2), defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage, produced a statistically significant F ratio, (see table 40). Thus the hypothesis that there would be no difference between programs on the second canonical variate, defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage, was not supported.

**Table 40**
Ancova comparing the three marriage preparation programs on canonical variate Y2, defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage, with covariate X2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>116.02</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 96, Groups (3).

The F test method of pairwise comparison was employed for post hoc-analysis of differences between programs (Pedhazur, 1973). This method involved comparison of differences between adjusted means. The adjusted mean score of the Couples' Workshop was first compared with the adjusted mean of the Roman Catholic
group on the second variate and found to be statistically significant (See table 41). The analysis continued with a comparison of the adjusted means of the Couples' Workshop and the Anglican Program. This also was statistically significant, and so analysis proceeded with comparison of the adjusted means of the Roman Catholic Program with the adjusted means of the Anglican program. This comparison was statistically non-significant. Thus the Couples' Workshop group was considered to have a more favourable outcome on this variable than the Roman Catholic or Anglican groups, and there was no statistically significant difference between the Roman Catholic and Anglican groups. This finding is in concert with those reported under hypothesis 2A.

Table 41
F Test Post Hoc Analysis of Adjusted Mean Differences Between Programs on Canonical Variate Y2 defined primarily by attitude towards help with marriage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couples' Workshop/</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Program</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples' Workshop/</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Program</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Program /</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Program</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Critical value = .05. Higher adjusted means indicate the desired direction of change.

* Significant at alpha level .05.
Hypothesis 3c. Canonical Variate \( Y3 \)

The ancova comparing the three programs on the third canonical variable \( Y3 \) defined primarily by relationship beliefs also produced a statistically significant F ratio (see table 42). This indicated a lack of support for the hypothesis that there would be no difference by program on relationship beliefs.

Table 42
Ancova comparing the three marriage preparation programs on canonical variate \( Y3 \) defined primarily by relationship beliefs, with covariate \( X3 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within cells</td>
<td>145.92</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( n = 96 \), Groups (3).

* Significant at alpha level .05.

Again the F test method of post hoc comparison of adjusted means was employed (see table 43). Statistically significant differences were found in comparisons of the adjusted means from the Couples' Workshop with the adjusted means from the Roman Catholic Program, and then the Anglican Program. This indicated a more favourable result in the Couples' Workshop. There was no statistically significant difference between the Anglican and
Roman Catholic programs.

Table 43
F test post hoc analysis of adjusted mean differences between programs on Canonical Variate 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Adjusted Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couples' Workshop/</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>13.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Program</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples' Workshop/</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>6.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Program</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. Program /</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Program</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Lower adjusted means indicate the desired direction of change.
* Statistically significant.
Notable Incidents

Introduction

The interviews with 10 subjects from each program, for a total of 30 subjects, generated 133 notable incidents (Appendix B). Each notable incident was reviewed by a panel that summarized each incident into a general statement. These statements were typed on individual pieces of paper and then sorted by a second panel. The sorting was done for all 133 statements without regard for which program they represented. The second panel placed statements that seemed to go together into piles. Once an initial sorting was completed by each member of the second panel, discussion of the placement of each statement commenced. Discussion continued until a consensus was reached. This was followed by a discussion of the meaning of the piles. The piles became the major categories for the notable incidents. In order to further understand the meaning of categories the researcher then reread the original interview remarks on which each category was based.

The notable incident statements were distributed in five major categories. The first category was called "awareness" and had to do with a participant learning something new about marital relationships. The second category was called "motivation" because all the statements within it seemed to refer to an increased motivation in regard to some elements of marriage. The third category was entitled "change". The statements in this category had to do with some change in behaviour or in relationship which the subject attributed to
the marriage preparation program. Statements in the fourth category had to do with the methods of the programs. The fourth category was broken into two subcategories, namely leadership and participation. The fifth category was a collection of negative statements about the programs. The panel believed there was a logical progression from the first category to the third, that is, from "awareness" to "motivation" to "change".

The number of subjects who generated statements in each category, as well as the number of notable incidents in each category, are reported in Table 44. As indicated in table 44,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Anglican</th>
<th>CW</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: a) leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of subjects</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of statements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the "change" category included 32 statements made by 70% of the sample. This category accounted for 24% of the statements. The
second largest category was "awareness". This included statements by 63% of the sample and accounted for 20% of the statements. The category of negative statements included statements by 50% of the sample. Following is a description of each major category along with prototypical statements from each category (Rosch, 1978).

**Awareness**

The first category included those statements which indicated that the teaching in the marriage preparation programs had led to some new awareness. Several subcategories emerged from this general category including "awareness of communication", "awareness of future difficulties", and a general category.

"Awareness" meant that the subject reported knowing something about marriage that they did not know at the commencement of the program. Statements in this category included those where the subjects attributed knowledge to information from the program. "Awareness" statements were not supported by any example of how the awareness had produced a change in the subject's relationship, nor did they indicate any motivation to change or do something different in the future. For example, a subject reported that the marriage preparation program "Taught to change the way you say things, not to get all hot and annoyed but to talk sensible" (A-7). When asked to give an example of how she had used this in her relationship, the subject said that she had attempted the new method, but had fallen back into her old patterns. She is aware of options in communication, but is not pursuing new strategies, nor did she indicate any further...
motivation to do so.

**Communication Awareness.**

All of the marriage preparation programs had content on communication skills. There were 10 subjects who reported gaining a new awareness of communication skills, three of these in the Anglican Program, six in the Couples' Workshop, and one in the Roman Catholic Program. Awareness of communication skills meant that participants reported learning something new about communication. A typical example of an incident from this subcategory would be the report from a subject in the Couples' Workshop. This subject recalled monitoring another couple during a skill practice session. He reported that the opportunity to observe others helped him to be aware of how important communication skills can be in facilitating understanding (CW-9).

**Awareness of Future Difficulties.**

The Couples' Workshop and the Anglican Program each have content on the developmental changes of marital relationships. The Roman Catholic Program provides lay models who provide some reference to developmental stages through the story of their own marriages. Overall there were five subjects who indicated that a new awareness of possible difficulties in marriage was notable.

The notable incidents in this category indicate that some subjects thought that they would have problem-free marriages. The program brought an awareness that these subjects could
anticipate change in their relationship, and perhaps even have problems. A typical example of this subcategory was a subject who reported that when she began the marriage preparation program she said to herself "Why would I ever rely on marriage counselling? Why would I need it?" (RC-9). She reported that her attitude had been "egotistical" and that after the program she was aware that someday she might benefit from relationship counselling.

**General Awareness.**

This subcategory included various notable incidents having to do with new learnings from the marriage preparation programs. These items had to do with awareness regarding a variety of aspects of relationships. Three notable incidents referred to new awareness regarding conflict resolution strategies. The programs seemed to give these three subjects an awareness of deficits in their relationship. For example, one subject reported that because he had been cohabiting for several years he thought he knew all about his partner. The marriage preparation program "got them talking" (A-9) about things they had not discussed before. Although he could not recall what the subject matter was, it was a new learning for him that his partner might have views different from his own.

Several statements related to new awareness from the programs referred to specific program content. These statements referred to new information on topics such as family of origin, family planning, spirituality and resources for strengthening
Notable incidents in the "motivation" category referred to those remarks by participants that indicated some anticipated change, although that change had not already come to pass. Statements in the motivational category comprised primarily notable incidents from the Roman Catholic and Couples' Workshop programs. The Roman Catholic subjects focused largely on motivation to resolve conflicts by confronting differences and not avoiding them. The adage, "do not let the sun go down on your anger" summarized the motivation of this group as seen in the prototypical statement "Don't give up, you should see it through even if you feel stuck" (RC-5). This statement was made by a subject who said that her usual method of conflict resolution was avoidance. This subject reported that the program enabled her to see the negative consequences of avoidance. The testimonies of lay coping models were important in shaping the motivation of couples in the Roman Catholic program.

The second major cluster of statements in the "motivation" category emerged from subjects in the Couples' Workshop. The common theme among these statements was the communication content of the program. This content not only offered new insight, but it also provided a motivation to learn more. An example of this was a subject who reported that she had been in relationship counselling with her fiance, but that the communication training in the marriage preparation program was as helpful to them as the counselling. She thought that she would like to have a "booster"
course in order to reinforce the communication skills learned (CW-7).

A minor focus of the "motivation" category was found in statements that referred to program content which had affirmed knowledge or beliefs about relationships which the subjects already held. In these cases the program seemed to provide encouragement and consequently new motivation for working on the relationship. An example of this would be one subject's report, "Basically we knew it all, but it gave us confidence in what we were doing" (A-8). There were other subjects who reported believing that there was nothing new for them in the program and these were recorded as "negative" notable incidents. Incidents in the "motivation" category differed from those in the "negative" category in that the former reported redundancy as needed confirmation.

Change

The third major category of statements related to reported changes in behaviour or relationship that were attributed to the marriage preparation program. This category could be broken down into two subcategories. The first has to do with changes that took place during the program through experiential or skill training exercises. The second major focus had to do with course content that has led to changes in the way the participants had behaved since the program. These notable incidents were mainly related to the impact of communication and conflict resolution content from the programs.
Change During the Program.

There were eight subjects from the Couples' Workshop reporting incidents in this section, four from the Anglican and four from the Roman Catholic. The common theme in this subcategory was that something during the program enabled the couple to achieve a new understanding (A-7), resolve a difference (CW-3), or achieve greater intimacy (CW-6). Differences resolved had to do with subjects such as sexuality (CW-5, A-7) and spirituality (RC-1).

The following two examples illustrate this subcategory. The first illustration came from a woman who reported that she and her fiance had been at a very busy period in their personal lives when they attended the program. Regular attendance at the Roman Catholic marriage preparation program enabled them to realize how little time they were devoting to nurturing their relationship. The marriage preparation program had focused them on each other again, and since the program they had continued to keep Wednesday nights for relationship building (RC-1).

The second example came from a participant in the Couples' Workshop. In the section of this program regarding resources for marriage, participants are asked to take part in a typical Marriage Encounter experience. They are asked to write a "love letter" to their partner and then exchange letters and discuss them. A participant in the workshop reported that this was the first letter that her partner had ever given her, and that in the letter he had disclosed feelings that she had not previously
known about (CW-1).

Change Happening after the Program.

The second major cluster of notable incidents having to do with "changes" focused primarily on the transference of new information regarding conflict resolution and communication into other settings. One subject reported that learnings from the program had been generalized to his communication skills with others than his fiancee (A-3). He reports that the program "made me realize that my attitude stunk...I never liked listening to anyone else. If I had an opinion then there was no changing it. Made me communicate with others and pick up on their feelings." He went on to say that since the program he has been more collegial in all his interpersonal relationships.

The remarks from the Roman Catholic program focussed largely on new conflict resolution strategies. A male participant in the Roman Catholic program related how the program had taught him about "hidden agendas" (RC-3). He reported that "hidden agendas" was "arguing about which table cloth to use". He reports that now when he and his partner are involved in a difference over something that seems minor they will take more time with it because they know there may be deeper issues at stake.

The notable incidents from the Anglican and Couples' Workshop programs focussed on the use of communication skills. The communication content dealt with the concept of "ownership of feelings". The use of "I" statements was particularly notable. One representative subject reported, "Chris and Ruth (course
leaders) explained that if something bothers you not to yell, but to say 'I feel this', not 'you make me' (CW-1). This subject went on to say that recently she became angry with her new husband and instead of hurling accusations, or nagging, which had been her usual pattern, she sat down with her husband and said "I feel mad", "This is what bothers me".

Methods

The fourth category contained incidents that seemed to pertain to the methodology of the programs. These could be divided into two main clusters, the first having to do with leadership and the other with participation. The first subcategory comprised primarily of incidents from the Roman Catholic and Anglican samples had to do with the use of leadership "coping" models. The second subcategory contained incidents related to both structured and skill-training exercises.

Leadership

The provision of talks by lay couples who disclosed their own experience of development in marriage seemed to provide a new realism regarding difficulties in marriage. This was especially the case among the Roman Catholic subjects. One subject noted that the lay couples spoke "intimately" (RC-1) and another found it notable that they had illustrated the "ups and downs" (RC-5) experienced in marriage. One subject said that the talks by lay couples "almost had me in tears" (RC-9). It seemed to be the emotion and the concreteness of these talks which made them
notable. However, response to the lay couples developmental stories was mixed. The same subject who was moved to tears reported being angry with the authoritarian model of marriage advocated by the lay couples. Two subjects in the Roman Catholic sample found the lay couples to be repetitious and boring (RC-7, RC-8). One of these objected to the models reading a prepared script. Listening to the scripts was like listening to "someone else's problems". The other said the lay couples "Didn't know what they were doing". Negative or positive, the lay couples were notable to participants in the Roman Catholic program.

Participation.

This subcategory represented incidents having to do with the benefits participants experienced from experiential or skill training exercises. These comprised primarily the subjects from the Anglican program and to some degree the Couples' Workshop. These notable incidents represented 29% of all notable incidents in the Anglican sample and 70% of their subjects.

These notable incidents reflected the importance these subjects placed on being able to actively participate and interact with content from the program. For example, Anglican subjects remembered an exercise using "I" statements. A prototypical example was a subject who recalled having to send messages beginning with "I appreciate" (A-3, A-5). This content was useful because it reminded them to be positive, and provided an alternative to nagging. Another subject recalled an exercise
on non-verbal behaviour (A-4). The exercises in the Anglican program enabled subjects to build friendships with other participants, and to interact with the leaders. This seemed to build group norms which supported new methods of communication.

Subjects from the Couples' Workshop reported that they had learned more about their partners through skill-training exercises (CW-2). Incidents in this category indicate that skill-training illustrated that the concepts taught were in some ways common sense but were not simple to use. This led to a desire for more skill-training.

**Negative**

This category comprised notable incidents that reflected negatively on the programs. There were six subjects in the Roman Catholic and Anglican programs and three from the Couples' Workshop whose notable incidents were in this category. Notable incidents from the Roman Catholic program dominated this category. These notable incidents about the Roman Catholic program accounted for one-third of the notable incidents from the Roman Catholic subjects.

The negative incidents from the Couples' Workshop usually referred to some particular aspects of the program, whereas negative notable incidents from the Roman Catholic subjects tended to be more global. One subject was disappointed that the Couples' Workshop did not have content on handling money, and another thought the content on sexuality was outdated. Both of these were made in the context of generally favourable
recollectons of the program. One subject thought the material in the course was too deep (CW-5) and that although the leaders had "explained it as best they could", it was still hard to understand.

Negative incidents related to the Anglican program had to do with perceptions of the program as redundant (A-2, A-8). One thought the program redundant because it was directed towards participants who had not cohabited (A-9). Another thought it was not responsive to specific needs of participants (A-5). One subject resented the program because he perceived it as "telling me what to do" (A-1). The most negative incidents in the Anglican program were recorded by participants who listed their willingness to attend as 1 out of a possible 10.

Negative incidents from the Roman Catholic subject's were related to the use of lectures rather than participatory methods, the compulsory nature of the program, and the stress on Roman Catholic Theology (RC-4). One subject with a generally negative response to the program thought the lay leaders were "keeners" in the church who related all solutions to marital problems to belief in God (RC-7). This same subject thought that the program had not raised any issues that she and her partner had not already discussed. Another subject echoed this global criticism saying "it was a waste of time" (RC-8). These subjects had recorded their willingness to attend the program as 5 and 6 out of a possible ten, respectively. This was just below the sample mean.

A controversial area of the Roman Catholic program seemed
to be the content on "natural family planning". Several subjects reported that they were planning to use this method as a result of attending the program (RC-3, RC-5). Two subjects reported being "fascinated" by this lecture (RC-5, RC-10). One of these was a dentist who was surprised that he had not gained this knowledge through his biological studies. In contrast, one subject thought this session was "a joke" and nothing different than she had heard in biology class. She thought it was "ridiculous" (RC-8) whereas another subject questioned whether it was hypocritical (RC-6). Another subject thought the instructors, who only had two children, likely did not use the method they were advocating (RC-7).

Content of Marriage Preparation

Several content areas seemed to cut across the inductively developed categorization reported above. There were 67 notable incidents which referred to specific content areas. Program content on communication was cited in 44% of these incidents by 66% of the sample. Topics such as conflict resolution, developmental crises, and sexuality were cited by one third or less of the sample. There were no negative incidents related to content presented on communication or conflict resolution.

Summary

Notable incidents were inductively clustered in five major categories. Three of these categories were conceptually related, namely, "awareness", "motivation", and "change". Subjects
from the Couples' Workshop dominated the "awareness" and "change" categories. The change category included changes that occurred in the relationship during the program, and changes that had taken place since the program. Subjects in the Roman Catholic program dominated the "motivation" category. This was related to the use of lay leaders who shared their personal stories of difficulty in marriage. Subjects in the Anglican program found the experiential exercises most notable, whereas in the Couples' Workshop sample the skill-training exercises were the most notable method. Negative incidents were reported by one-half of the sample. These were dominated by the Roman Catholic sample and to a lesser extent, the Anglican sample. New information on communication was by far the most reported content area.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion of Results

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the outcomes of marriage preparation programs in a field setting. The theory of marriage preparation suggests that marriage preparation should increase participants' willingness to seek help with their marriage (Clinebell, 1972; Stahmann & Heibert, 1980; Olson, 1983). Willingness to seek help with marriage is related to Mace's (1984) concept of a "belief in growth," one of three essential ingredients of the companionship marriage. This investigation sought to corroborate the findings of Bader et al. (1980) with regard to help-seeking.

The study also examined the untested assumption that marriage preparation programs offered in church-sponsored contexts will alter a participant's attitude toward the church. The religious community is the main provider of marriage preparation (Olson, 1983) and a goal of many church-sponsored marriage preparation programs is to "bond" participants to the church. Improved relations with the church may make subjects amenable to the use of the network of marriage support and enrichment programs available through the churches.

The study also investigated the effect of marriage preparation on relationship beliefs. Relationship beliefs are
considered important guides to behaviour in marriage, and have been demonstrated to correlate with marital satisfaction (Epstein & Eidelson, 1981).

Finally, the study sought an "insider's" (Olson, 1977) perspective on the outcome of marriage preparation. The purpose was to discover what participants in marriage preparation programs consider to have been important to them. These findings were meant to provide exploratory data as well as to corroborate and add meaning to the main findings of the study.

Hypotheses

The study investigated three main hypotheses. These were:

1) that the combined samples from three marriage preparation programs would show statistically significant improvement in willingness to seek help with marriage, attitude towards the church, and relationship beliefs,

2) that all three marriage preparation programs would show a statistically significant improvement in willingness to seek help with marriage, attitude towards the church, and relationship beliefs, and

3) that there would be no differential effect between the three marriage preparation programs on the three dependent variables.

Procedures

The hypotheses of the study were tested through a collaborative quasi-experimental methodology. The two methods of quantitative analysis were based on the recurrent institutional cycle design (Cook & Campbell, 1979) and the one shot
pretest-posttest design. Decisions on the first two hypotheses were made through a collaboration of these methods. The decision on hypothesis 3 was made on the basis of a non-randomized pretest-posttest control group design.

Qualitative analysis was conducted through a variant of the critical incident technique (Flanagan, 1954). Notable incidents were categorized inductively. The meanings of categories, the weightings of categories, and prototypical examples were reported.

Sample

The sample included 288 participants registered in three marriage preparation programs. The empirical literature on marriage preparation indicates that marriage preparation studies have been conducted largely with university volunteer participants. This sample represented a more heterogeneous population. In this sample only 20% had university backgrounds, 40% were cohabiting, there was a great diversity in willingness to attend the program, and for most participants the program was a mandatory requirement of a church wedding. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 45 years, and had been dating for as few as 3 months and as long as 13 years. There were no differences on the dependent measures between the overall sample of men and women when compared by multivariate analysis of covariance. However, descriptive data comparisons indicated that women scored consistently higher on willingness to seek help with marriage.
Statistical and Design Controls

Historical Effects.

Cook and Campbell (1979) cite history and maturation as threats to the recurrent institutional cycle design. Maturation was not considered an important threat because the brief duration of the programs. The investigation of historical effects was conducted through the repeating of the pretest-posttest design with the second cohort groups.

Leadership Effects.

The programs of study are all standardized and regularly offered with experienced leaders. The leadership of these programs is considered to be an integral part of the program. There were three different leadership conditions in each program. A statistical check for confounding influences of leadership on treatment was conducted through analyses of covariance comparing the outcomes of groups from each leadership condition within each program.

Initial Differences.

The differential effect hypothesis compared groups who could not be considered cohorts and thus the assumption of quasi-comparability " (Cook & Campbell, 1979. p.127) did not hold. Statistical controls were implemented through covariate analyses using composite data from canonical analysis. This canonical analysis produced three pairs of variables which maximized the relationship between the pretest measures and the dependent variables. These pairs of variables provided the best
statistical control for initial group differences.

Results

Willingness to Seek Help With Marriage.

All comparisons with the overall sample indicated support for the hypothesis that participants would improve on this variable during marriage preparation. However, this was not the case in relation to all three programs. Only the Couples' Workshop sample was found to have clear evidence of improvement. There was no evidence for improvement in the Roman Catholic sample and mixed results in the Anglican sample. This latter sample showed a statistically significant difference in the cohort phase of the study, but in neither of the pretest-posttest trials. The null hypothesis regarding differential effects on this variable was not supported. The Couples' Workshop sample was found to be significantly different than the Anglican or Roman Catholic samples, and no differences were found between these latter samples.

Attitude Towards the Church.

All interpretable comparisons on this variable indicated a lack of support for the hypothesis that marriage preparation would improve participant's attitude towards the church. There was no improvement in any of the three programs, nor were there any differential effects.
Relationship Beliefs.

No conclusive result could be drawn from the first hypothesis. Initial group differences left the significant between-subjects finding unclear. However, there were significant findings on both within-subjects trials suggesting improvement during marriage preparation. The Couples' Workshop sample demonstrated consistent improvement in relationship beliefs in all comparisons, whereas findings in the Roman Catholic sample suggested a lack of improvement. The findings in the Anglican sample were mixed. The one consistent relationship belief improvement in the Anglican sample was in unrealistic beliefs about communication (mindreading).
Discussion

**Help With Marriage.**

The support for the efficacy of marriage preparation on willingness to seek help with marriage was qualified by the lack of improvement found in the Roman Catholic sample and the equivocal results in the Anglican sample. Improvements in the overall marriage preparation sample are attributable primarily to improvement in the Couples' Workshop sample. Although results in the Anglican sample were equivocal, the non-significant results were approaching significance. The lack of improvement in the Roman Catholic program can be attributed to the performance of men in that sample. Results from the differential effects hypothesis clearly demonstrate the greater impact of the Couples' Workshop on this variable.

These findings are an enlargement of the Bader et al. (1980) study. The results of the present study demonstrated the efficacy of marriage preparation with a more heterogeneous sample including some who did not want to attend. Further, this study adds qualification to Bader's claim that marriage preparation improves help-seeking in marriage. These findings indicate that not all marriage preparation programs increase help-seeking attitudes.

Olson (1983) has reported that marriage preparation programs that rely primarily on lectures have an adverse effect on participants' willingness to seek help. The results of this study seem to support his finding. When compared to the other
two programs of study, the Roman Catholic program relies most on
the lecture method of instruction. There were no notable
incidents from this sample regarding methods other than those
about the lecture format. Although the "talks" by lay couples
were notable to many in this sample, the "talks" fall in the
same genre as lectures. One subject in the Roman Catholic
interview sample reported, "we sat like bumps on a log" (RC-8).
This could account for the preponderance of negative incidents
from this group.

The equivocal result in the Anglican sample may be
attributable to several factors. First, the Anglican program
is the shortest program in instructional hours. Although several
studies have demonstrated significant change in brief programs
(Blew & Morgan, 1982; Warmbord, 1982), others have not (Zodrow,
1981). The programs that did demonstrate change in a brief
instructional period also had limited behavioural objectives.
Comparatively, the Anglican program is a more general program
which introduces participants to a variety of marriage topics.

The second explanation for the findings in the Anglican
sample has to do with the limited extent of experiential
exercises. Although the Anglican program has more experiential
instruction than the Roman Catholic program, it has much less
than the Couples' Workshop. Notable incidents in the Anglican
sample were dominated by reference to experiential exercises.
This suggests the salience of experiential learning.

Marriage preparation is the first experience that most
people have with marriage help-seeking. In this sample, only
7% had any previous counselling or marriage training. It is logical to assume that their perception of this first experience will be generalized to other marriage-helping experiences. If participants perceive this first marriage-helping experience to be "listening to lectures" with little direct experiential consequence, then their motivation to pursue other such experiences will not be improved. The corollary to this supposition is that a first experience of help with marriage which provides experiential benefits will induce improved attitudes toward marriage help-seeking.

This reasoning is supported by the qualitative findings. Subjects in the Couples' Workshop sample dominated the "change" category and, in particular, the subcategory containing reports of changes occurring during the program. These changes were in the context of skill training or pairwise directed experiential exercises. Since the subjects had experienced a direct benefit from the program they were more favourable toward other marriage-helping experiences.

Further to this reasoning is the relationship of participants to program leaders. Experiential exercises, and especially skill training, bring leaders and participants into closer proximity. Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory of primary dyads suggests that increased interaction in relationships will support developmental tasks more than less intense relationships. Marriage preparation programs which involve couples more intensely with each other and with leadership may support new learnings regarding the tasks of marriage. Two of
Bronfenbrenner's five hypotheses regarding dyadic forces have particular relevance to this study,

Observational learning is facilitated when the observer and the person being observed regard themselves as doing something together. Thus the developmental impact of an observational dyad tends to be greater when it takes place in the context of a joint activity dyad.

The developmental impact of both observational learning and joint activity will be enhanced if either takes place in the context of a primary dyad characterized by mutuality of positive feeling (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p.56-57).

Although the Roman Catholic program offers consistent leadership, guest lecturers are brought in for special subjects, such as finance. The Anglican program also uses guest lecturers. The guest lecturers, and the lecture format per se, may impair the bonding between participants and leaders. The lack of interactional activity makes a weaker learning environment. Couple interaction is less, therefore the intensity of the experience is less, and impact impeded. In contrast, in the Couples' Workshop, participants have consistent uninterrupted leadership. Leaders monitor couples in the use of skills, participants observe each other in use of skills, and partners interact with each other discussing material with high emotional content. Thus, in view of Bronfenbrenner's theory, the leadership and instructional conditions are more amenable to bonding and intensity of dyadic interaction.

David Mace (1984) has suggested an ordering of learning conditions in marriage programs, namely; information, demonstration, and participation. Mace suggests that the lowest levels of educational achievement will accrue from information
giving, increasing through demonstration to the highest levels of learning taking place when couples participate and find a new experience rewarding. Sergiovani & Starratt (1979) have written "students must be given the opportunity to practice the kind of behaviour implied by the learning-teaching objective...the learning experience must give students the opportunity to deal with the content implied by the objective" (p.253). Marriage programs with the greatest empirical evidence for efficacy claims follow all three of Mace's learning conditions and provide couples with the opportunity to work with concepts that are supplied. For example, the Minnesota Couples Communication Program (Miller et al., 1977) follows this ordering of information giving, demonstration, and participation. The Couples' Workshop curriculum (Lees & Simonsen, 1983) also follows this design.

The theory of deliberate psychological education may have interpretive relevance to findings regarding help-seeking in marriage. Psychological growth is promoted through disequilibrium created by role taking, or introduction to stage higher reasoning (Erickson, 1979). Disequilibrium occurs when the subject's own reasoning is challenged or inadequate to make sense of new information.

Premarital couples with a sense that they will never need marriage-helping resources are confronted with contrary information in marriage preparation programs. Information-giving does not provide enough challenge to the "idealization" of the couples' ability to cope with marriage. The notable incidents
from the Roman Catholic sample regarding the testimonies of lay couples indicate that these demonstrations carried some degree of disequilibrium potential. The testimonies by the lay couples could be considered as introductions to stage higher reasoning. If participants believe that they will not have problems in marriage that could be helped by outside resources, then the testimonies of couples who have had difficulties would challenge these personal assumptions. However, these testimonies can be dismissed as "a problem someone else has that likely will not happen to me." The same is true of lectures and demonstrations of communication and conflict-resolution skills. These skills appear to be simple and common sense. However, when subjects attempt to implement the skills and receive feedback on their use of skills, they often find the skills to be awkward and difficult to practise. This creates a disequilibrium between perceived self-efficacy, and actual self-efficacy. It is at this point that the subject begins to rely less on idealized perception of their abilities and to sense deficits that may be addressed through marriage helping resources.

The Couples' Workshop program has skill-training components in both skill areas reported by Mace (1984) to be central in a companionship marriage, namely; communication and conflict resolution. These components are brief enough that participants do not usually gain mastery of the skills taught. Instead, participants are often left feeling awkward and inept. Participation provides convincing contrary evidence to any personal belief that the participants have the resources.
necessary to resolve all their marital problems. This disequilibrium promotes a belief in the need for help with marriage.

The disequilibrium created in the Couples' Workshop program is completed by a learning module on "resources for marriage". The other two programs of study have content on resources for marriage as well. However, in the Anglican and Roman Catholic programs the content on resources for marriage simply involves providing information. In the Couples' Workshop program an experiential exercise with a positive focus supports this information giving. This exercise is called the "love letter" and is an enactment of the Marriage Encounter methodology. It is a simple but often meaningful exercise. This may build positive associations with marriage enrichment, and thus increase a participant's willingness to seek such programs.

One final program difference may be relevant to the findings of the study on the help-seeking variable. The Couples' Workshop program has no content dealing with theology or religious doctrine. Thus the content is exclusively focussed on issues related to relationship development, maintenance, and enrichment. The time given in other programs to theological or other concerns, such as handling money, is used in the Couples' Workshop to present a learning module called "understanding relationship systems". This unit includes general theory on relationship dynamics, understanding family of origin influences, and finally, understanding one's own relationship development. The Couples' Workshop thus has content on
understanding relationship systems which the other programs do not. The central focus on relationship, as opposed to—
theological concerns, may present a stronger impression of the complexity of relationships and thus a stronger awareness of need for help with marriage.

The British actor Michael Caine recently reported in a radio interview "everyone thinks they can dance like Fred Astaire until they try it" (C.B.C. Entertainment Review, January 22, 1986). Caine's remarks are analogous to the situation of companionship marriage today. Mace (1984) contends that "The view is widely held that no special knowledge or skill is required to make a marriage work, and that to need help of any kind in such an elementary task is a sign of incompetence" (p.45). The idea that marriage should "come naturally" is challenged by the difficulty discovered in communication and conflict resolution skill training, and in the complexity of achieving a companionship marriage as described in Couples' Workshop sessions on the developmental crises and the understanding relationship systems. Marriage preparation programs with only lecture or demonstration content may reinforce the myth of naturalism rather than challenge it.

**Attitude Towards the Church.**

The lack of any improvement on attitude towards the church can be understood from several perspectives. The first is that the outcomes of marriage preparation do not have any effect on
the participant's attitude towards the church. The second is that this attitude is particularly intransigent. A third is that the measurement instrument was inadequate to detect changes made. A fourth is that this attitude is not central to the teaching of the programs and consequently the programs have little impact upon it. Finally, if changes occur on this variable as a result of marriage preparation, these changes may have a delayed effect.

It is notable that both the Anglican Marriage Preparation Program and the Roman Catholic Marriage Preparation Program have as a goal the "bonding" of couples to the church. Each of these programs have content on the church's view of marriage, and are clearly different in this respect from the Couples' Workshop which has none. This lack of any difference between the programs on this dependent measure may at first suggest that these two programs are falling short of their own goals. This is particularly evident when juxtaposed with the Couples' Workshop which is a program that can be used in non-church contexts.

The results of the post-program interviews offer some meaning to the lack of change on this inventory. A reading of these interview reports suggests that the programs do activate thoughts about the church. Prototypical statements were that participants found the church to be "open and liberal" (A-7; A-2; CW-4; CW-7), especially in the case of the Anglican and Couples' Workshop programs. It seemed that some subjects attended marriage preparation expecting the church to "push religion" (A-9; CW-2) but found that it helped with "practical
problems in relationships" (A-9). One subject had thought prior to the program that the church was "stuffy", but after the program she thought it was "absolutely great" (A-8). These positive feelings could have been counteracted by some negative feelings about the compulsory nature of attendance.

The Roman Catholic program focused the most of all the programs on spirituality in marriage. The qualitative reports indicate that this was helpful to some in terms of a deepening understanding of spirituality in marriage (C-1;C-4;C-5;C-6). However, these subjects did not equate spirituality with their attitude towards the church.

Only two subjects in the Anglican post-interview sample recorded negative comments in the interview section regarding the church. The first said that he thought it hypocritical that the church charged people money to attend a program that was compulsory (A-1). The other thought that the course leader had suggested that couples who go to church try harder to keep their marriage alive and the subject disagreed with this (A-6). However, both these remarks were made in the context of favourable reports regarding the program. None of the subjects in the Couples' Workshop recorded negative comments about the church. The Roman Catholic Program received the strongest criticism in the interview reports, but this negativity was not reflected in the measurement of attitude towards the church. Thus the interviews suggested that this instrument may have been unresponsive to changes in attitude towards the church during the program.
Relationship Belief Inventory.

The significant improvement of participants in the Couples' Workshop on relationship beliefs can be related to program differences in methodology as discussed under Willingness to Seek Help With Marriage. The greater participatory nature of the program and the greater focus on "relationship concerns" as opposed to theological or spiritual concerns are important differences.

Three of the five relationship beliefs studied relate directly to content covered in all three marriage preparation programs, namely: a) communication - M (Mindreading), b) conflict resolution - D (Conflicts are Destructive), and c) sexuality - S (Sexual Perfectionism). The content of all three programs supports the same rational relationship beliefs in relation to these three content areas. The consistent significant improvements in all comparisons of the Couples' Workshop sample on these three relationship beliefs, and not in the other two programs, can be attributed to the kind of learning environment created as discussed above in the sections dealing with Bronfenbrenner (1979) and Mace (1984).

Aside from the significant improvements in the Couples' Workshop sample, the only consistent change shown by the Anglican program on relationship beliefs was on the M (Mindreading) relationship belief. The notable incidents from the Anglican sample show that it was the experiential exercises related to communication skills which were most notable in that
sample. These exercises directly challenge the unrealistic relationship belief that it is possible and important to understand what one's partner is thinking without communicating clearly. This finding from the Anglican sample, and the findings from the Couples' Workshop sample again suggest the relevance of participatory methodologies.

The lack of consistent change on other relationship beliefs in both the Anglican and Couples' Workshop programs suggest the need for content and exercises focused more directly at these beliefs. For example, although the Couples' Workshop sample improved on four of the five relationship beliefs, there was no improvement on the relationship belief "M/F" (males and females). This belief has to do with whether or not males and females have the same emotional needs. Although it is implicitly understood in the content of the Couples' Workshop program design that this belief is an important basis of the companionship marriage, it is the only one of the five relationship beliefs studied with no specific content to address it. A pairwise experiential exercise on emotional needs may challenge this unrealistic relationship belief.

Relationship beliefs are cognitive sets which guide behaviour and the interpretation of the behaviour of others. The task of marriage preparation is not simply to provide information, but as well to enable the participants to share the perspectives on marriage held by the leaders. Thus, literature from the field of personal construct psychology (Adams-Webber, 1979; Kelly, 1955) may provide a useful reference for
understanding the differing outcomes in this study.

The differences between the programs in terms of program methodology have already been pointed out in the discussion of Willingness to Seek Help With Marriage. If an improvement occurs in relation to relationship beliefs, this can be understood in terms of the participant's assimilating the relationship beliefs purported by the leaders. The question becomes "why would participants in one program take on the beliefs of their instructors, when this did not happen in another program?".

Adams-Webber (1979) in a chapter entitled "Sharing the Perspectives of Others" (p. 102), discusses the quality of interpersonal exchanges in terms of moving "down through the hierarchy of meanings until all misunderstandings are identified and resolved in terms of direct reference to particular people and events in the common experience of both partners" (Adams-Webber, 1979, p. 106). Lectures, examples, and demonstrations provide more abstract exchanges regarding relationship beliefs. In this abstract level, partners in a dyad, namely the leader and participant, may believe they share a common perspective. It is when specificity is increased through experiential exercises that differences in the meaning of beliefs emerge. It is when these differences emerge that participants have the opportunity to examine the evidence for their own relationship beliefs and to fully understand the relationship beliefs of the leaders. When the meaning and evidence for relationship beliefs are explored in skill training or experiential exercises, participants see more clearly the
meanings of the leaders, and irrationality within their own relationship belief system is challenged.

Personal construct psychology suggests that "the critical factor in the development of productive role interaction ...lies in the ability of one or both participants in a dyadic relationship to subsume the points of view of the other person" (Adams-Webber, 1979). Adams-Webber points out that studies of the therapist-client relationship have supported this assumption. Similarly, as the concreteness of the learning environment is enhanced and the dyadic forces between leader and participant are intensified, participants have a greater ability to subsume the point of view of the leader.
Implications for Practice.

The findings of this study in some ways affirms the practice of marriage preparation and, in other ways, provides strong indications for change within marriage preparation practices. In some cases where statistically significant change was not found through quantitative methods, qualitative methods provided some anecdotal affirmations of current practices, the outcome on attitude towards the church being a case in point. However, in some places the cumulative weight of both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests changes that should be made in the practice of marriage preparation. A discussion of some of the affirmations and recommended changes will follow.

Methodology.

The results of this study indicated that a marriage preparation program with a strong conceptual basis related to participatory methods will lead to changes in important variables related to the success of companionship marriages. Marriage preparation programs, through provision of experiential exercises, can erode the barriers to further participation in marriage-helping experiences. Lectures, films, and demonstrations through the use of media or live models need to be complemented by skill training and experiential exercises.

Content.

The ability to deal with anger and resolve conflicts are considered essentials in Mace's (1984) model of companionship marriage. Results from the Couples' Workshop sample demonstrated
that it is possible to improve relationship beliefs regarding conflict. However, examination of the protocols of the other two programs indicates that a greater stress is given to communication than to conflict resolution. Although communication skills are prerequisite to conflict resolution, the latter should not be given less attention in the design of marriage preparation programs.

Realistic Goals For Marriage Preparation.

The review of the literature indicates that at one time marriage preparation was considered as a remedial/preventative intervention. The remedial/preventative approach could ask the question "Does marriage preparation prevent divorce?". The educational, developmental, and enrichment focusses have brought different perspectives to the goals of marriage preparation.

In particular the developmental perspective signals the importance of marriage partners having the ability to negotiate change at various points in the life cycle. From the developmental perspective, marriage preparation can be viewed as a first conjoint marital program designed to improve the ability to negotiate change. If the program has been effective, marriage partners will continue to seek out new skills and will also continue to renegotiate their marriage contract over their lifetime.

The review of the literature has indicated that it is possible to change communication and conflict resolution in highly motivated volunteer populations. However, as indicated
in the demographic data from this study, not all subjects in the field are highly motivated volunteers. This study has demonstrated that beliefs about skills and seeking help can be changed in a heterogeneous group.

The empirical literature also indicates that skill mastery requires concentrated time on limited behavioural objectives. Marriage preparation programs need to be longer to include the mastery of skills, or otherwise to focus on building interpersonal skills throughout the life cycle. Some evidence in the literature indicates that mastery of interpersonal skills wanes, and requires "booster" programs. A new attitude towards learning about marriage may be more important than actually learning skills which may be lost as relationships unfold.

Interdisciplinary Focus.

The review of the literature indicates the lack of studies of marriage preparation in the church-sponsored context. This study has demonstrated the efficacy of marriage preparation in such settings, but more research is required. The clergy have been the helping professionals with the greatest access to premarital couples. A greater linkage between the academic study of marriage, marriage therapy, and church-sponsored programs may strengthen program designs and the amount of research conducted.

As well, if an outcome of some marriage preparation programs is an openness to seeking further help with marriage, marital therapists may do well to take a greater interest in
promoting marriage preparation. Shonick (1979) has reported that the couples who received marriage preparation tended to return to the premarital counsellor for marital counselling. Several subjects in the post-program interviews suggested that if they had problems in marriage they would return to the respective leaders of their marriage preparation program. Marriage preparation may be a way to introduce prospective clients to the merits of the services offered by the marriage therapist. Distressed couples, having attended marriage preparation, may come for counselling sooner and with less severe problems.

Diversified Programs.

Qualitative reports indicated that the most general and frequent criticism of marriage preparation was redundancy of content. The demographic variables indicated the wide range of age and educational and relationship circumstances of the participants. Marriage preparation programs would do well to recognize the differential needs of participants. Programs are now offered for "remarriage" (Rolfe, 1985), but some other form of self-selection to various types of programs may eradicate the complaints of redundancy. Pre-screening procedures could also be utilized to channel participants into programs where the content may be more challenging or relevant to their specific needs.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study indicate that marriage preparation
programs with experiential exercises and skill training can improve a participant's willingness to seek help with marriage. This result must be qualified by the lack of random assignment. The methodology of the study is based on an assumption of "quasi-comparability" (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The logic of this assumption holds for the cohort comparisons within programs, but not necessarily for the comparisons between programs.

Although Gurman and Kniskern (1981) claim "there is no such thing as a true control group" (p. 746), randomization would satisfy concerns regarding the effects of maturation. Randomization would also address the issue of initial group differences on variables not measured in this study. There may have been significant self-selection variables differentiating the samples in the three marriage preparation programs. Although a wide array of substantive variables was considered, there may have been other important variables which were missed. Consequently there would be no control for the interaction effect of these variables. This is a serious qualification of the differential effect findings.

There are several procedures regarding the collection of qualitative data that should indicate caution in the interpretation of these findings. The post-program interviews were conducted by only one interviewer, namely the researcher. Since the researcher had developed one of the programs of study there was the possibility of greater bias and lack of objectivity. The objectivity of these results was further impaired by the lack of audio-taped recordings of the interviews. Finally, a
lack of pilot testing of the post-program interview format may have biased the quality and richness of notable incidents reported. It is possible that as the researcher's experience and confidence with the procedure increased he was able to elicit more salient responses.

There are two further qualifications that must also caution readers. First, although testing was meant to be as unobtrusive as possible, it did take half an hour from the beginning of each program, and half an hour from the end. Thus instructional time was reduced by 6% to 8%. Also the effects of pretest sensitization and any possible interaction of testing with treatment were not controlled.

Future Research

The results of this study suggest several tasks for further research. The first of these has to do with the integration of research methodologies. Qualitative data collection and analysis provided a valuable supplement to the main findings of the study. The post-program interviews provided explanatory leads not evident in the quantitative data. Future outcome studies of marriage preparation can be enriched by this mixing of methodologies. Qualitative analysis may provide results with heuristic value.

A second implication for research would be a repeat of the same experiment with tighter controls over sources of threat to internal validity. A randomized Solomon four-group design, although extremely difficult to arrange in the field, would deal
with the issue of sampling bias and pretest sensitization. Replicability of the qualitative findings could be improved through the use of a team of trained interviewers collecting taped, transcribed interviews.

Longitudinal research is needed to assess the durability of gains attributed to marriage preparation. Follow-up studies, such as those of Bader et al. (1980) and Wampler et al. (1980) are required to track the durability of attitudinal improvements.

The qualitative data from this study pointed to the diversity of conceptual and skill development levels of marriage preparation participants. Quantitative field research on the question "what kind of program for what kind of participant?" may provide criteria for prescreening and for program development. Correlational studies of participant descriptive variables and outcomes may add needed refinement to the field of marriage preparation.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS
YOUR PHONE NUMBER ____________
Fiancee's Number ____________

INSTRUCTIONS: This is not a test, and your responses will only be studied anonymously for the purposes of the research project. They will not be seen by anyone else associated with your marriage course, and will be destroyed at the fulfillment of the research project.

Please answer openly, and with those answers that best describe your circumstances. If you finish the questionnaires before others, please go over your responses to see that they are what you intended.

Age______ SEX: MALE______ FEMALE______

RELATIONSHIP HISTORY

1. How many months have you been going together as a couple?______
2. Relationship Status: Living Separately ___ Living Together_____
3. Have you ever been for counselling with your present fiance, or with any other intimate others? YES____ NO____
4. Have you ever been in any other course on how to get along in marriage? YES____ NO____
5. Please tick the category within which your individual income falls:
   Under $ 5,000 ____________
   $ 6 - 10,000 ____________
   $10 - 15,000 ____________
   $15 - 20,000 ____________
   $20 - 25,000 ____________
   Over 25,000 ____________
6. What is your present occupation:

7. Please tick the category which best describes your educational level:
   Grade 10 or less
   Grade 12 or less
   2 years of post secondary education
   Community college program completed
   University degree completed
   Graduate Program Completed
   Ph.D or equivalent completed.
8. On a scale of 1 to 10, would you express how you feel about attending the marriage preparation program you are registered for with 1 representing that you were only going because you have to in order to be married in the church, and 10 representing that you were wanting to attend such a course even if this one was not available.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Don't want to go  Very Much want to go

9. Which of these situations best describes your home.
   Raised with both natural parents in the home
   Parents separated. Raised by one parent.
   Raised with a natural parent and step parent
   Raised by other than my natural parents

10. On a scale of 1-10, what overall rating would you give to the happiness of the relationship of the people who raised you?

1.  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Extremely unhappy  moderately happy  Extremely happy

11. How often do you attend church?
   1. Never  2. Special Occasions  3. once a month  4. regularly

12. How often does your father attend church?
   1. Never  2. Special Occasions  3. once a month  4. regularly

13. How often does your mother attend church?
   1. Never  2. Special Occasions  3. once a month  4. regularly
Please read the following statements and circle the response which is THE RIGHT ONE FOR YOU. You are asked to avoid circling the undecided response if possible.

EXAMPLE:

Marriage is one of the best institutions that our society has. SA A MA U MD D SD

Circle the response that is right for you. The responses mean:

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree MA = Moderately Agree U = Undecided SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree MD = Moderately Disagree

1. For people who have problems in marriage, I think marriage counseling is a must. SA A MA U MD D SD

2. My behaviour in intimate relationships has nothing to do with my mental health. SA A MA U MD D SD

3. I will likely rely on marriage counseling at some point in my life to strengthen my marriage. SA A MA U MD D SD

4. In general, marriage counseling has to be short if it is to be useful. SA A MA U MD D SD

5. Most marriage problems are related to a lack of communication and conflict resolution skills. SA A MA U MD D SD

6. In the light of my own experience I consider that most marriages need little outside help. SA A MA U MD D SD

7. I would not mind marriage counseling when I am married if our relationship becomes boring. SA A MA U MD D SD

8. Most marriages can benefit from some type of organized marriage enrichment course to help them grow. SA A MA U MD D SD

9. If I were to talk about my marriage to a professional person I would feel quite comfortable. SA A MA U MD D SD

10. If I were in a course designed to strengthen my relationship and had to talk about my marriage to others like myself, I would feel UNcomfortable. SA A MA U MD D SD
11. Many of the skills needed to be a good marriage partner can be learned, just as you might learn some other skill or art. 

12. People who go to marriage counselors are usually headed for divorce. 

13. People who go to marriage seminars are admitting that they are weak and can't seem to solve their own problems. 

14. If people really want better marriages, they simply need to try harder on their own. 

15. I would likely discipline myself to go to a marriage workshop even if I didn't really feel like it, because it might do some good. 

16. Most marriage counselors can be highly trusted. 

17. Even though my marriage was satisfying, I would attend a marriage program to see if what we had could be made even better. 

18. If couples simply followed their religion more closely, they should not have need of counselors. 

19. People who want healthy relationships should go to a qualified marriage counselor, just like they go to the doctor every so often for check-ups. 

20. Couples should go to marriage workshops every few years to make sure they keep growing together.
Check (v) every statement below that expresses your sentiment toward the church. Interpret the statements in accordance with your own experience with churches.

1. I think the teaching of the church is altogether too superficial to have much social significance.
2. I feel the church services give me inspiration and help me to live up to my best during the following week.
3. I think the church keeps business and politics up to a higher standard than they would otherwise tend to maintain.
4. I find the services of the church both restful and inspiring.
5. When I go to church I enjoy a fine ritual service with good music.

6. I believe in what the church teaches but with mental reservations.
7. I do not receive any benefit from attending church services but I think it helps some people.
8. I believe in religion but I seldom go to church.
9. I am careless about religion and church relationships but I would not like to see my attitude become general.
10. I regard the church as a static, crystallized institution and as such it is unwholesome and detrimental to society and the individual.

11. I believe church membership is almost essential to living life at its best.
12. I do not understand the dogmas or creeds of the church but I find that the church helps me to be more honest.
13. The paternal and benevolent attitude of the church is quite distasteful to me.
14. I feel that church attendance is a fair index of the nation's morality.
15. Sometimes I feel that the church and religion are necessary and sometimes I doubt it.

16. I believe the church is fundamentally sound but some of its adherents have given it a bad name.
17. I think the church is a parasite on society.
18. I feel the need for religion but do not find what I want in any one church.
19. I think too much money is being spent on the church for the benefit that is being derived.
20. I believe in the church and its teachings because I have been accustomed to them since I was a child.

21. I think the church is hundreds of years behind the times and cannot make a dent on modern life.
22. I believe the church has grown up with the primary purpose of perpetuating the spirit and teachings of Jesus and deserves loyal support.
23. I feel the church perpetuates the values which man puts highest in his philosophy of life.
24. I feel I can worship God better out of doors than in the church and I get more inspiration there.
25. My experience is that the church is hopelessly out of date.
26. I feel the church is petty, always quarreling over matters that have no interest or importance.
27. I do not believe in any brand of religion or in any particular church but I have never given the subject serious thought.
28. I respect any church member's belief, but I think it is all "bunk".

29. I enjoy my church because there is a spirit of friendliness there.
30. I think the country would be better off if the churches were closed and the ministers set to some useful work.
31. I believe the church is the greatest institution in North America today.
32. I believe in sincerity and goodness without any church ceremonies.
33. I believe the church is the greatest influence for good government and right living.

34. I think the organized church is an enemy of science and truth.
35. I believe the church is losing ground as education advances.
36. The churches may be doing good and useful work but they do not interest me.
37. I think the church is a hindrance to religion for it still depends upon magic, superstition, and myth.
38. The church is needed to develop religion, which has always been concerned with man's deepest feelings and greatest values.

39. I believe the churches are too much divided by factions and denominations to be a strong force for righteousness.
40. The church represents shallowness, hypocrisy, and prejudice.
41. I think the church seeks to impose a lot of worn out dogmas and medieval superstitions.
42. I think the church allows denominational differences to appear larger than true religion.
43. I like the ceremonies of my church but do not miss them much when I stay away.

44. I believe the church is a powerful agency for promoting both individual and social righteousness.
45. I like to go to church for I get something worth while to think about and it keeps my mind filled with right thoughts.
The statements below describe ways in which a person might feel about a relationship with another person. Please mark the space next to each statement according to how strongly you believe that it is true or false for you. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE. Write in 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 to stand for the following answers.

5: I STRONGLY believe that the statement is TRUE.
4: I believe that the statement is TRUE.
3: I believe that the statement is PROBABLY TRUE, or more true than false.
2: I believe that the statement is PROBABLY FALSE, or more false than true.
1: I believe that the statement is FALSE.
0: I STRONGLY believe that the statement is FALSE.

1. If your partner expresses disagreement with your ideas, s/he probably does not think highly of you.
2. I do not expect my partner to sense all my moods.
3. Damages done early in a relationship probably cannot be reversed.
4. I get upset if I think I have not completely satisfied my partner sexually.
5. Men and women have the same basic emotional needs.
6. I cannot accept it when my partner disagrees with me.
7. If I have to tell my partner that something is important to me, it does not mean that s/he is insensitive to me.
8. My partner does not seem capable of behaving other than s/he does now.
9. If I'm not in the mood for sex when my partner is, I don't get upset about it.
10. Misunderstandings between partners generally are due to inborn differences in psychological makeups of men and women.
11. I take it as a personal insult when my partner disagrees with an important idea of mine.
12. I get very upset if my partner does not recognize how I am feeling and I have to tell him/her.
13. A partner can learn to become more responsive to his/her partner's needs.
14. A good sexual partner can get himself/herself aroused for sex whenever necessary.
15. Men and women probably will never understand the opposite sex very well.
16. I like it when my partner presents views different from mine.
17. People who have a close relationship can sense each other's needs as if they could read each other's minds.
VALUES: 5: I STRONGLY believe that the statement is TRUE
4: I believe that the statement is TRUE
3: I believe that the statement is PROBABLY TRUE, or more true than false.
2: I believe that the statement is PROBABLY FALSE, or more false than true.
1: I believe that the statement is FALSE.
0: I STRONGLY believe that the statement is FALSE.

18. Just because my partner has acted in ways that upset me does not mean that s/he will do so in the future.
19. If I cannot perform well sexually whenever my partner is in the mood, I would consider that I have a problem.
20. Men and women need the same basic things out of relationship
21. I get very upset when my partner and I cannot see things the same way.
22. It is important to me for my partner to anticipate my needs by sensing changes in my moods.
23. A partner who hurts you badly once probably will hurt you again.
24. I can feel OK about my lovemaking even if my partner does not achieve orgasm.
25. Biological differences between men and women are not major causes of couples' problems.
26. I cannot tolerate it when my partner argues with me.
27. A partner should know what you are thinking or feeling without you having to tell.
28. If my partner wants to change, I believe that s/he can do it
29. If my sexual partner does not get satisfied completely, it does not mean that I have failed.
30. One of the major causes of marital problems is that men and women have different emotional needs.
31. When my partner and I disagree, I feel like our relationship is falling apart.
32. People who love each other know exactly what each other's thoughts are without a word ever being said.
33. If you don't like the way a relationship is going, you can make it better.
34. Some difficulties in my sexual performance do not mean personal failure to me.
35. You can't really understand someone of the opposite sex.
36. I do not doubt my partner's feelings for me when we argue.
37. If you have to ask your partner for something, it shows that s/he was not "tuned into" your needs.
38. I do not expect my partner to be able to change.
39. When I do not seem to be performing well sexually, I get upset.
40. Men and women will always be mysteries to each other.
APPENDIX B

POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW NOTES
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-1


HELP          CHURCH          RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS
              D   M   C   S   MF  TOTAL
PRE           72    66    28  19  11  27  14  99
POST          85    62    15  5   7  9   5  41
CHANGE        +13  + 4  +13+14 +4 +18+9  58
COHORTS POST-TEST
MEAN SCORE    101    42    9  11  9  12  14  57

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

This subject summed up the program by saying that it was inconvenient for him, and a lot of it was common sense. He reported that "I don't like people telling me what to do", which was how he perceived attendance at the program.

LECTURING LEADS TO RESISTANCE.

The session on communication and conflict resolution seemed to introduce him to concepts that he had never been exposed to and he was able to "experiment" with some of these. He reports that he has strong opinions. He said that "the concept of going to a marriage course is unheard of in my family". He reported that his parents never argued: "Dad said it - mom did it". In the session on conflict resolution ("about arguing") he saw that there could be different ways for people to deal with disagreements. Although he does not think that he is a good "arguer", he has since experimented with some of the techniques that were illustrated in the program. The people who demonstrated in front of the group could really communicate well. He expressed a lack of confidence that he could ever be like them, but however he did try to communicate what he felt. "I will experiment with it, but can't see that I will do it consistently. Maybe on the little things, but on the big things I'll probably be like my parents".

-NEW CONCEPTS LEAD TO NEW AWARENESS BUT NOT IMPLEMENTATION
-COPING MODELS CREATE MORE INCENTIVE FOR CHANGE THAN MASTERY MODELS.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM PROGRAM SUBJECT # A-1.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject has said that it was unheard in his family to attend a course like this. He has demonstrated a strong movement in the desired direction on this scale, which in his mind seemed to be related to the fact that this whole concept of seeking help and learning about relationships was completely foreign to him. This may also explain the low starting score and seems to support the inventory.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

"I was brought up an old fashioned Catholic... I think the views of the church have changed.... that type of priest (Fr. Deck) is new to me. He showed it could be more laid back"

In this subject's mind, the realism of the program and the attitude of Fr. Deck seemed to be positive in terms of his perception of the church. However, he had some strong mixed feelings. Firstly, he did not want to attend the program but felt he had to in order to please his fiancee and her parents. He thought that the church made him take the course, and then had the nerve to make him pay for it! This seemed "hypocritical that a religious institution would charge for something like that...I know that the church has expenses, but it shouldn't be charging for something like that".

His remarks seem to support his unfavourable score on this inventory.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

It would seem that this introduction to different methods of communication could be linked to his large change on the subscales regarding mindreading, and conflict being destructive. He also had a large change on the subscale "sexual perfectionism" although he reported that it was interesting, but may have been more suited for people who were less well informed than he.

His remarks seem to support the posttest result.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT: # A-2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>D M C S MF TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9 9 11 11 6 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9 8 10 17 1 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0 +1 +1 -6 +5 +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

This subject said that there was nothing of note in the program for herself or her partner. This subject is a registered nurse and her fiance a physician. The general impression she gave the interviewer was that she was already in possession of whatever information the course might offer, and that it was not relevant to herself or her fiance.

PROGRAM CONTENT MUST BE ADAPTABLE TO DIFFERENTIAL COUPLE NEEDS.

WILLINGNESS TO SEEK HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject dropped 7 on this scale and so was asked what her perception was of the program's influence on this variable. She had not wanted to attend the program, and she said that she and her partner both agreed that "we are both very private people—we couldn't talk to a stranger. Mr. Archer (leader of the marriage preparation program) is doing our wedding. We could talk to him, and we agreed that we would go back to him if we had a problem."

Although this subject expressed a bond with the leader of the marriage program, it seemed clear that there had been no transference of a general willingness to seek help with her relationship outside of her own personal resources. Her remarks support the inventory score.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-2

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject had moved more than a point in the negative direction of this test in terms of favourableness of attitude towards the church. She was told that the test had indicated a change in terms of a less favourable attitude towards the church. She said, "On the contrary, we (she and her partner) talked about it and agreed that the church was 'positive' and very liberal." The course gave a positive impression of the church. Thus it seems that the instrument failed to record this. Her remarks seem to refute the test score.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject hardly changed on this instrument and this is supported by her remarks regarding notable incidents. She did not think that the program has influenced her. Her remarks seem to support the inventory.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT: # A-3

Female. Age 21. Medical Office Assistant.
Relationship Length: 11 months
Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:4, Dad 1.
Income Level: 1 Education 4 Willingness to attend:9
Home Structure:2 She reports having been raised primarily in a single parent situation, and then in a blended family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

The session on communication skills stood out in this subject's mind. In particular, content on giving "I" messages versus "YOU" messages, and the completion of "I Appreciate" messages. She reported implementing this sentence instead of nagging her partner. Also, the learning that mindreading was dangerous was also helpful.

AWARENESS OF NEW COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND PRACTICE OF THEM LEADS SOME TRANSFER TO LIFE SITUATION.

She was also struck by how similar the issues of other couples were to those of her own. She and her partner participated in the program by asking questions and forwarding comments to the leader. This participation seemed also to be determining as he interacted with the support/understanding of the leader.

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT, INTERACTION WITH LEADERS AND USE OF NEW MATERIAL LEADS TO A POSITIVE EXPERIENCE.
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

Change on this scale was small for this subject. One negative change item had to do with the expectation of using marriage counseling at some date in the future. Looking at the two scores, the subject said that she must have made a mistake when filling out the form. She said that she would go for marriage counseling, and that marriage counseling had helped her mother and father. She said that the course made her more favourably inclined to marriage counseling. The course taught her that it was normal to have problems, and that she might even consider speaking with the leader of the course if she had a problem.

Her remarks seem to support her inventory score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject's score indicated little change on this scale. She reported that she had found her minister to be a very "fun" and "open" person, and the leadership of her marriage program confirmed for her that there were many such unique people working within the framework of the organized church.

She reported that her mother attends church regularly, her father never, and she on occasion. In the interview she related that she had gone to Sunday School regularly, and to a private girls' school run by the Anglican Church. There she studied the Bible literature, and had a generally favourable and "open" view of the church. She was not compelled to take this marriage course by the church, but in fact, it was she who asked her minister to refer her to the course.

Her remarks did not seem to support her high test scores and lack of change.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed by 23 points in the negative direction on this scale. 19 points of this change was due to the subscale regarding male and female emotional differences. A realistic relationship belief, according to this scale, is that males and females are similar emotionally, and thus can really learn to understand each other's needs. The negative end of this subscale reflects the view that men and women are fundamentally different in emotional needs and thus will never really understand one another.

Her response to question # 5 "Men and women have the same basic emotional needs" revealed something of her thinking on this dimension. At pre-test she indicated believing this was true. At post test she indicated that she strongly believed it was false. It appears that the question had some ambiguity since she thought
that it meant "every human being is different, therefore each one will have different emotional needs". When she first went to the course she thought that her fiance felt the same way that she did, and had the same needs. From the program she came to think that perhaps his experience was different from hers. This was related to her general learning regarding communications theory that mindreading is unacceptable in intimate relationships. This would be considered growth in realistic relationship beliefs. Thus the test did not truly represent the change that had occurred. This suggests that the test recorded a negative change that had not taken place.

Although the test revealed this general negative change, the interview revealed that the subject attributed a positive change in relationship beliefs to the course. For example, she changed on question 7 in the positive direction. "If I have to tell my partner that something is important to me, it does not mean that s/he is insensitive to me." The subject said "sometimes I think that he should see things (i.e. that she would like done) but I really have to work at telling him."

A subscale of this test has to do with recognizing change as a part of relationships. This subject indicated that she had learned from the program that change happens to everyone, and that everyone goes through stages.

The findings from this subject may indicate that some negative change scores from this test may contain significant errors based on question ambiguity. Her remarks did not support the inventory scores.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-4

Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:2, Dad:1.
Income Level:6  Education level:2  Willingness to Attend:7
Home Structure 1 Home Happiness 9  Not cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COHORTS POST-TEST |
| MEAN SCORES       |
| 101               |

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

The subject had participated in group discussions, which is something he usually does not do. He found that when he spoke up and voiced his experience that others would echo his sentiment. He had felt like something of a leader in the program and had found that others shared his problems. He had made friends with some other couples, and they had plans for a re-union.

INTERACTION WITH PEERS AND LEADERS REGARDING USE OF CONCEPTS INCREASES MOTIVATION TO LEARN.

An item of content that stood out for this subject and his fiancee was teaching about non-verbal attending behaviour as a part of listening skills. He had enjoyed an exercise that had to be completed in class regarding this, and thought that this was a significant learning.

STRUCTURED SKILL PRACTICE INCREASES CONCEPT RELEVANCE.
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

He reported that the instructor was such an “open” person that by the end of the course he thought that he would be willing to take another. He had not wanted to take the course but went at the urging of his fiancee.

His remarks seem to support the test score and change pre-post.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

The subject reported that he was not “either for or against the church". He had gone to Sunday School and was "open" to the church. He thought that the course had not changed his mind regarding the church as an institution.

His remarks do not seem to support his unfavourable score, and change score.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject's scores on all the subscales changed in the negative direction but for the second subscale regarding “mindreading”. This was supported by the subject's statement, "As we went through the course I could see that, talking things out, she had different ideas than me." The Marriage Preparation program dealt with the subject of conflict, and this subject's scores on the subscale representing beliefs about conflict indicated that he increased in the belief that conflict is destructive. He reports, "Before the course we had arguments and discussions but we worked these out. We saw things (in the course) that we had hit head to head on". It seemed that the subject had truly grown in the unrealistic belief that conflict is destructive, rather than a certain pattern of conflict being destructive. These remarks regarding the differences he discovered in his fiancee while on the course may account for some of his negative change on the "male/female" subscale.

On the subscale representing beliefs regarding sexual perfectionism, the subject reported that there was little in the program about sex and that it had been an awkward subject for the instructor since some of the couples were living together, and others, like him and his fiancee, were not. He volunteered that he did not think that the instructor agreed with people living together before marriage.

Although this subject changed in an unfavourable direction, it appears from his remarks that his test scores are valid.
ANGELICAN: SUBJECT # A-5

Female. Age 28. Health Care Worker with retardates.  
Relationship Length: 14 months.  
Church Attendance: Self:1, Mom:1, Dad:1. No church attendance.  
Income Level 4  Education Level 5. Willingness to Attend 9  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORES</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 10 10 16 10 53  
6 13 12 17 10 58  
+1 -3 -2 -1 0 -5  
9 11 9 12 15 57

NOTABLE INCIDENTS

"I" and "You" statements were this subject's first response to the question regarding notable incidents. She reported that the instructor had asked the participants to complete several sentences to their spouse using "I appreciate ." and this was a highlight of the program for her. She appreciated the feedback given by her fiance, and has been more aware of the importance of giving her partner positive responses.

STRUCTURED EXERCISES LEAD TO GREATER RECALL AWARENESS OF CONTENT.  
STRUCTURED EXERCISES PROVIDE DISCIPLINE FOR COUPLES TO REACH NEW LEVELS OF INTIMACY

She also reported that the instructor had made it easy for her to express herself in class without fear of being put down.  

IDENTIFICATION WITH LEADERSHIP IS IMPORTANT TO CREATION OF AN OPEN LEARNING SITUATION.

The subject had heard that the program was "negative" but she did not find it so. She reported that there was nothing specifically to do with the situation of couples like her and her fiance where one works out of town a lot. However, she knew that it was a general program.  

PROGRAM CONTENT SHOULD BE FLEXIBLE ENOUGH TO MEET DIFFERENTIAL NEEDS OF PARTICIPANTS.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT #5.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

Change on three questions were indicative of the general attitude change:
Question 6. "I consider most marriages need little outside help." On this she changed the direction of her answer to say that she believes most marriages need some form of outside help. She verified that her mind had changed on this as a result of attending the premarriage course.
Question 7. "I would not mind marriage counseling if my marriage became boring." From undecided she agreed with this at post-test. She reported that this had also reflected a real change in her thinking resulting from the program. She realized that there was a likelihood that her marriage could fall into a state of boredom.
Question 10. "In a relationship course I would feel uncomfortable." At pretest the subject had agreed with this. Now she disagreed with it. She said that she had participated in the program and had talked out loud in the group. She saw that through the program that she could learn to say things in such a way that her partner may be able to listen to them without feeling hurt. She said that her instructor on the marriage program had talked about follow-up marriage course and that she would consider attending one.

Regarding the general attitude of seeking help with marriage, the subject said that the course had made her more comfortable with the idea and that, if you have a problem, you should go to a counsellor and get it off your chest.

This subject's remarks seem to support her test scores and change.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject reported no connection or experience with the church prior to this program but she reported being willing to attend.

This subject had thought that the program would involve more religious teaching. When the interviewer pointed out that her score on the church scale had changed in the positive direction, she responded, "I think it is a very good program... the church should push it ". At post-test she had added to her pretest items responses having to do with the value of the influence of the church.

Her remarks seem to support her inventory scores.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT #5.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

The negative change score on this inventory, and in particular on the "mindreading" subscale, are not supported by her remarks regarding the impact of the program on her thinking. Communication skills, and making meanings explicit were important learnings on the course, and this was not reflected in her inventory score.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # 6.

Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:2, Self:2.
Income Level 5. Education Level 2. Willingness to attend: 7
Home Structure 1 Home Happiness 8 Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORES</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS

This subject reported that the content on communication skills has stayed foremost in his mind when thinking of the program. "I" and "you" statements and proper attending behaviour were essential to really communicating. At first he had resisted this teaching, but the more he thought about it the more he thought it was true. He portrayed himself as being a real convert.

COMMUNICATION CONTENT LEADS TO NEW AWARENESS OF SKILLS.

He also volunteered that he had participated in group discussions and through these had met other couples that he felt might be potential friends. He reported that he and his fiancee both have many "single" friends and the program was an opportunity for them to meet others in circumstances similar to their own.

GROUP INTERACTION EXERCISES DEVELOP POTENTIAL FOR A NEW PEER GROUP WHICH REINFORCES THE NORMS OF THE PROGRAM.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT #6.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject began the program with resistance, and at completion was a total supporter. This positive change is not reflected in his test score, which is unfavourable, and unchanging. This challenges the validity of the instrument.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

The subject said that he had not wanted to attend the program, but went because he had to in order to be married in the church. He thought the program would be "propaganda for the church". His attitude changed from not wanting to go, to looking forward to going. He thinks that the program should be mandatory. He had expected more religious content but was glad that there was little. He reported that the instructor had said that people who got married in church put 100% into their marriages whereas those not married in churches only put 60% into their marriages. He disagreed with this remark. He thought that this program was a very worthwhile contribution on the part of the church.

He also reported that he had once made an effort to become involved with the church, but became discouraged when he found that the congregation was mainly "old people". His remarks seem to offer equivocal support for the instrument.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed on two subscales on the Relationship Beliefs Inventory in a positive direction. These two scales were regarding "Conflict" and "Change". An example of the former is his response to question #26, "I cannot tolerate it when my partner argues with me." At pretest he had responded with "probably false" and at post test that he strongly believed it to be false. This subject thought that the content regarding "I" and "you" statements would make it easy for people to disagree in a positive way. Thus he came to think that disagreement would not be so bad, confirming that the course had influenced him on this change.

Regarding "change" in relationships, he reported that he had thought that he and his fiancee were the "perfect couple", but the program had helped him to see they were not quite perfect and that there were things for them to work on, but that they could change them. He believed that the emphasis on overcoming problems through constructive communication was a key to his altered views on the ability of people to behave
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT #6.

differently in relationships. In fact he and his fiancee had tried out some of the ideas from the program.

This subject had relatively high, unchanging scores on the "mindreading" subscale. The lack of change here is not supported by his comments regarding the value of the communication skill theory he acquired at the course.

His remarks offer only equivocal support of the inventory.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-7

Female, age 22. Hairdresser. Relationship Length 60 months.
Church attendance: Self:2, Mom:1, Dad:4.
Income level 2, Education 3. Willingness to attend 9
Home Structure 2 (Raised by one parent). Parents had divorced
when she was a child. Father had remarried and was in the process
of another divorce Home Happiness 1. Cohabiting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS

"Overall this course was good for both of us. I really wanted to
take it. Dad had been to a marriage encounter with the
Catholic Church and you could see how much it changed him"

PERSONAL SATISFACTION AT DOING SOMETHING POSITIVE SEEMS TO
BE IMPORTANT HERE.

Financial session had stood out. "We stayed afterwards and
talked to the guy from the credit union"

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN NOTABLE AS WELL AS
RELEVANT CONTENT

Communication. "Taught to change the way you say things... not
to get all hot and annoyed but to talk sensible". This subject
reported that she attempts to use this new method but admits
that she often slips back into the old ways.

NEW SKILLS SEEM TO BE THE NOTABLE INCIDENT.

"Role Plays helped us to really see why people do what they do"

SKILL DEMONSTRATION SEEMS TO BE IMPORTANT HERE FOR SELF-
UNDERSTANDING
ANGLICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-7

- Session on sexuality gave a lot of good information and opened up this topic for them to discuss which had been "kinda taboo".

FACILITATING DIALOGUE ON IMPORTANT TOPICS THAT HAVE BEEN AVOIDED

- The course "taught you how to take the good with the bad, and not to give up. Like I was laid off a year ago, and that was really hard, but not like if you lost a child...any marriage will have down moments... you should ride them out."

PROVISION OF A RESTRUCTURED COGNITIVE FRAMEWORK REGARDING MARRIAGE THROUGH SOCIAL INOCULATION.

- This subject reported being given books at the course, and that she had read them and re-read them.

PROVISION OF SOME CONCRETE LINK WITH THE PROGRAM THAT COULD REINFORCE COURSE LEARNINGS

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject began with an extremely high pre-test score which is supported by her comments regarding her willingness to attend and her expectations based upon what she perceived as a very positive change in her father consequent to his attendance at a marriage workshop. She said " I am really open to things like that. " She also reported that she had been to a child psychologist when her parents divorced, and that " it made you realize that you do need help sometimes."

The negative change at post-test still left this subject with a high score relative to the rest of the sample. The negative change could be related to some disappointment that the marriage program had not been as determinative an experience for her as what she perceived in the case of her father's attendance at a marriage program.

Her remarks seem to support the inventory score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject reported that because of the course she saw the church as more "open and liberal". However, she reported that she was suspicious of fundamentalist churches with "Do's and Don'ts", and what she saw as religious "overreaction".

The test result reported a modest negative change, and so did not appear to be sensitive to this more favourable perspective.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had an overall negative change on this instrument. Positive gains were reported on the dimensions of Mindreading and Conflict. This can clearly be related to the subject's reported enthusiasm for the skills taught in the program, which centered around methods of communication to avoid misunderstanding (the opposite of mindreading) and that it is better to have conflicts out in the open than suppress them.

It is somewhat more difficult to understand this subject's negative change on the last three subscales, Partners cannot change, Sexual perfectionism, and Males and females are emotionally different. The subject did report that the course had brought she and her fiance to discuss sexuality frankly for the first time. This may have exposed some myths she had regarding her ability to change him, and at the same time she may have sensed a difference from him. As well, she may have felt a greater responsibility for his sexual needs as these became clearer in discussion.

Her remarks offer equivocal support for the instrument.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT # A-8

Female age 24 Secretary. Relationship Length 4 months. Church Attendance: Self 1, Mom 1, Dad 1, ie None. Income level 5, Education Level 2, Willingness to Attend 5. Home Structure 1, Home Happiness 10. Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D M C S MF Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 17 18 13 20 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 14 16 19 20 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3 +3 +2 -6 0 -6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST

MEAN SCORE 101 42 9 11 9 12 14 57

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

- COMMUNICATION: This subject reported that she was already doing what the course taught, so this was not very relevant.

- MATERIAL THAT IS REDUNDANT TO THE STUDENT SEEMED TO GIVE A NEGATIVE EFFECT IN REGARD TO THE PROGRAM.

- SEXUALITY: "I was surprised at how blunt the film was". The subject thought that the film used was very explicit in terms of describing pleasing sexual behaviour. She thought that it was good that each sex was able to view such a movie together.

- SHARED ACCURATE INFORMATION WITH PARTNER SEEMS TO BE IMPORTANT. ALSO IT SEEMS TO BE IMPORTANT THAT THE CONTENT HELPED HER PARTNER TO UNDERSTAND HER NEEDS.

- The course "affirmed that we all need the same things... love and affection".

PROGRAM CONFIRMED PERSPECTIVES ALREADY HELD BY THE SUBJECT.

- Session on money matters was interesting to this subject but she could not think of anything that stood out from this session other than that some of it was new.

NEW LEARNINGS PROVIDE RELEVANCE FOR THE PROGRAM IN THE SUBJECT'S EYES.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM   SUBJECT # A-8

- This subject reported that she was not doing anything different because of the course. "Basically we knew it all, but it gave us confidence in what we were doing".

PROGRAM PROVIDED CONFIRMATION OF COGNITIVE STRUCTURES REGARDING MARRIAGE.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject had a modest negative change at post test, and both her scores are in the bottom range of scores for the entire sample.

In regard to her willingness to attend the program, the subject reported that she was not "threatened" when she found out that she "had" to take the course as she had heard "that it was not going to be an interrogation" that she had understood others had to go through in order to be married. She stated, "I just didn't feel any great need for it." These remarks, and her rating of 5 about willingness to attend support a low pre-test score. From this subject's perspective the course did not offer anything that she did not know, therefore, these resources are not useful for her. This supports the low post test score.

This subject reported that she was an "open person", experienced in communication and so the course had not meant much to her.

When asked if the program had changed her willingness to attend other such programs, she said "if people need help they should go". However, in her case the course confirmed that they were doing everything right and so should have confidence in her relationship. Therefore she did not believe that she would ever need counseling. Her perspective was that these helping resources were irrelevant to her case. This supports the low scores.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

She does not attend church and the course has not altered that. However, she had entered the program thinking that the church was "stuffy", but found that it was "absolutely great" "more open to young people and their ways". She was especially surprised to find that Anglicans could be so "easy going". She thought that it was "useful that the church offers these programs because some people need them".

This subject recorded a gain on this instrument that is supported by her remarks.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject reported that the program had not changed her perspective on relationships, and the small negative change on this instrument seems to support this. There were small negative and positive changes on 3 subscales, no change on one, and a change of 6 on the sexual perfectionism subscale. This negative change is likely related to the course content on sexuality which the subject had found very blunt. It is difficult to understand how the course content could be related to this change, except in its ability to trigger old stereotypes latent within the subject and which were in play at time of post test.

Her remarks generally seem to support the inventory score.
ANGRICAN PROGRAM  SUBJECT # A-9

Male Age 22 Works as a Shipper/Receiver. Relationship Length 40 months.
Church Attendance: Self 1, Mom 2, Dad 1.
Income Level: 3 Education Level: 2 Willingess to Attend: 6
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness 8 Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>D M C S MF Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8 12 7 16 20 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8 10 4 16 24 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+20</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>0 +2 +3 0 -4 +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 11 9 12 14 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

- Some of the material for the course was not relevant to this subject as it seemed that it was designed for subjects who had not cohabited.

CURRICULUM SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO DEAL WITH DIFFERING RELATIONSHIP EXPERIENCE.

- This subject reported that, even though he had been living with his fiancee for almost three years, the program had "got them talking" about subjects that they had not discussed before. He could not articulate what these were.

PROVISION OF OPPORTUNITIES TO DISCUSS NEW RELATIONSHIP MATERIAL WAS HELPFUL.

- Communication: The subject reported that the program content on communication had helped him to see "how the way things are said can accelerate into little fights." He reported that he now monitors his speech more closely when speaking with his partner.

NEW SKILLS TAUGHT LEAD TO NEW PERCEPTIONS AND BEHAVIOUR REGARDING COMMUNICATION.

- This subject thought that the presentation on money matters presumed that course participants were not living together, and that this material was not relevant to his situation.

MATERIAL NEEDS TO BE RELATED TO DIFFERING RELATIONSHIP EXPERIENCE.
POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW NOTES

ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT # A-9

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject changed by 20 points on this scale which indicates a significant change on this inventory. His score regarding willingness to attend the program was low, indicating some resistance however his pretest score was close to the mean. He was asked if he would attend a program like this again or go for marriage counseling. He answered "definitely...it helped quite a bit. I didn't want to go. thought we knew everything because we had lived together for three years."

The change can be attributed to his perception that the program had been beneficial. From his other comments it seems that it was most helpful in providing a structure for him and his fiancee to discuss topics that they may have avoided. This may have helped the subject to see the value in outside helping resources as providing structure to deal with issues that may be outside of active consciousness.

His remarks seem to support the inventory scores.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject recorded a positive change on this measure. This was supported by his remarks that he had expected the program to "push religion" but found that it helped with "practical problems you have in relationships". Thus he had begun by expecting the church to be interested in its own agenda and found that it was interested in helping others. Thus the church could be seen as more socially relevant.

His remarks seem to support the inventory scores.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed by only 1 point on this measure, however there were gains on some subscales, and negative change on others. Those showing positive change had to do with communication skills and the belief that partners can change. These changes could be related to the benefit this subject reported receiving from the program content on communication skills (more realistic beliefs about communication) and the fact that he perceived that new dialogue had been opened up by the course, therefore things could change. This subject already had a relatively positive score in terms of relationship beliefs regarding disagreements and there was no change on this. The program did not seem to alter his rather unrealistic views related to sexual perfectionism, or the differences between men and women. On this latter the subject recorded negative change. One logical connection could be that, as the subject stopped
mindreading, and was opened up to his partner on some new material, he became aware of how different her perspective was from his own. Thus this perception could have been generalized to all male and female relationships at the higher level of general needs. This mistaken logic was reported by one other subject. His remarks seem to offer only equivocal support for the instrument.
ANGELICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT # A-10

Male age 24. Safeway Employee. Relationship length 60 months.
Church Attendance: self:2 Mom:2 Dad:2. This indicates occasional church attendance.
Income level:6 Education level: 2. Willingness to attend: 1
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness 8 Not cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORTS POST-TEST</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

Communication Skills: Subject reported that this taught him "not to jump to conclusions about what she meant". He used to "blast off" before he heard all the details. He reports that now when he is upset about something in the relationship he takes more time to elicit information. He reported that this helped them to stay out of confrontational conflicts, and to "get out of problems". This subject could not recall parts of the program dealing with finances and sexuality. He considered that the sole focus was on communication.

LEARNING NEW APPLICABLE RELATIONSHIP SKILLS.

- He reported that the program "made me realize that my attitude stunk..I never liked listening to anyone else. If I had an opinion then there was no changing it. Made me communicate with others and pick up on their feelings." He reported that he found that this new perception had helped him to deal in all his interpersonal relationships in a more collegial manner.

COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE ON ONE'S OWN RELATIONSHIP SKILLS LEADS TO RESTRUCTURING IN ALL INTERPERSONAL CONTEXTS.

- He reported that the leader "made you feel comfortable".

PERSONAL CONTACT WITH THE LEADER PERMITTED A MORE RECEPTIVE PERSPECTIVE TO LEARNING.
ANGLICAN PROGRAM SUBJECT # A-10

- He reported that he did not want to go. "I'm not the type. I can't believe I'm talking to you (the interviewer)...but I got involved". He was asked if this meant that he participated in the discussions. He reported that he had, and that this was unusual for him.

ACTIVE PARTICIPANT PARTICIPATION WAS AN IMPORTANT CONDITION OF LEARNING AND ENJOYING THE PROGRAM.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject recorded an extreme low score on not wanting to attend this program. He said "I never believe in outside help...never believed I'd need it...if you communicate properly you'll never need it." He also reported that he had referred several friends to the program. His low change score could be indicative of two things. First he perceived a benefit from the program and this accounts for the positive change. However his perception of help with marriage is still very simplistic.

He seems to be saying that, although the program indicated that he did have some relationship deficits, the program had taught him all he needed to know. Thus it was a favourable experience but did not convince him that there may be more things for him to learn at various points in his development.

His remarks seem to support the inventory score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

He reported that he "had to go to the program...the minister said there are no ifs, ands, or buts! But once I was there I was glad I went. I had a negative attitude but I enjoyed it". He then described his early church behaviour and how he had been compelled to attend Sunday School but when he was older he was given a choice. He reported that he seldom attends Church and is satisfied with this. He did not think that the program had altered his attitude towards the Church even though his test indicated a small negative change.

His remarks seem to support his inventory score.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had a positive change of 10 points on the combined two subscales related to communication and conflict resolution.

The subject thought that this was related to what he got out of the program in terms of new skills and a more collegial style of relating.

He changed by 7 and 5 points in the positive direction on the
subscales regarding sexual perfectionism and the equality of men and women. The subject had not thought that he had changed on these, and could not think of how the program had altered his perception. A plausible explanation is that his new communication style and attitude permitted him to relax a "macho" attitude towards sexuality thus decreasing unrealistic expectation. Changed communication may have helped him to learn that his partner is very similar to him in needs and wants and this would be related to the subscale "Male/Female".

His remarks offer equivocal support for his score on this instrument.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP SUBJECT # CW-1

Female age. 24 Physiotherapist's aide/receptionist. Relationship Length 18 months.
Church Attendance: Self 2, Mom:2, Dad 1. Special Occasions.
Income Level 4. Education level 2. Willingness to Attend: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>MF</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

- Communication: "When Chris & Ruth (course leaders) explained that if something bothers you not to yell but to say 'I feel this' not 'you make me.'" She reported that since the course they have been married and she finds that there has been a considerable adjustment. She finds that she has a tendency to "nag" her husband, but she has found herself saying "I feel mad", rather than blaming him. As a specific example of this benefit from the program she cited a recent talk where she and her husband sat down and said "This is what bothers me", instead of hurling accusations.

COMMUNICATION CONTENT ABOUT "I" MESSAGES HAD INCREASING RELEVANCE AS THE COUPLE HAD MARITAL ADJUSTMENT DIFFICULTIES.

- Communication: She reported that she thinks that the course helped them to have more patience with each other. She reported a recent week-long canoe trip they had taken, and of the many times they had become frustrated with each other, but realized that yelling at each other would not accomplish what they wanted. COMMUNICATION CONTENT PROVIDED A GREATER BEHAVIOURAL REPERTOIRE.

- Family of Origin: She realized that his family was more of the model she would like for her own life. It reminded her of the unhappiness of her parents marriage, and that they won't do anything about it, which makes her all the more resolved to work at this marriage.

FAMILY OF ORIGIN CONTENT LEADS TO AN AWARENESS OF CHOICE, AND DECISIONS.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-1.

- "The Love Letter was fantastic". (all couples had been asked to write a love letter, Marriage Encounter style) She reported that her fiance had articulated information in the letter that he had never said before. There were many small things that pleased him that she did not know about.

COUPLE EXERCISES PROVIDE STRUCTURE FOR RELATIONSHIP EXPLORATION.

- She remembered that the leaders had described marriage as being like a garden that needs to be tended or else it can become full of weeds. She sees this with friends whose marriages are in trouble. She thought that the male leader had disclosed his own personal experience so well that she could see the need to continually work at marriage. This has made her want to go to some of the marriage enrichment experiences the leader had been to.

LEADER SELF-DISCLOSURE PROVIDES RELEVANCE FOR COURSE CONTENT.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

- This subject said that she would definitely go to another course and that she has recommended this course to many other people. She had encouraged her boss to attend a marriage encounter program and in the next year would like to go to one herself. She thought that such a program would provide the structure for her and her husband to talk more deeply. She wished that she could get her parents to take such a course. These remarks seem to support her high post-test score and strong positive change on this scale.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

- She did not think that the program had changed her attitude towards the church. She said that she had expected that there would be at least one session in which they would "tell you to go to church" and was surprised that there wasn't. She explained that she was a "believer" but that she did not go to church because she was involved in sports activities on week-ends. This subject had expected some promotion of the church and was pleased and surprised that this was not a part of the program. This may support her positive change on this dimension.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS:

- This subject had an overall positive change of 8 points on this scale, most of this change coming on the "mindreading" scale. She reported recalling a particular vignette from the marriage course that had to do with mind reading. The notable incidents that she refers to were heavily coloured by perceived gains in terms of communication.

- This subject had a high score on the subscale regarding "Change." She related that she had close friends who were "breaking up" and she could not accept this, although her husband could. He had said to her "people change", but she does not know why this has to be.

   This subject's remarks seem to support her inventory scores.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-2.

Female age. 23. Sales Clerk/Cashier. Relationship Length: 71 months
Church Attendance: Self: 1, Mom: 2, Dad: 1. Never.
Income level 2. Education level 2. Willingness to attend 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

- "Too rushed". She thought that there was not enough time and too much material to cover.

TIME TO WORK ISSUES THROUGH IN A CONCRETE WAY IS IMPORTANT TO PROGRAM RELEVANCE.

- This subject thought that it was unfortunate that there was nothing in the program about finances and budgeting. She thought they needed this since her fiance tends to be irresponsible. She had hoped course leaders would reinforce her thinking.

PROGRAM NEEDS TO BE ADAPTABLE TO SPECIFIC NEEDS OF DISTINCTIVE COUPLES.

- Communication: She reported that she learned a lot about her fiance on the week-end through the various directed exercises. She reported that she had been going with her partner for almost 7 years and that although they were not living together they had become complacent. They thought they knew all there was to know about each other. The program helped them to see that they didn't.

SKILL PRACTICE AND EXERCISE LEAD TO NEW COUPLE UNDERSTANDING AND TO AN AWARENESS OF COMMUNICATION DEFICITS.

- Conflict: The conflict resolution questionnaire used at the course gave "the courage" to report to her fiance some things that were "bugging" her. After 7 years they were in a slump and this helped them both to share some stored up annoyances.

DIRECTED EXERCISES PROVIDE A SAFE STRUCTURE AND DISCIPLINE FOR DEALING WITH INTERPERSONAL CONFLICTS.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM  SUBJECT # CW-2.

-Communication: She thought that the course had taught her to think through what she was feeling before she would act in a way that may be "cutting". She thinks that she is a very closed person regarding intimate feelings, and the program helped her to see that she must attempt to reveal her true feelings.

THEORY OF SELF DISCLOSURE ENCOURAGED THE USE OF NEW SKILLS.

-Predictable Crises: The various skill exercises had paired her and her fiancé up with other couples. Through this process they were able to observe the way others communicated, and those subjects about which others were in conflict. She was surprised to discover that some couples who she thought were "golden couples", had problems. Seeing and hearing other couples on the program made her realize that people go through many different stages. She reported that the leaders' self-disclosure, and particularly that of the male leader, had helped her to realize that others have problems.

LEADER SELF DISCLOSURE AND INTER-PARTICIPANT INTERACTION FACILITATED REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS OF CHANGE IN RELATIONSHIPS.

-Film on sexuality was very outdated and was not taken seriously by herself, nor the rest of the class she thought.

RESOURCE MATERIAL MUST BE CURRENT AND RELEVANT TO SUBJECT'S PERCEIVED NEEDS.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE.

This subject reported that her family life had been so good that she could not see the need for marriage programs. However, her fiancé's parents had separated and this made her realize that her experience was not universal. She had benefitted from the program and would like to do something like this again.

-Her remarks seem to validate her scores and her change score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH
She reported that she thought most churches were out for money or were too aggressive. She said that the program was "not pushy" and she was glad because she does not appreciate that. "If it had been about church I wouldn't have lasted long". She did not think that it had changed her attitude towards the church.

-Her remarks do not seem to validate her scores or negative change on this inventory.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-2.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS:

-This subject had a favourable score on this scale on pre-test, but still changed considerably (+16) overall. This is accounted for primarily by the Mindreading subscale which is related to communication, although her score on the Male/Female subscale was cut in half. The change on the Mindreading scale can be linked to her remarks regarding notable incidents. These are centered around communication. She has also stated that she discovered that they had thought they had known each other, but that the program had opened up a lot of new material. This is directly related to the concept of "mind reading". She further reported that before the course she would "give him all the right hints" but he wouldn't seem to get her message. The course taught that she had to spell out her wants. If people will do this they will really understand each other. This relates to the change on the Male/Female scale.

- This seems to support the change reported on the inventory.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-3

Male Age. 21. Logger. Relationship Length: 10 months.
Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:1, Dad:1. Occasionally.
Income Level 4 Education level 2. Willingness to attend:10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

This subject was willing to grant the interview, but was shy and reticent.

Communication: This was the first thing that came to his mind. He said that he thought the course had helped him learn to talk to his partner better. He could not think of any specific examples.

A NON VERBAL SUBJECT BECOMES AWARE THAT THERE ARE SIMPLE SKILLS THAT CAN HELP HIM TO BECOME MORE ARTICULATE.

Family of Origin: He reported that the program had helped him to see that many of the differences between himself and his partner were related to two different family lifestyles. She was not necessarily acting a certain way in order to respond to him, but was only being "her own self". This helped him to be more accepting of differences between them.

NEW COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE LEADS TO GREATER TOLERANCE OF DIFFERENCES.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject said simply, "I'd try it again". This seems to support his change and post-test score.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM  SUBJECT # CW-3.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

He reported that he thought that the course had made him more positive towards the church, and that if they lived closer they would go to church more often.
This change does not seem to be supported by his small favourable gain.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS:

This subject recorded a change of 23 points which is largely accounted for by a change of 15 points on the "mindreading" scale. When this subject was told what this scale attempted to measure, he laughed and said, "I still think it sometimes (i.e.: that she should be able to read his mind)". However he said that the course had really shown that people need to sit down and really talk things through if they are ever going to understand each other.
This seems to support his change on this inventory.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-4.

Female. Age. 23. Relationship Length 10 months.
Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:2, Dad 2. Occasional.
Income Level 3. Education 4. Willingness to Attend: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE 110

CHANGE +3

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

D M C S MF TOTAL
PRE 19 22 14 17 15 82
POST 16 8 11 14 7 51
CHANGE +3 +14 +3 +8 +31

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE 110

43 9 10 9 13 12 52

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

Communication: This subject thought that the exercises on communication had helped her get through to her partner on a meta-communication level. Through the content and exercises she was able to help him see that she needed more feedback from him and he seemed to understand her position.

CONTENT AND EXERCISES PROVIDED A FRAMEWORK FOR SUBJECT TO ESTABLISH A NEW LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE RULES OF COMMUNICATION IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP.

Communication: Wording can be really important. Often when she gets angry she blows up. She thought that the course had taught that you give yourself some space to cool down, and then talk about the disagreement.

NEW AWARENESS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES.

Leaders: She thought that the leaders were excellent. They shared personally, and gave down to earth examples. The female leader had given a concrete example of a conflict between herself and her partner that week, and she thought that this made them "human", and people to whom they could relate.

LEADERS SELF DISCLOSURE ENHANCES CREDIBILITY AND CONTENT RELEVANCE.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-4.

Love Letter: She reported that her fiance had never written her a letter before and she discovered that he is able to communicate better in letter than verbally. She found that she learned things in the letter that she did not know about him.

STRUCTURED EXERCISES PROVIDE A DISCIPLINE WITHIN WHICH COUPLES DEEPEN INTIMACY AND UNDERSTANDING.

ATTITUDE TOWARD HELP WITH MARRIAGE:

She thought that the course had influenced her willingness to seek help, especially in regard to counseling. She said that if she had not taken the course and was in need of marriage counseling she doubts she would have gone. However, now she knows she would. Her remarks support her score, but not the high pre-test score. Equivocal support for the inventory.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

She thought that the course had made her more favourable to the church. The leaders had a positive attitude and there was not pressure like some "religious people" use. She had thought that religion might be "hammered" into people at such a course and it impressed that it wasn't. These remarks seem to support the test change score of 21 points.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS:

This subject changed by 31 points in the desired direction on the total inventory. This change can be accounted for primarily by changed in the "mindreading" and "male/female" subscales. In relation to mindreading this subject says that she wishes that her partner would know what she wants without her having to say, but she realizes that this is crazy thinking. She said at the program they discussed the issue of his driving and the things that bother her about it. She thought that he had known how she felt but that he was just ignoring her feelings. During the guided discussion at the course she realized that he didn't know how she felt on this issue... she had been expecting him to read her mind.

In relation to the "male/female" subscale she was shown various items on which she had changed. The example of the leaders, and her own experience during the course, in terms of understanding her partner, helped her to believe that men and women want the same things emotionally. Her remarks seem to support her change on this inventory.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM  SUBJECT # CW-5

Church Attendance: Self:1, Mom:1, Dad:1.
Income Level 6. Education 2 Willingness to Attend:8
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness: 7 Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D M C S M F TOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21 16 17 21 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15 11 20 12 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+16</td>
<td>+22</td>
<td>+6 +5 -3 +9+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9 10 9 13 12 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

Communication: The method that the leaders taught was foreign to this subject. He remembers one of the leaders saying that it was like learning a foreign language, and that it would be awkward at first. He thought that the point of this material was to have people rephrase what they were saying so that it was not as harsh or hurtful. He thinks that this has influenced his relationship in that they both now take more time with issues that are volatile. They try to create distance from the situation so they can think through what they feel.

NEW CONCEPTS ON COMMUNICATION LEAD TO AWARENESS OF NEW SKILLS AND ATTEMPTS AT IMPLEMENTATION.

This subject said that he thought that much of the material on the course was very deep. He thought that the leaders did very well, but that the material they were working with was very deep and difficult to understand. They "explained it as best they could", but it was still hard to understand.

COURSE MATERIAL PROVIDED AN AWARENESS BUT NOT AN UNDERSTANDING OR MASTERY OF NEW CONCEPTS.

Sexuality: He reported that prior to the course "sex had been kind of a tight-lipped subject with us", but the course content opened it up for discussion. He thought that the film was outdated, but the session in general helped them to talk about it.

COURSE CONTENT LEADS TO NEW LEVELS OF UNDERSTANDING ON SEXUALITY.
Couples' Workshop Program  Subject # CW-5.

Conflict: He thought that, as a result of the course content on conflict resolution, that he in particular was able to take constructive criticism from his partner better. When they had identified areas of conflict during an exercise on the course he realized that they were in agreement about the things that they wanted to change, and that by his hearing about the things that his partner wants to change they could get a more satisfactory relationship.

Directed Exercises on Conflict Lead to New Perceptions.

Attitude Towards Help with Marriage:

He reported that after the program he was "enlightened to go to something else". "The course kind of broke the ice", and he thought now that he would be more inclined to attend another such program.

His remarks seem to support his high score, and the favourable change, pre-post.

Attitude Towards the Church

This subject thought that the program had not influenced his attitude towards the church. He said his attitude was "totally the same".

This seems to refute his large favourable change score on this inventory.

Relationship Beliefs:

This subject had begun with a very high score and at post-test had a score approaching the mean for his group through a large favourable change. This change is accounted for primarily by gains on the "sexual perfectionism" subscale and the "male/female" subscale, and to a lesser extent the "Disagreement" subscale having to do with conflict (D).

This subject's remarks about the value of the program in opening up sex as a topic of discussion for him and his partner account for the change. He now knows what she thinks and wants, and therefore his expectations are more realistic.

In relation to the "male/female" subscale he said that he still thinks that men and women do need some different things from relationships, but that through the course he could see that they could understand each other. This seems to support his change on this dimension.

In relation to conflict he had acknowledged that since the course he is more open to "constructive criticism".

This subject's remarks seem to support his change on these dimensions.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-6.

Male. Age 27. Journeyman Mechanic. Relationship Length: 18 months
Church Attendance: Self: 2, Mom: 4, Dad: 2.
Income Level 6 Education level 2. Willingness to attend: 7.
Home Structure 4 Home Happiness 10 Not cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

The subject reported that the course taught him "how to talk about things and not to keep them to myself". This used to be a problem for him, and still is, but the course helped. When things bother him about the relationship he has a tendency to say nothing about it and to let his feelings come out in anger over other issues. Now he thinks he is more competent to deal with annoyances in his relationship.

NEW INFORMATION ON COMMUNICATION PROVIDES MOTIVATION TO DEAL WITH DISAGREEMENTS RATHER THAN AVOID THEM.

- He said that the program indicated that "you can't expect your partner to change radically... that you have to learn to accept that person as they are". He said that this has become very relevant for them because since the program they had been married and are going through some disagreements on lifestyle.

PROGRAM CONTENT ON ANTICIPATED CRISSES PROVIDED COGNITIVE PREPARATION FOR ADJUSTMENTS.

- He thought that the program had taught him not to use blaming words, and to try to have more patience. He could see from the course content that blaming would be self-defeating.

NEW CONCEPTS ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION LEAD TO AWARENESS OF NEW SKILLS.
COUPLES’ WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-6.

- He thought that the material on family of origin had helped him to understand why he and his partner were attracted to each other.

FAMILY OF ORIGIN CONTENT PROVIDES COGNITIVE RESTRUCTURING REGARDING RELATIONSHIP NEEDS.

- Love Letter: He said that from this exercise he learned "the degree of how much she cares for me". He reported that she had given him a very simple, honest letter, but that it helped him to know how much she cares.

STRUCTURED EXERCISE ESTABLISHED OPPORTUNITY FOR NEW LEVELS OF UNDERSTANDING AND INTIMACY.

- In some exercises this subject was able to observe other couples and he reported that this was both interesting and helpful. He could see that some couples needed help, and in some he could see his own relationship more clearly. From this he could see that they as a couple needed models to emulate. He had recently gone on holiday with another couple and cited this as an example of a couple he would like to emulate.

PEER INVOLVEMENT IN EXERCISES LEADS TO GREATER AWARENESS OF RELATIONSHIP ISSUES.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject thought that this program had "definitely" influenced his willingness to seek help with his marriage. He reported that at first he had gone to this program only because his fiancee wanted to go. He did it for her and didn't expect to get anything out of it, nor did he expect to be interested. He said that he was surprised that he felt comfortable and that this course "broke the ice" for him in terms of seeking help. His remarks support his favourable change on this inventory.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH.

He reported that he was surprised that "they" were so open, "being a church and all". There was "no hiding... they faced the facts". He was surprised that the course had dealt with what he perceived to be such realistic issues. His remarks would suggest a favourable change on this inventory which is not supported by his test scores.
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RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had a relatively high (unrealistic) score on this inventory at both pre-test and post-test. He showed considerable negative change on the "sexual perfectionism" subscale and small gains on the male/female" and "disagreements" subscales. In relation to the "sexual perfectionism" subscale, he said that he had found that "sex isn't as important as it is made out to be ... it is not one of the main issues". He thought that at the course this had come through, that sex is often a symptom of some other problem in the relationship. He said that in an earlier relationship he had had, "sex had been everything", but now it was not as important. He thought the course had supported this view. These remarks do not support his negative change on this scale. In relation to his improvement on the "disagreement" subscale he reported that he is a stubborn person, and that because of this he and his partner disagree a lot. He said that it bothers him when his partner disagrees with him, but that he thought the course had encouraged him not to "give up" when they have disagreements. Instead he should attempt to understand. These remarks seem to support the change on this dimension. On the subscale "male/female" he reported that he did think that men and women have "two different kinds of senses" but that from the program he realized that learning about each other is "what makes it interesting". Thus he seemed closer towards believing that the sexes could truly understand each other, thus supporting the test. His report on the subscales seem to offer equivocal support for his scores on this inventory.
COUPLES’ WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-7.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE:

- This subject's first remark was that the film on sexuality was out of date and a waste of time. She had benefited very much from other parts of the program, and she thought that the time spent on the film could have been used to elaborate on other topics.

FILM CONTENT MUST BE RELEVANT AND MODERN

This subject reported that she had been to counseling for several years related to concerns regarding an alcoholic parent, and then relationship concerns with her present partner. She thought that much of the content in the course refreshed some of the things that she had learned in counseling. However, she thought that the communication skills taught were new to her. She was aware of active listening, but thought that the emphasis on practice of the various skills was very helpful. She thought that she needed a booster every once in awhile to really be able to use the skills properly.

STRUCTURED EXERCISES ENHANCE AWARENESS OF CONCEPTS.
STRUCTURED EXERCISES LEAD TO AWARENESS OF THE NEED FOR MORE TRAINING.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-7.

-During the course the leaders had drawn an analogy of marriage to a garden. This analogy had stayed with this subject. She said that she had recently been listening to a woman at work tell of her marital misfortunes, and how her spouse had "quit trying". She thought of what the leaders had said regarding the garden, and how each partner needs to work at it. If one stops, the garden quickly goes to seed. These cognitions renewed her motivation to work on her marriage. She said that shortly after the program she and her partner were giving flowers and other gifts of first romance.

NEW COGNITIONS REGARDING MARRIAGE LEAD TO NEW MOTIVATION.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject began with a high score, and at post-test had the highest (most favourable) score in the whole sample. Her initial high score was related to experiences in counseling that she had viewed as being very positive. She had chosen to go to the program and sees herself as the type of person who is open to help with her relationship. She thought that she may have changed on this dimension because she had never been to a marriage course before, and seemed to think that it was as favourable as counseling. She thought that she would like to go to another one to upgrade her use of skills. She also reported that she could see how marriage courses could augment counseling. Her remarks seem to support her test score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject reported thinking that churches are not very open to "people". She was surprised that the minister preparing her for marriage had not insisted that they take the course, and she thought this signalled an openness to people. She thought that the particular church she was married in was "open to me if I ever needed them", but at this time she did not imagine herself getting involved. However, she thought that most churches were very aggressive about making people fit into a mould. Her general remarks about churches offer support for the somewhat unfavourable post-test score. However, they do not explain the negative change from pre-test. These remarks seem to offer only equivocal support for the test scores.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed considerably on this inventory, so that her post-test scores are among the lowest (most favourable) in the sample. Her overall change was 37 points, with the subscales of "mindreading", "Conflict is Destructive" and "Male/Female emotional differences" being the ones contributing to most of the change.

In relation to the "Conflict is Destructive" subscale this subject reported that she had grown up in a home where there was a lot of external conflict. "Both parents liked to argue". She often saw people being hurt, and she thinks that she therefore has a tendency to avoid conflict. She thought that the session on conflict resolution at the course had convinced her that conflict could be a growing experience.

Although she said that she knew that mindreading was not a helpful belief to have in relationships, that the skill practice sessions had helped her to see how often we misunderstand one another, and how hard real understanding is.

In relation to the "male/female" subscale, she reported that the course helped her to see that women have been socialized to be the ones who "bend". She thought that the course and the style of the leaders pointed out that men and women are becoming more the same. She said the course helped her to see that people are very different, but that difference is not based on sex. She said that through the use of the active listening skills one could see how, when people argue, it is often the same things that they want when they come to understand each other.

Her remarks seem to support her inventory scores.
Couples' Workshop Program Subject # CW-8.


Church Attendance: Self: 2, Mom: 1, Dad: 1.
Income Level 4. Education Level 2. Willingness to Attend 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>D M C S MF TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7 7 11 7 11 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1 +4 -4 +10 +4 +13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts Post-Test
Mean Score 110 43

Total 9 10 9 13 12 52

Notable Incidents

- This subject had attended the program with another couple who he thought had some problems. He thought that the course had changed the relationship of the other couple in a very beneficial way.

Interaction with Other Couples Encourages Insights Regarding the Ability of Helping Resources to Facilitate Growth in Relationships.

- The film and handout on sexuality had "opened" this topic up for this couple. He reported that prior to attending the course sex was one topic that they both had felt awkward to discuss. He said that after the session on sexuality, they had spent a long time discussing how they felt about it, and through this he came to a new comfort in their sexual relationship. He reported that he often felt guilty if his partner did not experience orgasm. Their talk in the context of the program had lifted this guilt. She convinced him that her sexual experience was different from his, and that experiencing orgasm was not all that important to her.

Course Content Provided a Stimulus for New Self-Disclosure and Mutual Understanding Regarding Sexuality.
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Communication: He reported that the content on attending to your partner was significant to him, and that now at times he will really concentrate on what she is saying to try to get her full meaning. He cited an example of how recently they were discussing birth control. Before he took the course he thought he might have had the attitude "I'll listen to you, but you just go ahead and do what you want". After the course he said that he felt that he wanted to be more involved in conversations. She tends to be more expert in verbal skills, but he could see from the course content that without his participation the relationship would suffer.

COMMUNICATION THEORY PROVIDES INCENTIVE FOR GREATER RELATIONSHIP INVOLVEMENT AND EQUALITY.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported that he had not wanted to attend the program but had gone to please his partner. He said that at first he had "dug in his heels", but that it was not like he thought it would be. He had expected information on finances law and spirituality. The leaders had helped him to feel comfortable because they really seemed to understand relationships. He reported that he would go to another program like this and that he thought that he was now more open to seeking help with their relationship.

His remarks seem to support his scores on this instrument.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

He reported that he did not go to church, nor had he had much to do with it, although he was engaged to a minister's daughter. He said he didn't have a negative attitude towards the church, he just didn't know much about it. Since the program he had been thinking more about his spirituality.

His remarks offer equivocal support of the inventory.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had a change of +13 on this scale with most of this accounted for by a favourable drop of 10 points of the "sexual perfectionism" subscale. This change can be related to his remarks under NOTABLE INCIDENTS regarding sexuality. He reported that he no longer felt responsible for his partner's sexual satisfaction and that this had relieved him of some guilt.

His remarks support his change on this instrument.
Couples' Workshop Program Subject # CW-9.

Male Age 26. Engineering Aide Relationship Length 48 months.
Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:1, Dad:1.
Income Level 6. Education Level 2. Willingness to Attend 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

Conflict Resolution: This subject's first response was "the part about fighting". He reported that he and his partner both have quick tempers. For about a week after the course he thought that he utilized some of the skills taught to resolve conflict and that it had been beneficial, however the skills had waned. He said that he could not recall all the skills but he remembers that if people used them they could "really break the ice". He thought that through the use of constructive conflict resolution skills people could reach compromises that were satisfying. He thinks that the lasting benefit of this content was that he and his partner tend to take more time to "cool down" before getting into fights.

SKILLS TRAINING CREATES AN AWARENESS OF THE VALUE OF SKILLS AND FOR FURTHER TRAINING.

Communication: He recalled that they were asked to identify areas of change they sought in the relationship. He was surprised by the changes that his partner sought, and he believed that other participants had experienced similar surprises. He thought he knew his partner well, but the exercises on the course helped him to see that he really needed to spend more time on communication.

STRUCTURED EXERCISES LEAD TO NEW AWARENESS OF PARTNER.
STRUCTURED EXERCISES REINFORCE LEARNING REGARDING THE NEED FOR COMMUNICATION SKILLS AND PRACTICE.
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Leaders: This subject thought that the leaders were "real professionals". They used some examples from their own relationship that made the material seem relevant. The leaders themselves had just been married and he thought that he could relate well to them.

LEADERSHIP SELF DISCLOSURE ESTABLISHES RELEVANCE FOR PROGRAM CONTENT.

Others: This subject remembers that some couples seemed to be struggling more than other to grasp the skills. The chance to observe other couples during some of the exercises helped him to see how important the proper use of communication skills could be.

STRUCTURED SKILL PRACTICE WITH PEER INVOLVEMENT LEADS TO AWARENESS OF THE RELEVANCE OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported that he was willing to attend the program and that he would "do it again tomorrow."

His remarks marginally support his score of 104, but they seem to support a favourable change which the test has not recorded.

His remarks give only equivocal support for the instrument.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject does not have any regular involvement with the church, nor any background of church involvement. He said that he did not think that the program had altered his feelings towards the church in any way.

His remarks seem to support his inventory score.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had small changes on most subscales and an overall favourable change of 6 points. His scores remained well above the mean of his cohorts.

The subscale "mindreading" was described to this subject and he said that, although he knew that mindreading was not possible and that this kind of expectation could be destructive to a relationship, the course had re-inforced this thought. These remarks do not seem to reflect his above-average score on this dimension.

His score on the "conflict is destructive" relationship belief was almost double the average, and was not supported by
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-9.

his remarks. He said that in the course it was evident that if conflict is handled properly it can be very healthy; however, if it is not used properly it can harm relationships.

In relation to the "Partners Can Change Scale" this subject said that he had learned from experience that people can change and be trusted even after they have hurt you once. He thought that the course content had re-affirmed old learnings in relation to this, and that he may have been more convinced of this at this end of the course. These remarks seem to support his slight favourable change on this subscale.

When asked about the sexuality subscale this subject said that he didn't think the course had any effect on him in regard to this. He said he thought that he was aware of anything that was offered on this topic at the course. His test scores seem to support a lack of change here.

Regarding the last subscale "Male/female differences" he said that he thought that men and women want the same things out of marriage. At one time people may have wanted different things, but today most people want companionship.

On some of the subscales this subject's remarks seem to support his scores and on others his scores seem to be too high given his remarks. His remarks seem to offer only equivocal support for his inventory scores.
COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM SUBJECT # CW-10.

Female Age 19. Bank Teller Relationship Length 36 months.  
Church Attendance: Self:2, Mom:2, Dad:4.  
Income Level 2. Education Level 2. Willingness to Attend 10  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D M C S MF TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTABLE INCIDENTS**

Conflict Resolution: She thought that the course had helped them to resolve conflicts more constructively. She thought that she had "fallen back" in terms of her ability to use the skills but that she was still aware of them. She said that she noted that in the course the presentation of these skills seemed "exaggerated" but she thought that this had to be in order to get the ideas across.

ABILITY TO USE SKILLS DIMINISHES, BUT AWARENESS OF SKILLS REMAINS

Communication: She reported that the course stressed taking responsibility for feelings. "when I am in a bad mood I'll think about it and realize that it is my feelings". At times in order to deal with her own of feelings she will write a letter to her partner, which was another methodology illustrated at the course.

CONTENT REGARDING OWNERSHIP OF FEELINGS LEADS TO NEW METHODS OF RELATING.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject did not think that she had changed on this dimension since she has always been open to seeking help with marriage. She said that she was interested in marriage enrichment and in group process. She said that since she had taken the program before getting married, she would like to try it now that they are cohabiting. The only thing that would be different in her attitude is that now she is a bit more comfortable with what to expect.

Her remarks seem to offer support for her scores.
ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject said that she had a favourable attitude towards the church and did not think that the program had altered it. These remarks support her favourable score, and lack of change on this inventory.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed in the favourable direction by 8 points on this inventory, most of which can be accounted for by the subscale regarding "mindreading".

In relation to this subscale the subject said that she does think that often she understands what her partner feels but that from the course she realized that their relationship could not be built on this intuition. She realized that communication skills had to be used to really understand each other, and that these would become more important with the years.

Her remarks seem to support her change on this inventory.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM  SUBJECT # RC-1

Female age. 22. Office manager. Relationship Length 66 months. Church attendance: Self 4, Mom 4, Dad 3. Indicates regular church attendance. Income Level 3. Education level 2 indicating high school or less. Willingness to attend rated as 7 out of 10. Home structure was a single parent family for part of her growing up, and then with one natural parent and a step parent. Rated her home happiness as 6 out of 10. Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D M C S M F TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
<td>14 20 15 23 17 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST</td>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>96 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 14 11 13 13 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

The lay helping couples who spoke at the program were very helpful from this subject's point of view. She reported that they spoke "intimately". She thought that it would have been even more relevant if these lay couples had been younger and closer to the peer level of other members of the class. However the emotional tone of their messages were notable.

COPING MODELS DEMONSTRATING POSITIVE SELF DISCLOSURE GAVE RELEVANCE TO PROGRAM CONTENT.

- She reported that she and her fiancee had been in a very busy period of their lives. It seemed like they no longer had time for each other. Since the program was on a Wednesday night, they began a tradition of Wednesday nights for their relationship development. They had continued this in the two months since the program. This couple had been going together for over 5 years and the program seemed to have provided a structure for them to focus on their relationship development again.

STRUCTURE PROVIDED FOR RENEWED ATTENTION TO NEEDS OF THE RELATIONSHIP.

- Communication. She reported that in the past she had avoided differences with her fiancee and would not pursue them. This avoidance of course continually limited the areas of dialogue and contact. This explains why after 5 years this couple had become preoccupied with the instrumental versus their affectional relationship development. She reported that the program taught that to pursue differences to a positive resolution was a sign of
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT # RC-1.

caring for one's partner. This seemed to be a new insight. She said that she learned "not to give up", and that dialogue can lead to new discoveries about each other. She reported that she has employed this strategy in her relationship. When asked for an example of this she reported that when a disagreement comes up her first thought is to say "why bother", but then she thinks about the program and brings the disagreement to her partner's attention.

TEACHING ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION LEADS TO NEW ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR.

- She reported that she goes to church regularly and that her fiance does not, and this had become awkward for them. She reported being "embarrassed" about her church attendance. She would go to church by herself and come home and not say anything about it to her partner. She said that she appreciated that the church offered such a program and that she was eager to learn what they had to say about spirituality. At the program her fiance had said to her."I can't understand you without your faith". She took this to mean that he respected that her faith was important to her. and that he wanted to understand it, if not share it. She reported that he does attend church with her a little more often, and that she feels free now to talk about her faith.

PROGRAM PROVIDED A STRUCTURE AND DISCIPLINE FOR CONFRONTING TABOO SUBJECTS

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE.

This subject recorded a positive change of 9 points on this scale. This was supported by her report that before taking the program she had a "fatalistic outlook". She thought that if a marriage didn't work, then there was nothing that could be done about it. She reported that the program encouraged her not to give up if they have problems and to believe that the relationship could be changed. She was asked if she would be willing to seek counseling or go to another course and she answered,"definitely". These remarks seem to support the report of the test.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject attends church regularly and reported being pleased that the church had offered the program. Although she attributes to the program a major change regarding spirituality in her relationship, she does not think that it affected her attitude towards the church as an institution. This supports her test score which was almost the same on both occasions.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

The subscale dealing with conflict reports a contradictory finding to this subject's anecdotal report, as does the scale on communication. The subscale on the ability of people to change is supported by her report of a new confidence that relationships can be helped and can change. Her positive change on the subscale regarding male/female similarity/understanding is supported by her report of her partner's new understanding of her faith. However, she could not understand why there had been such a negative change in her score regarding sexual perfectionism. One plausible explanation is that her renewed commitment to the affectional development of the relationship and her perception of her partner's willingness to understand her spirituality has placed pressure on her to be a better sexual partner. She may be more concerned with pleasing him sexually and this may lead to cognitions related to sexual perfectionism. (i.e., I am responsible for my partner's sexual fulfillment). This exchange theory perception illustrates the systemic nature of change in relationships.
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Female. Age 22 Tourguide. Relationship Length 10 months.
Church Attendance: Self: 4, Mom 4, Dad 4. Regular Attendance.
Income level 1 (lowest possible). Education level 2. High school.
This was a Chinese subject for whom English was a second language. The interviewer’s difficulty understanding the subject may have impeded this interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>D  M  C  S  MF  TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8  25  11  10  18  72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-1  +6  -2  0  -2  +5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST
MEAN SCORE 96  38  11 14 11 13 13 65

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:
- The subject reported on how the lay couples had told of their experiences. She reported that this made her think of what may happen to her. She thought that she had learned a lot from these couples, but could not identify anything specific.

LAY COPING MODELS PROVIDE RELEVANCE AND AND NEW COPING COGNITIONS IN ANTICIPATION OF FUTURE RELATIONSHIP CHANGES.
- This subject related that she was being married soon and that they had lost something in their relationship. She no longer felt like his "first love" and that he was preoccupied with his business. She thought that she was doing all of the work on the wedding and her fiance had not even bought the appropriate shoes. Also she reported that his mother is constantly in their home. She was asked if there was anything from the program that had helped her with this. She said that none of the couples presenting material at the program seemed to have the same problems as she.

LACK OF EXAMPLES DEALING WITH ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE COUPLE'S DEVELOPMENTAL STATE.
- She reported that she and her fiance were often in conflict and she attributed this to the pressure that he was under. Her future mother-in-law said, "Don't bother him", and so she had decided to follow that advice and avoid any conflicts. She could not report anything in the program that applied to this
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situation.

DIDACTIC PRESENTATIONS ABOUT SKILLS MAY BE LESS EFFECTIVE THAN ROLE PLAYS AND SKILL PRACTICE IN PROVIDING ALTERNATIVES FOR COUPLES.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported that she had "never heard of a marriage course before". She was surprised after the first session and said, "This isn't bad." She said that she thought she had learned something from the program and that this gave her a favourable impression. This seems to support her change score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

She said that she has always gone to church so it felt very natural to go to this course. Her church is important to her and she thinks that it is a "great idea" that the church do this kind of program. Although her tests indicated a negative change of 11 points, her pretest score was extremely positive and even with the change her second score still reflects a very positive attitude towards the church. It seems that the scores fairly represent her positive attitude, but that the change score does not really indicate any real change.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS.

The tests indicate a positive change of 5 points on her total score. Most of this, seen in a change on the subscale regarding mind-reading, may be a result of the program content on communication skills. However, even with the change, her score on this dimension remains high, or in what is considered to be unrealistic expectations. These unrealistic expectations are supported by her acceptance of her future mother-in-law's perception of her fiance's thinking. Her moderate score on the conflict subscale is not supported by her reported strategy of denying conflicts. However, the interviewer was given the impression that the subject did want to deal with these conflicts but that she was acquiescing to her future mother-in-law.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT # RC-3.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>D 12 M 19 C 15 S 18 M 24 TOTAL 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>D 13 M 8 C 11 S 15 M 27 TOTAL 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>D -1+1 M +4 C +3 S -3 M -3 TOTAL -14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE 96

CHURCH 38 D 11 M 14 C 11 S 13 M 13 TOTAL 65

NOTABLE INCIDENTS

-Natural Birth Control: This subject thought this was a very good lecture. He reported being skeptical of it, but since being a part of the lecture at the premarriage program they are planning to use it.

NEW INFORMATION WITH RELEVANCE FOR THE SUBJECT DISPELS MYTHS.

-Finances: This subject thought that the program material on finances was interestingly presented but not relevant to his circumstances.

INFORMATION ON FINANCES MUST BE GEARED TO SUBJECT'S NEEDS.

-Communication: This subject reported that he had learned about "Hidden Agendas" in arguments. ("arguing about which table cloth to use"). He reported that they still become angry with one another, but now when they "get some perspective on it" they see that there is something deeper involved. When this happens they now pursue the matter spending more time on the argument because they know that there is more at stake.

NEW CONCEPTS REGARDING COMMUNICATION LEAD TO NEW BEHAVIOUR PATTERN

-Conflict: He reported that he had learned from the program that conflict can be either good or bad, and that it should be dealt with, not stored up, and that they were now more inclined to deal with differences.

CONFLICT OUTCOMES CAN BE SATISFYING AND DEPEND ON THE WILLINGNESS OF THE PARTNERS TO DEAL WITH ISSUES TO RESOLUTION.
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Communication: He reported that a film shown at the program on communication had really "hit home". He saw the negative impact of non-attending and "not listening". Every once in a while he will remember the film and then he tells himself to pay attention, even if what his partner is saying is not of interest to him.

NEGATIVE DEPICTION OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF INADEQUATE INTERPERSONAL SKILLS LEADS TO DESIRE FOR PERSONAL CHANGE.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported that he "didn't have a negative view of marriage counselling before the course", but the course confirmed his confidence in marriage counselling because of supportive things others said about it.

His score indicates a positive attitude, although the drop in score is not accounted for.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

Although this subject had recorded himself on the demographic data sheet as a regular church attender, and his parents are not, in the interview he reported that he only went to church occasionally. He thought his attitude towards the church had not changed as a result of the course. He said he thought he was "more lenient" because he perceived the church to be more "lenient". He said he felt more at ease with the church although the program had not changed his attendance. He said he had been hostile towards the church as a teenager.

This subject's anecdotal report does not seem to account for the marked negative change on his post-test score.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed considerably in a positive direction on the subscale "mindreading is expected" (M). This change was supported by the subject's comments about the benefits of the program regarding communication.

Even though he reported a new attitude towards conflict, this was not indicated in his post-test subscale regarding conflict (D).

Other minor shifts in his score do not seem to be related to the course, except perhaps his more realistic score on sexuality, which could have to do with the information on natural family planning. This would stress sexuality as a partnership, rather than as all of one partner's responsibility. This subject had reported that the sexuality lecture was a notable incident.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT # RC-4.

Male age 26 Relationship Length 21 months.
Church Attendance: Self: 4, Mom: 4, Dad: 4. Regular
Income level 3. Education level 5. Willingness to attend 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST
MEAN SCORE 96

NOTABLE INCIDENTS

-Spirituality: "Janice and I had that kind of relationship they described in the course. It reminded us of things we already knew and things that we already do now. The course helped us to attach labels to some of these things". The program seemed to confirm this subject's view of the importance of sharing one's religious faith.

INFORMATION ON SPIRITUALITY CONFIRMS SUBJECT;S THINKING.
CURRICULUM PROVIDES ASSURANCE.

- He reported that "one guest speaker and his wife talked about having to learn to fight properly." He had thought that one should avoid conflict at any cost. He realized from the program that with this strategy little things would build up. He said, "since then (the program) I mention things that bother me, and because my partner took the course she tends not to be defensive... but she knows it is for the good of the relationship".

NEW ATTITUDES TOWARDS CONFLICT ARE DEVELOPED WHICH THE SUBJECT COMES TO SEE WILL BE BENEFICIAL FOR THE RELATIONSHIP IN THE LONG RUN.
- Finances: This subject reported that his fiancee is very cautious with money and that this session helped him to see that he needed to have some discipline and to put aside some savings before any other payment.

CURRICULUM ON FINANCES ENCOURAGED SUBJECT TO DO FINANCIAL PLANNING AND TO UNDERSTAND HIS PARTNER'S PERSPECTIVE.

- Family Planning: Subject reported that he was "startled and caught off guard" by this session. He hadn't thought of how spirituality interacts with sexuality.

NEW INTEGRATIVE AWARENESS OF SYSTEMIC FORCES IN RELATIONSHIPS.

- He reported that he is a "strong Catholic and also a Christian. . but I was irate and so were others that it came across that the Catholic faith was better than others." When asked what gave him this impression the subject responded "some of the diagrams the priest drew suggested this". He reported that the whole class had to go for a candle light service, and he thought that people who were not Catholic would have felt "pushed". They had no choice, and he resented this.

PERCEPTION THAT MARRIAGE PROGRAM IS BEING USED TO SUPPORT A RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION.

- One lay couple talked of never putting your partner aside for material gain, and this subject realized that he had been confronted with this situation. He related that there were times when he was given opportunity to work more, but it would mean giving up time with his fiancee. He said that from the lay couple's talk he could see that this type of behaviour would lead to problems.

ROLE MODELS ENABLE SUBJECTS TO ANTICIPATE NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF LACK OF ATTENTION TO THE RELATIONSHIP.

- He reported that generally the course helped him to be aware that there will be adjustments to be made (in marriage) and so "you won't be so shocked when they come along." The lay couple helped him to see that most couples have similar problems.

LAY ROLE MODEL'S STORIES PROVIDE RELEVANT REALISTIC EXPECTATIONS OF ANTICIPATED CRISES IN MARRIAGE.
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ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE.

This subject did not think that he had changed on this dimension, although he said that the course helped him to know that there are things that can help. He said he thinks that people should "do all they can to work it out themselves". This response does confirm both his low pre-test and low post-test scores, although his remark about having more knowledge of helping resources may account for the positive change on his dimension. His remarks seem to validate the test results.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

He reported that the program had not really changed his attitude towards the church. He thought that the church genuinely wants to help and to do something for couples, but that the program is "too Catholic". His church attendance, and positive attitude towards the spirituality sessions would support his generally favourable scores on this test. However, the test did not seem to register his annoyance with what he seemed to perceive as implied superiority of one faith over another.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject recorded moderate positive changes on all of the subscales. These changes seemed to be supported by his remarks in regard to notable incidents. He says that certain styles of communication and the anticipation of difficulties were learnings from the course. These could be related to the first three subscales.

Thus his interview remarks seem to support the test scores.
ROMAN CATHOLIC SUBJECT # RC-5.

Female Age 32 Student/Child Care Worker. Relationship Length 21 months.
Church Attendance: Self: 3, Mom: 2, Dad: 3 once a month
Income Level: 2 Education Level: 5 Willingness to Attend: 7 of 10
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness: 4 Not cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

-Communication: This subject noted that in her perspective a constant message of the course leaders was "don't give up...you should see it through even if you feel stuck". This would mean that, if one was having a hard time to communicate, they would persist until the partner understood what was being said.

CONTENT ON COMMUNICATION PROVIDES A RATIONALE AND MOTIVATION FOR WORKING ON COMMUNICATION SKILLS.

-Conflict: This subject reported that it was important that she and her fiance had both taken the course. They had been taught in the program not to avoid conflict, and so when one or the other of them would avoid a conflict they would use a key phrase such as "remember the course!" and this would encourage both of them to continue with the discussion.

CONTENT ON CONFLICT PROVIDES MOTIVATION FOR POSTIVE EXPLORATION OF CONFLICTS

-She reported that she had enjoyed the "lay couples" who shared something of the story of their marriages. Although there were several couples, she thought that one universal theme came through. Each couple reported having their "ups and downs" but without a constant flow of communication they grew apart.

COPING MODELS PROVIDE INCENTIVE FOR COMMUNICATION SKILL DEVELOPMENT.
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-Natural Family Planning. She thought that the session was fascinating. Since the course she had secured more information and was now using this method. NEW CONTENT LEADS TO FURTHER EXPLORATION OF THE TOPIC AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW BEHAVIOUR.

-She thought that a benefit of the program was that it assured her that many of her views about relationships were right. PROGRAM PROVIDED ASSURANCE OF VIEWS ALREADY HELD : POSITIVE REDUNDANCY.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported, "I've always been inclined toward that sort of experience, so it just confirmed it". This remark seemed to confirm her relatively high pre-test score, and the change.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

She reported that spirituality had always been important in her relationship, and that she and her fiance had a "deep spiritual understanding" before the course. She said that she did not think that the course had changed her views towards the church.

-Her negative change on this is test is not accounted for.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had a relatively high score on this dimension and it rose in the negative direction considerably at post-test. This is largely accounted for by negative changes on the "mindreading" (M) and "Sexual Perfectionism" (S) scales. Her remarks do not seem to account for these changes or her unfavourable score.
POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW NOTES

ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT # RC-6.

Female Age 24 Lab Technologist. Relationship Length 30 months
Church Attendance: Self:3, Mom:4, Dad:4. Parents are regular
attenders, and she attends about once a month.
Income level 5 Education Level 4. Willingness to attend 6 of 10.
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness:7 Not Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST
MEAN SCORE 96 38 11 14 11 13 13 65

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

-Conflict: "We talked better afterwards... we had a tendency to
bury conflict and then have a big fight... now I bring things up
sooner". Through the program she realized that religion was a
content area that she and her fiancee avoid. She is a Catholic
and he is not, and so they became aware that it was hard to talk
about this between themselves. The program opened up religion as
an area for discussion.

PROGRAM PROVIDED A STRUCTURE TO DEAL WITH ISSUES THAT HAD BEEN
AVOIED.

-Lay Couples: These leaders were important to this subject
because she said, "I can't relate to a man who has never been
married".
LEADERS MUST BE COPING MODELS WHO CAN RELATE TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES
OF THE SUBJECTS.

-The course taught her that it "won't be a bed of roses" and that
she should not have false hope or false expectations. The lay
couples who told their own story were able to draw this out, and
this has given her a more realistic expectation for happiness in
marriage.

PROGRAM PROVIDES COGNITIVE EXPECTATION OF DIFFICULTIES.

-She thought that the program enabled her to identify early signs
of relationship distress, and made her realize that if one was
experiencing some of these difficulties they had better get
some help before it is too late.

INTRODUCTION TO ANTICIPATED CRISIS CREATES FAVOURABLE ATTITUDES
TOWARDS SEEKING HELP.
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-Natural Family Planning: She thought that this was "entertaining". She does not think that the "ovulation method" is as reliable as the lecturer had suggested. She also wonders if the church is being hypocritical in that she thinks that natural family planning has the same purpose as "unnatural methods".

PROGRAM CONTENT NOT RELEVANT OR CREDIBLE.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject said that she is definitely more interested in other courses since taking this one. She thought that the course had helped her. During the course the leaders had talked about marriage encounter and she and her partner had subsequently talked about this and had decided that they would go.
- Her remarks support her high post test score and her change score.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CHURCH

-She stated that she did not think that the program had altered her attitude towards the church, although she had found herself more interested in the church since.

This subject's remarks, and her comments that the program had opened religion up as a topic of discussion in her relationship would seem to support her change on this test.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had a favourable change of 15 points in total which can be attributed primarily to changes on the "Male/Female" subscale and the "Change" subscale. In relation to the latter the subject said "I definitely believe people can change. Didn't used to think that, but now I think they can. I don't know if this is attributable to the course or not". Her remark under notable incidents referring to anticipated crises would seem to support the influence of the course on her thinking.

When told of the meaning of the "male/female" subscale she said that she definitely believed that men and women want the same things out of relationships and that they can reach a deep understanding. This is related to her progress during the course in discussing her religious faith with her fiance, and the opening up of areas of communication that had been closed.

These remarks seem to support her change on these subscales and on the total test score.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT # RC-7.

Female. Age 22 Special Ed. Teacher. Relationship Length 24 months
Church Attendance: Self: 3, Mom: 1, Dad 1. Once a month for
herself.
Income level 4. Education level 5. Willingness to Attend: 6
Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness 10 Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

-This subject's first remark about the program was that it didn't
do much good. She said that anything that she and her partner
were asked to discuss they had already discussed.

CONTENT SHOULD BE RESPONSIVE TO DIFFERENTIAL LEVELS OF COUPLE
DEVELOPMENT

- She thought that the contents of the program suggest that God
could solve all one's problems. In her opinion God can't take
them all away. Thus she thought that too much of the program's
message was unrealistic.

PROGRAM CONTENT NOT CREDIBLE .

-Lay Leaders: The Lay leaders who shared their own personal
marriage stories were "all the same". All the stories seemed to
have the same ending, which was that they found a religious
solution. She could not relate to the stories of the lay couples
as she thought that she and her partner were starting out at a
very different point. She also thought that the lay leaders had
been chosen because they were "keeners" in the Catholic church.
Thus they could not relate to what she considered the "ordinary"
person going to church. She thought that among the lay leaders
should be some younger couples. Her summary of this was that it
amounted to listening to "someone else's problems".

LEADER'S SELF DISCLOSURE MUST BE RELEVANT TO THE DIVERSE
BACKGROUNDS OF PARTICIPANTS. LAY LEADERS SHOULD PRESENT COPING
MODELS, NOT MASTERY MODELS.
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-Natural Family Planning. She reported that she "didn't believe" the session on Natural Family Planning. She reported that the couple who presented this lecture only had two children thus she didn't believe that they themselves used the method that they were teaching. She did not plan to use the method of birth control taught in the program.

PROGRAM CONTENT NOT CREDIBLE.

- She thought that the session on law and finances was interesting but there was really nothing new for her in it.

PROGRAM CONTENT DID NOT CONNECT WITH ANY OF SUBJECT'S PERCEIVED NEEDS.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

She reported that she had a friend who took a Marriage Encounter course and had gone on to become a leader within the Marriage Encounter Movement. However, she reported that programs like these are "just not my thing". She reported that she didn't think she would ever go to a counselor, and she said that she really didn't want to go to this course.

- This remark supports her unfavourable score at pre and post test.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

She reported "we didn't believe some of the things we saw... we thought they were really outdated... some people just lapped it up, but it all seemed to come back to God". This subject seemed to think that all of the presentations were simplistic. Although she goes to church, she did not agree with the view-point of the leaders whom she saw as "keeners".

- Her remarks support her negative change on this dimension.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject changed considerably in a unfavourable direction on this test, with most of the change accounted for by changes on the "Conflict is Destructive" subscale, and the "Change" subscale. In relation to the former, this subject reported that during the course she realized that she and her fiance differ on how to resolve conflicts. He doesn't believe in talking them out and she does. In these circumstances conflict could be destructive and would account for her changed score on this dimension.

- In relation to the subscale on Change this subject said that if she was hurt once it would be very difficult to trust again. This related to her whole impression of the program. She thought that the leaders were saying that as long as
one had faith in God they should forgive, and they could change. Her skepticism about the program is reflected in her score that indicates a belief that people do not change in relationships.

These remarks seem to support the report of the test.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT #8.

Female Age: 24 Civil Engineer. Relationship Length: 39 months. Church Attendance: Self: 1, Mom: 1, Dad: 1. i.e. Never. Said that she took the course because she wanted to be married in the same church as her parents. Income level: 5 Education level: 5 Willingness to Attend: 5 Home Structure: 1 Home Happiness: 10. Cohabiting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11 14 11 13 13 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

- This subject began the interview by stating that she thought the whole course was "a waste of time". She stated that her fiance feels even stronger about it. She was sorry he was not home at the time of the interview because he would have a lot to say about it. He is an atheist. She thought that the lay couples who were involved in the program "didn't know what they were doing."

CONTENT RELEVANCE AND LEADER'S PROJECTED EFFICACY ARE IMPORTANT TO SUBJECT'S RESPONSIVENESS.

- Natural Family Planning: She reported that she thought "it was a joke.. the fellow who did it was either too technical, or at too basic a level... I'd heard it all before in biology.. they didn't even refer to the use of the thermometer at all which was a huge oversight". She also thought this session was unfair because it did not report on other methods of birth planning. She thought that giving partial information to people, such as her view of this session, would be detrimental to some. She thought it was "ridiculous".

PROGRAM CONTENT NEEDS TO DEAL WITH DIFFERENTIAL LEVELS OF INTEREST AND KNOWLEDGE.

Communication: She thought that this could have been the best session but the couple who led it read a script. They needed more experience, and perhaps a younger couple that the couples might relate better to. She thought that the whole program was "so impersonal". "We sat like bumps on a log". She thought that there should have been some "interaction games" to help the couples deal with the content that was being presented.

A STRUCTURED CONTEXT IS REQUIRED FOR WORKING WITH NEW CONCEPTS.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM SUBJECT #8.

- Conflict: The suggestion in the course that couples have "rules for fighting" was a good one according to this subject. They had been away, and then on a honeymoon, but were definitely going to sit down and establish some ground rules for dealing with conflict.

NEW CONCEPTS LEAD TO MOTIVATION FORMING THE GROUND WORK FOR POSSIBLE NEW BEHAVIOUR.

- Session on law and finances was interestingly presented, but she knew it all. She thought that it was somewhat unrealistic as it told about buying a house, and in her opinion, most people getting married aren't at that point. She reported that she and her fiance already had financial planning.

PROGRAM CONTENT MUST BE RELEVANT TO SUBJECT'S PERCEIVED NEEDS.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE.

She thought that throughout the program there was a stress on seeking help if you need it. She thought that this was good. However, her whole feeling about this particular program was one of "disappointment". She reported that she has friends who have gone to other programs and have gotten a lot out of them. She stated that she might be a little more willing to attend another program. She cited a cousin who was taking a marriage preparation program through the Salvation Army and had heard that the cousin's experience was very different to her experience with this course.

Her generally low opinion of this program may have led to a negative change on this scale, but in her remarks she seems to place this experience in a broad context. Her remarks about others who have benefitted from their programs could be responsible for the lack of negative change.

Her remarks seem to support the test score.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

- She did not think that the course had changed her views of the church.

Her lack of interest in the church, and her remarks about the impact of the course on her view of the church seem to support her lack of change, and unfavourable score on this scale.
RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject began with a favourable score, and moved in a more favourable direction at post-test, with most of the change accounted for by the "Conflict is Destructive" subscale, and the "Change" subscale. She related these to new ideas that the program gave her on how to resolve conflicts. A new methodology gave her new hope that people could change. - Her remarks seem to support the change on this scale.
POST-PROGRAM INTERVIEW NOTES

ROMAN CATHOLIC SUBJECT # RC-9

Female. Age 23 Student Relationship Length: 12 months.
Income Level 1. Education 5 Willingness to attend: 1 of 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D M C S M F TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHORTS POST-TEST MEAN SCORE

96  38  11  14  11  13  13  65

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

This subject said that the session on communication skills was the one she remembered best, and in particular one lay couple who shared their experience and "almost had me in tears". The lay couples that took part told their stories well, but attempted to impose their view of marriage on others. In particular, one lay couple had intimated that the man was to be the authority in the marriage, and this made the subject angry.

SELF DISCLOSURE BY COPING MODELS PROVIDES RELEVANCE.

There was no one particular point of content that came through as most important to her. Little points that came up during the course seemed to be helpful, but none of these helpful points had to do with the religious content of the program.... it was only the social and relationship content that meant anything to her.

She said that she was "egotistical" and "surprised" to discover there were things that she didn't know. She found it hard to imagine that she could reach the point where she would ever need help, but the course helped her to see it may be possible.

CONTENT ON ANTICIPATED CRISES LEADS TO OPENNESS TO NEW AWARENESS OF HELP SEEKING.
ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

The posttest score of this subject on this inventory indicates a substantial movement in the favourable direction. Major changes were recorded in her answer to question #3: "I will likely rely on marriage counseling at some point in my life to strengthen my marriage" and #17: "Even though my marriage was satisfying I would attend a marriage program to see if what we had could be made even better." She related these two questions to question #7 (I would not mind marriage counseling when I am married if our relationship becomes boring.) in which she also showed a modest change.

When she began the marriage preparation program she thought "Why would I ever rely on marriage counseling.. why would we need it?" She spoke of being a little bit "egotistical" and thought it was hard to imagine that they would come to that point, especially now when their relationship is so young. She said that there is something of a taboo about marriage counseling, but after the course she could see that it might be more realistic that they could benefit from it one day.

Her remarks seem to support the test scores.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject showed a slight negative change toward the church, and she had expressed her reluctance to attend the program. She reported that she did not "need" the church and that she felt it did not have any social relevance. Religion for her amounts to "a sense of security within oneself".

She did report that her parents were first generation Polish immigrants and very strong adherents of the Catholic Church "Almost Fanatical". When asked why she had attended the program she said that it was so that she could be married in the church which would please her parents and herself. Being married in the church would be more "fun" than being married in a simple ceremony by the justice of the peace.

Her remarks seem to support her test score, but not the change.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

This subject had very favourable scores on this inventory at pre and post test, recording a positive change. These did not seem to be supported by her remarks in the interview.
ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM  SUBJECT # RC-10


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HELP</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D  M  C  S  MF  TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  8  3  4  9  31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 11 4 2 14 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7 -3 -1 +2 -5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHORTS POST-TEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 14 11 13 13 65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTABLE INCIDENTS:

This subject reported that it was the "practical things" from the program, and not the religious content, that he "got something from".

He reported that every night there was something that seemed new for him to think about.

CONTENT MUST RESPOND TO THE PERCEIVED NEEDS OF THE SUBJECT

The session on Natural Family Planning stuck out in his mind. He reported being angry that he, someone who considers himself a scientist, did not already know this. He was surprised by this session and "fascinated".

NEW INFORMATION INCREASES WILLINGNESS TO LEARN

ATTITUDE TOWARDS HELP WITH MARRIAGE

This subject reported a willingness to learn, and an openness to new information and concepts. This supports his relatively high pre-test and post-test score on this scale.
ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CHURCH

This subject explained the change in his response to this instrument in terms of his "belligerent" mood when he began the program. He did not want to attend, and resented the compulsory nature of the program. The change in his score represents his "mellowing" out during the course of the program. This seemed to mean that his belligerent feeling dissipated.

He reports that he has no changed feelings about the church. He respects the church as an instrument of social righteousness but does not need it himself nor plan to be involved in it. His remarks support his score on this instrument.

RELATIONSHIP BELIEFS

Although this subject indicated that he had gained during the program, he was non-specific in answers. This subject seemed to have a very rational view towards relationships. His relationship belief scores are far more favourable than his cohorts' mean score. His interview was supportive of his score on this inventory.
APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF EACH PROGRAM SAMPLE

BY WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND
TABLE 45
Description of the Anglican sample by reported willingness to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to attend</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't want to attend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 46
Description of the Couples' Workshop sample by reported willingness to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to attend</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't want to attend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 46

Description of the Roman Catholic sample by reported willingness to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to attend</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Don't want to attend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

OUTLINE OF THE ANGLICAN PROGRAM
SESSION 1.

Introduction
Explanation of Programme - not a course, not counselling, sharing of answers to make a good relationship better.

Name Game 1) Learning game
2) Introducing partner & special quality about him/her.

Meeting each other - A) Where do I come from?
B) What do I do?
C) What are my hobbies?
D) What is my favourite colour?
E) What is my favourite food?
F) When is my wedding date?

Film - "You Haven't Changed a Bit"

Discussion in groups

Report Back - reports are to be put on acetate for immediate use on overhead projector.

Definition of Marriage - "Marriage is a unique relationship in which each person takes responsibility for the growth of the other.

Communication - What happens? Role play differences.
1. Preconceived ideas
2. Prejudices
3. Non-listening
4. Avoidance
5. Judgements
6. Hidden Agendas

Communication Skills:
1. Self Awareness
2. Perception
3. Active listening and feedback

Couple Groups - What skills did you notice the couple in the film to be using?

Intentional marriage model a) I appreciate... b) I need.... (Couple groups to practice)

End: Explain topic for the next week.
SESSION 2.

Welcome

Introduce Problems of Conflict:
  a) Win or Else method
  b) Yield method
  c) Compromise Method
  d) Withdrawal Method
  e) Resolution

Pairwise couple dialogue on their methods of conflict

Rules of conflict resolution. PRESENTATION

Film "The Money Tree"

Discussion Groups

Group Report Back on the Discussions

Financial Questionnaire - Completed alone, then shared by partners.

Question and Answer period with Financial expert
  a) Mortgages
  b) Loans
  c) Debts
  d) Credit buying
  e) Insurance
  f) Wills

Handout "Your Money Matters" & "Wills"

End. Introduce next week's topic.
SESSION 3.

Introduction - Review of Session 2 questions
Introduce medical guest
Introduction on Sex.

Film "Sexuality and Communication" Reel # 1 only

Details of Intercourse: Feelings & Techniques
Teach "I Feel" method of communication.

Couples practice the "I feel" method

Questionnaire - completed alone, then shared with partner

Birth control presentation

Group discussion

Expert Panel responds to questions emerging from group discussion.

End: preview of the fourth session.

Film "Sexuality & Communication" Reel # 2.
SESSION 4.

Introduction and Review

Film "Johnny Lingo"

Discussion groups

Report back on discussion groups

Couple Groups: Discussion "What have you felt your partner has done to raise your sense of self worth"

Fish Bowl

Men Discuss "What is a wife?"

Women Discuss "What is a husband?"

Roles PRESENTATION

Passages PRESENTATION (Based on the book by Gail Sheehy)

Couple Groups discuss the meaning of marriage vows.

Explanation of secular terms in religious language

Evaluation Forms

Closing Party.
APPENDIX E

OUTLINE OF THE COUPLES' WORKSHOP PROGRAM
GOALS

1. Introduce group members to each other to the point that the group will begin building trust with each other.

2. To present a five point mode for facilitating self-revelation.

3. Differentiate between "blaming" styles of communication and "self-revealing" styles, and contrast the values of each style.

4. Participants practice using the five point mode to totally reveal themselves concerning a chosen issue.

SUMMARY OF SESSION 1. ACTIVITIES

1. Introductions & Course Overview
2. Group identification of problems in marriage today
3. Presentation #1-1: "I" verses "Blaming" messages
4. Worksheet #1-1: Sending "I" Messages
5. Presentation #1-2: Self Revelation
6. Presentation #1-3: Four Point Mode
   (REFRESHMENT BREAK)
8. Worksheet #1-2: Identifying self-revelations
9. Partners complete a self-revelation
10. Partners share their self-revelations
11. Leaders summarize the session's learning and provide an overview of the next session.
GOALS:

1. To reinforce feelings of membership in the group.
2. To reinforce learning on self revelation through review of session 1 material
3. To teach some good listening skills
4. To provide practice for couples in listening to each other
5. To recognize that conflict is intrinsic to a relationship
6. To provide a mode for conflict resolution
7. To demonstrate the use of the conflict resolution mode in a "peer" case study.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES

1. Reinforcing Group Membership Feelings
2. Review of Self-Revelation
3. Presentation #2-1: Listening Skills
4. Demonstrate the listening skills
5. Skill Practice: Self-Revelation & Listening Skills
6. Presentation #2-2: The Conflict Resolution Model
7. Demonstration of Conflict Resolution Model
8. Couples use the model with a supplied conflict.
GOALS

1. To review the conflict resolution model
2. To provide a stimulus for couples to explore possible sources of conflict in their own relationship.
3. To provide a setting where couples can resolve a specific conflict using the resolution mode.
4. To establish the goals of marriage in relation to three possible outcomes of marriage: Divorce, unhappily married and happily married.
5. To provide an overview of the stages of married life.
6. To provide cognitive preparation for the predictable and unpredictable crises of marital and family life.

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

1. Review the Conflict resolution model
2. Couples Explore Possible Conflicts.
3. Couples pick a real conflict in their relationship and attempt to resolve it privately, using the conflict resolution model.
4. Presentation #3-1: Three outcomes of marriage
5. Presentation #3-2: Innoculation
6. Presentation #3-3: Predictable crises
7. Presentation #3-4 and Group Discussion: Unpredictable crises
GOALS

1. To establish the concept that marriage is an entity separate from the individuals in it, and that relationships have patterns of their own.

2. To establish some categories on which couples can base a discussion about the nature of relationships.

3. To establish the idea that the style of relationships can be related to the sense of agency, and personal power of the individuals within them.

4. To enable each participant to look at their family of origin in an objective manner.

5. To provide accurate information on human sexual response and how partners can make their sexual relationships more satisfying.

6. To communicate an attitude that a satisfying sexual relationship is a product of the communication and sensitivity of each partner to the other.

7. To desensitize participants discussion of sexual response so that frank discussion between partners is enabled, and conflicts arising from their sexual relationship can be resolved.

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS ACTIVITIES:

1. Introduction the the Unit: a) analysis of relationships b) family of origin c) analysis of their own relationship history

2. Presentation #4-1: Styles of relationships.

3. Couple's Use Handout #4-1 to evaluate another relationship

4. Presentation #4-2 Family of Origin Influences

5. Individuals complete Family of Origin Handout #4-2

6. Couple's Discuss their family of origin

7. Group Discussion/Demonstration: Family of Origin

8. Presentation #4-3 Human Sexual Response

9. Film on Sexuality or Presentation # 4-4

10. Worksheet #4-3 "Sexuality"
GOALS FOR THE SESSION

1. Assist couples to objectively view their own relationship so as to recognize fluctuations and changes within it, and to articulate these as meaningful, disappointing, or exciting.

2. To encourage the notion that early identification of marital distress, and seeking help to restore the relationship is a sensible way to realize the dreams of marriage.

3. To raise couples' awareness of available resources for strengthening relationships, in particular:

   a) marriage counseling and
   b) marriage enrichment

4. Provide a small example of the methods employed in the marriage encounter model of marriage enrichment.

5. Review the major skills and concepts taught throughout the course.

6. Provide opportunity for the participants to provide a written evaluation of the workshops.

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP ACTIVITIES

1. Presentation #5-1 "Relationship History"

2. Individuals complete Handout #5-1 "Relationship History"

3. Couples dialogue on their Relationship History

4. Presentation #5-2 "Marriage Counselling"

5. Group discussion & response

6. Presentation #5-3 "Marriage Enrichment"

7. Group Discussion & response

8. Individuals write a "Love Letter" to their partner

9. Couples exchange letters and dialogue

10. Review of major skills & concepts from all 5 workshops

11. Individuals complete the Evaluation Form #5-3
APPENDIX F

OUTLINE OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PROGRAM
SUBJECT

Why Marry? The Goals of Christian Marriage
Marriage Today.

Communication: Two Becoming One.

Christ and Your Relationship:
It Takes Three to get Married!

Christian Family Life: Parents and Children:
Family Prayer.

Natural Family Planning:
Responsible Christian Sexuality.

Yours, Mine and Ours:
Law and Finances in Marriage.

Celebrating Your Wedding Day - and Beyond!

SPEAKERS

Priest and
Married Couple

Catholic Community Services

Priest and
Married Couple

Priest and
Married Couple

Natural Family Planning Couple

Lawyer and Accountant

Priest and
Married Couple

the catholic centre

150 Robson Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6B 2A7 Telephone 683-2494
Presentation Outline - First Evening - Goals of Christian Marriage

- Marriage Today

A. Introduction
- who we are, kids, how long we've been married,
- what theme of presentation is.

B. Sacrament
1. share your awareness or lack of awareness of what the sacrament of matrimony was all about on your wedding day - a one short deal vs. a daily lived commitment.
2. share what our sacrament means to us now - our relationship is our sacrament - we are ministers of our sacrament - decisions to be life-giving to love one another every day - give example.
3. as a sacrament in the Church we are as important to the Church as the other sacraments.

"When a man and woman live together in peace and harmony and joyful communion with one another, their relationship is a real sign to everyone of the love Jesus came to share with humankind" from -"Matrimony - Jesus Invites us to Love."

C. World's Influence on Marriage
1. to live as a sacramental couple is our goal. However we are constantly joining the world and the influences it has on our marriage.
- TV and movie portrayal of marriage - jokes & cliches
- looking at other peoples marriages - negative effects and comparing ourselves to them.
- in comparing we fail to strive for the greatness our sacrament calls us to.

D. We can't let the world decide how our marriage is going to be. We have to decide for ourselves. Every day we need to make plans and decisions in our lives together.

a) Beginning - how we made plans and decisions
- how much time went into it; a lot or just let things happen without really thinking about the consequences.
- dealing with falling flat on your face when you made a wrong decision.

b) How we try to make decisions now.
- Discuss fully between the two of us, our feelings as well as our thoughts.
- the best way we know to do this is to write down all our thoughts and feelings and exchange them, then discuss what we've said.
- don't rush into making a decision - take time to pray for direction and guidance.
- discuss with others not necessarily someone who will agree with you.
- when we go through this process we make better decisions for us.
- just share how you make decisions, this is what we do, you may have a different way.
E. Part God plays in our Marriage.

1) Permanancy of our relationship reflects Christ's love to the world.

2) As a Catholic married couple God is a part of our marriage. Because of God's stake in our marriage we should take the time to reflect on the graces we have been given as a married couple.
   a) particularly healing
   b) humility to ask for forgiveness - grace from God. - also grace to be forgiving - without this our relationship would weaken easily.

F. Summary

- How we feel about one another and our relationship right now.
MARRIAGE PREPARATION

2nd Evening - COMMUNICATION

1. Introduce Speaker and Topic.

2. Presentation - Catholic Community Services.

   (break for coffee is usually in the middle of the evening)

3. Presentation on Engaged Encounter.

4. TAKE - HOME - QUESTION.

   Give one.

   1) Do I listen to you with my mind or my heart?

      - How does my answer make you feel?

   2) What things do I find difficult to talk to you about?

      Why?
CHRIST AND YOUR RELATIONSHIP: IT TAKES THREE TO GET MARRIED

A. Christ and His Family
   1. The three of us at the front tonight are here because we believe this; that your marriage needs a third partner; Jesus Christ.
      We believe that He died on the Cross and rose again from the dead that you might have the divine life. All the divine resources are at your disposal for your marriage if you will only accept the.
   3. WHAT DOES JESUS CHRIST MEAN TO ME?
   4. Jesus started a family, the Church. You have a relationship to it. Catholics believe that they are full members of Christ's family. They also believe that other people have a partial relationship to this Church (Chart by Father Richard based on P. Paul VI, Ecclesiam Suam)
   5. WHAT DOES THE CHURCH (OR THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNION TO WHICH I BELONG) MEAN TO ME? HOW DOES IT RELATE TO MY LIFE NOW?

B. THE GRACE OF CHRIST
   1. Christ gives us grace - the divine life, spoken of above - the richest type of life possible.
   2. He does this in two ways; through Word and Sacrament (Fr. R. to explain these terms)
   3. Priest and Encounter couple then talk about how the Bible and the Sacraments relate to their daily lives. They recall occasions in which they experienced the power of Christ flowing into their (married) lives through the seven Sacraments.

C. THE LAST THINGS
   Every marriage comes to an end. There is death. Christ in your marriage enables you to meet this. Your love goes on. (Priest and couple talk about the experience of bereavement and the Church's resources to strengthen us at such a time.)

D. WORSHIP
   We have talked about Catholic belief. But being a (married) Catholic involves not only a belief, but also a worship and a life style.
   WHAT DOES OUR WORSHIP AT MASS MEAN TO OUR MARRIAGE?

E. LIFE STYLE
   HOW DOES BEING A CATHOLIC RELATE TO MY MARRIED LIFE STYLE?

F. CONCLUSION
   Christ will never force Himself on us. The Church does not force herself on us. But they are there to help.
   IT TAKES THREE TO GET MARRIED!
MARRIAGE PREPARATION

4th Evening - Becoming Family.

1) Introduce Evening
2) Talk by Priest - The Church and Children - 30 mins.
   see Outline attached
   - ask couple to take this seriously not
     for us, but for each other.
   1) - give out sheets - they are to answer the
     questions individually - not as couples -
     be honest in their answers - approx. 10 mins.
     - have the couples complete step 1 before
       explaining step 2.
   2) - exchange with partner and read silently
     twice, once for the head, once for the
     heart, Then discuss answers to question
     -10 mins.
   3) - break up into groups of 5 couples max.
     - quickly introduce one another.
     - talk about what you have discovered in
       answering these questions about yourself
       and your partner - 15 mins. max.
   4) - ask if anyone would like to comment on
     what was discussed in their group. 5 mins.

5. Coffee.

6. TAKE HOME QUESTION: Do I see prayer as something you do,
   I do, or We do? Explain.

1) Share who you are, how long you've been married, how many children you have, how you first met.

2) Share attitude toward having children when first married
   - e.g. size of family
   - to have children right away or wait
   - children as Gifts from God
   - children as necessary burden
   share some of these or others as they apply.

3) How you felt when you found you were pregnant and where child was born.

4) Decisions we had to make to form a Christian Family (little Church)
   - Baptism - share importance of child being a part of Catholic community.
   - Priorities - time for us and our relationship vs big house, new car, etc.
   - how we make prayer part of our family life
     e.g. grace
     rosary
     night prayers
   - what our prayer life means to us now
   - share some experiences you've had saying prayers as a family
   - share what your children have taught you through prayer - simplicity, faithfulness

5) Our children are the first ones to feel the effect of our love for one another
   - special time each day to share special quality of one another e.g.
     - dialogue
     - romancing
5th Evening - **NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING**

1) Introduce couple giving presentation
2) Coffee is usually served in the middle
3) Film - 1st Days of Life
4) Distribute Pope Paul VI, *Humanae Vitae*.
   *(Of Human Life)*
5) Take home Question
   
   - What would our having a child mean to me?
6th Evening - MONEY AND LEGAL MATTERS

1) Introduce evening and speakers
2) Lawyer and Accountant give presentation
3) Coffee is usually served in the middle
4) Take home question - one of the following
   - when we are married will the money be yours, mine or ours?
   - which of us worries about money?
   - would a budget improve our relationship?
7th Evening - HOSTING OUTLINE - Celebrating Your Wedding Day and Beyond

1. Introduce evening
2. Priest to explain prenuptial forms, talk about wedding ceremony with its various options, and speak on challenge of inter-faith marriage - 30 min.
3. Speaker from C.C.S. - 15 min.
4. Talk on "Strengthening your Marriage" - Couple (outline attached) - 10 min.
5. Candlelight service - 20 min.
6. Give out and collect evaluation sheets - 10 min.
7. Coffee and cookies.
Presentation Outline - 7th Evening - Celebrating Your Wedding Day and Beyond.

Strengthening Your Marriage - 10 min. talk

1) Share the kind of preparation we had for our marriage.

2) Today there are so many opportunities
   - Engaged Encounter
   - Evening for the Engaged
   - Rap sessions with priest

3) Need to work on our relationship doesn't ever end.
   - taking time to talk about your relationship
     instead of talking about things you are
     going to do past and future or other people.
   - Church supports us and offers programs to
     help strengthen our marriage
     - Marriage Encounter
     - Marriage Enrichment
     - Couple Retreat

4) What we do personally:
   - daily dialogue
   - romancing is a decision
   - anything else you do to make your relation­ship a priority.