INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

77-13,404

SHOFFNER, Sarah Moore, 1940-
   USE OF VIDEOTAPE LEARNING PACKAGES: A
   MARITAL ENRICHMENT FIELD EXPERIMENT WITH
   TWO DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

   The University of North Carolina at
   Greensboro, Ph.D., 1976
   Home Economics

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1976

USE OF VIDEOTAPE LEARNING PACKAGES: A MARITAL ENRICHMENT

FIELD EXPERIMENT WITH TWO DELIVERY SYSTEMS

by

Sarah Moore Shoffner

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1976

Approved by

Mary Elizabeth Keister
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following
committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the
University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser *Mary Elizabeth Keister*

Committee Members *Rebecca M. Smith*

Eunice M. Deemer

John C. Edwards

William A. Powers

November 2, 1976
Date of Acceptance by Committee

SHOFFNER, SARAH MOORE. Use of Videotape Learning Packages:
A Marital Enrichment Field Experiment with Two Delivery
Systems. (1976) Directed by: Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister.
Pp. 300

The purposes of this study were (a) to evaluate the

effectiveness of two procedures (traditional group workshop

and individual telephone conference/mail) for training home

economics Extension agents to use videotape resources in

working with married couples, and (b) to design, implement,

and evaluate videotape learning packages for facilitating

married couples' interpersonal competence skills in self-

understanding, communication, and growth toward states of

consensus and commitment to their relationships. Videotape

learning packages were utilized by Extension agents acting

as leaders with groups of married couples. The sample con-

sisted of 50 married couples and 10 agent-leaders from 10

counties in two Agricultural Extension Service districts.

Thirty-nine couples attended a series of four videotape/dis-

cussion programs and responded to pre-post inventories.

Eleven control couples who did not attend the series also

responded.

The acceptance of the two training methods was assessed

with items designed to measure agents' attitudes toward con-

ducting marriage enrichment groups and toward using videotape

learning packages. The self-administered pre-post inventories

for group participants included instruments to measure the

dependent variables marital consensus (Spanier, Dyadic Adjust-

ment Scale), communication (Bienvenu, Interpersonal

Communication Inventory), knowledge of concepts in human relations, and commitment to their relationships. Also included were items to evaluate group experiences and the four programs. Analysis of variance and multivariate analysis of variance techniques were used to examine pre-post change scores for participants.

Three hypotheses in the direction of expected findings were tested. The first which stated that there would be no difference in the attitude toward conducting enrichment groups between leaders who were trained in traditional group versus telephone/mail procedures was supported. The second hypothesis which stated that there would be no differences between pre-post changes on instrument scores between couples whose leaders were traditionally trained and couples whose leaders received individual telephone/mail training was supported. The third hypothesis was rejected, because an analysis of variance showed no increases in pre-post change scores on measures of consensus, communication, and knowledge of human relations concepts for individuals in the two experimental groups as compared to scores for the control group.

Couples who experienced the series of meetings reported having gained insight into aspects of their marriage--communication and personal growth--that they had previously identified as areas that they could improve. Couples expressed commitment to their own marriages, and a few were committed to learning how to help other couples enrich marriage.

An evaluation of the program series indicated that participants thought the most meaningful part of the program series was group discussion with other couples. Agents responded favorably to the method of teaching.

Five conclusions were drawn. The telephone conference/ mail training procedure is a suitable alternative at one-fourth the cost of traditional training procedures. Extension agents probably would not have conducted the group meetings without the availability of the videotape learning packages. The marriage enrichment program attracted clientele who had not previously attended Extension functions and therefore appears to be a new avenue for expansion. Although quantitatively measured test scores did not indicate change, couples' self-reports indicated gains in their awareness of marriage enrichment concepts. Upon close examination of the data the meaning of marriage enrichment becomes more clear; thus, the present study is viewed as a contribution to defining marriage enrichment. Recommendations for further development and study were offered: Marriage enrichment groups should be observed to behaviorally define components of enrichment and pretest scores should be examined to identify and establish a baseline from which to develop growth-promoting programs.

PREFACE

The School of Home Economics, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, maintain continuing efforts focusing on the interrelationships of research, extension, and resident instruction. This dissertation was a contributing effort to a cooperative project between these agencies and the North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station with whom the writer is employed. The researcher was encouraged to express professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the policies or official positions of the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service and Experiment Station and the School of Home Economics.

The videotape learning package--four videotapes and the program procedures for agents--was prepared by Sarah M. Shoffner, School of Home Economics, Department of Child Development and Family Relations, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Myrle L. Swicegood, District Agent, The North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, in consultation with Leo F. Hawkins, Human Development Specialist and leader on the videotapes, The North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, The North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Other project personnel are listed in the paragraphs describing their contributions.

iii

group meetings and the couples who attended the meetings and who cooperated with their time and interest in answering the inventories.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Kenneth R. Keller, Director, North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station; to Mr. J. C. Williamson, Jr., the former director; and to Dean Naomi G. Albanese, School of Home Economics, for granting the writer the opportunity to pursue graduate study and to complete this research.

Recognition is made to Dr. William A. Powers and Nancy Elliott, Statistical Consulting Service, for technical assistance in statistical analysis. Special acknowledgment is made of the valuable assistance, cooperation, and skill of Bobbie D. Wagoner in coding and key-punching data; of Sharon H. Welker for editing the entire manuscript; and of Elizabeth R. Hunt and Marsha A. Upton in the final preparation of the dissertation manuscript. Carol McLester Hobson and Sam Gladding assisted in developing code categories. Several graduate stu ~ts and recognized family authorities across the nation contributed to the research process through reading videotape scripts and responding to items during instrument development.

My deepest gratitude goes to my husband Eugene S. Shoffner, to our sons Richard Blair and David Eugene, to my mother Sallie P. Moore, and to my sister Helen M. Teter for their patience, understanding, and continued support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this research was on designing, implement-
ing, and evaluating a model for facilitating married couples'
interpersonal competence skills in self-understanding, com-
munication, and growth toward states of consensus and commit-
ment to their relationships. Videotape learning packages
were utilized in group settings by married couple members
to enable them to better understand their interactions as
a couple. The implementation and evaluation procedures
involved an assessment of two approaches to training for
group leaders.

The importance of developing and evaluating a videotape
program for marital enrichment through acquisition of inter-
personal skills found support from several perspectives.
Many couples seek participation in marriage and family
enrichment programs--educational ventures--at intervals
throughout the life cycle with a goal of improving relation-
ships among family members. This emerging trend is evident
in the popular interest in and the use of human relations
training that has grown rapidly in the past few years through
procedures frequently called encounter groups, sensitivity
training, and enrichment or growth groups. These experiential
programs, preventive rather than therapeutic, are aimed at

people with relatively stable family relationships and marriages. Such experiences have typically been termed "experience based learning" and have included varieties of structured exercises as well as unstructured discussions. Participants have been encouraged to engage in self-analytic activity through heightened awareness and discussion of the dynamics of their immediate interpersonal situations.

The growing interest in enrichment-type programs is surrounded with a plethora of general beliefs and statements which have been generated from leaders' and participants' reports of the effects of their experiences; however, few of these programs have been rigorously evaluated. For one reason, growth in interpersonal competence and enrichment is extremely difficult to measure objectively. The present study attempted, therefore, to determine whether couples' scores on pre-posttest measures changed as a result of their attendance at a series of four group meetings designed to raise awareness of some aspects of communication, consensus, and commitment to their relationship as a couple.

Since it is believed that the husband-wife relationship is vital to the well-being and satisfactory functioning of the family, it seems important for educators to provide resource opportunities for married couples to use in better understanding their marital and family interactions. In an evaluative study of weekend marriage enrichment retreats, couples reported that increased skills in communication were

an aspect of their marriage needing the most improvement
(Swicegood, 1974). Activities in human relations training,
particularly those focused primarily upon marital communi-
cation and promoting growth in marriage, have been available
only to the more affluent persons who were able to pay for
(ranging from 60 to 200 or more dollars) and to find the time
for intensive residential (sometimes weekend) workshops or
retreats (Mace, 1974a; Miles, 1974). A researcher who
studied marriage enrichment retreats suggested that the
educational experience appeared useful to participant cou-
ples, but that the cost of such training was of major con-
cern (Swicegood, 1974). Couples who may want or need the
training most may be the least able to afford the cost.

Success of growth groups, marriage enrichment retreat
groups, and other human relations training programs is
thought to depend upon a resource pool of teachers or leaders
who have the knowledge, skill, and personal attributes and
materials to teach overall content, while they are creating
an atmosphere of mutual trust in which people can learn.
At the time this study was planned, the training of leaders
for marriage enrichment groups was limited since it was done
on a one-to-one basis (Mace & Mace, 1974a). Few leaders were
trained because of the expense involved and unavailability
of funds to underwrite the training. Leaders who funded
their own training usually formed groups and charged each
participating member a fee for the total program. This

practice limited the potential population to be trained. Therefore, it was proposed that resources developed for the dual purpose of training leaders and providing materials for experiential groups could facilitate and expand programs that could be offered in interpersonal competence in marriage, family, and group interactions.

Another aspect of leader training, indicated in programming assessments (SEMIS) of work done in the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, provided impetus for this study. Agents with responsibility for human development subject matter spend less of their time working with topics and activities in the couple relationships area than in any other portion of subject matter. These agents had reported a need for more resources to use with groups and a need for training for themselves. Very little of their preservice training is focused in this area, and there is a reluctance to do teaching in the marital relationship area. This reluctance is understandable since there seem to be taboos in the American society relative to openness and discussion of marriage relationships. Also, the subject matter varies according to a couples' needs; therefore, preparation for group meetings cannot be as tangible as it is for other areas generally taught by Extension agents.

A comprehensive interpersonal competence program can be advanced only if more of the "natural growth facilitators" who are present in every institution and community are

trained (Clinebell, 1976). It is believed that enrichment training opportunities, strengthened by the use of videotape learning packages, could be made available at a nominal cost to North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service personnel for use with lay couples in their target communities. In addition, a part of the purpose of the Extension Service is to provide resources for use by other agencies and organizations. Clinebell (1976) has identified extended uses for cassette tapes which could be made available to the following:

> (a) counselors and mental health professionals who want to move beyond the repair models by learning growth skills; (b) ministers who want refresher courses in pastoral care and counseling; (c) teachers, nurses, and other person-centered professionals who are interested in positive approaches to education and prevention; (d) seminary, social work, and counseling students in courses on methods of helping persons; (e) trained lay counselors and paraprofessionals who resonate to the growth approach; and (f) lay individuals and couples, usually identified during enrichment groups and workshops, who are naturally gifted as growth enablers. (p. 259)

Heretofore, the format for marriage enrichment groups has been that of the retreat or workshop variety with trained leaders guiding structured experiences and spontaneous discussions. Only a few guides and written materials directly related to marriage enrichment have been available as resources for group leaders (Hawkins, 1972, 1973; Mace & Mace, 1974a). Videotape learning packages might make it possible for persons with less sophisticated training to feel secure and to lead couples' groups effectively.

> Deprofessionalizing much of the leadership of enrich-
> ment events maximizes the growth of lay persons and
> frees more of the time of highly trained professionals
> for lay training and other activities for which they
> have specialized skills.   (Clinebell, p. 259)

The two specialists in human development with the North

Carolina Agricultural Extension Service are continually seek-

ing newer and more effective ways to work with people. With

increased costs in travel it is becoming quite expensive for

specialists to travel throughout the state to train leaders.

Therefore, use of videotape learning packages would reduce

travel time and subsequent expenses for specialists and

for the agents who must travel to a central location within

their district to attend training workshops. Considering

these factors, an alternate to the traditional method of

training was proposed for this study. Essentially it was

self-instruction. Agents received videotape learning pack-

ages through the mail and had telephone conferences with

specialists before and after receiving the teaching pack-

ages. With this delivery system agents remained in the

county Extension locations for training and contact with the

specialists.

The medium of videotape has served as the information-

giving vehicle in a number of studies that reported signifi-

cant results in the attainment of interpersonal skills.

Topics were related to verbal and nonverbal communication

(Deets, 1972; Van Horn, 1974), developing communication skills

in nursing through observation (Narrow, 1972), several aspects

of being married (Pitzer et al., 1975), resolution of marital conflict (Bergner, 1974), change in family interaction patterns (Spring, 1974), understanding young children (Van Horn, 1974), and counselor education (Dendy, 1971; Kagan, 1975; Van Horn, 1974).

The present study proposed the use of videotape learning packages for teaching interpersonal competence skills to married couples in group settings within their community areas. For the following reasons this approach seemed practical: (a) the growing acceptance of groups oriented toward enrichment in marriage, (b) the limited resource materials on the topic of marriage enrichment--self-actualization, communication, consensus, and commitment, (c) the cost involved in retreats and workshops within or away from a couple's home community, (d) a need to develop low-cost training programs for group leaders equally as effective as having subject matter specialists conduct the training, (e) the arrival of videotapes on the audio-visual scene, and (f) the results of studies reporting uses of videotapes in training a variety of subject matter areas. In addition to providing resources for married couples, these same videotape learning packages comprised the core of subject-matter resources used in training the leaders who subsequently used these materials in working with groups of married couples. A pre-prepared set of materials was used by the subject matter specialists whose job it was to train

agent-leaders for working with community groups. Agents
extended their services further than the one-to-one leader-
ship training contacts which are typical for leader prepara-
tion within the retreat or workshop framework.

Sending Extension specialists throughout the state to
train agents is an expensive endeavor. At the present rate
of reimbursement, agents are paid 15¢ a mile for travel,
and up to $23 per diem is allowable for meals and lodging.
In 1975 and 1976 training for home economics agents was
redesigned and presented as an in-depth five-day learning
experience with agents from the whole state meeting together
in a central location. The equivalent of one day of their
time was required for travel. This format coordinated
training and made for greater efficiency; however, it lim-
ited subsequent training during the fiscal year because of
the cost involved in reimbursing agents for travel and per
diem allowances. Therefore, techniques to provide supple-
mentary training were explored.

A traditional face-to-face one-day training session in
the smallest Extension district (11 counties) would cost
$153.60 in agent travel alone, even when agents form carpools
whenever appropriate. Specialists' travel would be an
additional $18. The cost for meals for the day would amount
to approximately $39. The total, then, for one day of train-
ing, excluding resource materials, would be $210.60 in addi-
tion to 104 hours or 13 man-days of time. An alternative

training procedure for the same district utilizing indi-
vidual 30-minute telephone conferences for each agent with
the specialist would amount to $26.40 plus $22 for mailing
the resource materials in addition to 50 hours or 6 1/4 man
days of time. When the two training procedures were compared
on a cost basis, traditional training ($210.60) would be
over four times as expensive as a telephone conference/mail-
ing procedure ($48.40). Moreover, the latter would provide
individual conference time for each agent with the specialist
instead of being one of a group.

As evidence of belief in the suitability of videotape
for some subject matter training, the North Carolina Agricul-
tural Extension Service purchased videotape receiving sets
for each of the county units in the state. A limited number
of video teaching tapes had been prepared by specialists.
One set of videotapes dealing with nutrition and basic food
preparation had been utilized in training professionals and
paraprofessionals and as a supplementary resource for special
interest meetings (Donnelly, 1975). Another series pre-
senting the Commodity Futures Markets (hedging and market
alternatives) had been tested within the North Carolina
Agricultural Extension Service by specialists (Nichols &
Ikerd, 1975) who found that the same information could be
presented effectively and uniformly in a video format with
three-fourths less involvement of the specialists' time.
This venture was so innovative and successful in teaching

this subject matter that other states purchased the video-
tapes and the pupil and teaching guides.

In addition to subject matter presentations, adminis-
trative briefings are held once monthly via videotapes which
are mailed to the county units. During some of these presen-
tations, new state specialists are introduced to county
Extension workers, administrative guidelines are reviewed,
and special or new program emphases and other timely topics
for staff communication are sent to each of the county units.
It appears that staff communication has improved. County
personnel have been stimulated to ask for further informa-
tion and the dialogue between the administrative staff and
Extension personnel throughout the state has been increased.

In summary, the importance of producing and evaluating
a series of videotape programs in human development seemed
evident from several perspectives. Married couples were
seeking group participation and desired information in topic
areas contributing to marriage enrichment. There has been a
limited resource pool of leaders who have had the knowledge,
skill, and materials to teach groups of couples on a basis
that is economically compatible to the majority. Extension
agents with responsibility for teaching in the area of human
development have reported a need for resources to use with
groups of married couples and a need for training themselves.
The traditional training procedures have been expensive in
comparison to some proposed alternatives. Although subject

matter presentations by videotape are currently limited, those already studied have produced favorable results. Also, videotape receiving equipment is available in each county Extension unit in the state of North Carolina. Thus, it seemed that using a videotape learning package for teaching competence in interpersonal skills could be an efficient and effective mode of presentation for training agents and for providing resource materials for them to use in working with couples in their target communities. Additionally, it seemed important to evaluate alternative procedures to the traditional training methods used by the Agricultural Extension Service.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to design, implement, and evaluate videotape learning packages that would enable an individual or members of a group to understand better and to use more effectively some of the basic skills of inter-personal competence. Videotapes were utilized as a major teaching method within the learning package.

These videotape learning packages were designed specif-ically to meet needs of married couples. The overall theme "Becoming--You, Me, and Us" was utilized to give continuity to the areas in which interpersonal competence was needed. Since it is necessary to be able to deal with one's self before one can relate effectively with others, a basic tape dealing with self-understanding was developed as the first

of four tapes to be used in the learning package for married couples. The following topic areas were presented in four, thirty-minute tapes: (a) self-understanding, (b) communication, (c) consensus, and (d) commitment. A series of structured exercises and leader directions were prepared to accompany these tapes.

A basic assumption of the study was that change in marital functioning can be achieved by inducing an increase in the amount of process discussion (talking about the relationship) carried out by the couple. The conditions for the change relationship are described in the following paragraph and were components of the programs for the group meetings, both in the videotape learning packages and in content guidelines for the lecture/discussion groups that accompanied the viewing of the tapes.

The conditions conducive to change in the relationship that were highlighted in the videotape learning packages included the following aspects: (a) Awareness. Awareness by the partners of the phenomenon of giving conscious attention to oneself and the relationship; (b) Legitimization of discussion. Since cultural and interpersonal taboos exist against freely discussing the behavioral process phenomena of marriage (Mace & Mace, 1974a; Miles et al., 1974), it was necessary to increase the legitimacy of using the marital process as a content for discussions by the couples. Without such legitimization, Miles et al. (1974) suggested that

process discussion might not occur, even if the partner's awareness of process phenomena existed; (c) <u>Amount of discussion</u>. Presumably the more process discussion engaged in, the more opportunity for changes in perceptions and behavior in individuals in the partnership; (d) <u>Skills</u>. Sheer amount of process discussion may not be the key to improvement; however, skills in communicating (expressing feelings directly in an unthreatening way, listening, etc.) alone are not enough. Also essential are the process-changing skills (those communication skills) involved in working on an issue (Miller et al., 1972) or the abilities necessary to manage and make shifts such as decision-making, fighting fairly, and planning so that hoped-for outcomes may be reliably achieved (Miles et al., 1974).

These were the overall objectives of this study:

1. To develop the videotape learning packages to present subject matter in (a) self-understanding, (b) communication, (c) consensus, and (d) commitment.

2. To conduct a field experiment using the videotape learning packages in two types of leader training situations and for subsequent presentation to married couples in group settings.

3. To develop the procedures and guidelines for leaders' use of the videotaped materials with groups of married couples.

4. To evaluate statistically the changes in inter-
   personal skills that participants developed during
   group meetings in which the specially designed video-
   tapes were used as the teaching method, as compared
   with a control group (who received no treatment).

5. To evaluate the acceptance of videotapes by leaders
   and recipients as a resource and method of teaching.

6. To evaluate statistically the effectiveness of two
   delivery systems: (a) traditional leader training
   and (b) telephone conferences by specialists in com-
   bination with the same videotape learning packages
   disseminated by mail.

Statement of Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study were stated in the direc-
tion of the expected findings:

H_1 There will be no difference in the attitude toward
conducting personal enrichment groups in the human
relations area between (a) leaders who were trained
and received videotape learning packages in a tra-
ditional group workshop and (b) leaders who received
training instructions individually through special-
ist's telephone conferences and videotape learning
packages by mail.

H_2 There will be no differences in pretest-posttest
changes on instrument scores among (a) groups of
married couples who participate in group sessions

whose leaders were trained to use videotape learning packages in traditional group workshops and (b) groups whose leaders received training instructions individually through specialist's telephone conferences and videotape learning packages by mail.

H_3 There will be an increase in the change scores from pretest to posttest and a higher score on the posttest for individuals in both experimental groups combined as compared to the control group (no-treatment).

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to assure understanding of certain terms throughout this study. The dependent variables or operational definitions of the study are included in Chapter III.

Communication is viewed as a system of verbal and non-verbal interactions that not only convey information but at the same time affect the relationship of the communicants.

Commitment is the process couples experience in the integration of their goals.

Competence denotes capabilities for meeting and dealing with a changing world, to formulate ends and to implement them (Foote & Cottrell, 1955).

Consensus defines the harmony, cooperation, and empathy involved in unanimity regarding aspects of the marriage relationship.

Experiential learning defines a learning process in which
participants integrate knowledge, skills, and attitudes in
a learning situation characterized by a high level of per-
sonal involvement.

Interpersonal communication has as its principal goal
the coordination of human activity in regard to the devel-
opment, presentation, and validation of individual self-
concepts (Cushman & Florence, 1974).

Interpersonal competence implies the capability of
individuals to integrate their goals with those of others
and to collaborate in the realization of those goals and
includes the relationships between persons as they work toward
goals.

Marital growth is positive movement toward goals estab-
lished by a married couple (Swicegood, 1974).

Marriage is a relationship of one man to one woman which
is recognized by law and involves certain rights and duties
of both parties entering the union and to the children who
may result from the union (Swicegood, 1974).

Married couple is defined as the man and woman who are
married and currently living together.

Marriage enrichment defines a concept that encompasses
the process of growth and development and considers the
facilitation and/or training process which allows a couple
to promote growth and development toward their personal
goals, not by adding something, but by bringing into play
the existing but inoperative resources (Mace & Mace, 1974).

Process means how things are done; it acknowledges the affective (feeling) and action (behavioral) dimensions of reality and includes a time dimension--present time and immediate experience. Focus on the present experience is important because it is what can be changed, especially behaviorally (Miller, Corrales, & Wackman, 1975).

Process discussion describes the dialogue that occurs when a couple talks together about their relationship.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations of the study were acknowledged. The fact that the subjects agreed to participate in four sessions over a two-week period for two hours a session and that the subject matter was that which is not typically discussed among married couples in groups may mean that even in choosing to participate, the subjects represented an attitudinal set different from that found in the general population. The available pool of subjects was limited to those participants who responded to the typical recruitment procedures of the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service.

As is the case with many field experiments representativeness was a concern. Generalizations coming from this study were restricted to populations similar to that which formed the sample for the study. Other possible limitations to the study involved the relative unreliability of certain instruments of measurement and of obtaining comparable samples through the typical Extension recruitment procedures.

Considerable investment had already been made to secure
videotape receiving equipment in the North Carolina Agricul-
tural Extension Service county offices. Although this video
equipment provided an opportunity for utilization of the
videotape learning packages developed for this study, the
design of the tape delivery system was limited to the capa-
bilities of the existing equipment. Therefore, the tapes
were in black and white format, rather than in color, with a
reel-to-reel presentation rather than cassette. With the
prevalence of color TV receivers in so many homes, preferences
for color tapes may have created a negative acceptance of the
videotape presentations.

Communities within the two Extension districts were
not randomly assigned to participate in the two delivery sys-
tems. Extension agents within the districts work together
occasionally, sharing ideas and exchanging teaching materials;
therefore, it seemed wise to use counties in one entire dis-
trict as the location for the traditionally trained group of
leaders and a separate district for the group of leaders who
received instructions via telephone conferences with the
specialists and videotape learning packages by mail.

The location of the group meetings of married couples
within each county in the two districts was limited to the
North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service county office
buildings because the videotape receiving equipment was
housed there. This fact should not have been a critical
limitation since county agents frequently hold group meetings

in these locations; therefore, the spaces are arranged and
furnished appropriately for accommodating groups of varying
sizes.

The teacher appearing in the videotape programs was the
human development specialist in the North Carolina Agricul-
tural Extension Service. This person served as the video
leader because Extension was attempting to design and imple-
ment a mode of teaching that would extend the work of the
subject matter specialists. Others appearing in the video-
tape programs were resource couples selected by the Extension
specialists from the growth groups and the ACME (Association
of Couples for Marriage Enrichment) membership throughout the
state of North Carolina.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter II of this dissertation will present a review
of the literature used in the formulation of the design for
this study and the background for the content of the video-
tape learning packages, the experiential procedures, and
accompanying group meeting plans. The major focus for
Chapter III will be methodology and development of video-
tapes. This chapter will describe the design used for the
study; the selection of research areas, leaders, and group
participants; the instruments that were used to measure the
married couples' pre-post change scores on communication,
consensus, and commitment; group meeting plans; data collec-
tion procedures; and statistical procedures for testing the

three hypotheses of the study. Chapter IV presents the results and discussion of the data analysis. Chapter V summarizes the findings and presents conclusions and recommendations growing out of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review will include a theoretical view
of change in a relationship with emphasis on social learn-
ing and systems theories. The background information used
in developing the videotape learning packages is included
in discussions of marital communication, communication
training, marriage enrichment models, and program patterns.
A presentation of research on marriage enrichment programs
is followed by a discussion of some concepts for further
research in marriage enrichment: obstacles to group partic-
ipation, couple group process, program and leadership pat-
terns, marital growth and potential, therapeutic interaction
between couples, and the importance of the marital relation-
ship versus the parent-child relationship. The last part of
the review includes the effects of media presentations and
human relations training on behavior of participants, video
used in teaching, training, and feedback models, and the cost
of video training programs versus traditional face-to-face
training approaches. Additionally, training methods for the
acquisition of interpersonal skills are reviewed. Four
projects which used the videotape format for presenting con-
cerns in marriage and promoting marital growth will be
described.

Theoretical Discussion

Several theoretical bases have influenced those people who have developed programs in communication and marriage enrichment: family development theory (Hill & Rodgers, 1964), symbolic interactionism (Foote & Cottrell, 1955), modern systems (Buckley, 1967; Lederer & Jackson, 1968) and communication theories, social learning theory (Patterson, 1971), and humanistic psychology (Otto, 1976). This present study is based upon components of these several theories; however, only three will be discussed in this review.

Systems Theory

A family and even the marital dyad can be considered to be a complex system. Buckley (1967) defined a system as follows:

> A system is a complex of elements or components directly or indirectly related in a causal network such that each component is related to at least some other in a more or less stable way within any particular time period. (p. 41)

One characteristic of a system, then, is that its elements are interdependent. Any change in one element has an effect upon other elements. In terms of the marital dyad (and the family) this theory means that the elements or positions (husband-wife, wife-mother, husband-father, etc.) are interdependent to varying degrees.

Marriage can be viewed as a system which is the

> combination of the ever-changing qualities of the individuals involved. Just as the individuals are unique, so is the system they create. When they

> are each flexible, enlivened, sexual, and oriented,
> they will produce a system which includes those
> qualities plus interesting additional qualities
> which are products of each individual's own style
> of asserting those qualities. (Zinker & Leon,
> 1976, p. 145)

A couple's marriage is their own creation, open or closed

to their own modifications and to those of others. They may

like the system, be afraid of it, or be bored with it.

Still, the system is theirs to keep or to alter in any

desired combination.

Any change by one person will affect the other person

in the marital system. Because all elements of a marital

system are interdependent, resources that introduce ways

for couples to experiment with changing their system should

be designed for both members of the couple. One rationale

for viewing marriage as a system is that marriage is not a

collection of unrelated assumptions, behaviors, experiences,

failures, successes, and so forth. Rather, all the factors

and aspects of marriage are interlaced and mutually influ-

ential. According to Van Eck and Van Eck (1976), "marriage

needs to be experienced and reflected on holistically"

(p. 222). Assets in exploring the marriage relationship

holistically are the "ability to receive and utilize feed-

back and a willingness to engage in self-disclosure" (Van Eck

& Van Eck, 1976, p. 222).

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory provides explanation as to how

married couples, parents, and children go about the normal

process of learning from each other and thereby changing each other (Patterson, 1971). Much behavior which occurs in the couple relationship and in the family represents the outcome of what we have learned from other people. Social learning theory presents the belief that all behavior is a function of learning through social interaction. In this theory the term learning implies that gradual adaptations or changes in behavior are mechanical modifications of responses and learning is an intelligent and flexible process of coping with new experiences. The environment in social learning theory is the meaningful milieu as perceived and interpreted by the individual instead of the objective environment.

Human behavior can be explained by mediational processes between stimuli and responses. An individual recognizes a stimulus, mediates on it according to a base of past experiences, and then decides on a course of action. The resulting behavior is related to the individual's past experiences and is assumed to be goal directed. Two key processes from social learning theory indicate how learning occurs: (a) positive reinforcement and (b) social imitation. The effect of the reinforcing conditions is directly related to the value or meaning placed on a reinforcement; the greater the value, the greater the reinforcing effect on behavior. Social imitation is a process in which one person imitates the behavior of another person, including when to smile, what and how to communicate, and how to express affection (Carnes &

Laube, 1975). Aside from the nature and value of goals and reinforcements, the probable occurrence of a behavior is also determined by the individual's expectation that these reinforcements will come. The continuous interaction between the individual and his meaningful environment creates and modifies anticipation or expectancy.

Social learning theory maintains that even though personality is essentially stable new experiences can modify anticipation and behavior. This perceived control is important in the modification of behavior, and perhaps is the theoretical basis for the willingness of married couples to seek growth experiences in the hope of strengthening and enriching their relationships.

Humanistic Psychology

The humanistic psychology perspective is evidenced in the programs of the present study and in the marriage enrichment movement through centering attention on the worth of experiencing a person and his uniqueness (Otto, 1976). Sessions for enrichment purposes are dynamically designed so that participants experience direct learning interaction with spouses; each person individually relates directly to the other. Another emphasis is on the human qualities of choice, creativity, and self-realization. Central to the movement and to the programs which have resulted is the establishing of a supportive environment and structuring time for couples to talk about their values and issues related to their own situations.

Marital Communication and Marriage Enrichment

The development of skills in interpersonal competence through marriage enrichment has become part of a movement toward enriching marriages. Society now values a companionship-type marriage in which the achievement of personal and interpersonal growth and fulfillment are paramount (Mace, 1975). Programs are being promoted that focus on ways in which couples can develop relationships-in-depth through open communication. These emerging models attempt to help couples with the qualitative aspects of marriage as they strive to reach new demands and expectations placed on marriage. Guerney (1975) proposed that the

> degree of personal and interpersonal satisfaction
> one achieves in life, insofar as this stems from
> psychological factors, is dependent upon learned
> skills. Up to now for the most part, people have
> acquired these skills unsystematically, uncon-
> sciously, indirectly, and inadequately. (p. 1)

He believes that through programs designed to directly and systematically teach such life-skills, couples are attempting to improve marital communication and gain better interaction through the use of communication skills.

Marriage enrichment, devoid of precise scientific meaning, has been described by Mace and Mace (1975) as "the improvement of a relationship by the development of unappropriated inner resources" (p. 132). Terms which express this goal of marriage enrichment are "marital growth," "marital potential," and "marital health." Within this

"unappropriated resource" concept, the shift is toward the
preventive notion of "facilitating positive growth" rather
than through a remedial emphasis. Couples are encouraged
to talk about their strengths instead of easily dwelling on
problems. Recognition of couple and family strengths and

> methods for utilizing strengths for enrichment has
> been a new and enormously important development.
> The focus on strengths encourages educators and
> couples to enjoy the strengths couples already
> have, as well as to recognize their potential as
> a couple for continued growth and development.
> (Miller, Corrales, & Wackman, 1975, pp. 144-145)

Otto (1975), who surveyed marriage and family enrich-
ment programs in the United States and Canada, formed a
description of marriage enrichment programs based on the
program objectives he reviewed. The following quotation
can be considered a definition of marriage enrichment pro-
grams:

> The programs are not designed for people whose
> marriage is at a point of crisis, or who are
> seeking counseling help for marital problems.
> Marriage enrichment programs are generally con-
> cerned with enhancing the couple's communication,
> emotional life, or sexual relationship, fostering
> marriage strengths, and developing marriage poten-
> tial while maintaining a consistent and primary focus
> on the relationship of the couple. (p. 137)

Forces Fostering the Growth of the Marriage Enrichment Movement

Several factors are fostering the growth of marriage
and family enrichment programs. A trend toward in-depth
communication through marriage enrichment programs is indi-
cated, although the effectiveness and long-lasting results

of such programs have not been thoroughly evaluated. One factor is couched in philosophy, particularly naturalistic humanism, one aspect of which is concerned with "actualization of human happiness" (Lamont, 1971). There is increasing recognition by couples that marriage and family life as it exists can be improved and enriched.

A second idea is that the

ongoing momentum of the human potentialities movement is continuing to provide a climate in which group experiences . . . are not only a part of the social climate but are the "acceptable thing" to do. (Otto, 1976, p. 4)

A third force fostering the growth of the movement is focused on prevention. Emphasis in enrichment groups (Mace & Mace, 1972, 1974a, 1974b) and in much marriage counseling (Adams, 1973) tends to be shifting from the therapeutic approaches toward "good" marriages with a goal of helping couples strive for higher levels of interaction and collaboration as they seek to integrate their goals. Mace and Mace (1972) believe that the continuance of marriage will depend on couples being fulfilled through mutually rewarding in-depth experiences achieved via improvement in communication techniques. Included in this concept as the basis of enrichment and reaching potential is the idea of preventive maintenance for couples.

Sherwood and Scherer (1975) have developed a model of preventive maintenance for couples which shows how roles are established and changed between two people. Many problems

that surface between couples and family members arise because
of failure to clarify and/or agree on the expectations reg-
ulating role performance (Peterson, 1969). When couples have
skills in sharing their reactions to one another's behavior
and role performance, in talking about their feelings, and in
describing their relationship, change can be introduced in a
controlled and fairly systematic way. Disruptions are treated
as sources of new information from which the couple can
planfully renegotiate expectations of their relationship.

In addition, marital bonds for contemporary couples
are focusing on affectional areas rather than functional
areas (Farson, 1969). Today, couples are looking for more
in their marriages than "adjustment" and "compatibility"
(Travis & Travis, 1975). No longer are their goals primarily
economically based; the marriage focus is on "achieving
personal and interpersonal growth and fulfillment" (Mace &
Mace, 1972). Tofler's (1972) post-industrial, stress-
overloaded, bewildered, and isolated man may seek to over-
come his state by placing greater dependency on in-depth
relationships as a means of maintaining personal homeostasis
and increasing one's "copeability" to adapt to the future.
Travis and Travis (1975) stated:

> Over and over we see the committed couple in a state
> of despair and frustration because they are not grow-
> ing personally and/or interpersonally in their rela-
> tionship. We are concerned with this potential to
> grow "individually together" in the marriage. (p. 161)

Farson (1969) believes that the couple relationship provides a broad range of emotional expression that will become the rehabilitative agent or buffer against a very complex and demanding world. Achievement of these goals will depend on communication and interaction resulting from a knowledge of the techniques needed to achieve interpersonal competence.

Communication Training and the Husband-Wife Relationship

Evidence is frequently cited that the quality of the interpersonal relationship is associated with marital happiness (Gurin et al., 1960). Disclosure or communication of feelings has been found to correlate with general marital satisfaction and more highly with feelings of favorability toward specific objects of communication (Levinger & Senn, 1967). Kind (1975) found that communication satisfaction was highly related to marital satisfaction for most of the 86 couples in her study. In the Gruin et al. (1969) study individuals who reported happiness in marriage were more likely to concentrate on relationship sources of happiness, whereas the less happy concentrated on situational aspects. It was also reported that the more educated individuals tended to be happier, but they expressed more feelings of inadequacy than the less educated did. The variable of awareness of potential may have been operating here.

Levinger (1966) found that middle-class spouses were more concerned with emotional and psychological interaction; lower-class spouses found unstable physical actions and

financial problems of greater concern. This finding may explain the fact that middle-class people have been more receptive than have other groups to studying communication techniques in order to achieve relationships that support their interests in emotional and psychological interactions. Middle-class professionals have participated in marriage enrichment retreats to a greater extent than have other class and occupational groupings (Swicegood, 1974).

There is some evidence of a "positive relationship between affective involvement in marriage and happiness in marriage and between open communication and happiness in marriage" (Hicks & Platt, 1972, p. 562). If marital happiness is related to the quality of interpersonal relationships, then it seems evident that techniques should be available to those people who seek to enhance the skill with which they handle interpersonal relationships. Bauby (1973) explored the causes of misunderstanding and conflict between people who live intimately and determined as a prime cause the failure to communicate properly. Effective dialogue was demonstrated as a way to overcome interpersonal conflicts.

Self-disclosure, the voluntary opening of one's person to another, has been suggested as a facilitator of satisfaction in marriage. Freed's (1974) study indicated that couples can be taught to disclose themselves more fully to one another and that such disclosure is measurable. The eleven couples in the experimental group, which emphasized

the practice of self-disclosure, perceived themselves as
more open and honest and viewed themselves as more satis-
fied in their marriage relationship than they did before
participation in the eight-week experimental course.
Increased self-disclosure was correlated with greater objec-
tivity and the traits of gregariousness, expressiveness,
tolerance and self-discipline. Zieff (1971) found that
self-disclosure was positively correlated with marital adjust-
ment and negatively related to duration of marriage, giving
rise to a "progressive deterioration of communications"
hypothesis.

The quality of the marital dyad is related to family
development. It is believed that when there is strength in
the husband-wife relationship many problems of the family
are prevented or at least minimized. Conversely, when the
husband-wife relationship lacks cohesion, stability, and
growth, the resulting problems may be reflected in child
development and parent-child relationships (Satir, 1972).
The Maces (1974a) view the marriage relationship as the
prototype for all other adult relationships. They even go
so far as to say "As marriage goes so goes the nation."
Miller and Nunnally (1970) see the husband-wife relationship
as the most important relationship that a married couple has;
it is a relationship that is even more important than parent-
child or other relationships. O'Neill and O'Neill (1972a)
believe that it is in the interpersonal relations arena that

marriage and the family will have to find new meaning and gain greater strength. They contend that parents have to develop qualities of supportive love and caring responsibility and competencies in communication and problem solving in their own relationships before children can learn to value these things.

Rogers (1972) wrote that man has a fundamental craving for secure, close, communicative relationships with others and feels very much cut off, alone, and unfilled when such relationships do not exist. Satir (1972) identified communication as one of the four components of family life that are changeable and essential to a well-functioning family. Lederer and Jackson (1968) suggested that the central task of a couple is to learn to communicate so that they can continue to work on their relationship throughout their life together. Clinebell and Clinebell (1970) believe that many couples actively seek ways to strengthen their communication and thus make the "whole of life" more meaningful through "growth facilitating experiences."

Navran (1967), Collins (1971), and Rappaport (1971) studied the relationship between marital adjustment and effective communication. Happily married couples were found to have better verbal and nonverbal communication than unhappy couples had. It was also found that good verbal communication rather than nonverbal communication was more strongly associated with good marital adjustment.

Prior to the mid 1960's, very little research had been conducted about specific behaviors that could effectively facilitate communication in personal and relationship issues. Recently, a variety of sources have developed training programs for teaching some specific behaviors or skills which facilitate communication (Gordon, 1970; Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1975).

Miller, Nunnally, and Wackman (1973; 1975) stressed the importance of increasing communication skills in expanding a couple's ability to shape relationships as they choose, instead of by events or by others outside the relationship such as friends or professionals. They developed a communication program (1972; 1975) for couples to (a) increase awareness of oneself, one's communicative behavior, one's impact on others, and vice versa, (b) increase the individual's ability to exchange information with others, (c) introduce alternative communication styles, and (d) teach skills so that couples can communicate more effectively. The emphasis is not on problem solving, but on equipping couples with skills that may be used in maintaining and directing their marital relationship.

All communication is learned, so that "you can set about changing it, if you want to" (Satir, 1972). Carkhuff (1973) found that training in communication could significantly raise the level of interpersonal skill with spouses in a relatively brief time. These findings support the idea

that communication skills can be learned, but they do not consider how the setting affects a couple's success. A group situation (such as couple communication meetings or marriage enrichment retreats) which lends a supportive aspect to learning skills has been the typical setting. Clarke (1970) found that group sessions helped couples to become more skilled in a type of dialogue that is often a forgotten or unlearned interpersonal art. Bosco (1972) reported that this experience in a supportive atmosphere where other couples are undergoing the same experiences releases dynamic forces that lead to dramatic change in many marriages.

Marriage Enrichment Models

Although the programs currently being conducted are eclectic in nature and utilize varied techniques and diverse resources and materials, it is possible to range the programs on a continuum using the amount of structure as the main variable (Otto, 1976). With this paradigm three models for couples' marriage enrichment groups can be identified which have stimulated the basic format for a few marriage enrichment programs. Common standards among these models have not been outlined because experiences offered by the various programs are of three identifiable types (Mace & Mace, 1975b).

Private couple encounter. The earliest pattern of all the models was the Catholic marriage encounter model developed in Spain by Father Calvo in 1958 (Gallagher, 1974;

Mace & Mace, 1975b; Regula, 1975). This model was developed extensively through the Catholic Church under the title of Marriage Encounter and has been adapted by other religious denominations (Kligfeld, 1976; Mace & Mace, 1975b). The five leaders consist of a team of couples and a priest who, in a retreat situation, share their experiences, observations, and insights of married relationships. The purpose of the retreat is to provide the climate--the stimulus, the setting, and the support--in which husband and wife can "encounter" deeply and realistically themselves and each other. The model focuses on the couple and provides a private encounter experience (Genovese, 1975).

The Catholic pattern is distinctive from the others to be described because it makes no use of group interaction, except social and religious interaction, which can contribute support to the couples. The primary concern is to allow couples to experience genuine interpersonal communication with their spouses (Bosco, 1976; Regula, 1975).

In this model, the leaders must be willing to share their personal experiences of marital growth in talks which they give together. They must have had productive communication experiences of their own and must be able to present that experience effectively to the group. The action, however, is in the private intra-couple confrontation (Mace & Mace, 1975b). The vital exchanges are designed to take place exclusively between husband and wife in the couple's own

room. The program structure provides the opportunity to the couples who may ask questions and then involve themselves in the private encounter of sharing with their partner their personal responses. However, the way in which they use the opportunity is their own responsibility, and the group never knows what went on between them.

Structured experiential education. This model is the pattern which first emerged through the Marriage Communication Labs of the United Methodist Church. This model designed by Smith and Smith (1972; 1975) stresses teaching sessions, lectures and exercises, followed by free sharing and discussion. The group uses a manual which structures the program made up of exercises designed to challenge and facilitate communication. The leaders consist of two or more couples who share the responsibility for this series of teaching sessions in which content is provided and illustrated by organized experiences. There are also small group sessions for free sharing and discussion; however, the main emphasis is on the teaching sessions which require detailed preparation by the leaders. This pattern and the third model to be presented make extensive use of open interaction between the couples. This interaction is of two kinds--individual husband-wife dialogue and sharing between couples. Use may also be made of interaction within the total group between individuals.

In this model the leader couples, using a repertoire of educational materials (wall charts, audio-visual aids,

etc.), must be able to design and lead a structured learning experience. Additionally, the leaders conduct experiential exercises related to the teaching material (Mace & Mace, 1975b).

Several national and regional programs have been formed from the basic format of the structured model (Hayward, 1976; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1976; Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1975; Smith & Smith, 1976; Van Eck & Van Eck, 1976; Vander Harr & Vander Harr, 1976). Many of these programs emphasize areas of communication and skill development since marriage enrichment is heavily dependent on improved couple communication (Mace & Mace, 1975a). The ultimate purpose is to enrich a couple interaction through improved couple communication.

One program developed by Miller, Nunnally, and Wackman (1973 and 1975), called Couples Communication Programs (formerly Minnesota Couples Communication Program), focuses on the self-awareness, communication styles, and interaction patterns of the couple. Trained leaders have expertise in human development and interpersonal relationships.

The first two sessions of four two and one-half hour sessions center on the content of communication and present the self-awareness and shared meaning framework. Emphasis is on becoming aware of all of the different types of self-information that are available to share with a marital partner and on developing the ability to share that information

completely and accurately. Attention is also given to methods useful in determining the actual message received by the spouse in a communication sequence. Emphasis in the last two sessions is on flexibility in communications as four styles of communication are introduced and practiced. Techniques of working toward growing marital relationships through flexible communication patterns are developed.

Free couple group interaction. The third model, first developed in 1961 by Mace and Mace (1974a) for the Society of Friends (Quakers), differs from the others in that it has no prepared programs and uses a minimum of structure. However, it is similar to others in that groups meet for a weekend in a retreat setting for about 15 hours of interaction extended over five sessions.

The couples in the group decide what area of marriage they want to explore and make their own agenda. Therefore, the leaders must have skill in directing the group and assisting it to reach its own objectives. The leader couple act both as facilitators and participants. The main focus is kept on couple dialogue and interaction between partners and with couples in the group. With the development of trust and openness, couples can learn from feedback and try new kinds of behavior to enhance their relationship. Several components of the other models are incorporated in this model, but there is decidedly less structure and preplanning, since the program is built around the expressed needs of the participating couples.

In order to focus on the couples' needs, a "rolling" agenda is developed by the couples dealing in topics of interest to them. This type of agenda can be altered at any time the group desires, with items rearranged, added or deleted. Attention to various topics moves at the discretion of the group and their participating facilitators. Items on the agenda are dealt with through communication skill of dialoguing. When a couple dialogues, they turn and face each other with focused attention only on the partner and begin to talk or dialogue on their chosen topic. Other group members then become observers.

For this third model, leaders do not have to prepare a program and a minimum of structure is required. However, this format requires that the leaders have skill in directing groups and guiding members to establish their own objectives. One way of guiding this format is through sharing their own marital experiences, and if necessary making themselves vulnerable in order to encourage sharing among the couples. They must be able to dialogue and help other couples dialogue before the group. The intra-couple and inter-couple interaction must be followed closely and supportively (Mace & Mace, 1974b).

Other programs which utilize the format of the third model are available. The dialogue concept of this model forms the basis of an unstructured program by Zinker and Leon (1976) who focused on enriching the contact that can take place

between two persons through the Gestalt perspective of working with an emerging situation. The rationale of this program is that what is currently happening with a couple is a good indication of what has happened in the past and what may happen in the future unless awareness is brought to it. This awareness is surfaced through dialogue. Capers and Capers (1976) use the unstructured format with major transactional analysis concepts to teach communication in marriage enrichment programs.

Even though the three models are distinctly different, all of these methods are dynamic and not didactic. The Maces (1974b) clearly emphasize this point:

> A marriage enrichment retreat is not an occasion for lectures, or for discussions that are an exchange of views. Its objective is to bring about new experiences of openness and honesty between couples, so that new growth of relationship can begin. It is our conviction that this does not happen to a significant extent, as a result of information-giving processes. (p. 4)

Although the Maces do not use as structured a format as that presented by other models, they nevertheless view these activities as experiential rather than didactic. Thus, all models can contribute to the overall goals of marriage enrichment.

Program Patterns

Weekend retreats. The first and third of the three models described above typically take place in a retreat setting. Mace and Mace (1974b), who have always conducted

their program as a weekend retreat, define the word <u>retreat</u>
as

> a temporary withdrawal from the normal pressures
> and demands of life, in order to reflect, to gain
> new perspective, and to initiate new and better
> courses of action. (p. 1)

The Maces contend that this usage "describes very well what
should happen to the couple who take full advantage of what
a retreat experience has to offer" (p. 1).

The marriage enrichment retreat sessions(Mace & Mace,
1974; Swicegood, 1974) usually begin with the evening meal on
Friday and conclude with a noon meal on Sunday. This weekend
experience is scheduled into five sessions lasting approxi-
mately three hours each session. This format provides approx-
imately 15 hours for group interaction and couple encounter
in addition to some private encounter sessions for the
couples.

Two opposing ideas emerge from the weekend retreat plan
versus that of extended groups held at weekly intervals.
Mace and Mace (1974b) favor the weekend type of residential
retreat because "weekends are such convenient times for
couples to get away" and because they have observed that

> in more prolonged programs the factor of fatigue
> leads to diminishing effectiveness. On the other
> hand, shorter meetings may not allow full effec-
> tiveness of the cumulative experience to develop.
> (p. 3)

Groups meeting at weekly intervals have their own independent
values, such as an opportunity for couples to do "homework"
between sessions.

Weekly meetings. Groups of couples holding regular weekly meetings represent an attempt to provide something like the marriage enrichment weekend retreat experience with less cost and inconvenience, so as to make it available to a larger number of couples. These growth groups usually form with a nucleus of couples and are subsequently closed to newcomers. After a specified time period the growth groups stop meeting and participant couples, who wish to do so, become facilitators for new growth groups (Mace & Mace, 1974c).

Research on Marriage Enrichment Programs

Although the marriage enrichment movement has become popular and couples acclaim its benefit, very few research studies have evaluated the models. However, those few studies have reported some significant results among the variety of variables and program patterns studied. Overall, these variables deal with the concepts of skills in communication, interaction, and self-disclosure, personality types, program effectiveness, conflict negotiation, rate of relationship change, self and mate perceptions; self-esteem, consensus and commitment between spouses, and marital roles.

Programs Based on the Major Models

Wittrup (1973) developed a marriage enrichment group program and studied the question of whether couples can improve their marital relationships as a result of learning

certain skills, settling conflict, and setting goals. In

an analysis of pre and post interview material each couple

indicated a change in perception of the spouse. Significant

other people such as parents, friends, and children observed

the changed relationship and gave positive reactions to the

new roles and behaviors. Overall, the couples perceived the

program as contributing directly to their awareness and

changed relationship.

A marriage enrichment program in a retreat setting was

evaluated by Bruder (1972). Well-functioning couples who

wished to enhance their relationship participated in a weekend

experience of five sessions lasting approximately three hours

each. The program was comprised of exercises involving

(a) personal reflection on a marital question, (b) dialogue

with one's spouse, and (c) group discussion with other partic-

ipants. Couples were tested prior to treatment and again two

months later with questionnaires which measured marital com-

munication, marital adjustment, and relationship improvement.

Bruder found that greater gains were made by the experimental

group couples than by the control group couples who were

similarly tested and retested. Women gained more than men

on the marital adjustment scale and the relationship change

scale. Conclusions included recognition that there were

limitations with regard to random assignment of couples to

experimental and control groups and that low reliability

coefficients for the scale were evidence of lack of validity.

Nevertheless, the intent of the study was accomplished: to
search out problems, to eliminate them, and thereby improve
the program. The author concluded that certainly there was
enough evidence to warrant continued efforts along those
lines.

Nadeau (1972) investigated the effectiveness of a marital
enrichment group. The program involved 13 married couples
in a variety of communication exercises designed to help
focus on the positive qualities of their relationship, to
increase their awareness of feelings and sensitivity to their
marriage, and to improve the communication patterns between
them. Thirteen other couples comprised the control group
which was tested twice and which received the same ques-
tionnaires as the experimental group without participation
in any group experience. Instruments to measure marital
communication and roles and personality traits, interaction
testing, and an evaluation of group experience were used.
Results from the study suggested that participation in the
marital enrichment group increased nonverbal communication
skills, caused one's view of self, spouse, and marriage to be
more positive, and increased the effectiveness of inter-
action patterns between spouses. The follow-up testing two
months after group participation suggested that attitude
change may show less decay effect than behavior change brought
about through participation in the marital enrichment group.

Swicegood (1974) evaluated a marriage enrichment program
based on the Mace model. The 23 couples who were participants

in the experimental group attended retreats led by either
the Maces or facilitator couples who had been trained by the
Maces. The primary purpose of this study was to explore any
measurable change in consensus, communication, and/or commit-
ment between spouses that may have resulted from their partic-
ipation in a weekend marriage enrichment retreat. A pilot
group of 18 couples, who did not participate in any group
experience, served as a control group.

As a measure of consensus, individual couple members
ranked ten standards of family success. Responses of hus-
bands and wives from pre-inventory to post-inventory showed
that consensus between spouses in their ranking of selected
values did increase. A marital communication and agreement
test, used to assess participant couples' frequency of dis-
cussion and agreement on selected topics, showed significant
improvement between spouses in their ability to communicate
thoughts, feelings, and intentions with each other. Couples
also expressed increased commitment to their own marriage
after the retreat experience. Some expressed doubt in their
ability to help other couples.

Swicegood (1974) reported that increased skill in com-
munication was seen by participant couples as an aspect of
marriage needing most improvement. It was also the area of
concern into which they gained greater insight as a result
of the retreat experience. Some evidence of washout effect
of the retreat with time lapse was provided through anecdotal

records of interviews with six participant couples who had

attended a Mace retreat one and one-half years to two weeks

prior to the interview. Swicegood's (1974) conclusion is

that "it appears unlikely that a weekend experience could

meet the needs of participants to the depth desired or pos-

sible in all dimensions of their relationships" (p. 82).

Further reinforcement following participation in a marriage

enrichment retreat was a recognized need.

Travis and Travis (1975) designed the Pairing Enrichment

Program (PEP) for married couples who wish to enhance their

interpersonal relationship through a positive approach to

improving both social and sexual communication in marriage.

One goal encourages the establishment of

> authentic, open lines of communication with each
> other--to relate honesty with feeling and sensitiv-
> ity; the other encourages improving and sustaining
> an effective, meaningful sexual intimacy. (p. 162)

PEP is characteristically a structured experience with

sessions organized into discrete escalating steps toward

effective communication. It is couple-oriented within the

"group" sessions; all communication exercises and transac-

tions are experienced privately by each couple with an objec-

tive to open up new communication and feeling experiences

between the couple without emphasis on group problem-sharing.

The Travis team offers two versions of PEP. One version

is a weekend retreat with five three-hour sessions covering

effective social and sexual communication. These sessions

are separated by a three-hour period in which each couple

can privately follow the suggested intimate encounter exercises in their motel room. A printed three-week follow-up manual which contains summaries of the sessions and further suggestions for social and sexual communication exercises is provided for each couple. The second version is a three-week format: a maximum of six married couples meet with the leaders for six three-hour sessions. The basic difference is that the "intimate encounter exercises" are followed at home instead of in the retreat setting.

Evaluation procedures are an essential part of the pairing enrichment programs offered by Travis and Travis. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was used to measure changes in levels of self-actualization. The Love Scale (Swenson), marital Pre-Counseling Inventory (Stuart) and the Caring Relationship Inventory (Shostrom) were used to measure understanding, appreciation, and general level of marital health. Reporting their results to date, Travis and Travis note a definite trend toward greater "self and partner understanding, personal growth, interpersonal intimacy, warmth, appreciation, and development of the characteristics of the actualized marriage" (p. 165).

Stein (1975) designed a Marriage Diagnostic Laboratory (MARDILAB) which is a five-week series of weekly two-hour sessions for married couples concerned about their relationships, but who are not in counseling. Groups are limited to six couples. The main objectives are to provide an

opportunity for couples to explore options for growth and to find ways to improve areas of strain in their marriage. Stein's intent is "not to do any 'diagnosing' as much as to give couples the tools for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their relationships" (p. 170). These tools include questionnaires, role-play, communication exercises, movies, brief lectures, and discussion based on all of these techniques.

Concerns to the couples are dealt with through anonymously submitted questions. The two group leaders usually present take turns speaking to the questions and stimulating discussion. Stein noted how free and pointed the questions were, as well as how quickly they exposed the mutual concerns the couples shared.

> The obvious value was twofold: anonymity allowed depth and candidness without embarrassment, and the dialogic response of the leaders permitted a conversational rather than a lecture atmosphere. . . (p. 68)

and permitted the inclusion of didactic material.

Although Stein (1975) has not statistically assessed the sessions to date, the reported "subjective impression is that such an option for couples carries considerable preventive and positive potential for the strengthening of marriage" (p. 170).

Group Experiences with Specific Emphases

Even though several research studies have focused on some aspect of marriage enrichment, only the ones previously

described have dealt with programs based on the major models.
These additional studies involved some type of group exper-
ience with emphasis on these topics: conflict negotiation
skills, communication training, physical contact, transac-
tional analysis, and behavioral-exchange programs.

Pearson (1975) experimented with marriage enrichment
seminars (four weeks with two hours each session) in which
participants were introduced to transactional analysis from
a Christian perspective. A marital communication inventory
was given at the beginning and end of the seminars. Scores
were compared on each individual to determine that TA had
aided in better communications between couple members.
Capers and Capers (1976) also used transactional analysis
as a technique for helping couples learn to communicate in
marriage enrichment programs. However, data were not
reported to demonstrate effectiveness.

Through a growth group-experience for married couples,
Weinstein (1975) studied the differential change in self-
actualization and self-concept and its effect on marital
interaction. The growth group-experience, an educational
seminar strategy committed to facilitating development of an
individual's potential, was offered to an experimental group
of 80 couples (executives in a national company). Results
from the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) showed a sig-
nificant gain in self-actualization. Results on the Inter-
personal Checklist (ICL) showed significant overall change

in both perceived self and ideal self. For husbands only,
the significant change was in the ideal self, which became
more aggressive and competitive and at the same time more
affectionate; for wives only, a significant change was in
the perceived self.

Gruber (1974) studied 40 married couples who volun-
tarily sought to improve their marital relationships by
participating in a six-month Conjugal Relationship Enhance-
ment program. It was hypothesized that gains in marital
adjustment and marital communication could be predicted on
the basis of positive self-concept, self-dissatisfaction,
and psychological adjustment through employing residual gain
scores on self-concept tests and marital adjustment and com-
munication inventories as a means of assessing improvement.
The results failed to establish a significant relationship
between the predictor variables of self-concept and adjust-
ment and the criterion variables of gains in marital adjust-
ment and communication. However, relationships were noted
between gain in marital adjustment and communication.

Neville (1972) concluded that goals and procedures used
in marital enrichment groups were more familiar and compli-
mentary to some personality types than to others. He found
that volunteer participants in marital enrichment groups
were predominantly intuitive-feeling type personalities
whereas those with the sensing-thinking personality combina-
tion were least in number. The "intuitive-feeling-perceptive"

personalities were comfortable with the marriage enrichment
format because it was in basic agreement with their life-
style. Even though the "sensing-thinking-judging" types
may have felt uncomfortable with some of the procedures, they
responded well to the treatment.

Programs Related to Communication

Enrichment programs considering variables related to
communication have been designed for engaged couples, married
couples, and family groupings as well (Benson, Berger, &
Mease, 1975). Miller (1971), one author of the Minnesota
Couples Communication Program, studied engaged couples' self-
disclosure and style of interaction. With the 17 experi-
mental couples there was not a significant increase in self-
disclosure; however, systemic work style increased signifi-
cantly. Nunnally (1971), who assessed the impact of the
same communication program on interaction awareness and
empathic accuracy of engaged couples, suggested that couples
who volunteered for such training were more aware of dissat-
isfactions in their relationships than were couples who did
not volunteer. The experimental group couples increased
significantly with respect to interaction awareness.

Using the same program and a similar research design as
Miller (1971), Campbell (1974) studied the self-disclosure
and communication effectiveness of married couples in the
child-rearing years--a time when communication often tends
to focus on topics outside the dyadic relationship. The

purpose of the study was to determine whether the couples communication program could affect the couples' dyadic interaction. Results showed differences in favor of the experimental group in communication effectiveness and in "work" patterns.

Larsen (1974) also studied married couples who had experienced the Minnesota Couples Communication Program for changes in marital communication and in self and mate perceptions. Persons who scored high on a pretest marital communication inventory did not change their scores on the posttest; however, persons whose pretest scores were low increased over 20 points on the posttest. For those couples who changed, there was a tendency to work towards a companion-type marriage.

A two-month intensive Conjugal Relationship Modification program (Rappaport, 1971) designed to enhance marital communication was used with 20 married couples who indicated, on self-report measures, significant improvement in their marital relationships. Improvement was defined as the perceived enhancement of marital adjustment, marital satisfaction, marital communication, trust, intimacy, and the ability to successfully resolve relationship problems. Behavioral scales, in addition to the self-report measures, indicated improvement in participants' speaking and listening abilities: husbands were significantly better listeners than their wives were.

Collins (1971) further evaluated the Conjugal Relation-
ship Modification program to determine if it would lead to
improvement in husbands' and wives' perception of their mar-
ital adjustment and communication relative to the couples
who received no training. Although the 29 couples improved
in communication and perceived greater improvement in marital
adjustment, the improvement over the control couples was not
statistically significant.

Orling (1976) evaluated a Proactive Marital Communica-
tion Training (PMCT) model, the goal of which was to improve
the marriage relationship by providing training in effective
communication. Proactive marriage counseling was defined as
a system which attempts to improve the marital relationship
and communication between partners before divisive problems
occur. The proactive model was proposed in contrast to the
frequently used systems which tend to be reactive in orienta-
tion and which intervene to remove negative influences from
the relationship only after problems in marriage become
severe.

The Proactive Marital Communication Training program
was presented to the experimental group in five weekly one
and one-half hour sessions. The critical behaviors of this
group were compared to those of a no-training contrast group
and the research indicated that PMCT was effective in improv-
ing marital adjustment (measured by the Locke Marital Adjust-
ment Test) in the experimental group. Additionally, there

was improvement in self-perception, especially for the wives, and some improvement in understanding. The researcher suggested that such a plan is efficient for use in schools, churches, community agencies, and by professional counselors before any disruptive conflicts impede communication.

The Behavioral-Exchange Program (popularly known as the Marital Bargaining Program) was presented in Harrell's (1975) study as a new model for marital enrichment and/or counseling designed to teach groups of couples cooperative negotiation skills for managing marital conflicts. The program was developed from literature in social exchange, conflict management, and operant behavior principles. The approach focused on skill training in a nine-step negotiation process which included these aspects: (a) listening carefully, (b) locating an issue, (c) identifying contributions to the issue, (d) generating alternative solutions, (e) evaluating alternatives, (f) making an exchange, and (g) renegotiation of the exchange. This structured program was conducted in small groups with supervised homework exercises.

Harrell (1975) hypothesized that the experimental group (N=30) relative to the control group (N=30) would demonstrate significant improvement in four areas: marital conflict negotiation skills, marital satisfaction, rate of relationship change, and verbal interaction style. Analyses reported no significant results on marital satisfaction, relationship change, or positive verbal behavior; however,

negative verbal behavior showed significant results. Over-
all, significant results were reported for marital conflict
negotiation skills; therefore, it was concluded that the
Behavioral-Exchange Program was a useful approach for teach-
ing conflict negotiation skills. Alternative explanations
offered for lack of significant results on marital satis-
faction and relationship change included these difficulties:
(a) the skills did not generalize to the overall marital rela-
tionship, (b) there was insufficient time for couples to
apply the skills in day-to-day interaction, (c) there was a
non-romantic, rationalistic philosophy inherent in the pro-
gram, and (d) overt reciprocity (as taught) is not conducive
to enhancing marital satisfaction as a perceived altruistic
form of reciprocity.

A Word of Caution

Although the recent research and program developments
reported herein have identified concepts, principles, and
skills which can be used to improve marital relationships,
these advances in themselves are not a panacea. Miller,
Corrales, and Wackman (1975) noted this caution by explain-
ing that, even though "these advances are truly significant
because communication is a central process in marital rela-
tionships," there is warning about the "fallacy of oversim-
plifying this complicated process" with the insistence that
"communication should be clear, straightforward, open,
direct, in a word, total" (p. 150). Much more than open

verbalness is involved in communication: "communication

involves not only behaviors (what is said and how), but also

a spirit, i.e., the intentions behind the message" (p. 150).

Miller et al. (1975) further emphasized that

> principles and skills should be provided only on
> a voluntary basis to assist couples in becoming
> more aware and in charge of their own unique
> marital adventure. Attempts to teach couples
> communication principles and skills, without a
> conjoint contract to do so may prove to be
> contra-developmental. (p. 150)

Finally, Miller et al. pointed out that research in thera-

peutic contexts has provided most of the skills which are

taught to "enhance effectiveness in marital communication."

The researchers' awareness of the danger in application of

insights learned primarily from pathological relationships

to the developing relationships was followed by the idea

that "what is needed is research of 'enriched' couples from

various social strata to discover more about the ingredi-

ents of enriched marriages" (p. 150).

This need for understanding factors operating in

enriched marriages and the design of previously mentioned

studies raises questions concerning the level of research,

measurement, and definition of constructs which are necessary

to do such research with short-term personal growth groups.

Group structures used in enrichment programs, regardless of

type, duration, or measurements used, do not produce such

obvious changes in the participants that superficial measure-

ments will reflect those changes. O'Dell and Seiler (1975)

stated:

> Research in personal growth groups is a complex
> undertaking, and considerable further basic re-
> search seems necessary to determine what types
> of treatments are effective in producing changes
> in the participants with varying characteristics.
> (p. 269)

Concepts for Research in Marriage Enrichment

Judgments of the effectiveness of marriage enrichment

programs are largely subjective because of the relative new-

ness of the movement. More about the variables operating

in enriched marriages needs to be investigated, and the

subjective judgments need to be evaluated through some

objective measurement. From these needs, concepts for future

research have been identified (Mace, 1975), and ways to

investigate these are being explored (Smith & Keister,

1975).

Obstacles to participation. Although many couples want

to focus on their relationship, they find difficulty partic-

ipating in programs for this purpose because of the "inter-

marital taboo" which restrains them from "acknowledging

their need for help, and communicating their need to others"

(Mace, 1975, p. 171). There are two primary causes. One is

the widespread belief in our culture--myth of naturalism--

that neither skills nor insights are required for success

in marriage, and that by needing help one declares incom-

petence and inadequacy. The other cause is privatism which

prevents couples from seeking counseling help before it is

too late; thus the way toward preventive intervention is

blocked.

Couple group process. Theory in group process has been
founded on groups of individuals, but a new paradigm is
required for groups of married pairs because these are
groups of subgroups, pre-existing and ongoing social units.
Interrelationships--person-to-person, intra-couple, inter-
couple, and leader-group--in such groups are different from
interactions among individuals with no previous subgroup
attachment.

Program patterns (Smith & Keister, 1975). Marriage
enrichment programs have ranged from weekend retreats to the
growth groups meeting weekly within a specified time period.
The format has also varied from instructional couple encoun-
ters to structured programs of facilitative exercises.
Evaluation of the merit of the various patterns would guide
future developments.

Leadership patterns. A variety of leadership patterns
as well as roles of leadership are in use--married couple,
individual, and unrelated woman-man team. The leader(s)
may be in authority positions (therapist-type) or full par-
ticipants as when married couple facilitators function as
full members of the group. The quality of leadership abil-
ities is varied also. Effective leadership could be defined
from studies of the "effect of leadership style--facilitation,
teacher, surrogate parent, or therapist--on group process and
development of relationships of the marital pair . . ." (Smith
& Keister, 1975, p. 9).

Marital growth and potential. Unlike the areas of per-
sonality and family development, the concept of marital
potential has not been the subject of research in the past.
Heretofore, the concept of a successful marriage stressed
stability and permanence. Recently concepts of satisfaction
based on the "quality of the relationship and potential for
the individuals because of the marriage" (Smith & Keister,
1975) have been proposed as better measures of satisfaction.
Exploring such concepts as growth, involvement, and quality
as forms of measurement would add to a needed base of objec-
tive evaluations.

Therapeutic interaction between couples. Traditionally,
therapeutic intervention has been by a counseling therapist
with one or both couple members. Interaction between couples
has been proposed as being both educational and therapeutic
because of four mechanisms: (a) reassurance when couples
share openly with each other, (b) identification when couples
find others who are involved in same or similar adjustment
processes, (c) modeling when couples see another couple
resolve a difficulty similar to the one with which they are
struggling, and (d) support as couples develop friendships
with other couples out of shared married enrichment exper-
iences. Mace (1975) believes that "services to families
could be usefully supported and augmented" by the use of
non-professional couples working under professional super-
vision. However, these areas are yet to be researched.

The love-anger cycle. Typical, but inappropriate,
patterns of dealing with anger are purported to be sup-
pression and venting. Mace (1975) believes that a more
effective approach is that of teaching couples the techniques
of acknowledging, renouncing, and resolving their anger. He
sees this process as vital to development of marriage enrich-
ment programs.

The marital relationship as more important than the
parent-child relationship (Smith & Keister, 1975). The pre-
ventive approach to serving families may need to shift from
"parent-child relationships as the important factor in devel-
opment of the child" (Smith & Keister, 1975) to a "deter-
mined focus on marriage as a nuclear relationship which
determines family quality" (Mace, 1975). In much of the
literature on parent-child relationships,

> the investigators speculate that the husband-wife
> relationship was probably influential in the devel-
> opment of the child's personality and abilities,
> but little or no data were collected to support
> this possibility. (Smith & Keister, 1975)

Finding the influence of the husband-wife relationship would
strengthen the case and thus the potential for marriage
enrichment programs.

Media Presentations

Studies with audio-visual means of communication have
been devoted to highly instrumental tasks such as group
problem-solving, information transmission devices for train-
ing or therapeutic purposes to bring about changes in empathy,

and collaborative skills (Miles et al., 1974). Even some evidence is available that self-directed groups can use audio stimulus exercises for self-analytic activity conducted by group members without a professional leader. Members of these groups have achieved significant gains in self-esteem by following the taped directions for "experiential" exercises (Berzon, Reisel, & Davis, 1969; Miles et al., 1974).

The effects of human relations training on participants were reviewed by Miles et al. (1974) who reported that participants in human relations training demonstrated significant changes in interpersonal sensitivity. A majority of evidence suggested that "people who participate in experiences aimed at improving their interpersonal skills, do, to a larger extent, experience such changes" (Miles et al., 1974, p. 10). Among the variables Miles et al. reported were that positive changes have been found as a result of laboratory training on openness, receptivity, tolerance of differences, skill in operation of interpersonal relationships, and understanding of self and others. Thus, it should be reasonable to expect that participation in human relations events has positive effects on participants' ability to effectively deal with each other in interpersonal situations.

The Effects of Media Presentations on Behavior

Both radio and television have been found to affect the amount of information a person gains, the creation of images and tastes, and the level of attention a person will

pay to something (Klapper, 1968; Pool, 1963). Generally,
it seems that information transmitted via mass media guides
existing behavior, rather than starting new behaviors.
These minimal effects may be the result of the media's
"one-way" character, which may promote either passivity or
resistance in the viewer (Miles, 1974). A "two-step" theory
of influence through communication proposes that the behav-
ioral influence of media occurs sequentially: "changes
induced in a viewer are extended, mediated, stabilized,
and diffused through his interaction with significant oth-
ers, such as family, or friends" (Katz, 1975; Klapper, 1968;
Miles, 1974, p. 8). Pool (1963) argues that:

> Changes in skills and attitudes are less apt to
> be brought about by the mass media operating alone
> . . . . Often a face-to-face relation with a
> human being toward whom the learner has consid-
> erable cathexis is essential for producing changes
> in those variables. Finally, we return to actions,
> changes in which . . . are almost always checked
> with reference persons before an individual embarks
> upon them. (pp. 251-252)

Based on the above reports the present study proposes
the "two-step" process. The exercises for increasing compe-
tence in interpersonal skills presented on the videotapes
will be followed by interaction between the viewing couples.
As suggested by Miles (1974), "the couple's _interaction_,
rather than the program's 'message' itself," will provide
the basis for behavioral and relationship changes.

Video Used in Teaching, Training, and Feedback Models

Research studies with the use of videotapes are notably
few because of the relatively recent appearance of videotape

equipment on the instructional scene; however, some are
available. Only a very few studies have dealt with human
relations training presented through a video media format.
However, these few efforts to date have been large-scale
projects and have focused on couple interaction.

Cable television programs designed to promote growth
in marital happiness. Miles, Fisch, Pollock, and Tichy (1974),
affiliates of the Center for Policy Research, New York,
designed a cable television program to promote growth in
marital happiness. The study, supported by a grant from the
National Institute of Mental Health, was aimed at adapting
laboratory human relations learning technology for purposes
of marriage enhancement and using the medium of television.
A six-program series, The Subject Is Marriage, was broadcast
four times to cable TV audiences in New York City. The auth-
ors had successfully pilot-tested the programs for absence
of risk to viewing couples. The programs dealt with topics
including communication, affiliative sharing, decision-
making, conflict management, and planning. All programs
provided opportunity for active couple participation in dis-
cussion and analysis of their own marital processes. Most
couples watched the programs in their homes but a few watched
in small groups and carried out post-program discussion. A
telephone support service that offered help for emotional
upsets was available but was never used by viewer couples.

The theoretical basis underlying the study was that:

a marital intervention which increased a couple's self-analytic behavior would enable them to alter specific marital processes (such as conflict management), would induce altered activity patterns, and would increase satisfaction both with particular marital processes and the marriage in general. (Miles et al., 1974, p. 14)

Data for 32 viewing couples and 40 control couples were collected on program processes and outcomes via a one-hour pre-post questionnaire from husbands and wives, a weekly questionnaire assessing learning processes, and a semi-structured interview. An analysis of 72 indicators from these domains showed significant changes in each domain as predicted. These measures were made two to six weeks after the broadcasts. The effects were somewhat stronger for husbands on variables including openness, ease in process-analytic discussion, and productive conflict management. Positive change on outcome measures was reported for 35-55% of experimental couples over a base rate of about 20% of control couples, who did not watch programs but completed pre- and post-instruments. Assessment of questionnaire, interview, and telephone call-in data did not disclose any instance of emotional upset occurring as a result of the program broadcasts. Thus, Miles et al. concluded that "for a fully-informed, self-selected population, with telephone support available, the programs as designed are efficacious" (p. 2).

The proportion of couples interested in the Miles et al. cable TV programs was approximately 20% of those who were

made aware of it; of those, about 2-5% actually decided to take part. These participation rates were for mass audiences. When strong institutional sponsorship (the Catholic Archdiocese of New York) was present to aid in recruiting couples and supporting the broadcasts, participation rates were approximately forty times higher.

Although further causal analysis is needed, the model of intervention developed by Miles et al. appears to be cost effective: "clear changes in variables as 'ultimate' as over-all marital satisfaction and happiness were achieved by an intervention lasting less than six hours" (p. 3). It was further concluded that if institutionally-supported means can be found for facilitating couples' use of programs of this type, rather than depending on mass broadcasts to an atomized audience, it appears that there is a considerable potential for expansion of delivery of educational, counseling and supportive services by agencies concerned with the improvement of marital functioning.

Television programs for understanding common concerns in marriage. Pitzer, Meyers, Anderson, Christianson, Gunsalus, and Tybring (1975), family life and human development specialists with the Cooperative State Extension Services of five midwestern states (Minnesota, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin), cooperated to produce a television series, Living Married, and a Viewer's Guide designed for use only when accompanying the 12 half-hour television units.

These states received partial support from a grant from USDA, Extension Service. This series of color TV programs is intended to help persons, especially committed premarrieds and early marrieds, better understand some of the common concerns and processes in marriage.

Pitzer et al. based the series on the premise that if marriage is to be a vital, satisfying, growth-producing experience, a great deal of determination, commitment, time, energy, and skill must be expended. By offering a variety of views on the nature and meaning of marriage and by providing information on marital interaction, the authors hoped that viewers might be helped to gain the perspectives and understanding necessary to develop their own design for their life together.

The series entitled Living Married features twelve programs, each with a different title and focus: Program 1, The Many Meanings: What is perceived, believed, expected, hoped, feared and wanted of marriage; Program 2, In A Time of Change: Changes in marriage and society, forces affecting marriage, and myths and facts about marriage and divorce; Program 3, Two Selves Together: The place of importance of individual identity, self-worth, and personal growth in marriage; Program 4, Designing Our Own Style: Marital "life styles," goal-setting, developing a "design" for marriage; Program 5, I Am Woman, I Am Man: Sex roles, role-making, flexibility, power, authority, and division of labor

in and outside the home; Program 6, <u>Hard Spots, Little Things</u>:
A look at some difficult areas of adjustment and at "tremen-
dous trifles;" Program 7, <u>Disagreeing Agreeably</u>: Anger and
conflict in marriage--constructive and destructive; Pro-
gram 8, <u>We Cannot Not Communicate</u>: Communication in mar-
riage--verbal and nonverbal; Program 9, <u>Have I Given You a</u>
<u>Valentine Lately?</u>: Marital satisfaction through the marriage
career, the typical processes of disenchantment and disen-
gagement, "vitalizing" the relationship through marital
interaction and new experiences; Program 10, <u>The Place of</u>
<u>Sex</u>: Some common concerns of young people regarding sex in
marriage, the importance of sexual competence; Program 11,
<u>The Art of Intimacy</u>: Focuses on the ability to give and
accept love and to establish and maintain an intimate and
mutually trusting relationship; and Program 12, <u>The Choice</u>
<u>Is Ours</u>: Decision-making in marriage--issues and process.

The series began being broadcast in early 1975 over
educational television in some of the producer states. The
intention was to make it available to Extension homemaker
groups, church groups, high schools, colleges, men's and
women's civic organizations, public social service agencies,
and other nonprofit groups and organizations. The authors of
the series suggested that married couples at home may view
the programs with their spouses and discuss the program, by
following the viewers' guide and focusing the discussion
upon "How it makes me feel." Suggestions also included

several married couples viewing the programs together in a group, discussing them first with their spouse and then with their friends within the group, and referring again to materials in the viewers' guide for stimulating discussion.

Couples communication skills through a television instructional sequence. The Nebraska Educational Television Council for Higher Education (1975) produced four half-hour color video programs to teach communication skills to couples. A married couple, instructors trained by the Couples Communication Program (previously described in this review), outline and demonstrate some of the techniques which couples can use in an effort to communicate effectively. The leaders work with four other couples who have been trained in communication skills to demonstrate self-awareness, shared awareness, perceived meaning, styles of communication, and structuring intentions. The couples build patterns of communication with a focus on the "I count/I count you" concept. The leader couple suggest that "when each partner counts and values the feelings and intentions of the other, the opportunity for personal and collective growth is enhanced" (p. 2).

Videotape delivery system for family counselor education. Van Horn (1974) produced a 29-unit videotape program for use by county Extension personnel in training nutrition aides in the Expanded Nutrition Education Program of the Pennsylvania State University Cooperative Extension Service. These aides typically work with individual families in teaching nutritional information; however, oftentimes they present other

subject matter such as the content of the series being
described: skills involved in interpersonal communication
within a family setting and understanding young children's
behavior, needs, and desires. The subjects (nutrition aides)
in the study were from rural and urban areas. Because random
selection of project counties was not possible, subjects in
comparison and control groups were matched to the extent pos-
sible according to age, race, experience, and educational
characteristics with those subjects in the experimental
group.

Evaluation included a subject matter and performance
ability posttest to measure knowledge on content of the pre-
sentations for all three groups. The subject matter test
was a short questionnaire given at the end of each series,
whereas the performance ability test included several open-
ended videotaped role-playing situations to evaluate the
aides' functioning ability in the training areas. The aides'
responses to the role-playing situations were videotape
recorded and then rated by three independent raters.

In examining the comparison between the controls or
untrained subjects and the experimental and comparison or
trained subjects, Van Horn found that there was a highly sig-
nificant difference in subject matter scores. Therefore, it
can be concluded that the training, whether through the video-
tape or live presentation, did contribute significantly to
the subject-matter knowledge as well as performance ability
of the nutrition aides.

When the writer considered that the present study would be conducted in rural areas, it became important to associate another finding from the Van Horn study. The rural counties scored significantly higher than the urban counties on the subject-matter evaluation. Rural performance ability scores were also higher than the urban scores, although this finding was not significant at the .05 level. It can, therefore, be concluded from the Van Horn project that rural counties respond very positively to the video method of presentation. Additionally, Van Horn emphasized the "practical" significance of the research in that it was research in a naturalistic setting with a training program to improve performance and subject-matter knowledge of people performing a service within a community.

Video programs for adult learning. Trent and Dierking (1975) conducted a study to determine how much information on teen-age nutrition could be acquired by mothers of teen-agers during a specific 30-minute informal learning experience. Half of the mothers viewed a videotape of a presentation on teen-age nutrition while the other half viewed a live presentation on the same topic presented by the same person who prepared the videotape. Posttests, which included an attitude scale, were given to both groups at the conclusion of the presentations. A re-test to determine retention was mailed to each study participant one month after the meeting date.

Trent and Dierking found no significant difference in the amount of information that could be recalled immediately by study participants when the information was presented live and by videotape. Members in the group which saw the live presentation were able to recall 53% more specific information than they had on the pretest, and those in the video group recalled 55% more. Trent and Dierking concluded that if interest in a topic is high, a particular population such as theirs could gain just as much knowledge through a videotape presentation as through a face-to-face situation.

Although there were no group differences in terms of immediate recall, the difference was significant between the amount of education information retained after 30 days and the method of presentation. Those participants viewing the presentation live were able to recall significantly more information than those who viewed the videotape presentation. There were, however, strong positive attitudes toward the videotape presentation which may be explained by the novelty of the technique.

Trent and Dierking offered an explanatory hypothesis for the fact that the group participating in the face-to-face situation was able to recall significantly more information after 30 days, but they stated that the finding was open to many interpretations. They suggested that perhaps during the period following the learning experiences mothers who saw the live presentation thought more about the facts presented, whereas those who viewed the videotape thought more

about the method of presentation. If their hypothesis is correct, the difference in recall should be minimized after the "novelty" of the videotape technique wears off.

Video feedback models in interpersonal relationships. A longitudinal project directed by Kagan (1975) began with the use of a feedback videotape model. Through Kagan's initial efforts, he observed that stimulated recall by means of videotape could enable people to understand themselves better, to recognize their impact on others and to realize the impact of others on them, and could allow people an opportunity to try out new interpersonal modes of relating and responding. Kagan tapped the apparent potency of videotape playback and designed the Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) system for reviewing a videotape with a person trained in recall so that the neophyte could learn interpersonal developmental tasks.

The IPR methods were used for interpersonal relationships education with professionals and paraprofessionals (Dendy, 1972) in the medical (Jason, Kagan, Werner, Elstein, & Thomas, 1971), teaching, social (Heiserman, 1972) and mental health areas. Clients received the training as an adjunct to their regular counseling or therapy. Rye (1969) conducted one of several studies using Interpersonal Process Recall and concluded that group sessions with video-recall at the beginning of a practicum helped counselor trainees respond more affectively to clients. Also, those students who had participated in the small groups using interpersonal interaction

process were more successful in their counseling practicum than were students not receiving these experiences as measured by the supervisors' evaluations. Additionally, Archer (1972) and Archer and Kagan (1973) successfully used the IPR system with undergraduate paraprofessionals who trained other undergraduates to have more effective interpersonal skills. The interpersonal process recall system was more effective when used by paraprofessionals than a more traditional encounter-developmental model was.

In order to extend the methods to a larger audience than Kagan and his colleagues had reached through consultation and yet maintain the integrity of the system, they "packaged" the process in a series of videotapes. Thus, the eventual product involved the use of video to teach groups how to use video feedback in learning interpersonal competence skills. The program was not intended to be self-instructional, but rather the films and accompanying manual provide the necessary aids so that the full IPR program can be implemented by an instructor.

The series developed by Kagan consists of several units, approximately six hours in length and requires 30 to 60 hours of a student's time. The films provide demonstrations and theoretical concepts and instruct the viewers in a sequential series of exercises designed to help them improve interviewing skills or human interaction competencies.

Two additional researchers used a videotape feedback model in studies. Gustafson (1975) evaluated a relationship

skills training program called Enriching Intimacy (EI).
This behavioral presentation included modeling, immediate
video feedback, and short practice interviews in teaching
specific behavioral components of empathy, respect-warmth,
and genuineness. Participants (freshmen medical students)
in the EI program were compared with those in a traditional
experiential-didactic (E-D) program and with those in a con-
trol group on rating assessments of videotape segments. On
the judges' videotape ratings the EI group showed a signifi-
cant increase in respect-warmth in contrast to the control
group, and the E-D group showed a significant increase on
empathy in contrast to the control group. Elbert (1970)
found that the use of videotape feedback in sensitivity
training was effective in producing changes in some areas
of self-concept (self-criticism subset) and self-actualization
(inner directed subset), but not for interpersonal relations.
His findings implied that visual feedback was a significant
factor in producing change in sensitivity training.

Price (1975) used a videotape feedback presentation for
teaching 20 experimental mothers about adaptive attitudes
toward maternal-infant feeding interactions and the develop-
ment of reciprocity within the relationship. Mothers who
viewed themselves in interaction with their firstborn infants
responded in a more reciprocal manner to the infant than
mothers did in the control group. Experimental mothers
showed a positive and significant correlation between

adaptive attitudes and change in the direction of greater reciprocity.

Cost of Video Training Programs Versus Traditional Training Methods

A conclusion in the Van Horn (1974) study having relevance to the present study concerned the cost of the live face-to-face training program by an Extension specialist versus the cost of the video training program offered in the county by home economists. Van Horn trained 191 individuals through the videotape training method, totaling 3,598 unit hours of instruction at $3.34 per instruction hour of training or $33.40 for the 10-hour program series based on the costs of initial production. This cost, of course, would decrease as the videotape training programs were repeated. In comparison, the cost of conducting a 10-hour, live, face-to-face training program by an Extension specialist would range from approximately $61 to $190 or $6.10 to $19 per instructional hour, excluding participants' expenses. Springer (1976) found that an Extension video cassette teaching method had the highest mean post score, the greatest amount of change from the pretest mean score, and lowest cost per person of the five methods tested. Telenet ranked as the most expensive ($8.12 per person) with the specialists' method a reasonably close second ($7.16). Following in order were the County Agent ($2.38), Self Study ($2.14), and Video Cassette Methods ($1.99). From these figures, it can be

concluded that the videotape method is much less expensive than the live face-to-face method of training.

Training Methods and the Acquisition of Interpersonal Skills

Several studies have investigated the effectiveness of various training approaches for the acquisition of inter-personal skills. Training has been accomplished through videotape presentations, structured-experiential programs, and programmed instructional format at differing levels of significance.

Structured experiential-type format. Structured exper-iential-type programs have been compared with the encounter group models for their effectiveness in facilitating changes in interpersonal communication skills. Shilling (1971) found a systematic didactic-experiential training mode to be super-ior to an encounter group model (T-group experience) in facil-itating communication skills for lay helpers in training for a neighborhood service project. In overall improvement Heck (1969) found both a T-group and a structured exper-iential program to be effective in the development of com-munication skills.

Hoover (1975) studied three treatment groups to test the efficacy of experiential learning techniques: (1) a cogni-tive experience group reading and discussing materials related to empathic interpersonal communication, (2) a role-playing (direct experience) group, and (3) a group observing the role-playing group (vicarious experience). The major

hypothesis of the study was that the role-playing (direct experience) and observation (vicarious experience) groups would demonstrate more improvement in empathic interpersonal communication verbalizations, skill levels, and attitudes than would the cognitive experience and control groups. Although the findings did not support this hypothesis, the general pattern of results did point to two general conclusions. The cognitive experience group tended to be inferior on performance criteria to all other groups, including the direct experience role-playing group. The study suggested the relative merits of vicarious/observational methodologies. Learning approaches, such as vicarious learning, which foster a high level of involvement on at least two of the learning dimensions—cognitive, affective, or behavioral—appear to facilitate the acquisition of empathic interpersonal communication skills.

Programmed instructional format. This technique lends importance to the interpersonal competence area because it is a method for approximating a goal through a series of clearly defined small steps. Programmed materials have been effectively used to teach communication skills to student nurses (Norod, 1971), to improve empathic understanding among junior high school students (Seamons, 1972), to improve the ability to understand and communicate empathetically for educators, school administrators, and counselor trainees (Magnus, 1973), and to teach verbal communication techniques

to marital pairs (Cassidy, 1973). Hickman (1970) used the programmed approach and a counseling format to modify attitudinal sets of marital partners toward their mates. Successful guided performance in teaching interpersonal skills through the written format has been a predecessor to guided performance through a videotape format.

Videotape presentations. Video methods of teaching behavioral skills in communication to a wide variety of populations, from children to psychiatric patients to counselors (Ivey, 1974), and studies dealing with teacher trainees (Rafael & Marinoff, 1973) and married couples have been researched. Nonverbal communications of emotions have been presented through the videotape with the most accurate reception being through the facial-vocal mode as opposed to the other modes of facially, vocally, gesturally, and gestural-vocally (Gotts, 1972).

Narrow (1972) developed a unit of instruction based on a combination of observational learning and small-group self-instruction to teach basic communication skills in nursing. Learning was increased with the number of films seen and with the use of a study guide which provided practice in responding to verbal stimuli in addition to the observed film interactions. The subjects attempted to reproduce the behavior of a role-model when the interaction was seen as beneficial to the participants and to the observer; thus, it was concluded that observational learning in

conjunction with small-group self-instruction was an effective and efficient method. These results are supportive of Walter's (1975) results which clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of videotape training, especially videotaped model groups which performed significantly better than did those groups receiving only video training without models. The addition of videotape feedback to the video modeling resulted in a significant but relatively small incremental performance improvement in group problem solving.

Bergner (1974) developed and evaluated a training videotape for the resolution of marital conflict. The tape employed (a) the use of plays of marital conflict performed by actors, (b) the provision of commentary about how the participants were going wrong in the plays in their attempt to resolve their differences, and (c) the use of multiple-choice questions posed to the viewing audience in order to promote active learning. Data indicated that couples who viewed the marital conflict videotape subsequently exhibited substantive behavior change in conflict resolution as indicated through behavioral observations of couples in actual conflict. Through self-report procedures, the couples reported significant changes in the direction of more amicable and constructive resolutions of their everyday disagreements. Control couples, in comparison, exhibited no such changes.

Andes (1975) used videotape and small group feedback to help couples improve their communications in conflict resolution. Another study (Van Zoost, 1973) supported these ideas

that modeling from video training is effective. Dating cou-
ples increased communication skills through practice and
observation of behavior in themselves (video feedback) and
others (video modeling).

Viewing a videotape model perform and receiving verbal
information via film seems to be an effective way to learn.
Whalen (1969) increased interpersonal openness in group
setting with a film model plus detailed exhortative and
descriptive instructions. Wilett (1974) compared video
modeling (group viewed videotape of discussion among four
experienced group leaders) with instructions (reading, ques-
tions and answers) and reinforcement (light signals contin-
gent upon effective communication). He found modeling
effective for perceptual as opposed to behavioral change.
Wall and Boyd (1971) compared the videotaped method of pre-
senting information that resulted in attitude change with
oral and written presentations, and concluded that the
videotapes offer more control when they deal with verbal
information. Meadows (1974) found videotape modeling to be
significantly effective in increasing the total number of
self-disclosure responses given by subjects in a simulated
counseling interview. However, in contrast, Croft (1969)
found that a live presentation elicited significantly more
attitude change than a taped presentation did. Also, Spring
(1974) failed to support modeling conditions as being any
more effective than instructions alone in an attempt to

mediate change in family interaction patterns. Canino-Stolberg (1976) found that tapes presenting physical and verbal exercises related to touching behavior were most effective in inducing positive change when the instruction was accompanied by a modeling experience.

A type of modeling experience coupled with an opportunity to practice writing responses to simulated interpersonal relationships significantly facilitated subjects' general communication skills in a study by Appenfeldt (1974). Simulated interpersonal relationships presented through a videotape were accompanied by a program that provided practice in responding. This combination benefited the subject more than listening to an audio-visual presentation of the same content did. This finding suggests that the subject's response to simulated interpersonal relationships is heightened if he is experientially involved. Shepell (1975) encouraged counselor trainees to reflect feelings through a modeling format.

Appenfeldt's conclusions are supported by another study (Hilkey, 1976) in which the experimental groups were exposed to a thirty-minute videotape of a simulated group counseling session followed by actual practice of group counseling behaviors. These pretraining procedures facilitated clients' entry into group counseling and resulted in significantly better counseling behaviors for the initial session.

Group size. Group size, although not a training method, is an important factor to consider in the selection and use

of any technique. This factor has been studied in relation to the acquisition of interpersonal communication skills. Collingwood (1971) considered the differential effects of large and small group training and retraining on the long term retention of facilitative communication to find that training significantly improved all subjects' interpersonal functioning levels regardless of whether training had been in large or small groups. Additionally, subjects in all size groups significantly dropped from their posttraining peak ratings over the follow-up period with retraining having the effect of increasing the subjects' functioning commensurate with their posttraining peak levels. In a previous study Collingwood (1969) had demonstrated gains in subjects' functioning levels through use of large group training methods to teach communication at higher levels of relevant interpersonal dimensions.

Despite the success of some researchers who facilitate interpersonal communication skills in large groups, the majority favor small groups with 12 to 20 participants (Miller, 1971). Length of the training has also been studied with short-term programs being successful as compared to programs meeting for several weeks. Generally, six, eight, and twelve-hour designs have been found effective (Downing, 1971; Kind, 1968; Miller et al., 1972).

Conclusions

When the variety of approaches, the popularity of
programs, and the prevalency of subjective reports of its
benefit are considered, it seems that the marriage enrichment
movement has been effective. However, few research studies
have attempted to evaluate the programs and to determine
what types of treatment are effective in producing changes,
particularly in the areas of interpersonal competence as it
relates to marital communication, consensus and commitment.
The studies through the marriage enrichment perspective have
been limited not only in number but also in the diversity of
the samples. Generally, the participants in marriage enrich-
ment programs have represented a narrowly defined population
of middle-class professionals.

Although the existing programs, definable into three
major models, are eclectic in nature utilizing varied tech-
niques and diverse resources, the videotape medium has not
been used in these programs by groups of couples meeting
together with a focus on marriage enrichment. The videotape
medium, however, has been used in teaching teen-age nutrition
to a group of mothers and for training nutrition aides who
work for the Agricultural Extension Service. Two additional
exceptions have used the television medium. One project
tested a series of cable television programs designed to pro-
mote growth in marital happiness. Individual couples viewed
a six-program series privately. Another project designed

twelve television programs concerned with common concerns in marriage. A manual was available as a guide for couples that wished to discuss the programs in relation to their own marriages. The use of these programs on a group basis has not been tested.

Videotape presentations for teaching behavioral skills in communication to a wide variety of populations have been demonstrated effectively as have video modeling experiences. However, among all the studies to date, none have focused primarily on the interactions of married couples in their marital relationships.

CHAPTER III

METHODS OF PROCEDURE

A comparison of two methods of training Extension home economics agents was made to determine if both methods were equally as acceptable by the agents and as effective in teaching the subject matter. This study included the development, group use, and evaluation of four videotape learning packages designed to promote growth in interpersonal competence. These materials were used in group meetings of married couples in two Extension districts of North Carolina.

Design

The basic research plan for this field experimental study was a pretest-posttest-control group design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). This research took place in a realistic situation in which the independent variables were manipulated under as carefully controlled conditions as the situation would permit (Kerlinger, 1973). As in most field experiments there was little or no way of controlling extraneous variables which may have operated during the two weeks from the inception of pretesting through the completion of posttesting. In spite of its limitations, the field experiment was well suited to the social and educational problem of interest in this study.

The research design for this study (see Table 1) included two experimental groups and a control or contrast group (no treatment group). The treatment methods were the two delivery systems for training the agent-leaders (see Table 2). County home economics agents were trained as leaders for the couples' groups through two delivery systems: (a) a traditional training workshop led by an Extension specialist in which the videotape learning packages were used and (b) a combination of self-training and individual telephone conferences with the specialist after mail delivery of the videotape learning packages. Using specified recruitment procedures agents in the selected districts secured couples for the experimental and control groups. Couples in both experimental and control groups received the pre-post inventories, but the control couples did not participate in the group meetings.

The following demographic and other relevant data were used in the analysis: age of the couple members, educational level, sex, number of years married, number of times married, number of children, other members of the household, occupation, prior acquaintance and participation with marriage enrichment-type groups, and frequency of attendance at functions sponsored by the Agricultural Extension Service. The effectiveness of the training methods was measured on these dependent variables: scores on measures of (a) communication, (b) consensus, (c) commitment to the marital relationship,

Table 1

Design of Field Experiment: Method of Presentation

| TRAINING METHOD | PRESENTATION METHOD | NUMBER | | FOUR GROUP MEETINGS |
		Initial Participants	Completed All Sessions	
A Traditional Workshop Training for Agent-Leaders (One district with 11 counties)	Three agent-leaders used videotape learning packages in teaching groups (three counties)	26 couples N=52	10 couples* N=20	Four group meetings,** each two hours in length. Videotapes, experiential techniques and discussion
B Mailing/ Telephone Conference Training for Agent-Leaders (One district with 16 counties)	Seven agent-leaders used videotape learning packages in teaching groups (seven counties)	66 couples N=132	29 couples* N=58	Four group meetings,** each two hours in length. Videotapes, experiential techniques and discussion
C Control Group (Couples from both districts)		17 couples N=34	11 couples* N=22	No group meetings **

* Preinventory (including demographic data)
** Postinventory

Table 2

Design of Field Experiment: Agent-Leader Training

TRAINING METHOD	PRESENTATION OF RESOURCE MATERIALS	NUMBER AGENT-LEADERS	GROUP MEETINGS	EVALUATION
A Traditional Workshop Training for Agent-Leaders	Introductory letter; one-day training session in central location in the district; human development specialist presented the videotape learning packages and program procedures to agent-leaders.	N=11	Agent-leaders conducted four group meetings with no more than 10 couples.	Agent evaluation of the resource materials
B Mailing/Telephone Conferences for Agent-Leaders	Introductory letter; human development specialist held telephone conference I with agent-leader to explain the project and mailing of videotape learning packages, and arranged another telephone conference to be held after receipt of materials. Telephone conference II scheduled for 30 minutes. Specialist used guidelines for both calls.	N=16	Agent-leaders conducted four group meetings with no more than 10 couples	Agent evaluation of the resource materials and training method

and (d) knowledge or awareness of concepts about marriage. The acceptance of the training methods was measured by an evaluation by the agents themselves.

Participants in Experimental and Control Groups

Eleven county agents, one in each of 11 counties in one Extension district, were trained to use videotape learning packages in a traditional one-day group workshop (Experimental Group A). Sixteen additional county agents, one in each of 16 counties in an adjacent Extension district, received training instructions individually through specialist's telephone conferences and received the videotape learning packages and instructions by mail (Experimental Group B) (see Tables 1 and 2).

Agents in the 27 counties planned group meetings for married couples following the recruitment strategies outlined in the procedures manual for agents (see Appendix E). In 10 of the counties, agents were successful in organizing classes. They each used the videotape learning packages with couple groups during four two-hour sessions for a total of eight hours of treatment. An optimal group size of six to eight married couples (no more than 10 couples) for each of the experimental groups was suggested in the program procedures manual. However, no group had more than six couples participating in the series of classes.

Several more couples than actually attended the sessions had been recruited in each county. Some of these couples

attended the first session, but they were unable to complete the series (see Table 1). Ten groups of couples, one in each of 10 counties in the two Extension districts comprised the two experimental groups--three counties in group A and seven counties in group B. The total number of subjects included 78 (39 couples) in the two experimental groups and 22 (11 couples) in the control group. The number of particiants who completed the series of four meetings ranged from four to 16 subjects over the 10 groups. The control group included 11 couples from both districts. Those people who responded to recruitment procedures or were contacted by the agents, but who could not attend the sessions at the scheduled time, were asked to participate by taking the pre-post inventories. When this procedure was used to secure the control couples, the subjects in this group were comparable to those who participated in the experimental group meetings. Control couples were asked to complete the pre-post inventories with the same amount of intervening time as between the pre-post inventories for the experimental groups. Envelopes prepared for mailing were included with the inventories so that control couples sent them directly to the researcher upon completion.

The 100 participants, 50 married couples, who participated in the study were largely middle-class individuals ranging in age from early twenties to late fifties and early sixties with varying years of marriage represented. One member of the couple (and often both members) had completed

more than a high school education and some members had com-
pleted graduate degrees. One experimental group included
10 couples (N=20) from one district (group A) and the other
experimental group included 29 couples (N=58) from another
district (group B) (see Table 1). The control group
included 11 couples (N=22) from the two districts.

Recruitment of Participants

Recruitment procedures emphasized that the programs were
for couples who viewed their marriages as stable, healthy
relationships and that none should be in therapy or counseling
situations. A part of the couples' agreement to attend the
sessions was that they view these programs as enrichment and
personal growth experiences.

Since entire Extension districts were assigned to each
treatment method, and since agents were not matched, no
attempts were made to match groups of couples. Couple groups
formed as they do typically for Extension activities. The
policy of the Extension service is to include those persons
who desire services and who volunteer to participate in
the various activities and learning experiences which are
offered.

The recruitment strategies were those typically used
by the Extension Service to inform their clientele of programs
to be presented. Sample announcements about group meetings,
topics, and leader were provided for each agent in the manual
of procedures (see Appendix E, Recruitment Procedures). The

announcements included a letter to send to the contact lead-
ers in all communities within the counties that had Extension
homemaker organizations, a news release to appear in the news-
papers which served the counties included in the study, and
a radio spot announcement. Contact information for inter-
ested participants was included in each form of publicity.
In addition to the above, the general strategy for recruiting
participants included getting community leaders to speak to
others about the programs and asking signed-up participants
to name friends who might be interested in attending the
series. The agent then followed up this lead with a call or
letter.

Agents in the participating counties publicized the group
meetings using the forms of publicity most appropriate to
their community situations. After couples signed up for the
series, a reservation confirmation card was mailed to each
couple. The card acknowledged their reservation for the
series and listed the dates, time, and meeting place.

Leaders for Couples' Group Meetings

Since the two treatment methods were randomly assigned
to the two districts and since all the agents who were respon-
sible for the human development subject-matter areas in both
of these districts were included in the study, specific match-
ing and assignment to training groups were not used. The
assumption was that agents throughout each district are
qualified to work in the subject-matter areas for which they

are responsible. They are accustomed to receiving resources from specialists and using these materials in their community work.

Procedure for Training Leaders (Agents)

All of the 27 agents in the two districts selected for the field experiment received letters from their respective district agents and the Extension specialist in human development introducing the videotape series, inviting them to participate, and explaining the type of training they were to receive (see Appendix A, Letters A and B). The 11 Extension agents in the district selected to receive training in the traditional one-day workshop session (Experimental Group A) received a travel authorization along with the announcement about the day, time, and place for the training program. The 16 Extension agents in the district selected to receive training through the telephone/mail procedure (Experimental Group B) received an introductory letter comparable to the traditional training group. This letter included a note that they would receive a personal phone call from the specialist within two weeks.

Training for both groups was conducted one month prior to the beginning of the first group meeting with married couples; however, in the initial contact to the present project, all agents were told the anticipated time schedule and were asked to reserve a block of time for the training session and for conducting the group meetings. It was not necessary

to train county agents in the use of video equipment since
they already had skill in using it.

Traditional training workshop procedure (Group A). The
traditional training workshop session was conducted by the
human development specialist with the Agricultural Extension
Service. A location in the district as central as possible
to the participating counties was chosen as the site for the
traditional workshop session. One day was planned for this
activity, a typical procedure used in Extension.

As a control to insure that all leaders received the
same subject-matter content, the specialist used the guide-
lines in the learning packages and presented the same direc-
tions and concepts included for agents who received materials
via mail and telephone conferences. The specialist presented
the program procedures manual (see Appendix E) and previewed
the four videotapes. Agents reviewed supplementary materials
for couples during the "tape-off" times as specified in the
manual. Instructions were given for conducting group meet-
ings and agents were told they would receive packets of pre-
post inventories and a letter about administering the research
instruments (see Appendix C, Directions to Agents). They
were free to ask questions and discuss concerns with the
specialist.

Telephone/mail training procedure (Group B). The tele-
phone/mail group received training through self-instruction,
an on-site preview of the tapes, review of the manual, and

an individual telephone conference with the specialist.
After the agents in group B had received the initial letter
announcing the project, the human development specialist made
a telephone call to each of the 16 agents in the district.
Guidelines for structuring these calls had been established;
therefore, the same procedure was followed for all of these
calls (see Appendix B). The specialist invited the agents
to participate in the project, explained how they were to
receive the videotape learning packages through the mail,
and arranged further telephone conferences for a convenient
time after agents would have received and reviewed the
resources. The agent/leaders were given instructions for
conducting the group meetings and were told they would
receive packets of pre-post inventories. These packets
included the same letter (see Appendix C, Directions to
Agents) as agents in Group A received with their packets.

During the second telephone training call agents were
free to ask questions and discuss concerns with the special-
ist. Any sections in the manual, the videotapes, and the
supplementary resources not clear to the agent after the
individual preview were brought up for discussion. The tel-
ephone guidelines provided space for the specialist to record
any areas of concern surfacing during this telephone con-
ference.

Development of Videotape Programs

When the videotaped programs and accompanying materials used in this study were created one guideline was that of making experience-based learning available to the couples through a new medium. Overall subject matter was presented through a variety of teaching methods with modeling as a major technique. Couples viewed other couples in the situations being portrayed and then had an opportunity, as the planned guidelines were followed, to be personally involved in structured experiential learning exercises.

All programs and exercises were geared toward facilitating the couples' interpersonal skills (communication) and growth toward states of consensus and commitment to their relationships. Attention was given to minimizing the risk of having couples raise feelings and issues which could prove disruptive and unmanageable in a group setting during a short term.

Another crucial criterion followed in the development of the tapes was a focus on the developmental sequences of the programs. It was important to have the videotape programs build on each other, and yet at the same time be sufficiently self-contained so that couples could grasp the ideas and experience certain exercises within one meeting period. Because all elements of a marital system are interdependent, resources that introduce ways for couples to experiment with changing their system should be designed for both

members of the couple. Therefore, programs were designed on the assumption that both husband and wife would be present at every session.

Preparation for Implementation

The present researcher, in consultation with the Extension human development specialist, a district agent, and two university consultants in family relations took responsibility for deciding on the content of the programs and the level at which it was to be presented. This group prepared the scripts and located the actor couples. Technical aspects of videotaping--design of presentation and sets, the development of illustrative materials, the operation of the camera, the editing and processing of the videotape--was handled by personnel in the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service Audio-Visual and Art and Exhibits Departments. Views of the producer regarding technical aspects, the best medium for presentation, and the appropriate personalities for video teaching were respected. He was responsible for helping the specialist, who appeared on the videotape, develop the art of performing for one person or a few couples as the subject-matter content was presented and the model couples, who were to illustrate various content points, were introduced (Rich & Luckey, 1970).

Assumptions and Description of Videotape Programs

The assumptions of the programs and videotape learning packages were that they were designed (a) for "normal" married couples, rather than for those needing therapy sessions, (b) as a preventive to problems instead of being remedial in nature, (c) as a structured-experiential program and not totally an academic approach, (d) as a means for developing an awareness of communication skills, and (e) to enrich a couple's potentiality for interaction rather than focusing on confrontation.

The core of the videotape learning packages was beamed toward specific needs of married couples. An overall theme "Becoming--You, Me, and Us" was utilized to give continuity to the other tape areas in interpersonal competence: self-understanding, communication, consensus, and commitment. The use of the term Becoming was intended to symbolize a growth process and an enrichment endeavor.

Throughout the four videotapes and accompanying couple exercises, emphasis was on couple interaction and on responses to an individual's actions that reinforce or alter one's self-concept. A basic concept for the series in which subject-matter ideas were presented was cognitive empathy, a knowledge of human behavior that allows one to be aware of others' feelings and behavior in building more positive relationships.

Program 1--Self-Understanding

The design of the videotape on self-understanding was based on the belief that a positive self-concept results in a more satisfying and productive way of life. This tape included the following concepts: personal capability and worth, the uniqueness of an individual, realistic expectations for self and others, and personal responsibility for one's feelings and actions. Couples completed a self inventory as one means to self-understanding. A major focus was on better self-understanding as a first step in understanding other people (particularly one's spouse) and their feelings.

Program 2--Communication Skills

The second videotape presented communication and the competent use of some basic skills that enable people to communicate in a direct, clear, specific and open manner. Couples used the technique of dialoguing to share feelings about situations familiar to married couples and to illustrate the rules in communication. After the dialogue, actor couples discussed how they checked with each other to be sure they heard what was actually meant and how to speak for oneself from a feeling level.

Program 3--Couple Consensus

The videotape on consensus was built on the focuses of the first two tapes and presented the notion that consensus is agreement on basic values, goals, and behaviors, in a flexible developmental relationship so that there is not

constant battling and nagging between the couple members.
Couples separately viewed their relationship and then tried
reaching consensus through an analysis of their differences.
A model for creative compromise was presented to show married
couples how to accept the differences or the individuality of
their spouses without losing their sense of personal worth
and self-respect. This model and the actor couples' dialogues
illustrated resolving conflict through an alteration of a
problem situation. Actor couples showed the rules for fight-
ing fairly prior to the time when viewing couples were to
practice the process.

Program 4--Commitment to the Relationship

The last videotape focused on how one actor couple
analyzed their marriage, how they altered their situation
through creative compromise, and how each contributed to the
"climate" of their marriage as they committed themselves to
a change. The viewing couples then focused on their own
marriages as they considered questions about the things in
their marriage that pleased them, things that could be bet-
ter, and things each would be committed to doing in an effort
to improve their marriage. The actor couples and the couples
in the viewing audience examined their marriage in relation
to a marriage climate chart. Emphasis was on commitment to
making life a dynamic growth process in which relationships
are not static.

Group Meeting Conditions

A few logistical limitations determined the group meeting situations. Group meetings in all counties were held in the county Agricultural Extension Service office building. The meeting rooms within this facility were determined by the location of the video equipment. In the event this equipment was located in an auditorium, the agents were urged to place it in a room more suitable for small groups. Directions for arranging portable chairs to insure optimal viewing of the TV monitor were included in the guidelines. There were additional suggestions included for moving into comfortable chairs in circular groupings for the discussion and experiential phases of the program during times when the videotapes were not being viewed.

Agents were advised that no more than 10 couples (or an optimal number of six to eight couples) should be enrolled for the sessions since this is a maximum number for good group dynamics and the ceiling reported in the marriage enrichment literature. The range of couples attending any series was from two to eight (or four to sixteen individuals). Leaders knew the names of the expected participants prior to the meeting time since couples had responded to a recruitment strategy and had received a confirmation.

The Research Instruments

The instrument for assessing the acceptance of the two training methods was an evaluation by the agents (see Appendix D). This instrument included sixteen items designed to

measure the agents' attitudes toward conducting personal enrichment groups in the human relations area. Six of these items were administered to the agents as a preinventory before the training sessions and were included again in the evaluation which agents completed after the last group meeting. Agents responded on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Ten additional open-end items were designed to obtain agents' opinions about these areas: (a) comments group members offered about the videotapes, (b) adequacy of video examples in preparing couples to apply skills to their own situation, (c) rating the use of video resources as a method of teaching, (d) suggestions of subject matter that could be taught effectively utilizing the videotape learning package method, (e) effectiveness of various recruitment procedures, and (f) general reactions to the procedures manual--detail, divisions, most useful sections, and improvement or omission of sections.

The overall research instrument for assessing the effectiveness of the two training methods was a self-administered pre-post inventory, consisting of the following parts: (a) a face sheet explaining directions for completing the questionnaire and for recording demographic and other relevant data, (b) a measure of couple communication, (c) a measure of marital consensus, (d) questions to ascertain a couple's commitment to the relationship, and (e) items to ascertain awareness (perceptions) or knowledge of concepts

presented in the videotape learning packages (see Appendix C).
The instruments were pretested with five couples who were
representative of the expected population. Total adminis-
tration time averaged 20 minutes. Both the preinventory and
postinventory were completed independently by each spouse.
Couple responses were identified by a pre-assigned number.
A description of each part of the instrument will be pre-
sented in the remainder of this section.

These instruments were intended to answer the following
overall research questions: (a) Will there be differences
in pre-posttest changes on instrument scores from measures
of communication, consensus, commitment to the relationship,
and awareness of concepts between couples who participate in
group sessions and those who do not participate? (b) Will
there be any differences on these scores for couples whose
leaders were trained in traditional group workshops and
couples whose leaders received training instructions indi-
vidually through specialist's telephone conferences after
having received videotape learning packages by mail?

Couple Communication

The Interpersonal Communication Inventory (ICI) (Bien-
venu, 1970, 1971; Bienvenu & Stewart, 1976) was used as the
index of communication (see Appendix C, Section III). Par-
ticipants responded to the 40-item inventory by checking one
of three possible categories--"Yes," "Sometimes," and "No"--
which are scored from zero to three. The higher score is

given the favorable response indicative of good interpersonal communication. The possible range of scores to be earned is from 0 to 120: the higher the total score, the higher the level of interpersonal communication.

Bienvenu (1974) reported that the ICI was "useful as an objective measure of success or failure in interpersonal communication," and as a "tool for measuring gains in enhancing skills" (1974, p. 2). Originally, 50 items were formulated from a review of the literature, Bienvenu's experience with his related communication scales, and from his counseling experience. To test face validity, Bienvenu presented items to numerous sociologists, psychologists, and others in the human relations field whose consensus indicated that the items were relevant to interpersonal communication. Several groups of undergraduate and graduate students reviewed the items to make sure they were understandable.

The ICI was administered to 316 subjects (in 1970) ranging in age from 17 to 64 with a median age of 28.0 years, and a range of education from high school through graduate school (median, 15.5 school years completed). Bienvenu described the group as predominantly Protestant in religious orientation from upper-lower and middle-class backgrounds. A quartile comparison, using the chi-square test, was used in an item analysis to determine that 50 of the 54 items significantly discriminated between upper and lower quartiles ($p < .01$) of the inventory. A similar study (Bienvenu,

1971) with 241 subjects resulted in the current 40-item version. These items were administered as pre-and post-measures to 300 students in a college interpersonal communication class, norms were established, and a significant difference in interpersonal communication was found in favor of the posttest (using the Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test).

Further validation of the ICI was reported on 55 students who completed the inventory before an interpersonal communications course and again at the close of the class three months later. A highly significant difference in interpersonal communication was found in favor of the post-test. The mean at the beginning was 83.44 as compared to 93.49 at the end of the semester.

Bienvenu (1974) made two reliability studies in 1973 with the present 40-item inventory. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to derive split-half reliability revealed a coefficient of .87 after correction. Data were gathered on a sample of 130 college students. With the same formula Bienvenu made a test-retest study of the same subjects within a three-week period and revealed a .86 coefficient of reliability for this inventory.

Bienvenu and Stewart (1976) completed a principal components analysis. Bartlett's Test of Residuals revealed 11 significant factors. Both Varimax and Promax rotations were carried out on the 11 factors. Promax failed to improve

the results; therefore, the Varimax rotation was retained.
The factors appeared to be related to these particular
dimensions of interpersonal communication: self-disclosure,
awareness, evaluation and acceptance of feedback, self-
expression, attention, coping with feelings, clarity, avoid-
ance, dominance, handling differences, and perceived accep-
tance.

Consensus

A 13-item subscale from Spanier's (1976) 32-item Dyadic
Adjustment Scale was used as an index of consensus (see
Appendix C, Section II). The husband and wife separately
marked their approximate extent of agreement or disagreement
with each other on a six-point scale (0--always disagree;
1--almost always disagree; 2--frequently disagree; 3--occa-
sionally disagree; 4--almost always agree; 5--always agree).
The consensus subscale has a range of 0-65, with 65 indicating
the highest degree of consensus.

Spanier (1976) reported that items in the total scale
had been evaluated for content validity by three judges.
Criterion-related validity--

> effectiveness of a test in predicting an individual's
> behavior, attitudes, or characteristics in specified
> situations (predictive validity) or diagnosing or
> assessing an existing status (concurrent validity)....
> (Spanier, 1976, p. 23)

--was determined by administering the 32-item scale to a
married sample of 218 persons and a divorced sample of 94
persons. Each of the items correlated significantly with

the external criterion of marital status; that is, for each item the married sample differed significantly from the divorced sample ($p < .001$) when a t-test was used for assessing differences between sample means (Consensus Subscale—Divorced sample: Mean, 41.1; SD, 11.1 and Married Sample: Mean, 57.9; SD, 8.5).

Construct validity—"the extent to which a test measures a theoretical construct or trait" (Spanier, 1976, p. 23)—was determined when the scale was correlated with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale. The correlation between the scales was .86 among married respondents and .88 among the divorced sample ($p < .001$). Construct validity was further established through a factor analysis of the entire 32-item scale.

Reliability was determined for the total scale and the component scales since Spanier (1976) was interested in developing a comprehensive scale with identifiable and empirically verified components. The reliability coefficient for the total scale is .96 (Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha). Spanier's data indicated that the subcomponents had sufficiently high reliability to justify their use alone without one losing confidence in the reliability of the measure. The reliability of the dyadic consensus subscale was reported at .90.

Commitment to the Relationship

Individual questions were presented to ascertain the priorities couples place within their relationship (see Appendix C, Section I). On the preinventory couples were asked to list (a) two things that could be better about their marriage and (b) two things they would like to be able to do to improve their marriage. On the postinventory each participant was asked to list (a) the concerns about marriage into which s/he had gained deeper insight, and (b) the concerns about marriage which, in his/her opinion, had not been adequately dealt with in the group meeting experience. Swicegood (1974) developed these items for use in evaluating marriage enrichment retreats.

Awareness of Concepts in Videotape Presentations

Items to measure knowledge gained through viewing the videotapes and through other resource materials used in the group meetings were developed specifically for the present study (see Appendix C, Section V). Items in the set were evaluated by two judges for content validity. Items were included only if the judges considered that the items were (a) relevant measures of the concepts presented in the videotapes and resource materials, (b) consistent with the definitions of self-understanding, communication, consensus, and commitment suggested as guidelines for the development of the tapes, and (c) carefully worded to describe the intended concepts. Positive and negative forms of the items were then

prepared and additional judges, recognized authorities in the field, indicated whether or not the items represented truths in the indicated aspects of human behavior.

Group Experience Evaluation

This section of the postinventory was a 36-item self-report questionnaire designed by Nadeau (1972) to allow participants in a marriage enrichment group to report changes in themselves, their spouses, and their marital relationships which they felt had resulted from their experiences in the classes. The first 28 items concerned a variety of behaviors, feelings, and attitudes regarding the self, the spouse, and the marital relationship. Participants responded to these items on a 5-point scale (0--not relevant to my experience; 1--considerable decrease; 2--slight decrease; 3--no change; 4--slight increase; and 5--considerable increase). The last eight items dealt with awareness of self and the relationship with a 4-point response mode (1--no change; 2--slight change; 3--moderate change; and 4--considerable change) (see Appendix B, Postinventory, Section VI).

Evaluation of the Series

Seven items developed especially for the present study were designed to allow couples to evaluate the series of classes by marking their general reaction to various sections of the programs. Three open-end items asked statements about the most important parts of the series, if there was anything in the series of meetings that either spouse brought out that

they wished had not been disclosed, and for suggestions for similar meetings in the future. Other items dealt with the division of time between viewing videotapes and the discussions and couple interactions and with the helpfulness of specific parts of the classes and videotapes (see Appendix B, Postinventory, Section VI).

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

The design for the present study included two levels of the treatment factor. One level was delivery system A, the traditional one-day workshop training for agent-leaders and the other level was delivery system B, the mailing-telephone conference training for agent-leaders. Another factor of interest was sex.

Data Collection

At the time the married couples confirmed their intentions to attend the group meetings or were selected for the contrast group, the agent told them that they would be helping Extension evaluate some procedures and programs for possible use with the other counties in the state. At the first meeting the agent asked them to fill out self-administered inventories (preinventory). In reassuring the couples that their answers could not be identified when combined with others in the study, the agent explained that the preinventory information was confidential and would be made available only to a coder who would not know the couples and who would record the answers by number. Directions were then given to

the participants to complete the preinventories independently without consulting each other and to place them in the mailing envelopes provided for each group. In the presence of the group the agents then sealed the envelope containing the completed inventories. At the third class meeting, each person completed a form for recording demographic data.

At the time of completion of the fourth group meeting the couples attending the group meetings and the control group couples were asked to complete another self-administered inventory (postinventory). Directions were to complete the inventory at the close of the last group meeting and to enclose it in the envelope which the agent then immediately sealed.

Code numbers were assigned to the couple's schedules prior to the time packets were mailed to the agents so that follow-up contacts could be made in the event some inventories were not received as expected. The agents sent master records to the researcher.

Data Analysis

Items on the couples' inventories and agents' evaluations were coded according to a predetermined plan, recorded on code sheets, punched on IBM cards, and verified against original data. Data were computer analyzed with the statistical packages, SAS -- The Statistical Analysis System (Barr, Goodnight, Sail & Helwig, 1976) and SPSS -- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Brent, 1975).

Data collected from group participants were used to determine changes that occurred over the two-week period of time in which the group meetings were being conducted. Since a basic assumption of the study was that change in marital functioning can be achieved through increased awareness of the relationship, legitimization of discussion, and development of communication skills, data on communication, consensus, and knowledge of concepts were collected from all participants in the video presentation groups and from a control sample.

Pre-post data for husbands and wives separately were used in determining changes that had occurred. For each measure percentage figures for experimental and control groups were determined. Gain scores or "change" for an individual was defined as any pre-post obtained difference regardless of size; thus a shift was taken as indication that change had occurred for the subject.

Analysis of variance. Pre-post change scores for agents' attitudes toward videotape teaching methods, agents' total evaluation scores, and pre-post change scores for each of the three dependent variables--consensus, communication, and information--were analyzed by analysis of variance techniques. An additional analysis of variance procedure was performed on these dependent variables using a pairwise analysis of couple scores. If data for either member of the

pair had to be deleted[1] that couple's data were deleted from the analysis. All groups did not have equal numbers of couples attending the group meetings; therefore, a statistical program that is capable of accommodating unequal N's was selected.

Multivariate analysis of variance. Change scores from pre-post data from the three dependent variables--consensus, communication, and information--were analyzed by a multivariate analysis of variance technique through a multiple regression procedure. An additional multivariate analysis of variance procedure was performed on these three variables using a pairwise analysis of couple scores. Again, as in the previous multivariate pairwise procedure, if data from either of the pair had to be deleted (see Footnote 1) that couple was deleted from the analysis.

Crosstabulations. Couples' commitment to their relationship was ascertained through the pre-post answers on open-end items. The responses to these items were coded by the researcher. Two judges separately coded the responses and these responses were compared with those of the researcher. Percentage of agreement with the researcher was 84 and 85 for the two judges. A consensus was reached among the three coders

---

[1]If more than 50 percent of the items on any one scale were missing, that person's data were deleted from the analysis of that particular measure. If fewer than 50 percent were missing, values were estimated for the missing items. The mean value for all other subjects on any particular item was assigned in place of the missing value.

on items of disagreement. Response categories from two areas
on the preinventory were cross-tabulated with responses
couples reported as gains on the postinventory.

The study provided a system of reciprocity in that
following the analysis of the data the results were made
available to couple participants, to Extension agents, and
to district and state Extension personnel.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this field experiment was (a) to evaluate
the effectiveness of two procedures for training agents to
use the videotape learning packages with groups of married
couples, and (b) to evaluate couples' responses to both the
group meetings and the videotape learning packages. This
evaluation was done through examining pre-post test changes
on instrument scores measuring the dependent variables and
comparing scores for couples whose leaders were trained in
traditional workshops and for couples whose leaders received
training instructions individually through specialist's tele-
phone conferences. The analysis of these data showed that
there was no difference between training methods and no sig-
nificant change in couples' responses after the series of
group meetings.

The results of this evaluation will be presented in the
following sequence: (a) description of the population,
(b) explanation of procedures used in preparation of data
for analysis, (c) testing hypotheses, (d) factor analysis of
the items measuring knowledge gain, (e) discussion of the
analysis of the data, (f) description of the participants'
responses to open-end items about their marriage, (g) a sum-
marization of group experience and videotape evaluations, and

(h) agents' reactions to video teaching methods and their evaluations of the series and the procedures manual.

Description of the Population

The couples participating in this research represented the young and middle adult population from upperlower to upper middle socioeconomic classes. Nearly all couples had children. See Appendix H., Table A for the summary of the demographic information.

Age and Length of Marriage

The subjects who participated in the two experimental group sessions had a mean age of 38.22 years with a range from 22 to 61 years. The control group was slightly younger with a mean age of 35.82 years and a range of 22 to 58 years. The mean length of time couples had been married was slightly over 16.6 years for the two experimental groups and around 13 for the control group. Only four experimental group participants had been married twice.

Number of Children

The two experimental groups had more children (mean 2.40) than did the control group (mean 1.68). Two couples in the control group had no children as compared to one childless couple in the experimental group. Only one experimental group couple had as many as six children, whereas three was the largest number of children of any control couple. When children of all couples were considered, the range of ages represented was from one to 34 years.

Composition of Households

The majority of couples in both groups lived alone with their children. One experimental couple and two control couples had a brother or sister of one of the couple members living in their households. One couple in the experimental group had one parent in-law living in the household. Two persons reported step-children living in the household, and two others reported grandchildren.

Educational Level

There was an overall mean difference of nearly one year in the educational level of the experimental and control groups, with means of 13.7 and 12.9 years respectively. The range for all the groups was from eight to 20 years of schooling. In the experimental group four of the participants had completed the 8th grade (the control group was not represented in this category), whereas two individuals had completed 20 years of schooling, four years beyond college graduation. The control group had one person completing 17+ years of school. Reports of marriage enrichment programs in the literature have indicated that the higher educational levels were to be expected. However, with a format different from the traditional marriage enrichment retreat weekend, it is not surprising that the couples in the present study represented a wider range of educational backgrounds than did those couples in the retreat format. The sample reached in this endeavor represented more diverse educational levels than those levels reported in other studies.

Occupational Categories

Two procedures were used for examining the occupational characteristics of the group participants. First, education and occupation were considered in determining categories according to the Hollingshead (1962) two-factor index of social position. The combination of these two factors determines within approximate limits the social position an individual occupies in the status structure of society. The precise occupational role the participant performed and the amount of formal schooling he received were scaled according to a scoring system. These two factors were then combined by weighting the individual scores obtained from the scale positions. The computed scores were then arranged on a continuum, divided into groups of scores from a low of 11 to a high of 66 (Hollingshead's range of scores is from 11 to 77), and assigned the corresponding social position code from Category I (the highest) to Category V (the lowest). Additional categories were included for homemakers who were not employed. Otherwise, women's occupations were classified using the two-factor index (see Appendix H, Table B). One of the criticisms of the Hollingshead scale is that it does not include the homemaker role in the occupational scale; therefore, it is not possible to classify persons with varying educational and professional backgrounds who choose to be homemakers.

The second procedure examined the occupational roles according to categories descriptive of the jobs. About

27 percent of the participants held jobs classified as pro-
fessional and managerial. Other occupational categories
included: clerical and sales (20.5%), craftsmen and opera-
tives (11.5%), service and laborers (6.5%), homemakers (26.9%),
and farmers (9%). See Appendix H, Table A, for details about
this information and that of the control group.

Prior Attendance at Extension Functions

Sixty percent of the participants in the two experimental
groups had never attended a function sponsored by the Exten-
sion Service and 30 percent of the control group had not
attended such functions. Eighteen in the two experimental
groups and six from the control group had attended from one
to six programs. Fifteen percent of the two experimental
groups and 31 percent of the control group had attended nine
or more Extension Service functions. Eight wives in the two
experimental groups had attended from nine to 40+ Extension
functions, and four husbands had attended from 10 to 21.
About half of the subjects in both experimental and control
groups had never heard about marriage enrichment-type pro-
grams before becoming interested in the series presented in
this study. Only one person in the control group had ever
participated in a marriage enrichment program; likewise,
only 10 people (12.8%) in the two experimental groups had
participated. These programs had been sponsored by the
church (3.8%) and the Extension Service (15.4%).

Reasons for Attending the Group Sessions

Participants were asked to list the reason(s) they had agreed to attend the four-part series (see Appendix H, Table C). (This question was omitted for the control group who did not attend group meetings.) "Couple growth" was the largest category of all the reasons given with 14 women and 10 men responding (30.8%). Included in this category were two closely related responses, "understand spouse better" (2 men and 2 women) and "understand others' problems." Slightly over 14 percent, (more than twice as many men as women), reported attending the meetings because the "spouse suggested it." Another 14 percent attended for the "novelty of the experience" with more than twice as many men as women reporting this reason. "Direct invitations" from agents, ministers, and friends were reported by nearly 13 percent of the attendants. Nine percent reported wanting to "increase their knowledge" regarding marriage.

Analyses

The results of the analyses are presented in this section in relation to the three hypotheses of the investigation. The hypotheses were stated in the direction of the expected findings.

Pre-and post-test totals for the dependent measures-- consensus, communication, and information [2] --were calculated

---

[2]The instrument used to measure consensus was from Spanier's (1976) Marital Dyadic Adjustment Scale; the instrument used to measure communication was Bienvenu's (1974) Interpersonal Communication Inventory; and the information items were devised especially for the present study.

by use of the computer. Moreover, the differences between the pre-and post-measures or change scores were computed for each person on each of the variables so that they could be used in the analysis of variance and multivariate analysis of variance procedures.

Two procedures were followed in handling missing values within the individual scales. If more than 50 percent of the items on any one scale were missing, that person's data were deleted from the analysis of that particular measure. If fewer than 50 percent of the items were missing, values were estimated for the missing items. The mean value for all other subjects on any particular item was assigned in place of the missing value. Whenever a value was missing for a particular item for a member of the experimental group, the mean was computed from all the scores on that particular item for all the other members of the experimental group. It was necessary to delete only five subjects from the experimental group and one from the control group when all three variables were being used in the multivariate analysis of variance. On analyses of individual variables fewer cases were deleted.

Tests of Differences Between Groups of Agents

The first hypothesis was tested by an analysis of variance procedure.

H_1 There will be no difference in the attitude toward conducting personal enrichment groups in the human relations area between (a) leaders who were trained

and received videotape learning packages in a tra-
ditional group workshop and (b) leaders who received
training instructions individually through special-
ist's telephone conferences and videotape learning
packages by mail.

Table 3 presents the results of the analysis of variance for
agent change scores on six pre-post items measuring feelings
toward using videotapes as resource materials and working
with married couples. Table 4 presents the results of the
analysis of variance for sixteen items completed by the agents
after the group meetings measuring their attitudes toward
teaching human relations subject-matter, organizing the
series, and aspects of group interaction. The data supported
the no-difference hypothesis. Generally the scores for all
agents were high, indicating a positive attitude toward the
videotape teaching method.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance for Change
Scores on Agent Evaluation by Training Group

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Main Effects Group	1	4.005	0.500
Residual	8	8.012	

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance for Total
Scores on Agent Evaluation by Training Group

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Main Effects Group	1	104.302	2.425
Residual	8	43.012	

Tests of Differences Between Groups of Couples

Separate analyses were performed on the consensus, communication, and information variables. For each of these three variables, a two-way analysis of variance (group x sex) was performed on the change scores. Additionally, multivariate analyses of variance were performed.

The results of the analyses of variance to test Hypotheses II and III are discussed in this section.

H_2 There will be no differences in pretest-posttest changes on instrument scores between (a) married couples who participated in group sessions whose leaders were trained to use videotape learning packages in traditional workshops and (b) couples whose leaders received training instructions individually through specialist's telephone conferences and videotape learning packages by mail.

The data supported the no-difference hypothesis for all three
dependent variables (see Table 5). Means, standard devia-
tions, and change scores for the dependent measures by group
and sex are presented in Tables 6, 7, and 8.

H_3 There will be an increase in the pretest-posttest

change scores from pretest to posttest and a higher

score on the posttest for individuals in both exper-

imental groups combined as compared to the scores

of the control group.

This hypothesis was rejected for all three dependent vari-
ables. There were no significant increases. In some in-
stances individuals had negative change scores indicating a
decrease. (See Tables 6, 7, and 8.)

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the
mean change scores for the consensus, communication, and
information variables. There were no significant group, sex,
or interaction (group by sex) effects. The Roy's maximum
root criterion was used to test for significance (Harris,
1975, pp. 300-309). These values appear in Table 9.

Pairwise Comparisons of Couples within Groups. In the
procedures for testing differences between groups, mean
scores are used in the computations. Differences in change
scores may cancel out whenever the averaging is done across
the total group. Because it was desired that these differences
not cancel out, pairwise analyses of individual scores were
performed through analysis of variance and multivariate

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance for Change Scores

on Measures of Dependent Variables, Consensus, Communication, and Information

Source	df	Consensus Mean Square	F	Communication Mean Square	F	Mean Square	F
Group	2	32.36	1.79	16.21	.20	46.08	2.47
Sex	1	1.71	.10	2.04	.03	1.22	.07
Group x Sex	2	11.92	.66	97.24	1.17	26.26	1.40
Residual	88	18.10		83.13		18.70	

N=94

TABLE 6

Means (X̄), Standard Deviations (SD), Range of Scores, and Change Scores
for Dependent Measure Consensus by Group and Sex

		PRE		POST		CHANGE	
GROUP	N	X̄	SD	X̄	SD	X̄	SD
Traditional	19	45.11	9.96	46.05	9.04	0.63	2.98
Wife	10	45.70	10.22	46.20	8.54	0.50	2.95
Husband	9	44.45	10.25	45.90	9.98	0.77	3.19
Telephone	58	49.36	6.87	50.47	5.51	1.16	4.74
Wife	29	49.77	6.67	51.50	5.30	1.80	4.07
Husband	29	48.95	7.16	49.51	5.62	0.56	5.29
Control	21	51.67	9.29	51.11	9.49	-0.78	3.64
Wife	11	52.55	8.40	51.09	9.68	-1.46	2.38
Husband	10	50.70	10.56	51.14	9.76	-0.03	4.68
Total	98	49.03	8.28	49.71	7.50	0.63	4.25

RANGE OF SCORES	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Total Possible
Pre	20	57	37	65
Post	25	59	34	
Change	-4	8	12	

TABLE 7

Means (X), Standard Deviations (SD), Range of Scores, and Change Scores for
Dependent Measure Communication by Group and Sex

GROUP	N	PRE		POST		CHANGE	
		X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Traditional	20	83.12	14.79	83.94	18.55	0.82	10.68
Wife	10	85.65	17.43	86.50	18.22	0.85	11.30
Husband	10	80.58	11.98	81.37	19.49	0.79	10.63
Telephone	58	85.84	15.93	87.74	16.34	1.90	8.76
Wife	29	86.84	14.22	89.70	13.95	2.86	9.19
Husband	29	84.84	17.68	85.78	18.47	0.94	8.37
Control	22	85.36	17.76	87.27	16.87	1.92	7.62
Wife	11	86.98	20.45	86.69	16.92	-0.29	8.71
Husband	11	83.73	15.43	87.85	17.62	4.12	5.93
Total	100	85.19	16.00	86.87	16.80	1.68	8.87

RANGE OF SCORES	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Total Possible
Pre	62	107	45	120
Post	52	107	55	
Change	-19	27.48	46.48	

TABLE 8

Means (X), Standard Deviations (SD), Range of Scores, and Change Scores for
Dependent Measure Information by Group and Sex

GROUP	N	PRE		POST		CHANGE	
		X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Traditional	20	71.21	6.28	69.73	6.36	-1.55	3.35
Wife	10	73.03	5.79	72.29	4.92	-0.74	3.16
Husband	10	69.39	6.51	66.87	6.81	-2.45	3.50
Telephone	57	71.56	6.05	72.34	5.50	0.86	4.81
Wife	29	72.49	5.51	72.72	5.54	0.24	4.17
Husband	28	70.59	6.53	71.97	5.53	1.51	5.39
Control	22	69.76	3.88	70.68	4.83	0.91	3.24
Wife	11	69.89	3.89	71.27	5.61	1.38	2.63
Husband	11	69.64	4.06	70.08	4.08	0.45	3.83
Total	99	71.09	5.69	71.47	5.58	0.41	4.32

RANGE OF SCORES	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Total Possible
Pre	57	81	24	100
Post	54	78	24	
Change	-8	5.49	13.49	

TABLE 9

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of
Dependent Variables Consensus, Communication, and Information

Source	Roy's Maximum Root Criterion*
Group Effect	0.06467
Sex Effects	0.00633
Group x Sex Effect	0.07698

* Level of significance determined from a table indicating
  the greatest characteristic root distribution (Harris,
  1975, pp. 300-309)

analysis of variance procedures in order to examine couple

within group effects along with group, sex, and group by sex

effects for the three dependent variables.

An analysis of variance with pairwise analysis of couple

scores (3 x 2 factor analysis with repeated measures) was

performed for each of three dependent variables. There were

no significant differences (see Table 10).

A multivariate analysis of variance with pairwise anal-

ysis of couple scores was also performed. Instead of an

analysis using mean change scores as described in the previ-

ous multivariate analysis discussion, this was an analysis

using individual couple scores examined by pairs. There were

no significant differences (see Table 11). Also, in the anal-

ysis of pairwise comparisons, there were no differences between

husbands and wives in total changes. Means for change scores

on the dependent variables are presented in Table 12.

Factor Analysis of Information Items

The instrument used to measure the dependent variable

information was constructed for this study. A factor anal-

ysis was used on the 20 items as a method of construct vali-

dation to discover which items clustered, to describe inter-

correlations, and to reduce the number of necessary variables

(Kerlinger, 1964; Nie et al., 1975). The factor analysis

was based on correlations between the variables of the R-factor

technique, extracted by a common-factor solution, using the

varimax rotation to orthogonal factors. These procedures were

TABLE 10

Results of Analysis of Variance for Change Scores
on Dependent Variables Consensus, Communication, and Information
(Pairwise Analysis of Couple Scores)

Source	df	Consensus		Communication		Information	
		Mean Square	F	Mean Square	F	Mean Square	F
Group Effects	2	28.22	1.46	13.43	0.179	35.14	1.69
Couple within Group Effect	41	19.24	1.022	75.05	0.823	20.82	1.322
Sex Effect	1	1.92	0.102	11.64	0.128	.28	0.018
Group x Sex Effect	2	6.85	0.364	85.46	0.937	19.18	1.217
Residual	41	18.83					

N = 88

TABLE 11

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of

Dependent Variables Consensus, Communication, and Information
(Pairwise Analysis of Couple Scores)

Source	Roy's Maximum Root Criterion*
Group Effects	0.11394
Couple Within Group Effect	2.04613
Sex Effect	0.01937
Group x Sex Effect	0.09825

* Level of significance determined from a table indicating
  the greatest characteristic root distribution (Harris, 1975,
  pp. 300-309)

TABLE 12

Means for Change Scores on Dependent
Variables Consensus, Communication Information
by Group, Sex, and Group by Sex

	N	Consensus	Communication	Information
			Means	
Group				
Traditional	16	0.750	0.813	-1.688
Telephone	52	1.423	2.019	0.462
Control	20	-0.550	2.500	0.900
Sex				
Wife	44	1.000	2.273	0.227
Husband	44	0.705	1.546	0.114
Group x Sex				
Traditional				
Wife	8*	0.875	0.750	-0.500
Husband	8*	0.625	0.875	-2.875
Telephone				
Wife	26+	1.846	3.423	0.0
Husband	26+	1.000	0.615	0.923
Control				
Wife	10	-1.100	0.500	1.400
Husband	10	0.0	4.500	0.400

* Data for two couples deleted.

+ Data for three couples deleted.

performed on the pretest data for all groups (Appendix F, Tables A and B) and on the posttest data for the experimental groups (Appendix F, Tables C and D).

Emerging Factors

A total of six significant factors emerged. Three factors exceeded an eigenvalue of 1.0, and the other three factors were close to 1.0 (.9, .8, and .7). Loadings exceeding .5 and .6 were used to identify items to include in the factor. Loadings exceeding .4, and .3 in three instances were used when their inclusion contributed to delineation of meaningful factors. The total factor matrix (Appendix F, Table C) and Tables 13-18 show these correlation coefficients. Eigenvalue and percentage of variance for each factor are presented in Appendix F, Table D.

Factor 1. Working with and being accepting of others is descriptive of items in this factor (see Table 13). Thirty-nine percent of the variance was accounted for in this factor. High factor scores indicate positive interpersonal interactions encompassing such beliefs as these: (a) disagreement in marriage does not mean failure, (b) people can be different and still normal, (c) effort on the part of both couple members is important for marriage to work, (d) awareness and acceptance of one's own feelings can help one understand better the feelings of other people, and (e) learning skills in communication can lead to greater understanding of oneself and others.

TABLE 13

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 1

Item	Loading
2. Being aware of and accepting your own feelings can help you to understand better the feelings of other people.	.6765
3. For marriage to work, it takes the effort of both partners.	.7422
4. People can be different and still normal.	.8097
5. Disagreement in marriage does not mean it is a failure.	.6071
10. There are skills in communicating that can be learned.	.4373

Factor 2. This factor, which accounted for over 22 percent of the variance, might be called the adjustment philosophy (see Table 14). Items in this factor deal with fulfilling self and partner needs in marriage in relation to marital fulfillment. A high factor score indicates a person who would hold to these beliefs: (a) to have an ideal marriage does not mean that the couple should satisfy all needs of each other, (b) personal fulfillment should not be sacrificed for partner fulfillment, (c) marriage does not have to restrict the freedom of the individual, and (d) decisions between partners may change with time. Item 12, with a factor loading below .30, added clarity to the factor interpretation; therefore, it was retained.

TABLE 14

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 2

Item	Loading
6. The ideal marriage is one in which the man and woman should satisfy all needs of each other.	.4774
13. Fulfilling your partner's needs in marriage leads to marital fulfillment.	.6157
14. In marriage husbands and wives should spend their leisure time together whenever possible.	.8925
12. Decisions between partners should hold once they are made.	.2752

Factor 3. Open interaction describes the next factor which accounted for over 13 percent of the variance (see Table 15). This factor reflects the ideas that debating issues is helpful to marriage, no feelings are wrong, and even a self-confident person cannot live effectively without other people who are important to him.

TABLE 15

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 3

Item	Loading
16. Debating an issue is never helpful.	.5365
19. Some feelings are wrong.	.4722
20. A self-confident person can live effectively no matter what other people who are important to him or her say.	.4259
17. When you are very dissatisfied with your marriage, there is little you can do about it.	.3797

Factor 4. This factor, accounting for almost 10 percent of the variance, describes surface versus perceptive communication (see Table 16). Persons disagreeing with these items would believe in the ideas that what a person says may not be what s/he means and that people treat you as they perceive you and not as you really may be.

TABLE 16

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 4

Item	Loading
8. What a person says is what s/he means.	.9012
7. People treat you as you really are.	.3231

Factor 5. Items in this factor, which account for eight percent of the variance, deal with skills of communication (see Table 17). Agreement with these items, resulting in high scores, is indicative of the belief that speaking for oneself helps others know how you think and feel, that skills in communicating can be learned, that couples with different points of view and personalities can have workable marriages, and that different skills are used for different purposes.

Factor 6. These items accounted for slightly over seven percent of the variance and generally describe the concept of understanding (see Table 18). Positive responses would be indicative of the concept that one can better understand another person by telling in his own words what he heard the

TABLE 17

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 5

Item	Loading
9. Speaking for yourself helps others know how you think and feel.	.6108
10. There are skills in communicating with others that can be learned.	.4002
15. Couples can have workable marriages even though they may have different personalities and different points of view.	.5328
18. Different ways of talking are used for different purposes.	.4808

TABLE 18

Factor Loadings on Items Comprising Factor 6

Item	Loading
1. Some differences between husbands and wives must be put up with in order to have a good relationship.	.7221
11. Telling in your own words what you heard another person say shows you understand.	.3527

other person say and that some differences between husbands and wives may need to be tolerated in order to have a good relationship.

Descriptive Data

Descriptive data from couples and agents are presented in this section. Data for measures of consensus, communication, information, and the group experience evaluation are summarized here. Other sections include the following: (a) commitment to the relationship, (b) group experience evaluation, (c) couples' evaluation of the program series, (d) agents' attitudes toward videotape teaching methods (including the six items used earlier in the analysis of variance), and (e) agents' evaluation of the program series.

Although the results of the analyses did not approach a statistical probability level of less than .05, there may be some "practical" significance. For research of this kind--that is, research in a naturalistic setting with a training program to improve performance and subject-matter knowledge of people in a community--many times "practical" significance is almost as important as statistical significance is. This idea should be kept in mind as the descriptive data from this videotape project are presented and discussed.

Consensus

For the measure of consensus, participants responded to 13 items in relationships by indicating the extent of agreement or disagreement between themselves and their partners.

These items and the corresponding percentage of agreement for each response are presented in Appendix H, Table D.

The areas in which at least one fourth of the participants always agreed (posttest) were (a) aims, goals, and things believed important, (b) career decisions, and (c) religious matters. Participants made fewer responses in the "always agree" column on the postinventory than they had on the preinventory. Initially, there were five areas in which 25 percent of the responses had been "always agree": (a) religious matters, (b) friends, (c) philosophy of life, (d) making major decisions, and (e) career decisions.

The major areas of occasional disagreement (preinventory) included (a) handling family finances (38.5%), (b) matters of recreation (34.6%), (c) ways of dealing with family members or relatives (28.2%), (d) household tasks, (e) leisure time interests and activities, and (f) amount of time spent together. Areas of frequent disagreement were listed by at least 10 percent of the respondents: (a) amount of time spent together (12.8%), (b) matters of recreation (11.5%), (c) household tasks (10.3%), and (d) leisure time interests and activities. Participants indicated increased (by 8.3%) disagreement in the household task area on the postinventory.

Communication

Participants responded to 40 items relating to aspects of communication. Percentages are reported for each item by pre-post inventories for both the experimental and control

groups (see Appendix H, Table E). When there was over a five percent change from pretest to posttest in the number of people reporting in the highest category, the items are discussed in this section. For 14 of the 40 items there was a reported decrease from pre to posttest. The items for which an improvement in reported behavior was not indicated related to these topics: (a) discussing problem areas with another person without losing control of emotions, (b) the tendency to change the subject when one's feelings enter into discussion, (c) pretending to listen to others when actually not really listening, and (d) awareness of how others may be reacting to what one is saying.

For 12 of the 40 items, over five percent of the participants indicated an increase. The items for which an improvement in behavior was indicated related to these topics: (a) expression of words in conversation, (b) empathetic listening in conversation, (c) listening more in conversation, (d) awareness of how voice tones may affect others, (e) acceptance of constructive criticism from others, (f) reduction in the tendency to jump to conclusions without having the facts, (g) willingness to express disagreement with others without fear that they will get angry, (h) satisfaction in the way differences are settled with others, (i) helping others understand you by saying thoughts, feelings, and beliefs, (j) awareness that others are listening when you are talking, and (k) differentiating between a person's words and feelings during a conversation.

Information

Four of the information items that showed more than a six percent increase for the experimental group from pre to posttest are discussed in this section. On each of these items the control group showed a decrease. Percentages of response for all 20 items are presented in Appendix H, Table F.

Almost 18 percent more of the experimental group on the postinventory than on the preinventory disagreed with the idea that "fulfilling your partner's needs in marriage leads to marital fulfillment" (Item 13). Likewise about 13 percent more disagreed that "in marriage husbands and wives should spend their leisure time together whenever possible" (Item 14). These responses indicate that participants were acknowledging personal fulfillment in marital fulfillment.

Two of the items concerned communication skills. Six percent more on the postinventory than on the preinventory agreed that "speaking for yourself helps others know how you think and feel" (Item 9), and that different styles of communication are used for different purposes (Item 18).

Commitment to the Relationship

Couples' commitment to their marriage, another dependent variable, was studied through their responses to two items on the preinventory: (a) "Things about our marriage that could be better" and (b) "Things that I would like to be able to do to improve our marriage." On the postinventory each

participant listed (a) "The concerns about marriage into
which I gained deeper insight" and (b) the concerns about
marriage which in the respondent's view were not adequately
dealt with in the series of classes. Coding categories were
formed from the varied responses to these open-end questions.
Opportunity was allowed for couples to describe their intent
with open-end responses rather than forcing their choices
into prestructured categories. The researcher coded all
responses after which two judges verified them. Any disagree-
ments were considered and consensus between the researcher
and the judges was reached before final coding.

The first nine categories were the same as those used
by Swicegood (1974) in describing the responses couples made
to the same questions before and after retreat weekend exper-
iences. The other categories evolved from the present study
(see Appendix G) and were retained in an effort to describe
meaningfully the couples' intentions and uppermost concerns
in marriage enrichment.

Things about marriage that please. As a preface to
examining areas needing improvement, couples were asked to
focus on some positive aspects of their marriage. One indi-
cation to support the assumption that the couples attending
the group sessions had relatively stable marriages and were
committed to their marriages (if not to growth and enrichment)
was that almost every couple listed something about their
marriage that pleased them (see Appendix H, Table G).

Thirty-three statements were made that fit the expectation of
the spouse-role that the individual held. Typical answers
included these abbreviated responses: "spouse is cooperative
in every way," "similar life goals," "good husband or wife,"
"we are happy," "determination to aid others in every way,"
"he's decent, kind, attractive, temperate," and "spouse is
faithful and thoughtful." The next largest category of
responses that pleased the participants was "sharing experi-
ences and companionship," followed by "mutual love." Others
mentioned by five or more respondents were "feelings and un-
derstandings," "openness and honesty," "communication," "per-
sonal growth," and "compatibility." Although these latter
categories indicate things already in the marriage that
pleased a few respondents, they are also listed among the
most prominent needs of couples as shown in the following
sections.

Things about marriage that could be better. The data
in Appendix H, Table H show that the experimental group gave
top rating to "communication" as the factor in their marriage
that could be better. The second largest response category
for the experimental group was "sharing experiences and com-
panionship." This category had the top rating for the con-
trol group with "security" as the second factor. Swicegood
(1974) also found that couples in marriage enrichment retreats
gave top priority to "communication." Typical responses in
the "sharing experiences and companionship" category indi-
cated that the respondents wanted more free time together as

a couple whether at home or away from home and more involve-
ment with each other's interests, including civic activities,
traveling together, etc.

Things that couples thought could be improved. In list-
ing things that each spouse would like to do to improve his
marriage, both males and females listed "personal growth"
(16.7%) as the top factor they would improve and "communica-
tion" (12.2%) as the second (see Appendix H, Table I).
"Sharing experiences and companionship" was the third cate-
gory. The responses in the "personal growth" category in-
cluded "understand and express myself," "learn to be a happier
person," "be more thoughtful," "learn to be more patient,"
and "have more confidence in myself." Accomplishment in
these areas would contribute to growth in the second and third
areas in which couples wanted to improve. The first and sec-
ond areas of priority for couples in the marriage enrichment
retreats studied by Swicegood (1974) were the same as those
for the present study--first, some element of "personal
growth," and second, "communication." However, in the present
study, more females than males gave second priority to communi-
cation. This result was the opposite of Swicegood's (1974)
findings that more males than females listed "communication"
as second priority.

Concerns into which insight was gained. In the post-
inventory couples gave an open-end response to "concerns
about marriage into which I gained insight." Several men-
tioned as many as three concerns (see Appendix H, Table J).

Again, communication was the overwhelming response and was
listed as the first gain by 49 persons (20.9%) and as the
second gain by 12 persons (15.4%). "Feelings and understand-
ing" was the second largest gain, followed by consensus.
These first two categories were again identical to the
responses in Swicegood's sample. Therefore, it appears
that couples in weekend retreats and those attending a series
of weekly meetings are not different in their response pat-
terns.

When concerns into which insights were gained were
analyzed according to educational levels, the largest num-
ber (20) responding "communication" were the high school
graduates, with half as many (10) from the 17 year-plus group
making that response. Nine respondents in the college grad-
uate category and six in the group with 13-15 years of edu-
cation marked "communication." These data indicate that,
regardless of the educational level, people believed they
gained the most benefit in the broad areas of communication.

Couples in the control (no treatment) group were asked
to list concerns into which they would like to gain insight.
Three-fourths of them did not respond to the item; but of
those who responded, six percent indicated no improvement
was needed. None of the couples attending the group meetings
gave this response. About five percent of the control group
listed communication responses and another five percent stated
items that fit into the "security" category.

Concerns not adequately covered. In relation to concerns about marriage which the participants believed were not adequately dealt with during the series of meetings, responses tended to be varied. (As many as three concerns could be stated.) Around 73 percent of the participants did not list a concern for this item. The main concerns mentioned fit into such categories as (a) sex (10), (b) security (7), (c) mananagement (7), and (d) feelings and understanding (6). A few others were mentioned once or twice (see Appendix H, Table K).

These findings were different from those of Swicegood (1974) who reported that retreat participants tended to say "no improvement, couldn't be better," and "retreat was excellent." Couples in the present study were specific in stating areas of concern.

Cross-tabulations between concerns that could be better and improved and concerns into which insight was gained. Open-end responses on the preinventory dealing with things that could be better in their marriage and those that participants thought they could improve were cross-tabulated with the postinventory responses about concerns into which insight had been gained during the series of meetings (see Appendix H, Tables L and M). This technique provided the information for determining the responses on the pre-postinventories which matched. Matching is defined through this example: the area of communication was mentioned as a factor of marriage

that could be better; after the two items were cross-tabulated, it was found that 18 people reported gains in that category. Four wanted "feelings and understanding" to be better and four reported gains in that area. Moreover, other matched categories included security (3), personal growth (2), consensus (2), and fits expectation of role of spouse (1). Two people said no improvement was needed and repeated this response when asked about gains. Of the 11 subjects who indicated "no response" on the preinventory, nine reported areas of insight gained--feelings and understanding (4), communication (5)--and two indicated "no improvement" (see Appendix H, Table L).

When the responses without identical category matches were considered, the cross-tabulations indicated several interesting results. Of those respondents who described personal growth as something that could be better, seven indicated gains in feelings and understanding, whereas five indicated that communication had improved and one each responded with consensus, couple growth, understanding spouse better. Those people who wanted management to be better had gained in feelings and understanding (6), communication (11), and consensus (4). The reason for the gain may be that they perceived the management situations differently after they had focused on several aspects of marriage. Perhaps what appeared in need of betterment was really insight into "feeling" and "communication" areas.

When a comparison was made of things respondents would like to improve with those areas into which insight was gained, the following categories coincided: communication (16), personal growth (6), feelings and understanding (5), security (4), consensus (1), and no improvement needed (1) (see Appendix H, Table M). Of those respondents who did not respond on the preinventory, gains were reported on the post-inventory in the areas of feelings and understanding (9), consensus (3), and personal growth (1).

Commitment to helping others. Commitment to helping others was viewed as one aspect of commitment to marriage enrichment. This factor held true for participants reported in the Swicegood (1974) study; however, a lower proportion of participants (56.4%) in the present study than in Swice-good's study thought they would like to learn to help other couples enrich their marriage. Eight more women than men agreed with the statement. About 31 percent (10 women and 14 men) were unsure about this idea and nine percent (5 men and 2 women) indicated no desire to learn to help other couples in marriage enrichment.

When couples responded to the open-end question, "I wish I could...," only nine (11.5%) responses indicated that couples were focusing on helping others in the marriage enrichment area. This category tied with "personal growth" and "communication" as the areas in which couples expressed wishes indicating self-enhancement rather than other-enhancement.

Three people in each category desired to apply what they had learned, increase their knowledge about marriage, and share experiences and companionship with their spouse. Four more wished for improvements in expressing feelings and in under- standing others. Again, these wishes seem to reflect self- enhancement through need-meeting and personal growth rather than a commitment to helping others. Nearly 38 percent gave no response to this item.

Extent to which couples felt their marriage had been enriched. From the group experience 33 women and 29 men (79.5%) of the experimental group agreed that their marriage had been enriched, whereas 5 women and 10 men were unsure. One woman disagreed that this experience had been enriching. Before the series began, 91 percent (71) had agreed that their marriage could be enriched, 5 were unsure, and 1 man dis- agreed. Overall, the responses indicated that about 11 per- cent found that the series here failed to be as enriching as they had expected. When these thoughts about marriage being enriched were examined according to years of schooling, there was approximately the same number of people represented in each educational category; however, proportionate to the total population in each category, those respondents with 8-12 years of schooling were less sure that their marriage had been enriched.

Perceptions of self, spouse and marriage. A summary of these seven items is presented in Appendix H, Table N.

Appendix C, pre-post inventory, Section IV is also relevant here. Responses on the postinventory indicated that some changes had occurred in the way couples perceived their marriage. Fifty-four (69.2%) of the 78 respondents saw their marriage as dynamic and 57 (73.1%) said their spouse thought the same. In Swicegood's (1974) study, there appeared to be some indication that the individual thought his perception of their marriage was better than the spouse's opinion of the marriage was. In contrast to Swicegood's (1974) participants, individuals in the present study perceived their spouses as having more positive feelings than they had. On the postinventory the self and spouse responses were very close. More individuals on the postinventory (18.7%) than on the preinventory thought their marriage was dynamic, and more individuals (15.4%) reported thinking that their spouse thought the marriage was dynamic. On the preinventory 95 percent of the control respondents thought they had a dynamic marriage. On the postinventory all indicated a dynamic marriage.

Respondents were more willing to say that they needed growth or change in some area than to say their spouses needed it; however, they were readily willing to say that their spouses had learned more than they had in almost every category. This fact was indicated with increases in these categories: (a) understanding thoughts, feelings, and intentions (12.8%), (b) communicating thoughts, feelings, and intentions (12.8%), (c) more positive view of self (26.9%),

and (d) more positive view of others (35.9%) (see Appendix H, Table N; see Table O for data on the control group).

There was a dramatic increase (almost 27%) in those respondents who thought their spouse had developed a more positive attitude of self. About 13 percent reported an increase for themselves. Again, approximately 36 percent of the individuals reported that their spouse had developed a more positive view of others.

Group Experience Evaluation

There were no statistical differences between the two experimental groups on the group experience evaluation when tested with analysis of variance. The mean of the total group on the group experience evaluation was 106.03 out of a total possible score of 140. The range of scores was from 84 to 132.

Even though measures of the dependent variables--consensus, communication, and information--did not statistically show change, couples reported that they had changed through increases on a 28-item group experience evaluation and also they reported an additional eight items on change in marital experience (Appendix H, Tables P and Q). The items for which the category "considerable increase" was reported at post-testing by nearly 25 percent of the respondents were these: (a) ability to communicate with your spouse, (b) feeling of closeness to your partner, (c) strength of your marriage, (d) efforts to make your marriage better, and (e) awareness

of what is positive in your marriage. Other items on which
considerable increase was reported by nearly one-fifth of the
respondents were these: (a) feeling of understanding your
spouse, (b) feeling that you do not do enough to communicate
your love, (c) involvement in your marriage, (d) ability to
express your feelings, (e) time spent talking together with
your spouse, (f) emphasis on positive aspects of your mar-
riage, (g) honesty with your spouse, (h) awareness of what is
positive in your marriage, (i) awareness of your own deficien-
cies, (j) awareness of the meanings of your spouse's behavior,
and (k) awareness of your partner's qualities. Almost 36
percent reported a slight decrease in their tendency to take
things for granted in their marriage. Also, around 16 percent
had slightly decreased in placing emphasis on problems in
marriage and in experiencing uncomfortableness while being
told positive things about themselves.

Couples' Evaluation of the Program Series

Couples were asked questions specifically related to the
videotapes and the program series (Appendix C, Postinventory).
Generally the couples reacted favorably to the series of
classes. Sixty-two percent (N≈76) were satisfied and 25 per-
cent indicated that they were very satisfied with the series.
Only seven people (8.9%) indicated they were either "dissatis-
fied" or "very dissatisfied."

Most Meaningful Parts of Series

Couples responded with a variety of topics when they were asked about the most meaningful parts of the series. Responses in the category "group discussion," mentioned by 16.7 percent of the respondents, included such comments as "talking with other couples," "talking over one's own problems," "group experience with other couples," and "being able to meet some new people at various stages of marriage and comparing and sharing ideas and experiences." Group support and getting feedback from the group were other facets of the "group discussion" category.

"Dialoguing" was mentioned by 13 people (16.6%) who apparently appreciated having learned the technique, the value of using the technique, and the meaningfulness of dialoguing in the couple relationship. Reaching a consensus was a helpful outcome for four people. Becoming aware of others' problems was indicated as important to nearly 13 percent of the people.

Two persons mentioned the series as being valuable to them because it provided a time for them to be with their spouse away from distractions that prevent focusing on the couple relationship. Two participants thought they had gained greater insight regarding their spouse. Another person had grasped the idea that couples have to work at marriage just as in a business. Couple growth was mentioned by over five percent of respondents.

Twelve respondents mentioned specific classes as being meaningful: 16.6% thought the second class on communication was very meaningful and about four percent mentioned the class on commitment. Four others went beyond citing the specific class and related how communication had been meaningful to their relationship. For some, the classes reinforced previous experiences with marriage enrichment. The teaching aids used by the couples at various points in the series were helpful (3 mentioned this). One person reported that nothing was helpful.

Self- or Spouse-Disclosure

Occasionally in personal growth-type experiences, issues and concerns may surface that couples wish had not been brought out; therefore, couples in this study were given the opportunity to report such an occurrence. Only six people reported an undesirable self or spouse disclosure; only three of these respondents chose to state the topic. One husband expressed his difficulty in dialoguing (practicing) before other couples.

Plan for Class Activities

The couples were questioned about the time allotments for viewing videotapes and discussions and couple interactions. About 77 percent thought enough time was allowed for discussion; another 19 percent said "no," indicating that they would have liked more time for discussion. Sixty-three percent would not have wanted more time during the sessions to talk

with their spouses, whereas about 31 percent wished they could have had more time to talk individually with their spouses. About 67 percent checked that they would not have liked for the leader on the videotapes to present more examples of couple dialogue, and 28 percent would have liked more couple interaction presented on the videotapes.

Number of Class Meetings

Couples marked items that described their preference for the number of class meetings in the series. Four classes were enough for 48 people (62%), more than four sessions would have pleased 19 people (25%), and eight people would have preferred fewer than four classes. Those respondents who wanted more than four classes suggested six and no more than eight meeting times in a series. More meetings were desired in order to practice techniques presented.

Helpfulness of Techniques

Discussion with other couples was the technique rated very helpful by 72 percent of the respondents (see Table R). Generally, the majority of the other techniques (such as videotapes in general, leader on videotapes, dialogues with spouse, and resources used during "tape off" time) were rated between "somewhat helpful" to "very helpful."

Suggestions for Future Meetings

About half of the participants gave no suggestions for similar meetings in the future. Of those people responding,

few gave the same suggestion; however, the largest percentage
reporting a single item focused on the value of group dis-
cussion. This result is further support for a previous find-
ing which emphasized the value of group discussion. About
7.6 percent indicated a desire for a growth group experience
to follow the series of meetings, a finding which seems to
offer further support for the value of group discussion.
Suggestions included these: omit pre-post inventories, pre-
sent dialogue technique earlier in the series, attract larger
groups, and publicize such a series more widely. About eight
of the suggestions dealt with location of the meetings and
the mode of videotaping (some respondents would have pre-
ferred color tapes). Three individuals who thought the tapes
lacked content did not make suggestions for future meetings.
Some respondents suggested adding more subject matter through
increased group discussion among group members and the leader
while reducing the video viewing time.

Agents' Attitudes Toward Videotape Teaching Methods

Agents responded to the first six items on the question-
naire (see Appendix C, Agent Evaluation) before receiving train-
ing in the procedures for conducting the group meetings. After
the group sessions the agents again responded to the first six
items plus an additional 10 items as the postsession measure.
Table T in Appendix H presents pre, post, change, and total
value scores for these items. The number of agents responding
to each category appears in Appendix H, Table S. The item

with the highest mean response (4.6) and the highest change
score (0.6) on the postinventory was "I felt comfortable
using videotapes as resource materials." Item six "I felt
comfortable working with married couples in a group setting"
had the second highest change score (0.5) and a 3.9 mean
value. Although the agents apparently had changed positively
in their attitudes toward working with groups of married cou-
ples, the mean approached only the "agree" response. Two
agents disagreed with this item and one strongly agreed that
she felt comfortable in this setting.

Generally the agents strongly agreed that without the
videotape resources they would not have attempted to organize
a series of classes to teach the subject matter; they would
recommend the videotape learning packages to other agents
and planned to use them again in their own programs. The
agents also thought they did a better teaching job with the
tapes than they could have done without the tapes.

Comparison of Telephone/Mail and Traditional Procedures

The seven agents in the telephone/mail training group
compared, through open-end items, their training experience
with the traditional type to which they were accustomed. Gen-
erally, they reacted very favorably and offered some positive
suggestions for improvement of the telephone/mail training
procedure.

Because the manual and instructions were as adequately
detailed as they were, it was the agents' consensus that a

group training session was not necessary. However, some
alternatives were suggested. Agents realized that schedules
are crowded and travel is expensive and time consuming.
Nevertheless, they suggested some group discussion with other
agents and perhaps with the specialist after individual pre-
view of the videotapes. Most agents would not have objected
to travel because they wanted the group experience of hearing
the questions and feedback of the other agents. They missed
the group interaction and admitted that the traditional train-
ing was what they knew best.

One individual felt rushed during a telephone conversa-
tion and thought that she would not have felt this way in a
group training session. Another agent suggested that group
training would be particularly valuable in areas of subject
matter new to them. Over half of the agents thought that
there probably were some questions they would have asked in
a group session that they did not think to ask during the
telephone conferences. Most of these questions would have
been stimulated from the group interaction. They did point
out, however, that the mailed instructions were clear.
Therefore, they did not have many questions about what should
be done. Any questions would more than likely have been
related to subject-matter.

The agents believed that it was particularly appropriate
to suggest that the tapes and materials on human relations
subject matter be individually reviewed by the agents before
any type of training session, traditional or telephone. Some

suggested the addition of human relations experiential sessions for all agents prior to their training sessions relating to use of the videotape series.

Most of the agents agreed that they would favor a portion of their future training sessions by a telephone/mail procedure, but no one was willing to say that more than 50 percent should be by such a procedure. One agent suggested that about a third of training might be handled in this way.

Agents' Evaluation of the Videotape Learning Package Program Series

Agents evaluated the program series by rating the effectiveness of the video resources as a teaching method, ranking recruitment procedures and describing the detail and clarity in the divisions of the manual. They identified the sections of the manual which were most useful, those sections needing improvement, and the sections which could be omitted.

Rating the effectiveness of video as a teaching method. Agents rated the use of video resources as a method of teaching. All three agents in the group trained through the traditional workshop thought the video resources were better than were other methods, whereas four of the seven agents in the telephone mail training group agreed with this response. One responded that this procedure was about the same as other methods. Two were undecided. No one indicated that these resources were not as good as or considerably less effective than other methods were.

The response was a unanimous "yes" when agents were asked if they thought preparing the videotape series was good use of the specialists' time. The agents documented their answers with these following comments:

   ---The specialists' effort and time are multiplied many
      times.

   ---The specialist was obviously involved; this visibil-
      ity is very important to agents. Because I think
      this area of communication skill development is most
      neglected.

   ---The series gave me encouragement, took less of my
      time; I felt I had the best and correct teaching.

   ---I enjoyed the materials. I only wish more couples
      could have participated.

   ---Having visual resources gives "visual" backing for
      agents who need to develop self-confidence in working
      in the area of interpersonal relationships.

   ---The tapes enabled me to present a program I otherwise
      would not have attempted.

   ---Because the tapes gave us "nerve" to attempt a class.

   ---I do not feel secure teaching this subject; however,
      with the tapes I felt secure. Since the specialist
      cannot be in every county, it's an excellent second
      choice.

   ---Marriage, separation, and divorce are topics of the
      day in many areas. Couples need this type of infor-
      mation.

In addition, agents offered suggestions for other areas of subject matter that in their opinion could be taught effectively by utilizing the videotape learning package method. Some of the topics suggested were these: child development with emphasis on developmental stages, family resource management and decision-making, training for day care workers,

setting values and goals for the family, aspects of aging,

consumer education, and parent-child relationships.

Ranking recruitment procedures. The news release and

radio spot announcement were used by nine of the 10 agents.

Letters, word-of-mouth and individual contact were used by

eight of the 10 agents. One agent used a TV announcement

in addition to the five suggested procedures as means of

recruitment. Individual contact was rated the most effec-

tive recruitment procedure with word-of-mouth (friends tell-

ing friends, etc.) as the second best method. The third

rating was tied between the letters and the news release.

Radio ranked fourth.

If agents did not choose to use certain recruitment pro-

cedures, they listed the reasons. Since one agent was new

to the community and did not know many couples to contact

personally, she used the other four procedures. Another

agent who had to limit recruitment procedures because of

several commitments for her time chose individual contact,

which she rated as the most effective of all the methods,

followed by the radio announcement and the news release.

Although a third agent used all five procedures, they were

not ranked; however, a comment indicated that individual con-

tact had been the most effective of all the recruitment pro-

cedures.

Detail and clarity of the procedures manual. All of

the agents thought the procedures manual for agent-leaders

was adequately detailed (rather than being incomplete in stating necessary details or so detailed that meaning was lost). Moreover, all agents responded that the divisions of the manual were clearly defined so that sections could be easily located and were not difficult to follow.

The most useful sections of the manual for the agents were identified as the program procedures and the leader guides for each class meeting. The suggested recruitment strategies were more familiar to the agents; therefore, they probably did not mention them as being the helpful sections. No one suggested that any parts from the manual or the tapes should be omitted; however, several comments were included about how the manual and tapes could be improved. These suggestions chiefly involved incorporating more discussion into the tapes about the resources used by the couples, improving two of the couple examples on the tapes, clarifying the manual presentation of the communication concepts, and shortening one tape segment of a couple dialogue about strengths and weaknesses. One agent was undecided about sections to be improved and three agents wrote that all sections were fine.

Four agents added comments about how much they and the participant couples liked the series and how they planned to offer it again. One agent reported plans for maintaining group contact on a continuing basis (growth-group model).

Comments about presentation and content of the videotapes. Agents were asked to list comments the group members offered about the videotapes. These comments varied from

"excellent" and "the subject matter is good" to stating the need for professional actors because some of the video model couples seemed insincere and unreal to the group participants. To one group of class members the video couples appeared too "civilized" (articulate perhaps) in their discussions. Some group members in one series would have preferred the video leader in person to answer questions related to the video topics. Most of the couples had not experienced video as a method of instruction and thought it was excellent, although several participants suggested more time for group sharing and discussion.

Other participants commenting about the content said that the pace was adequate for following the ideas being presented and that they liked the tapes as an aid for starting discussion. The use of varied age groups represented on the tapes was noted as a plus by one agent in contrast to another who reported that younger couples could have been used with more realistic examples and "down-to-earth" responses.

Apparently many couples found that they had much in common with the examples presented on video. Couples identified with the tape situations presented to illustrate styles of communication, commitment, and reaching consensus through compromise or alteration. One agent pointed out that couples could see similarities in the process although the situations were not identical.

All 10 of the agents thought that enough examples were given in the videotapes so that during "tape-off" couples could apply to their own situations the skills being taught. Even though one agent reported that her group agreed with the number and adequacy of the examples, she was not successful in getting her couples to practice dialogue.

Discussion of the Results

The fact that agents, who received their training through two different procedures, did not differ in their attitudes toward teaching human relations subject-matter, organizing the series, using videotape resources, and in working with married couples, provided support for the effort of Extension personnel to find alternate training procedures for their agents. A major advantage of the telephone conference/mail training procedure is that it costs one-fourth as much as equivalent training through traditional procedures without consideration for the time involvement in man-hours.

Responses on instrument scores for couples participating in the group meetings conducted by agents who had been trained through the two different procedures did not differ. Thus, the type of training an agent experienced did not statistically affect the scores of the couple participants.

Instrument scores for couples in the experimental group were not statistically different on the postinventory as compared to instrument scores on preinventory. Also, the scores were not higher than the scores of the control group were;

however, in some few instances the scores were lower indicating a negative change. Even when pairwise analyses of couple scores were performed, no differences evidenced. However, it was noticed in the pairwise analysis that men and women did not differ in the way they responded. Perhaps men and women are more alike in instrumental and expressive responses than traditional views have indicated (Bruder, 1973).

The findings of no differences between pre and posttest scores should be discussed from the fact that the mean for the communication instrument score was nearly as high on the pretest as the norms for the instrument (Bienvenu, 1974). This high mean score on the pretest indicates that participants had very little opportunity for change between the pre and post test.

The unexpected situation of negative change scores, or an apparent loss instead of the expected gain, may be explained by the process which occurs when behavior changes. Negative scores may represent not so much the failure of enrichment programs as a reflection of a period of disorganization for participants. If the married couples had relatively stable marriages (as was the assumption in the present study and others in marriage enrichment), the couples probably had developed accommodated behaviors. Thus, they responded to the preinventories in ways that involved their perceptions and stereotypes of what relationships and marriages are "supposed" to be like. Subsequently, when the participants became involved in the awareness process and were stimulated by

topics during the group sessions, disorganization of many
of their preconceived notions occurred. It was, perhaps,
during this point in time that the postinventory was adminis-
tered. Integration had not occurred and the scores were
reflecting disorganization. It should be noted that the
postinventory was filled out at the end of a two-week period.
Persons (Franklin, 1976) who work with growth groups and
therapy groups indicate that disorganization may occur within
two to six weeks after the onset of a skill development or
change program.

Wackman, Miller, and Nunnally (1976) described phases
in skill development which parallel phases that persons in
family therapy experience in the process toward integration
and finally to a changed behavior. Franklin (1976) also said
that "when persons are involved in an awareness process, they
become overly analytical of their own and others' behaviors."
The evidence of this characteristic coincides with the period
of disorganization. Wackman et al. (1976) termed this phase
the "awkwardness stage" when increased awareness of alterna-
tive skills is evident, but there is also difficulty in using
the new skills. A third stage, the "skillful stage," even-
tually follows awkwardness. The final step in the process
of change is the "integrated stage" which occurs after several
weeks, often some time after a course is completed. Franklin
(1976) stated that disorganization usually occurs three to
six weeks after the onset of therapy or the onset of any
period of increased awareness. According to this rationale,

administration of the postinventory in the present study probably came during the "awkwardness stage" (period of disorganization) before participants had had time to move through the "skillful stage" to the "integrated stage."

The decrease in scores may also be explained by the intermarriage taboo that Mace (1975) described. Thus, one might contend that during preinventory time participants were answering from the stereotypic position of not talking about their marriage in realistic terms, but in terms of the unrealistic expectations that are held for marriage (Crosby, 1974, Farson, 1969). Mace (1975) has promoted the idea that in marriage enrichment sessions barriers to communication between spouses with other couples can be broken down or relaxed. At the time the postinventories were presented, the couples may have achieved just enough awareness that they were freed to make the realistic responses that on the surface appear as negative responses to growth. Before the series, coping mechanisms were hindering their willingness to admit reality. After awareness occurred, the willingness was there to view their situations more realistically.

The continuity and high emotional levels experienced in retreat experiences may not occur during a series of weekly sessions. Leaders of growth groups (Hawkins & Swicegood, 1976) have observed that during every meeting time must be taken to "rebuild" the group. With a time break between sessions levels of enthusiasm, confidence, and group trust

decrease. Continuous encounter is needed to rebuild or promote the beneficial interaction that seems to be maintained at a higher level in retreat experiences.

The no-gain situation in this present study may be a function of the methods of evaluation available for use in relationship areas in general and in marriage enrichment experiences in particular. The task of testing the relative effectiveness of various programs of marriage enrichment is just beginning. Newer forms of working with couples, whether in counseling or marriage enrichment, call for newer forms of evaluation. Until alternative forms are devised, researchers must resort to traditional forms which may not be sensitive enough to detect the kinds of changes that may occur.

Commonly, it is asserted that good research relies on well-developed theory (Cookerly, 1976). The fact that marriage enrichment theory is not well developed may be the reason why so little research has been done with marriage enrichment programs. Although the field is expanding, there is still much speculation about what takes place during marriage enrichment experiences. The process of marriage enrichment has not been adequately defined. Without definition, without an operational framework, and without a theoretical base the field, it is not surprising, has failed to conduct well-controlled, definitive research. This comment is not intended to derogate marriage enrichment efforts; it is offered in an effort to explain why research findings are often sparse and limited in scope. Studies may be methodologically weak

because researchers are not adequately testing the phenomena they are intending to test (Cookerly, 1976).

Studies may need to include independent judges' evaluations, self-report correlated with behavioral-interaction data, interpersonal and multidimensional assessments (Cromwell, Olson, & Fournier, 1976). However, this appraisal cannot be done until the meaning, goals, and behaviors of the process of marriage enrichment are defined (Smith, Scott, & Shoffner, 1976). The extensive discussion in this section is done in an effort to shed some light into the meaning and goals of marriage enrichment. The attempts have been to use global measures of improvement. Purely statistical evaluation with such measurements may have caused researchers to err in the direction of assessment. Smaller and smaller segments will need to be tested before the total process can be evaluated. When the field is more clearly defined, the possibility will emerge for making better use of a control no-treatment group of couples to which a treated-couples group could be compared. Then a satisfactory baseline of change or improvement may be established (Beck, 1976).

Comments by agents and some of the couples suggested that participants objected to taking the time to respond to the pre-post inventories. Couples may rather have spent the time in group discussion. This idea was one of the often mentioned suggestions for future meetings. These concerns over responding to inventories may in themselves have affected the results.

The results of this study as indicated by the test scores probably tell only a fragment of the story. Some of the most important and most lasting facets of the group meetings cannot be expressed quantitatively with the data available. Because of the limitations of the research procedures employed, there may be a gap between the testable results found and the impact of the personal experiences of couple relationships.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purposes of this study were two-fold: (a) to evaluate the effectiveness of two procedures for training home economics Extension agents to use the videotape resources in working with married couples and (b) to design, implement, and evaluate a videotape-learning package model for facilitating married couples' interpersonal competence skills in self-understanding, communication, and growth toward states of consensus and commitment to their relationships. One group of agents was trained through the traditional group workshop method led by the Extension human development specialist, and the other group of agents received the videotape learning packages by mail, previewed the tapes and the procedures (self-training), and then received training through two individual telephone conferences with the specialist. Each agent was asked to conduct a series of four two-hour group meetings with married couples using the videotape resources and the procedures manual developed to accompany the videotapes. There was no difference between training methods and no significant change in couples' responses after the series of group meetings.

The sample consisted of 50 married couples (100 participants) from 10 counties in two North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service districts. Thirty-nine couples attended

the series of programs in which videotape learning packages
were used. Ten couples were in groups led by three agents
who had received their training through a traditional group
workshop. The other 29 couples were in groups led by seven
agents who had received their training through the telephone/
conference mailing procedure. Couples in both of these groups
responded to pre-post inventories. Eleven couples from the
two districts, comprising the control group, did not attend
any group meetings but responded to the pre-post inventories.

An instrument for assessing the acceptance of the two
training methods included 16 items designed to measure the
agents' attitudes toward conducting marriage enrichment
groups and using videotape learning packages. The first six
items were administered as a pre-post measure. Additional
open-end items were designed for agents to evaluate the video-
tape resources and the group meeting procedures.

The self-administered pre-post inventory for participants
included instruments to measure marital consensus (Spanier,
1976), interpersonal communication (Bienvenu, 1976), know-
ledge of concepts in human relations (instrument designed
especially for the present study), couples' commitment to
their relationships (Swicegood, 1974), a group experience
evaluation (Nadeau, 1972), and a participants' evaluation of
the series of classes.

Analysis of variance techniques were used to examine
pre-post change scores for agents' attitudes toward videotape

teaching methods and their total evaluation scores. - Analysis of variance and multivariate analysis of variance techniques were used to examine pre-post change scores for participants and a pairwise analysis of couple scores on measures of the dependent variables, consensus, communication, and information. Couples' commitment to the relationship was ascertained through cross-tabulations of pre-post answers to open-end items.

Three hypotheses in the direction of expected findings were formulated and tested by this research. Each hypothesis and the results are listed below:

1. There will be no difference in the attitude toward conducting personal enrichment groups in the human relations area between (a) leaders who were trained and received videotape learning packages in a traditional group workshop and (b) leaders who received training instructions individually through a specialist's telephone conferences and videotape learning packages by mail. The hypothesis was supported.

2. There will be no differences in pretest-posttest changes on instrument scores between (a) married couples who participated in group sessions whose leaders were trained to use videotape learning packages in traditional workshops and (b) couples whose leaders received training instructions individually through specialist's telephone conferences and videotape learning packages by mail. The hypothesis was supported.

3. There will be an increase in the pretest-posttest change scores on marital consensus, interpersonal communication, and knowledge of human relations concepts from the pretest to the posttest and a higher score on the posttest for individuals in both experimental groups combined as compared to the scores control group. The hypothesis was rejected for three dependent variables.

Couples who experienced the series of four group meetings reported having gained insight into aspects in their marriage that they had previously identified as those areas that could be better or that they could improve. Communication was cited by the participants as the aspect of their marriage that they most wanted to improve, and it was further identified as the area into which they gained insight. The second area of desired improvement into which they gained insight concerned aspects of personal growth. Couples expressed commitment to their own marriage and a few couples expressed commitment to learning about how to help other couples enrich marriage.

An evaluation of the program series by the couples indicated that the most meaningful part was the group discussion with other couples. Learning the technique of dialogue was also mentioned as important to the couples.

Agents responding favorably to the method of teaching indicated that without the videotape resources they would not have attempted to organize a series of classes to teach the

subject matter. They felt comfortable working with married couples in a group setting and in using videotapes as resource materials.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn:

1. The telephone conference/mail training procedure is suitable as an alternate training procedure at one-fourth the cost of equivalent training through traditional group workshops.

2. Home economics Extension agents accepted the video-tape teaching method and conducted group meetings with married couples which they probably would not have done without the availability of the videotape learning packages.

3. The marriage enrichment program attracted clientele who had not previously attended Extension functions, and therefore appears to be a new avenue for expansion of Extension programs.

4. Although the quantitatively measured test scores were not indicative of change, couples' self-reports indicated that they appeared to have made gains in their awareness of marriage enrichment concepts which showed that this marriage enrichment program met the primary goal of such programs.

5. When the data are examined very closely then the meaning of marriage enrichment becomes more clear.

This present study is viewed as a pilot effort and one of the contributors to defining marriage enrichment.

Implications and Recommendations

After considering the overall findings, the agents' attitudes, evaluations, and suggestions for improving the videotape series, and the results of the couples' evaluation, the writer offers these recommendations for further development and study.

1. Redesign the telephone conference/mail training procedure to include some small group discussion involving at least three agents and the specialist, perhaps through a group telephone communication system.

2. Utilize the videotape format in other subject-matter areas for training Extension personnel and community leaders, and for working with participant groups within communities.

3. Develop videotape resources in other subject-matter areas to further test the telephone conference/mail procedure versus the traditional group workshop procedures for agent training.

4. Replicate the couple participant portion of this study by using the videotape learning packages in a week-end marriage enrichment retreat setting.

5. Revise the videotape series by taking into account the content changes and the color cassette format suggested by couple participants and agents in the present study.

6. Develop a series of human relations videotapes for two additional focal audiences: (a) individuals who are seeking ways to develop greater competency in interpersonal situations, including the world of work, and (b) family groups.

7. Use the four tapes developed in the present study as the beginning content tape for a series of tapes on each topic. The four could be used in their present sequence or individually as a preface to a more indepth tract on each topic.

8. Use the pre-post inventories as teaching aids in the series of classes and as self-evaluation devices for the couples.

9. Explore various videotape formats, using small group training and printed supplementary materials as a means of increasing training capabilities while decreasing the cost of training.

10. Refine the information items by studying the factor analysis and considering those factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater. An analysis of variance could be employed with factor scores to test sex differences and those differences between participants in experimental and no-treatment groups.

11. Further analyze the couples' responses to pre-post items in the consensus, communication, and information measures through item by item cross-tabulations to determine changes. The couples may have had no overall change in scores but could have changed on different questions.

12. Examine pretest scores as a means of identifying content and establishing a baseline from which to develop programs that will promote growth and provide opportunity for change beyond the starting point.

13. Conduct studies with marriage enrichment groups in an attempt to behaviorally define the components of enrichment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, W. The marriage counselor and interspousal communi-
cation. Western Psychologist, 1973, 4, 4, 112-117.

Andes, D. A. An evaluation of a couples' relationship-
building workshop: The use of video and small group
feedback in teaching communication skills (Doctoral
dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1974).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35,
4637B. (University Microfilms No. 75-5984)

Appenfeldt, L. The effects of practice in programed video
simulation of counseling on student communication skills
(Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1973).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35,
182A-183A. (University Microfilms No. 74-14,334)

Archer, J., Jr. Undergraduates as paraprofessional leaders
of interpersonal communications skills training groups
using an integrated IPR (interpersonal process recall)
videotape feedback affect simulation training model
(Doctoral dissertation,Michigan State University,
1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972,
32(09-A), 4932. (University Microfilms No. 72-8624)

Archer, J., & Kagan, N. Teaching interpersonal relation-
ship skills on campus: A pyramid approach. Journal
of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20 (6), 535-540.

Barr, A. J., Goodnight, J. H., Sail, J. P., & Helwig, J. T.
A user's guide to SAS 76. Raleigh, N. C.: SAS Insti-
tute, Inc., 1976.

Bauby, C. Between consenting adults: Dialogue for inti-
mate living. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Beck, D. F. Research findings on the outcomes of marital
counseling. In D. H. Olson (Ed.), Treating relation-
ships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic Publishing Company,
Inc., 1976.

Benson, L., Berger, M., & Mease, W. Family communication
systems. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6(1), 91-105.

Bergner, R. The development and evaluation of a training
videotape for the resolution of marital conflict (Doc-
toral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1973).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 3485B.
(University Microfilms No. 73-32, 510)

Berzon, R., Reisdl, J., & Davis, D. P. PEER: An audio
tape program for self-directed small groups. Journal
of Humanistic Psychology, 1969, 9(1), 71-86.

Bienvenu, M. J. Measurement of marital communication.
The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 26-31.

Bienvenu, M. J. An interpersonal communication inventory.
The Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 381-387.

Bienvenu, M. J. A guide to accompany the interpersonal
communication inventory. Natchitoches, Louisiana:
Millard J. Bienvenu, 1974.

Bienvenu, M. J., & Stewart, D. W. Dimensions of inter-
personal communication. The Journal of Psychology,
1976, 93, 105-111.

Bosco, A. The marriage encounter: The rediscovery of
love. St. Meinrad, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1972.

Bosco, A. Marriage encounter: An ecumenical enrichment
program. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrich-
ment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville,
Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Bruder, A. Effects of a marriage enrichment program upon
marital communication and adjustment (Doctoral disser-
tation, Purdue University, 1972). Dissertation
Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 5317A. (University
Microfilms No. 73-5595)

Buckley, W. Sociology and modern systems theory. Engle-
wood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Buros, O. (Ed.). Tests in print (Vol. 2). Highland Park,
New Jersey: The Cryphon Press, 1974.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-
experimental designs for research. Chicago, Illinois:
Rand McNally & Co., 1972.

Campbell, E. E. The effects of couple communication training
on married couples in the child rearing years: A field
experiment (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State Univer-
sity, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974,
35, 1942A. (University Microfilms No. 74-23,420)

Canino-Stolberg, G. The effects of physical contact exer-
cises in marathon encounter leaderless groups, on dimen-
sions of self-concept, self-disclosure and touching
behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University,
1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976,
36, 3592B. (University Microfilms No. 75-28,205)

Capers, H., & Capers, B. Transactional analysis tools for use in marriage enrichment programs. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Carkhuff, R. The art of helping: A guide for developing skills for parents, teachers and counselors. Amherst, Massachusetts: Human Resource Development Press, 1973.

Carnes, P. J., & Laube, H. Becoming us: An experiment in family learning and teaching. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6(1), 92-106.

Cassidy, M. J. Communication training for marital pairs (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 3054A. (University Microfilms No. 73-28, 680)

Clarke, C. Group procedures for increased positive feedback between married partners. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19(4), 324-328.

Clinebell, H., & Clinebell, C. The intimate marriage. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Clinebell, H. J., Jr. Cassette programs for training and enrichment. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Collingwood, T. R. Differential effects of large and small group training and retraining on the long term retention of facilitative communication (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31, 5617B. (University Microfilms No. 71-5999)

Collingwood, T. R. The effects of large group training on facilitative interpersonal communication. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25(4), 461-462.

Collins, J. D. The effects of the conjugal relationship modification method on marital communication and adjustment (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 6674B. (University Microfilms No. 72-13, 836)

Cookerly, J. R. Evaluating different approaches to marriage counseling. In D. H. Olson (Ed.), Treating relationships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.

Croft, R. G., Stimpson, D. V., Ross, W. L., Bray, R. M., & Breglio, V. J. Comparison of attitude changes elicited by live and videotape classroom presentations. AV Communication Review, 1969, 17(3), 315-321.

Cromwell, R. E., Olson, D. H., & Fournier, D. G. Diagnosis and evaluation in marital and family counseling. In D. H. Olson (Ed.), Treating relationships. Lake Mills, Iowa: Graphic Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.

Crosby, J. F. Making it together: Growth from within. In C. E. Williams & J. F. Crosby (Eds.), Choice and challenge. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1974.

Cushman, D. P., & Florence, B. T. The development of interpersonal communication theory. Today's Speech, Fall 1974, pp. 11-15.

Deets, C. Nonverbal communication of emotions (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6187A. (University Microfilms No. 72-6701)

Dendy, R. A model for the training of undergraduate residence hall assistants as paraprofessional counselors using videotape techniques and interpersonal process recall (IPR) (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(09-A), 4940. (University Microfilm No. 72-8676)

Donnelly, M. Down home cooking: Videotape. Raleigh: North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, North Carolina State University, 1975.

Downing, C. J. The development and evaluation of a program for parent training in family relationship and management skills (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 3023A. (University Microfilms No. 72-1541)

Elbert, W. Changes in self-concept, self-actualization, and interpersonal relations as a result of video feedback in sensitivity training (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30(12-A), 5233. (University Microfilms No. 70-11, 285)

Farson, R. The future of the family. New York: Family Association of America, 1969.

Foote, N., & Cottrell, L. Identity and interpersonal competence. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Franklin, H. Personal communication, October 14, 1976.

Freed, F. H. Self-disclosure as a facilitator of satisfaction of marriage (Doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1974). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1975, _36_, 440B. (University Microfilms No. 75-5974)

Gallagher, Father C. _The marriage encounter_. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975.

Genovese, R. J. Marriage encounter. _Small Group Behavior_, 1975, _6_(1), 45-56.

Goover, J. D. Experiential learning effects on empathic interpersonal communication skills and related attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1974). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1975, _35_, 5609A. (University Microfilms No. 75-6600)

Gordon, T. _Parent effectiveness training_. New York: Peter H. Wyden, Inc., 1970.

Gruber, G. R. The relationship of self-concept and adjustment to gains achieved in the conjugal relationship enhancement program (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1974, _34_, 6770A. (University Microfilms No. 74-7875)

Gruin, G., Veroff, J., & Feld, S. _Americans view their mental health_. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Guerney, B., Jr. _Ideals_. State College, Pennsylvania: Institute for the Development of Emotional and Life Skills, Brochure, 1975.

Gustafson, K. An evaluation of enriching intimacy--a behavioral approach to the training of empathy, respect-warmth and genuineness (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1975, _36_, 909B. (University Microfilms No. 75-16,558)

Harrell, J. E. Efficacy of a behavioral-exchange program for teaching conflict negotiation skills to enhance marital relationships (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1974). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1975, _36_, 4063A. (University Microfilms No. 75-27, 618)

Harris, R. J. _A primer of multivariate statistics_. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Hawkins, L. _More roads to the enrichment of marriage_. Raleigh: North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, 1973.

Hawkins, L. <u>Roads to the enrichment of marriage</u>. Raleigh: North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, 1972.

Hawkins, L., & Swicegood, M. Personal communication, October 20, 1976.

Hayward, D. Positive partners: A marriage enrichment communication course. In H. Otto (Ed.), <u>Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs</u>. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Heck, E. J. A study concerning the differential effectiveness of two approaches to human relationship training in facilitating change in interpersonal communication skill and style of interpersonal perception (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1968). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1969, <u>30</u>, 1398A. (University Microfilms No. 69-17,695)

Heiserman, M. The effect of experiential-videotape training procedures compared to cognitive-classroom teaching methods on the interpersonal communication skills of juvenile court caseworkers (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1972, <u>32</u>, 4949A. (University Microfilms No. 72-8690)

Hickman, M. E. Facilitation techniques in counseling married couples toward more effective communication (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1970, <u>31</u>, 2107A. (University Microfilms No. 70-20,916)

Hicks, M., & Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of research in the sixties. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family</u>, 1970, <u>32</u>, 553-574.

Hilkey, J. H. The effects of video-tape pretraining and guided performance on selected process and outcome variables of group counseling (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, 1975). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1976, <u>36</u>, 4261A-4262A. (University Microfilms No. 75-27,922)

Hill, R., & Rodgers, R. H. The developmental approach. In Harold T. Christensen (Ed.), <u>Handbook of marriage and the family</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964.

Hollingshead, A. B. <u>Two-factor index of social position</u>. New Haven, Connecticut: August B. Hollingshead, 1962.

Hoover, J. D. Experiential learning effects on empathic interpersonal communication skills and related attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1974). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1975, <u>35</u>, 5609A. (University Microfilms No. 75-6600)

Hopkins, P., & Hopkins. L.   The marriage communication labs.
    In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New
    perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee:
    Abingdon Press, 1976.

Ivey, A. E.   Microcounseling and media therapy: State of
    the art. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974,
    13(3), 172-183.

Jason, H., Kagan, N., Werner, A., Elstein, A., & Thomas, J.
    New approaches to teaching basic interview skills to
    medical students. American Journal of Psychiatry,
    1971, 127(10), 1404-1407.

Kagan, N.   Interpersonal process recall: A method of influ-
    encing human interaction. East Lansing: Michigan
    State University, 1975.

Katz, E.   The two-step flow of communication: An up-to-date
    report on a hypothesis. Public Opinion Quarterly,
    1975, 21, 61-78.

Kerlinger, F. N.   Foundations of behavioral research
    (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.,
    1973.

Kind, D. D.   Communication, personality, and satisfaction
    in marriage (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia Univer-
    sity, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International,
    1975, 36, 1439B.   (University Microfilms No. 75-18, 398)

Kind, J.   The relation of communication-efficiency to mari-
    tal happiness and an evaluation of short-term training
    in interpersonal communication with married couples
    (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1968).
    Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 29, 1173B.
    (University Microfilms No. 68-11, 956)

Klapper, J. T.   Effects of mass communication. In D. L.
    Sills (Ed.), International encyclopedia of the social
    sciences (Vol. 3). New York: MacMillan Co. and Free
    Press, 1968.

Klemer, R. H.   Marriage and family relationships. New
    York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Kligfeld, B.   The Jewish marriage encounter. In H. Otto
    (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspec-
    tives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon
    Press, 1976.

Lamont, C.   Naturalistic humanism. Humanist, 1971, 31(5),
    9-10.

Larsen, G. R. An evaluation of the Minnesota Couple Communications Training Program's influence on marital communication and self and mate perceptions (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 2627A. (University Microfilms No. 74-20, 137)

Lederer, W., & Jackson, D. The mirages of marriage. New York: Norton and Co., 1968.

Levinger, G. Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36, 803-807.

Levinger, G., & Senn, D. Disclosure of feelings in marriage. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13(3), 237-249.

Mace, D. Marriage enrichment concepts for research. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 171-173.

Mace, D., & Mace, V. Marriage enrichment through group interaction. Unpublished manuscript, April, 1972.

Mace, D., & Mace, V. The role of the contact couple. Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment (ACME), Newsletter, October, 1974. (a)

Mace, D., & Mace, V. We can have better marriages if we really want them. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1974. (b)

Mace, D., & Mace, V. Marriage enrichment--wave of the future? The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24 2, 131-135. (a)

Mace, D., & Mace, V. Plans for the selection, training, and certification of leader couples. Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment (ACME), Newsletter, July, 1975. (b)

Magnus, R. E. Development of an individualized autoinstructional program to improve the ability to understand and communicate empathically (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 3296A. (University Microfilms No. 73-160)

Miles, M. B., Fisch, E. S., Pollock, K. M., & Tichy, N. M. The evaluation of a cable TV program designed to promote growth in marital relationships. (Final report, National Institute of Mental Health Grant RO1 MH 20221-01, 02). New York Center for Policy Research, Inc., October 1974.

Miller, S. The effects of communication training in small groups upon self-disclosure and openness in engaged couples' systems of interaction: The field experiment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 2819A. (University Microfilms No. 71-28, 263)

Miller, S., Corrales, R., & Wackman, D. Recent progress in understanding and facilitating marital communication. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 143-152.

Miller, S., & Nunnally, E. A family developmental program of communication training for engaged couples. University of Minnesota, Family Study Center, Monograph, 1970.

Miller, S., Nunnally, E., & Wackman, D. Minnesota Couples Communication Program. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc., 1972.

Miller, S., Nunnally, E., & Wackman, D. Alive and aware: Improving communication in relationships. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc., 1975.

Nadeau, K. G. An examination of some effects of the marital enrichment group (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 22(09-B), 5453. (University Microfilms No. 72-9714)

Narrow, B. The development of communication skills through observational learning and small group interaction (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 3868A. (University Microfilms No. 71-11, 013)

Nauran, L. Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 1967, 6, 173-184.

Nebraska Educational Television Council for Higher Education Instructional Sequence. Couple communication skills--four half-hour video programs. Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska Educational Television Council, 1975.

Neville, W. G. An analysis of personality types and their differential response to marital enrichment groups (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Florida, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 6766A. (University Microfilms No. 72-16, 640)

Nichols, T. E., Jr., & Ikerd, J. E. Commodity Futures market: Videotape. Raleigh: North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service, Department of Economics and Business, North Carolina State University, 1975.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Stienbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. SPSS--Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

Noord, D. The process of training in communications and interpersonal skills (Doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Francisco, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 3590B. (University Microfilms No. 75-478)

Norod, E. F. Effects of simulated instruction in interpersonal relationships on verbal behavior of student nurses (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Rochester, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 1400A. (University Microfilms No. 71-22, 333)

Nunnally, E. W. Effects of communication training upon interaction awareness and empathic accuracy of engaged couples: A field experiment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32, 4736A. (University Microfilms No. 72-5561)

O'Dell, S., & Seiler, G. The effects of short-term personal growth groups on anxiety and self-perception. Small Group Behavior, 1975, 6(3), 251-271.

O'Neill, N., & O'Neil, G. Open marriage. New York: M. Evans and Co., Inc., 1972.

Orling, R. A. The efficacy of proactive marital communication training (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 3618A-3619A. (University Microfilms No. 75-21, 316)

Otto, H. (Ed.). Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976. (a)

Otto, H. Marriage and family enrichment programs: An overview of a movement. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976. (b)

Otto, H. Marriage and family enrichment programs in North America--report and analysis. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 137-141.

Otto, H., & Otto, R. The more joy in your marriage program. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Patterson, G. R. Families: Application of social learning to family life. Champaign, Ill.: Research Press, 1971.

Pearson, C. J. An experimental marriage enrichment program for navy personnel and dependents using transactional analysis (Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1975, <u>36</u>, 3097B. (University Microfilms No. 75-26, 119)

Peterson, D. M. Husband-wife communication and family problems. <u>Sociology and Social Research</u>, 1969, <u>53</u>(3), 375-384.

Pitzer, R., Meyers, S., Anderson, C., Meredith, N., Christianson, M., Gunsalus, M., & Tybring, J. <u>Living married</u>. Cooperative Extension Services: Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Ames: Iowa State University, 1975. (Twelve half-hour TV programs and viewers' guide)

Pool, I. de S. The mass media and politics in the modernization process. In L. W. Pye (Ed.), <u>Communications and political development</u>. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Price, G. M. Influencing maternal care through discussion of videotapes of maternal-infant feeding interaction (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1975). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1975, <u>36</u>, 1928B-1929B. (University Microfilms No. 75-21, 007)

Rafael, B., & Marinoff, S. L. Using videotape for teacher training. <u>Young Children</u>, 1973, <u>28</u>, 217-219.

Rappaport, A. F. The effects of an intensive conjugal relationship modification program (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, 1972, <u>32</u>, 6571A. (University Microfilms No. 72-13, 917)

Regula, R. Marriage encounter: What makes it work? <u>The Family Coordinator</u>, 1975, <u>24</u>(2), 153-159.

Rich, J., & Luckey, E. B. The use and production of television tapes for courses in family life education. <u>The Family Coordinator</u>, 1970, <u>19</u>(3), 203-208.

Rogers, C. A humanistic conception of man. In G. Carr (Ed.), <u>Marriage and the family in a decade of change</u>. Reading, Pa.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1972. (a)

Rogers, C. <u>Becoming partners: Marriage and its alternatives</u>. New York: Delacorte Press, 1972. (b)

Rye, D. A comparative study of three small group treatments and their effects on accurate communication between counselor trainees and their clients (Doctoral dissertation,

Indiana University, 1969). _Dissertation Abstracts Inter-national_, 1969, _30_, 554A. (University Microfilms No. 69-13, 244)

Satir, V. _Peoplemaking_. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1972.

Schmitz, D. R. Facilitating self-disclosure responses in a simulated counseling interview through the use of audiotape modeling, videotape modeling, and instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1973). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1974, _34_, 6392A. (University Midrofilms No. 74-9468)

Seamons, T. R. An individualized learning unit approach for teaching empathy as a necessary element in effective interpersonal relationships (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1972, _33_, 2775A. (University Microfilms No. 72-32, 635)

Sherwood, J. J., & Scherer, J. J. A model for couples: How two can grow together. _Small Group Behavior_, 1975, _6_(1), 11-30.

Shepell, W. E. J. Encouraging reflection of feeling through modeling as a function of communication made in counselor preparation (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1974). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1975, _35_, 4153B. (University Microfilms No. 75-2776)

Shilling, L. E., Jr. The differential effect of two small-group training procedures upon the acquisition of interpersonal communication skills and the extinction of interpersonal anxiety (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970). _Dissertation Abstracts International_, 1971, _31_, 4977B. (University Microfilms No. 71-3781)

Smith, L., & Smith, A. Developing a nation-wide marriage communication labs program. In H. Otto (Ed.), _Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs_. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Smith, R. M. _Klemer's marriage and family relationships_ (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1975.

Smith, R. M., & Keister, M. E. _Variables associated with marriage and family enrichment_. Unpublished research proposal, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1975.

Smith, R. M., Scott, J. P., & Shoffner, S. M. _Marriage and family enrichment: A position paper_. Greensboro, North Carolina: The North Carolina Family Life Council, Inc. and The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976.

Spanier, G. B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and The Family, 1976, 38(1), 15-28.

Spring, F. Mediators of change in family interaction patterns: Video modeling versus audio modeling versus instructions (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 1927B. (University Microfilms No. 74-22, 547)

Springer, D. Video cassettes "tops." Manhattan: Kansas State University, Office of Extension Radio, Television, Film. Unpublished paper, 1976.

Stein, E. MARDILAB: An experiment in marriage enrichment. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 167-170.

Swicegood, M. L. An evaluative study of one approach to marriage enrichment (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 1780B. (University Microfilms No. 74-22, 032)

Tofler, A. Future shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Travis, R., & Travis, P. The pairing enrichment program: Actualizing the marriage. The Family Coordinator, 1975, 24(2), 161-165.

Trent, C., & Dierking, J. Evaluating an adult learning experience in teen-age nutrition. Raleigh: North Carolina State University Adult Education. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.

Van Eck, A. O., & Van Eck, B. A. The phase II marriage enrichment lab. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Van Horn, J. E. Tri-county experiential video tape delivery systems for family counselor education. University Park, Pennsylvania: Cooperative Extension Service, College of Agriculture, Pennsylvania State University, Final Report, September, 1974.

Van Zoost, B. Premarital communication skills education with university students. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 22(2), 187-191.

Vander Harr, D., & Vander Harr, T. The marriage enrichment program--Phase I. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

Wackman, D. B., Miller, S., & Nunnally, E. W. Student work-book: Increasing awareness and communication skills. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc., 1976.

Wall, V. D., & Boyd, J. A. Channel variation and attitude change. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21(4), 363-367.

Walter, G. A. Effects of videotape training inputs on group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60(3), 308-312.

Weinstein, C. G. Differential change in self-actualization and self-concept and its effect on marital interaction, as an outcome of a selected growth group-experience (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 4067A-4068A. (University Microfilms No. 75-28, 659)

Whalen, C. Effects of a model and instructions on group verbal behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33(5), 509-521.

Wilett, J. R. The effect of instructions, modeling and rein-forcement on training communication skills in small groups (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2454B. (University Microfilms No. 74-24, 158)

Wittrup, R. Marriage enrichment: A preventive counseling program designed to attain marriage potential (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 6399A. (University Microfilms No. 74-9660)

Zieff, R. M. Communications effectiveness in marriage: Its measurement in young married dyads and its relation-ship to other interaction and demographic variables (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32, 3656B. (University Microfilms No. 71-30, 618)

Zinker, J. C., & Leon, J. P. The gestalt perspective: A marriage enrichment program. In H. Otto (Ed.), Marriage and family enrichment: New perspectives and programs. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1976.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE TO PARTICIPATING
AGENTS *

* The guidelines, questionnaires, and agent evaluations
in the following appendices appear as they were used in
the study except for the addition of some phrases which
name the variables being measured and the source of the
scale or items and variations in format to comply with
guidelines for the preparation of the dissertation manu-
script.

(Letterhead used)

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

OFFICE OF DISTRICT HOME ECONOMICS AGENTS

March 29, 1976

Note: Experimental Group A,Traditional Training

To: Home Economics Agents in the South Central District
with Responsibility for Human Development

(names listed)

(Signature)   (Signature)

From: Myrle L. Swicegood   Leo F. Hawkins
District Ext. Agent   Specialist in Charge
Human Development

A special pilot project between UNC-G School of Home
Economics and our Extension staff has enabled us to provide
an exciting new teaching tool:

A learning package entitled:
"The Subject Is Becoming, You, Me, and Us."

Contents of learning package:

.....4 videotapes produced at N.C.S.U. using married
couples to demonstrate major concepts taught by
Dr. Leo Hawkins, family life specialist.

.....A manual of guidelines containing supplementary teach-
ing aids, recruitment strategies, and evaluation
instruments.

Purpose of learning package:

.....to facilitate teaching of married couples who are
interested in learning interpersonal skills such as:
.understanding yourself
.how to communicate more effectively

.how to handle conflicts constructively and com-
mitment for themselves and their partners to the
goals of their marriage

.....to evaluate the effectiveness of this method in facil-
itating your teaching role and to determine the value
of the learning experience for participants.

Implementation:

.....to field test the project and effectively evaluate the
videotape learning packages, we would like you to
organize just one group to participate in a series of
four meetings, during May (or prior to mid-June).
Think of a small group of no more than ten couples
or less than six couples. This format appears best
for good interaction.

Other help you will receive:

.....A training meeting April 20 to view tapes and become
familiar with teaching plans. Meeting in Carthage at
the Agricultural Extension Building, 9:30 a.m. (Auth-
orization enclosed).

You are being invited to participate in this project because:

.....agents have expressed the need for specific teaching
aids in the area of human development.

.....it is believed married couples in the South Central
District will be interested in participating in this
learning experience.

.....the effectiveness of this learning package needs
to be evaluated through a field test.

We appreciate your cooperation.

MLS:LFH:kc

(Letterhead used)

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

OFFICE OF DISTRICT HOME ECONOMICS AGENTS

March 29, 1976

Note: Experimental Group B--Telephone/Mail Training

To: Home Economics Agents in the Southwestern District
with Responsibility for Human Development

(names listed)

(Signature)   (Signature)

From: Carolyn C. Register   Leo F. Hawkins
District Ext. Agent   Specialist in Charge
Human Development

A special pilot project between UNC-G School of Home
Economics and our Extension staff has enabled us to provide
an exciting new teaching tool:

A learning package entitled:
"The Subject Is Becoming, You, Me, and Us."

Contents of learning package:

.....4 video tapes produced at N.C.S.U. using married
couples to demonstrate major concepts taught by
Dr. Leo Hawkins, family life specialist.

.....A manual of guidelines containing supplementary
teaching aids, recruitment strategies, and evaluation
instruments.

Purpose of learning package:

.....to facilitate teaching of married couples who are
interested in learning interpersonal skills such as:

.understanding yourself
.how to communicate more effectively

.how to handle conflict constructively and com-
mitment for themselves and their partners to
the goals of their marriage.

.....to evaluate the effectiveness of this method in facil-
itating your teaching role and to determine the value
of the learning experience for participants.

Implementation:

.....To field test the project and effectively evaluate the
videotape learning packages, we would like you to
organize just one group to participate in a series of
four meetings, during May (or prior to mid-June).
Think of a small group of no more than ten couples or
less than six couples. This format appears best for
good interaction. Learning packages will be put in the
mail for you by April 19. If it is possible for you to
hold one series of meetings prior to mid-June, please
begin to think about when you could hold the classes
and tell Dr. Hawkins your plans when he calls. Since
research shows that effective learning is sequential,
best results are likely achieved if you select a two-or
three-week period and have two sessions a week, for
example: Tuesday and Thursday nights, or a three-week
period with sessions on Thursday, Tuesday, Thursday,
Tuesday.

Other help you will receive:

.....In lieu of an all-day training session you will receive
more details in a personal phone call from Dr. Leo Haw-
kins. You may expect this call within the next two weeks.

.....The complete learning package so that you may view
tapes and become familiar with teaching plans at your
own convenience.

.....A second phone call from Dr. Hawkins to answer ques-
tions, hear your reactions, and provide any needed
clarification.

You are being invited to participate in this project because:

.....agents have expressed the need for specific teaching
aids in the area of human development.

.....it is believed married couples in the Southwest District
will be interested in participating in this learning
experience.

.....the effectiveness of this learning package needs to
be evaluated through a field test.

We appreciate your cooperation.

CCR:LFH:kc

APPENDIX B

GUIDELINES FOR INITIAL TELEPHONE CONFERENCE*

TO PARTICIPATING AGENTS

* Telephone contact was made two weeks following the posting of the letters to agents in the Southwestern District.

> **Guidelines for Telephone Conference
> to Participating Agent**

Phone #_____

Name_____

Time Beginning_____

County_____Date_____

Ending_____

    Good Morning!_____
(Or appropriate   (name called)
 greeting)

This is_____
    (name of specialist calling)

You know that in Extension we are
always looking for ways to do
things better. I'm calling to tell
you about an exciting new project.
We are inviting you to participate.
Also, other home economics agents
in the Southwest district who have
the human development area of re-
sponsibility will be working on
this project.

According to SEMIS reports we are
not spending as much time in human
development as would appear justi-
fiable from the concerns in this
area. From time to time you agents
have told us that you need specific
help in order to feel better pre-
pared to teach in this area. How
do you feel about teaching subject
matter in human development? We
have listened to this request,
and therefore, in cooperation with
UNC-G we have developed some video-
tapes for you to use with groups of
married couples.

The tapes are entitled "Becoming
You, Me, and Us." Using several
married couples to role-play the
main teaching points, they were
filmed here at the university.
The content in one of the tapes
deals with <u>understanding yourself</u>,
one deals with <u>communication</u>, and

COMMENTS & CONCERNS--NOTES

(Please record agent's ques-
tions, comments, and respon-
ses throughout this initial
telephone conference)

another is concerned with under-
standing what is important to each
member of the couple. We are call-
ing this <u>consensus</u>. The fourth
deals with <u>commitment</u> to each
partner's learning and becoming a
more adequate person and with
commitment to the growth of their
marriage.

These four tapes are designed for
your use with couples in a group
setting. We believe that no more
than 10 couples would be as many
as you would want to invite to
participate in this learning
experience. Now what I would like
to do is to send you the four tapes
and ask you to look at them. I
will also send some additional
material with the tapes so that
you will see the total learning
package and how to organize these
materials for your groups.

The package will include a teaching
guide for you that will outline
procedures for organizing and con-
ducting the four group meetings,
suggested activities to use, and
background information. Of course
you will still need to use your
judgment in meeting the needs of
the group members.

After you have viewed the tapes
and read the materials, I would
like us to talk again by phone.
We can discuss questions that you
have and review points in the leader
outlines.

During the pilot study we would
like you to organize just one
group to participate in a series of
four meetings during May. We
believe you will get the best
results if you select a two-or
three-week period and have two
sessions a week--say Tuesday and
Thursday nights. Then the four

sessions would be completed. Or a three-week period with sessions on Thursday, Tuesday-Thursday, and Tuesday.

You should receive your materials in the mail within the week. I want you to have time to review them before we talk again. Let's choose a time next week when it would be convenient for me to call you.

(Agree on date and hour for follow up telephone conference)

Follow up call:

Date:_____

Hour: a.m._____

    or
    p. m._____

I'm really looking forward to work-ing with you on this project. There will be some evaluation built into this so we will be able to measure our accomplishments. An evaluation will probably involve pre-and post-meeting inventories for those who participate in your group meetings; and some general questions about what you think of this method of teaching.

I'll call you next week (give day and time agreed upon). Be sure to have the packet of materials at the phone. Then we can discuss any points that you question.

Goodbye and thank you.
Ending time_____

Follow-up Telephone Conference

Phone #_____

Name_____   Time: Beginning_____
                                          Ending_____

County_____Date_____

        Good Morning!_____   COMMENTS & CONCERNS--NOTES
(Or appropriate   (name called)
 greeting)
I have been looking forward to
talking with you again about the
videotape learning packages. I
hope you enjoyed them!

Do you have questions about either
of the four tapes or the leader
outlines?

             COMMENTS AND CONCERNS--NOTES

     (space for writing)

Have you set the dates for your classes?
What are these dates? RECORD DATES BELOW.

            1st class   2nd class   3rd class   4th class

DATES   _____   _____   _____   _____

Time   _____   _____   _____   _____

What type(s) of publicity are you planning for recruiting
class participants?

             COMMENTS AND CONCERNS--NOTES

     (space for writing)

Is there anything else I can help you with? Please ask any
questions that come to mind. (Specialist: If you notice
other concerns that need discussing, please record them along
with questions you may ask and the agent's responses.)

     (space)

It seems from our conference that plans are going well. I
appreciate your willingness to try these new materials. Your
thoughts and comments as you experience the series will cer-
tainly be valuable to me.

Please contact me if you have additional questions. I'll be
looking forward to receiving your comments and evaluations.

Ending Time_____

APPENDIX C

DIRECTIONS TO AGENTS

AND PRE AND POST INVENTORIES

TO: AGENTS
RE: Inventories for Couples in Classes
      Inventories for Couples NOT in Classes
      Agent Evaluations

   Each piece of the pre and post inventories is labeled with the number of the class meeting in which it is to be administered. Explanations for the inventory procedures follow in this memo.

<div align="center">INVENTORIES FOR COUPLES IN CLASSES</div>

Numbers on Pre and Post Inventories

   Numbers have been assigned and recorded on the pre and post inventories. The same number is used for both husband and wife; but the number appears only once on each inventory in the block beside the word "husband" or "wife." The wife should complete the inventory with the number beside "wife." Likewise, the husband should complete the inventory with the number beside "husband." No names should be written on the inventories.

Master Code Form

   The master code form shows couple numbers. This form is to be the master record of couples who participate in the classes. Please record their names and addresses on this master record. The responses of individuals will never be compared to the names of the participants. However, it is possible that we would like to contact these couples sometime in the future either to answer more questions or just to thank them for participating in the series of classes, etc. When you give out the prenumbered inventories, to be completed at the various meetings, always give the same numbers to the couples as you have them recorded on the master record. You may tell the couples their numbers and let them help remember; however, it does not mean that you will not need to double-check.

   Please remind the couples to fill out the inventories individually without consulting their spouses. You may want to read the directions aloud to the couples, particularly the first time you present the inventories. As soon as all inventories are completed, place them inside the return envelope and seal it in front of the group. This action reinforces confidentiality and shows them that neither you nor anyone else in the community will be looking at their inventories.

Schedule for Inventories

A preinventory is to be completed <u>before</u> the <u>first class</u> begins. <u>No</u> information is to be collected before the second class. Some general information is to be obtained <u>before</u> class <u>three</u> begins. The postinventory and class evaluations are to be completed <u>after</u> the <u>fourth</u> class. When the evaluations are compiled, you will be sent a summary of the comments made by your group. Later, you will receive a summary of the overall pilot study.

Be sure to have some extra pencils in case the couples do not have any with them.

INVENTORIES FOR COUPLES WHO DO NOT ATTEND CLASSES

In order to have a comparison group of couples who do not participate in the series of classes we would like you to locate two couples who would be willing to fill in the pre and post inventories. Tell them that they will be participating so that their overall responses can be compared with those of couples who attend your classes. This comparison will enable us to make a better evaluation.

Completion of inventories for this comparison group should be done at approximately the same time interval that you have scheduled for your classes. Ask the couples to complete the preinventory package around the time you will be meeting the first class. Suggest a definite time period. Ask them to seal the preinventory in the envelope as soon as they have completed it and mail it. The envelope is pre-addressed. Near the end of the time period during which your classes are scheduled, ask these same couples to complete the postinventory schedules. Follow the same sealing and mailing procedure as used for the preinventory.

When you initially ask for their help, tell them that you'll want them to complete another inventory soon. Encourage them to answer <u>all</u> questions on the postinventory even though they may recognize the similarity to the first inventory. This inventory is very important to the success of the overall evaluation.

Suggestions for Securing Couples to Fill Out the Inventories

If you receive more inquiries than you have spaces in the class, you might ask these couples to complete the inventories. (Their "thanks" is a place in future classes!) You also may have couples who are interested in the classes but who cannot attend all four in the series at the time you have scheduled them. These couples could be asked to participate by completing the inventories. If these possibilities

do not yield couples for the comparison group, then ask some couples that you think would be willing to complete them for you. These couples should be as nearly like those attending the classes as possible.

AGENT EVALUATION

The "Agent Evaluation" is for your use in reacting to the type of training you experienced, your series of classes, and the use of the videotape resources as a teaching method. Complete the inventory <u>after</u> the last class and return it in the pre-addressed envelope. You have a separate envelope from the couples' envelope because you will want to complete this evaluation after your responsibilities with the group are over. Since we want you to tell us your reactions just as you see them, allow some thinking time. However, try to return the evaluation within three to five days after your last class. Thank you.

<u>Class I</u>   (couple number)[___] Wife

PREINVENTORY   (couple number)[___] Husband

<u>Directions for Couples</u>

You are a part of a research project in which you will be
helping the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service
evaluate some procedures and programs for possible use with
other counties in the state.

<u>This is confidential information;</u> the answers will not be seen
by anyone in the group and will be coded by a professional
coder who will only work with the numbers. Your answers will
be combined with answers from many other couples.

Numbers have been assigned to the inventories prior to sending
them to the agent. Husbands and wives have the same numbers.
The husband should complete the inventory with a number in
the block beside the word "husband" and the wife should com-
plete the inventory with the number inserted in the block
beside the word "wife."

There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses should
be what you think or feel at the present time. Please fill
out all you can.

Please answer these individually without talking to your
spouse.

[Section I]   <u>Commitment to the Relationship</u> *

Please write a brief statement or check (X) the response
under each item that best describes your opinion about your-
self or your marriage.

1. For what reason did I come to this meeting and agree to
    come to three more classes? <u>(space allowed for writing</u>
    <u>on original)</u>

2. Two things about our marriage that please me. (Please
    list.)____(space)

3. Two things about our marriage that could be better.
    (Please list.) __(space)

4. Two things that I would like to be able to do to improve
    our marriage. (Please list.) __(space)

5. I think that our marriage can be enriched. (Check one X.)

    _____I agree _____I am not sure ____I disagree

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form
given to the respondents.

| Section II | Consensus * Please circle the number that shows the extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list. |

		Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occa- sionally Disagree	Fre- quently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
1.	Handling family finances	5	4	3	2	1	0
2.	Matters of recreation	5	4	3	2	1	0
3.	Religious matters	5	4	3	2	1	0
4.	Friends	5	4	3	2	1	0
5.	Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	5	4	3	2	1	0
6.	Philosophy of life	5	4	3	2	1	0
7.	Ways of dealing with parents or in-laws	5	4	3	2	1	0
8.	Aims, goals, and things believed important	5	4	3	2	1	0
9.	Amount of time spent together	5	4	3	2	1	0
10.	Making major decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0
11.	Household tasks	5	4	3	2	1	0
12.	Leisure time interests and activities	5	4	3	2	1	0
13.	Career decisions	5	4	3	2	1	0

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form given to the respondents.

Section III   <u>Interpersonal Communication</u> *

Please answer each question as quickly as you can according to the way <u>you feel about yourself</u>.

The YES column is to be used when the question can be answered as happening <u>most of the time</u> or <u>usually</u>. The NO column is to be used when the question can be answered as <u>seldom or never</u>.

The SOMETIMES column should be marked when you definitely can not answer YES or NO. USE THIS COLUMN AS LITTLE AS POSSIBLE.

Be sure to answer each question.

	YES Usually	NO Seldom	Some-times
1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?	3	0	2
2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask the person to explain what he means?	3	0	2
3. When you are trying to explain something, do other persons have a tendency to put words in your mouth?	0	3	1
4. Do you assume the other person knows what you are trying to say without your explaining what you really mean?	0	3	1
5. When in a discussion, do you attempt to find out how you are coming across by asking for feedback?	3	0	2
6. Is it difficult for you to converse with other people?	0	3	1
7. Do you find it very difficult to become interested in other people?	0	3	1
8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from those around you?	0	3	1
9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person's shoes?	3	0	2

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form given to the respondents.

		YES Usually	NO Seldom	Some- times
10.	In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than the other person?	0	3	1
11.	Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others?	3	0	2
12.	When you are angry, do you admit it when asked by someone else?	3	0	2
13.	Is it very difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from others?	0	3	1
14.	In interacting with others, do you have a tendency to jump to conclusions without having facts?	0	3	1
15.	Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?	3	0	2
16.	Does it upset you a great deal when someone disagrees with you?	0	3	1
17.	When someone has hurt your feelings do you discuss the matter with that person?	3	0	2
18.	Do you avoid expressing disagreement with others because you are afraid they will get angry?	0	3	1
19.	When a problem arises between you and another person, are you able to discuss it without losing control of your emotions?	3	0	2
20.	Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with others?	3	0	2
21.	Do you postpone discussing touchy subjects with others?	0	3	1
22.	In meaningful conversation, are you aware of how you are feeling and reacting to what the other person(s) is saying?	3	0	2

	YES Usually	NO Seldom	Some-times
23. Do you have difficulty trusting other people?	0	3	1
24. In attempting to settle a misunderstanding, do you remind yourself that the other person could be right?	3	0	2
25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from others?	0	3	1
26. Do you help others to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?	3	0	2
27. Do you confide in people?	0	3	1
28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?	0	3	1
29. In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before replying to what he says?	3	0	2
30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with others?	0	3	1
31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when someone is talking?	3	0	2
32. Do others seem to be listening when you are talking?	3	0	2
33. In a discussion is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view?	0	3	1
34. Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not really listening?	0	3	1
35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying (his words) and what he may be feeling?	3	0	2

	YES Usually	NO Seldom	Some- times
36. While speaking, are you aware of how others may be reacting to what you are saying?	3	0	2
37. Do you feel that other people wished you were a different kind of person?	0	3	1
38. Do other people fail to understand your feelings?	0	3	1
39. Can you tell what kind of day another person may be having by observing him?	3	0	2
40. Do you admit that you are wrong when you know that you are wrong about something?	3	0	2

Perception of Self, Spouse, and Marriage *

Please mark (X) the response beside each item that best describes your opinion about yourself.	ITEMS	Please mark (X) the response beside each item that best describes <u>your opinion about your spouse.</u>

___I need ___I do not need	1. To learn more about under-standing thoughts, feel-ings, and intentions	___I think my spouse needs ___I think my spouse does not need
___I need ___I do not need	2. To learn more about com-municating thoughts, feel-ings, and intentions.	___I think my spouse needs ___I think my spouse does not need
___I need ___I do not need	3. To develop a more positive <u>view of self</u>.	___I think my spouse needs ___I think my spouse does not need
___I need ___I do not need	4. To develop a more positive <u>view of others</u>.	___I think my spouse needs ___I think my spouse does not need
___I think ___I think	5. That our marriage is <u>dynamic (growing)</u>. That our marriage is <u>static (not growing)</u>.	___I think my spouse thinks ___I think my spouse thinks
___I think ___I think	6. That we have a <u>better mar-riage</u> than most couples. That we have a <u>worse mar-riage</u> than most couples.	___I think my spouse thinks ___I think my spouse thinks
___I think ___I think	7. A periodic marital checkup <u>would</u> be helpful. A periodic marital checkup <u>would not be</u> helpful.	___I think my spouse thinks ___I think my spouse thinks

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form given to the respondents.

Section V   Knowledge of Concepts *

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

Mark an "X" in the space that describes whether you "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," "strongly disagree," or are "undecided" about the statement.

5	4	3	2	1+	1. Some differences between husbands and wives must be put up with in order to have a good relationship.
					2. Being aware of and accepting your own feelings can help you to understand better the feelings of other people.
					3. For marriage to work, it takes the effort of both partners.
					4. People can be different and still normal.
					5. Disagreement in a marriage does not mean it is a failure.
1	2	3	4	5 °	6. The ideal marriage is one in which the man and woman should satisfy all needs of each other.
				°	7. People treat you as you really are.
				°	8. What a person says is what s/he means.
					9. Speaking for yourself helps others know how you think and feel.
					10. There are skills in communicating with others that can be learned.
				°	11. Telling in your own words what you heard another person say shows you understand.
				°	12. Decisions between partners should hold once they are made.
				°	13. Fulfilling your partner's needs in marriage leads to marital fulfill-ment.
				°	14. In marriage husbands and wives should spend their leisure time together whenever possible.
					15. Couples can have workable marriages even though they may have different personalities and different points of view.

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form given to the respondents.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
				∘	16. Debating an issue is never helpful.
				∘	17. When you are very dissatisfied with your marriage, there is little you can do about it.
					18. Different ways of talking are used for different purposes.
				∘	19. Some feelings are wrong.
				∘	20. A self-confident person can live effectively no matter what other people who are important to him or her say.

+ Response values unless otherwise indicated
∘ Values reversed in these items

Age _____ (couple number) Wife

Class 3   Age _____ _____ Husband

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How many <u>years</u> have you been married?_____.

2. How many <u>times</u> have you been married?_____.

3. What are the ages of your male children? _____,_____,_____,
   _____,_____.

4. What are the ages of your female children?_____, _____,
   _____, _____, _____.

5. What other people are in your household and what kin are they to you?_____

6. Mark the number of years you completed in school. (Circle one.)

   7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20+

7. Describe your main occupation_____.

8. How many times in the last three years have you attended functions sponsored by the Agricultural Extension Service? Do not include this series of meetings._____.

9. Have you ever heard of groups such as this one you are attending?

   ___Yes ___No If <u>yes</u>, have you participated in marriage enrichment-type groups?___Yes ___No

   If <u>yes</u>, what person or agency sponsored them?_____

Class 4   (Couple number) [____Wife

POST INVENTORY   (Couple number) [____Husband

By participating in this inventory you will be helping us to
determine whether or not the series of classes was meaningful
to you. Thank you for attending the classes and completing
the inventories.

This is confidential information; the answers will be combined
with those from many others couples by a coder who will work
with the response numbers.

There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses should
be what you think or feel at the present time.

Please answer individually without talking to your spouse
about the items.

| Section I |

1. These are some concerns about marriage into which I gained
    deeper insight:___(space)_____

2. These are some concerns about our marriage that in my
    opinion were not adequately dealt with: _(space)_____

3. I think that our own marriage has been enriched. Check
    one (X).
    ____I agree   ____I am not sure   ____I disagree

4. I think that I would like to learn to help other couples
    to enrich their marriage. Check one (X).
    ____I agree   ____I am not sure   ____I disagree

5. I wish I could_____

| Section II | Same as preinventory, questions relating to
                 consensus.

| Section III | Same as preinventory, questions relating to
                 interpersonal communication.

| Section IV | Same as preinventory except for responses which
                 were in the past tense--"I think I have (not),"
                 "I think my spouse has (not)," "I think," and
                 "I think my spouse thinks."

GROUP EXPERIENCE EVALUATION

As a result of your experience in the group, you may have experienced an increase or decrease in each of the following areas of marital experience. Please indicate what kind of change, if any, using the following 5 point scale. Circle the number in the column under your choice.

	Considerable increase	Slight increase	No change	Slight decrease	Considerable decrease	Not relevant to my experience
1. Ability to communicate with your spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0
2. Amount of behaviors or activities by which you communicate your love.	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Amount of behaviors or activities by which your spouse communicates his (her) love for you.	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Tendency to take things for granted in your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
5. Feeling of being understood by your spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Feeling of understanding your spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0
7. Feeling that you do not do enough to communicate your love.	5	4	3	2	1	0
8 Feeling that your spouse does not do enough to communicate his (her) love.	5	4	3	2	1	0

	Con- siderable increase	Slight increase	No change	Slight decrease	Con- siderable decrease	Not relevant to my experience
9. Frequency of expressing positive feelings to your partner.	5	4	3	2	1	0
10. Feeling of closeness to your partner.	5	4	3	2	1	0
11. Feeling of personal individuality and independence within your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
12. Involvement in your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
13. Strength of your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
14. Time spent with your partner.	5	4	3	2	1	0
15. Feeling of similarity between you and other couples.	5	4	3	2	1	0
16. Ability to express your feelings.	5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Feeling of being valued, loved, apprec- iated by your partner.	5	4	3	2	1	0
18. Efforts to make your marriage better.	5	4	3	2	1	0
19. Time spent talking together with your spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0

	Con-siderable increase	Slight increase	No change	Slight decrease	Con-siderable decrease	Not relevant to my experience
20. Personal self-confidence.	5	4	3	2	1	0
21. Emphasis on positive aspects of your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
22. Emphasis on problems in your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
23. Things which you do to meet your partner's needs.	5	4	3	2	1	0
24. Things which your partner does to meet your needs.	5	4	3	2	1	0
25. Uncomfortableness while being told positive things about yourself.	5	4	3	2	1	0
26. Feeling of having more in common with spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0
27. Ability to cope with problems in your marriage.	5	4	3	2	1	0
28. Honesty with your spouse.	5	4	3	2	1	0

As a result of coming to these classes, indicate the amount of change in the following areas of your marital experience using the four point scale below. Circle the number that corresponds to your choice.

	No Change	Slight Change	Moderate Change	Con- siderable Change
1. General sensitivity to or awareness of your marriage.	1	2	3	4
2. Awareness of the meanings of your spouse's behavior.	1	2	3	4
3. Awareness of your partner's positive qualities.	1	2	3	4
4. Awareness of your partner's deficiencies.	1	2	3	4
5. Awareness of your own positive qualities.	1	2	3	4
6. Awareness of your own deficiencies.	1	2	3	4
7. Awareness of what is positive in your marriage.	1	2	3	4
8. Awareness of what is lacking in your marriage.	1	2	3	4

Evaluation of the Series

Mark or write the response that describes what you think about the series of classes you have just completed. By doing this you will be helping us to know whether or not your needs were met in the series and what you think about the materials you used.

1. In general, my reaction to the series of classes is: Mark one (X).

   ____Very dissatisfied   ____Satisfied

   ____Dissatisfied   ____Very Satisfied

2. What did you get the most out of in this series of meetings?

_____

3. Was there anything in this series of meetings or that you or your spouse brought out that you wish had not been?

    _____Yes _____No

    If "Yes" share it only if you wish:_____

    _____

4. How do you feel about the division of time between view-ing videotapes and the discussions and couple interactions?

    a. Was enough time allowed for discussion? ____Yes ____No

    b. Would you have liked more time to talk with your spouse?
        _____Yes _____No

    c. Would you have liked for the video leader to have presented more examples through couple dialogue?
        _____Yes _____No

5. Mark one item below that describes your preference:

    ____4 classes were enough

    ____more than 4 classes would have pleased me (how many?_____)

    ____fewer than 4 would have been better (how many?___)

6. What other suggestions do you have about similar meetings in the future?_____

7. Below is a list of things about the series of classes. Mark the items according to how helpful they were to you in understanding the ideas presented in the programs.

	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not very Helpful
a. videotapes in general			
b. discussions with other couples			
c. the leader on the videotapes			
d. dialogues with my spouse			
e. the guidelines, questions, etc. used by couples during the "tape off" times			

THANK YOU, THANK YOU, THANK YOU

PREINVENTORY   For Control Couples * (couple number)___Wife

___Husband

Directions for Couples

You are part of a research project in which you will be help-
ing the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service find out
what couples think and feel about themselves and some aspects
of marriage.

This is confidential information; the answers will be coded
by a professional coder who will only work with the numbers.
Your answers will be combined with answers from many other
couples.

Numbers have been assigned to the inventories prior to send-
ing them to the agent who gave them to you. Husbands and
wives have the same numbers. The husband should complete
the inventory with a number in the block beside the word
"husband" and the wife should complete the inventory with
the number inserted in the block beside the word "wife."

There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses should
be what you think or feel at the present time. Please fill
out all you can.

Please answer these inventories individually without talking
to your spouse.

When you have completed the inventory return it to the enve-
lope, seal it, and then mail it.

Section I

1. Two things about our marriage that please me. (Please
   list.)
   (space for writing allowed in original)

2. Two things about our marriage that could be better.
   (Please list.) (space)

3. Two things that I would be able to do to improve our
   marriage. (Please list.) (space)

| Sections II, III, IV, and V | same as preinventory for couples
attending the classes.

GENERAL INFORMATION Items 1-8 same as the inventory for
   couples attending the classes. Item 9 "Have you ever
   heard of marriage enrichment-type groups?"

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the form
given to the respondents.

POSTINVENTORY (couple number)____Wife

<u>Directions for Couples</u> ____Husband

You are part of a research project in which you will be help-
ing the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service find
out what couples think and feel about themselves and some
aspects of marriage. This project was to see if couples who
were taught four classes in marriage change their opinions
because of the classes. They were given the same question-
naires that you were given prior to the classes and after
the classes. It is necessary in good research to see if
couples in a project change more than couples who were not in
the project. Therefore, we need your answers after the same
length of time, but without your having attended the classes.

<u>This is confidential information</u>; the answers will be coded
by a professional coder who will only work with the numbers.
Your answers will be combined with answers from many other
couples.

Numbers have been assigned to the inventories prior to send-
ing them to the agent who gave them to you. Husbands and
wives have the same numbers. The husband should complete the
inventory with a number in the block beside the word "hus-
band" and the wife should complete the inventory with the
number inserted in the block beside the word "wife."

There are no right or wrong answers. Your responses should
be what you think or feel at the present time. Please fill
out all you can. Please answer these inventories individually
without talking to your spouse. When you have completed
the inventory return it to the envelope, seal it, and then
mail it.

Section I

1. I would like to gain a deeper insight into these concerns
   about marriage:
   __(space)_____

2. I would like to attend classes which focus on aspects
   of marriage.
   _____I agree   _____I am not sure   _____I disagree

3. If you agree that you would like to attend classes,
   which of the following topics appeal to you? (You may
   check as many as you like.)
   ____understanding yourself   ____commitment to the goals
   ____how to communicate more   of my marriage
        effectively   ____other--What topics?____
   ____how to handle conflict
        constructively

Sections II, III, IV, and V Same as postinventory for
couples attending the classes.

APPENDIX D

AGENT EVALUATION FORMS

AGENT PREINVENTORY*

District_____

County_____

Please read each statement and place an "X" in the space beside the response that describes how you feel about the statement.

1. I feel comfortable using videotapes as resource materials.
    _____strongly agree
    _____agree
    _____undecided
    _____disagree
    _____strongly disagree

2. I feel comfortable leading discussion groups.

    The same response mode, shown above, was used for all six items.

3. I feel reasonably well prepared to conduct sessions concerning the subject matter of marriage.

4. I feel comfortable with subject matter related to interpersonal relationships.

5. I feel comfortable working with one married couple at a time.

6. I feel comfortable working with married couples in a group setting.

* Reader information label--phrase did not appear on the for ' given to the respondents.

AGENT EVALUATION　　　　　　District_____

County_____

Please read each statement and place an "X"
in the space beside the response that best
describes how you feel about the statement.

	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
1. I felt comfortable using videotapes as resource materials.					
2. I felt comfortable leading the discussion groups.					
3. I felt reasonably well prepared to conduct these sessions about marriage.					
4. I felt comfortable with this subject matter related to interpersonal relationships.					
5. I would have felt more comfortable working with one married couple at a time than with the group of married couples.					
6. I felt comfortable working with married couples in a group setting.					
7. Teaching with videotapes is better than other resources I've used in the human development area.					
8. Without the videotape learning package, I would not have attempted to organize a series of classes to teach the subject matter.					
9. I would recommend this videotape learning package to other agents.					
10. I think I will use this videotape learning package again.					

	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
11. The videotapes interfered with my interaction with the group members.					
12. I think I could have done a better job of teaching these classes without using the videotapes.					
13. I was familiar with the subject matter dealt with in the tapes prior to the training.					
14. Preparing for the classes (getting ready to lead them) took more time than I usually spend in preparation for 4 classes of the same length.					
15. Preparing for the classes took too much time.					
16. The "Program Procedures for Agents" was essential to my planning and conducting the four classes.					

17. What comments did the group members (couples) offer about the videotapes?_____

18. Did the couples in your classes have anything in common with the videotape couples? If so, which situations presented in the tapes were similar to those faced by couples in your classes?_____

19. Were enough examples given in the videotapes so that during "tape off" couples could apply the skills being taught to their own situations?_____

20. How do you rate the use of video resources as a method of teaching?
    _____better than other methods
    _____about the same as other methods
    _____undecided
    _____not as good as other methods
    _____considerably less effective than other methods

21. Do you think preparing this type of series was good use of the specialist's time?

    ____yes

    ____undecided

    ____no

Why did you respond as you did?_____

22. Can you suggest other areas of subject matter that in your opinion could be taught effectively utilizing the videotape learning package method?_____

23. What recruitment procedures did you use in announcing your classes? Mark (X) the one(s) used.

X	Rank	
____	____	news release
____	____	radio spot announcement
____	____	letters to family life leaders in the communities
____	____	word-of-mouth
____	____	individual contact with those people I thought would like to know about the classes

Now rank the ones you used according to how effective you think they were in recruiting interest and/or participation in your classes. Use #1 to show the most important, #2 the next most important, etc. Place the rank numbers in the blank beside the item.

If you did not choose to use some of the recruitment procedures listed above, why not?_____

24. The manual was:

    ____so detailed I got lost in the ideas

    ____adequately detailed

    ____incomplete in giving necessary details

25. The divisions of the manual were:

    ____clearly defined so that I could find sections

    ____difficult to follow

26. Refer to the sections in the manual and answer the following questions.

Which sections were most useful?_____

Which sections need to be improved and how?_____

Which sections could be omitted?_____

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM PROCEDURES FOR AGENTS

VIDEOTAPE LEARNING PACKAGE *

* Only selected pages or portions of pages from the manual
  are included in this appendix to illustrate the format
  design. The pages approximate the original except for
  variations in format to comply with guidelines for the
  preparation of the dissertation manuscript. The entire
  manual or further information about the project may be
  obtained by writing the North Carolina Agricultural
  Extension Service, North Carolina State University,
  Raleigh, North Carolina 27607.

P R O G R A M   P R O C E D U R E S

F O R

A G E N T S

Videotape Learning Package

BECOMING YOU, ME, AND US

Pilot Study
April, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Sample)
(Page ii)

INTRODUCTION

The videotape learning package contains an eight-hour
program of instruction for use by county extension agents
in facilitating married couples' interpersonal competence
skills. Its focus is in self-understanding, communication,
and growth toward states of consensus and commitment to their
relationships. These materials will be utilized in group
settings by couple members to enable them to better under-
stand their interaction as a couple.

The skills necessary for satisfying interpersonal rela-
tionships can be successfully taught and learned. In this
learning partnership you are the facilitator or the on-hand
teacher. This cooperative endeavor will enable you to have
additional resource people to assist you in teaching and will
help us all to find out more about how people learn. The
pre and post inventories will enable us to evaluate the
learning package.

You are the teachers, we are the writers, and the couples
are the learners. We are providing some guidelines for you
to consider as you carry out your facilitator role. This
leader outline is designed to complement other teaching aids
which have been included in the videotape learning package.
These aids include the following:

       1) videotape presentations

       2) practical exercises and other handout material

       3) publications

       4) a promotional

(Sample)
(Page 1)

PROGRAM PROCEDURES FOR LEADERS

These leader guidelines are based on adult learning principles and are provided to implement your role in the teaching process. You may use these guidelines as you the leader become the planner, the recruiter, and the group leader. Use the margin to check off each step as it is completed.

1. **THE PLANNER**

☐ Check to be sure the video equipment is cleaned and in proper working order.

☐ First view all four tapes. Please read the guidelines for each tape before viewing it. See yourself as you view the tapes and complete all the exercises that participating couples will complete.

☐ Share with other staff members and county extension homemaker family life leader this opportunity in teaching married couples. Show them the videotape learning packages and invite their support in recruiting participants.

☐ Select date, time and location for workshop. We believe you will get the best results if you select a two or three week period that appears best for the series. Within a two week period, have two sessions a week--for example, Tuesday and Thursday nights. Or if you choose a three week period, a sequence like Thursday, Tuesday-Thursday, and Tuesday would complete your four sessions. Since each session will last approximately two hours, plan to meet at the time that will best suit your group. You will need to meet in the area in which your video receiving set can be located for a small group meeting.

2. **THE RECRUITER**

☐ Becoming familiar with the content and the plans for this videotape learning package will enable you to be enthusiastic in recruiting participants. Talk about the classes; this advertising will create interest. As you recruit you may want to let couples know that this is the first time this opportunity has been available and that you can invite no more than 10 couples to participate in the first series. This participation limit will more nearly assure ample time for each couple. It is essential that each couple understands that you are asking them to make a commitment to attend each of the four sessions. When

you secure a commitment from 10 couples, keep a waiting
list just in case you have a last minute "drop out."
(This list could also be a beginning for a later series.)

☐ The enclosed news release and radio spot announcement
may be personalized and taken to your local newspapers
and radio stations. This mass media approach will give
wide coverage to your program.

(Sample)
(Page 2)

(Research shows that radio spot announcements repeated
many times in a concentrated period of two or three days
are most effective). If possible, talk with the radio
and newspaper editors. They will more likely give sup-
port if they understand what you are trying to do.

You may know couples who might like to attend or who have
expressed an interest in this type of learning oppor-
tunity. Make an appointment to visit with both the hus-
band and wife if possible to enable you to tell them
about plans for the four meetings and some of the things
that you will be doing.

☐ As a sign of your mutual commitment, send the confirmation
post card to each couple who makes a reservation for the
classes.

3. THE GROUP LEADER

☐ Have videotape threaded on the equipment with the receiv-
ing set (monitor) in place. Arrange chairs so that all
participants can view the receiving set. Communication
specialists tell us this arrangement afford maximum
viewing:

TV receiving set

x x x x x x
x x x x x
x x x x
x x x
x x

Lighting will need to be adjusted for comfortable
viewing. You may have to raise the level of
lighting for group activities. Plan seating and
lighting to suit your individual facilities.

During the "tape off" time when couples are completing
exercises and discussing points, they may prefer to move
within the room to a more informal arrangement. Let the
space available and the couples' wishes determine the
plan.

☐ To Do's as the participants arrive. Greet each couple as they arrive and make them feel "special." If it is convenient couples may enjoy having hot water available to make instant coffee or tea. Do not plan for a specific coffee break; instead each person may help himself whenever preferred. This arrangement will add to the informality without taking extra time.

☐ The time length of each videotape segment is printed. Suggested time allocations for couple interactions are included for your convenience in planning group participation. Stay within your total class length, but refrain from using the phrase--"Our time is so limited." This phrase sounds apologetic and may limit couples' willingness to participate. Simply state the suggested time when you give couples directions for an exercise.

(Sample)
(Page 3)

☐ As a part of your commitment with the couples when they agree to attend, start and end on time. Give a brief overview of how the sessions will progress. People like to know what is going to happen and in what order, but let them know there is flexibility to meet their needs and wishes. You and the group decide together when to stop for a break and how long. Remember your time allocation! Respect each participant: their feelings, their questions, their concerns. Your behavior becomes a model for the group. When you as the leader become perplexed or concerned about how things are going, ask the group for help. Have faith in the group and their ability to handle their concerns.

☐ More specific guidelines for each class and materials needed will be specified in the outline for each class. But in general

- You, the teacher, will use your good judgment in guiding the group members through viewing the tapes, participation exercises, and sharing their ideas with others.

- As each tape ends, observe the group for their reactions; then ask questions or concerns. Determine if there is a need to review portions of the tape for clarification. If the group desires to see some segments again, turn the tape back and replay that portion. Let the group members know this replay is possible and that you want them to tell you when they would like to see a section over.

. As each class begins and ends, ask for questions or concerns of the group.

. Be sure each couple understands the next meeting time before leaving.

This procedures manual is intended to be as helpful as possible for agents or others who might use it in leading groups. After this pilot study the manual will be revised if necessary before another printing. Therefore, we invite your comments and suggestions as you use it. Please write in the margins, on the backs of the pages, etc. whenever you need to make additional notes for class or have an idea for making the manual more useful. You may return the manual after your classes and we will include your suggestions in the revision. It will be sent back to you for use until a revision is circulated.

(Sample)
(Page 5)

BECOMING YOU, ME, AND US

CLASS/TAPE 1

SELF-UNDERSTANDING

Reminder: First class:
Have on hand for each
participant:

☐ Preinventory enve-
lopes

☐ Self-Inventory sheets

☐ Pencils

Note: In the original man-
ual tape scripts had a sin-
gle line at the left margin
and were typed in script
style letters. Leader di-
rections and specific points
for group presentation were
enclosed by double bars.
Items in parentheses were
leaders' directions.

SUMMARY--ACTIVITIES/TIME SEGMENTS

Videotape Segments Agent Discussion Couple Interaction	Time in minutes and seconds
1. Group Activities---------15	
2. Preinventory-------------30	
3. Introduction------------ 5	
4. Tape Segment # 1--------- 4:00	
5. Self-Inventory-----------10	
6. Tape Segment # 2--------- 9:30	
7. Couples Share Self-Inventory----------- 5	
8. Tape Segment # 3--------- 2:30	
9. Couple Goals-------------10	
10. Tape Segment # 4---------14:00	
11. Sharing Wrap-Up----------15	

15 minutes

|| (After you have greeted each couple as they arrive,
these "icebreakers" should help the group get to know
each other better and to begin to talk together. Group
activities acquaint group members with each other and
build trust in the program. Give directions for one
activity at the time. Stop the activity when the group
is at a high point of interest. Do not let an activity
drag.

Names Review--Ask for a volunteer. Then ask him or her
to tell his own name. Ask the person seated on the
right to tell the name of the first person and then
his own; the third tells the name of the first, the
second, and his own. Progress around the group using
the same procedure. Last person has to give all
names. (First person to volunteer actually has the
easiest job.) It is really reassuring for someone to
call you by name, and it helps you become part of the
group. ||

Party Talk--Ask the group to help you arrange the chairs in two circles (an inner and outer circle). The inner and outer circle persons talk with each other for 3 minutes; each tells the other his name and something about himself. Ask: "What do you like most about yourself? What is a good thing about you?" Then this pair talks with another pair. (Help them divide into a foursome in order to talk together for 2 minutes.) The leader then asks the groups to come together into the large group. At this point say: "Now I'd like for each of you to share something good about yourself that you think you'd like for this group here to know." This activity builds group support and individual confidence. These two activities should take no more than 15 minutes.)

(Sample)
(Page 6)

30 minutes

(Preinventory envelopes--Give them to the group.)

The preinventory is designed to enable us to improve this series of classes and gain a better understanding of the needs of married couples. Your cooperation is needed and appreciated. Please do not discuss your answers with anyone, not even your spouse. Your responses will be kept confidential. Please complete the preinventory as quickly as possible and then we will begin the series.

5 minutes

(Collect the preinventory envelopes from each participant.)

(Try to be familiar enough with the sections you are to present that you do not have to read them word-for-word. However, use of notes is permissible as a guideline. Begin the session with the paragraphs below.)

I will be leading the four sessions and will be assisted by Dr. Leo Hawkins, extension human development specialist, from North Carolina State University.

In these sessions we will learn from the specialist and couples who assisted him in preparing the videotapes. The couple dialogues presented on the videotapes were not from script, but from a feeling level and in the couples' own words. The video leader did not know exactly what would be said. These dialogues are

excellent examples of good communication and the sensitivity of an effective leader. The variety of concerns presented are illustrative of the many issues that most couples experience at one time or another. The couples you will see believed enough in the marriage enrichment concepts that they volunteered time from their busy work and family schedules to appear on the series.

The classes are divided into four two-hour sessions during which time we will view a videotape and use practical exercises to learn important concepts and to develop needed skills in relating to other people. The meetings are scheduled a few days apart to allow you to think about each session and to practice the skills presented. We will talk more at the end of this session about the other three classes.

But right now the important thing is for you to see you--the inner you. THE SUBJECT IS BECOMING.

(Turn on videotape and <u>follow your copy of the script</u> so that you will be ready to turn off the tape at the right times and lead the group in their learning experiences.)

| TAPE ON | BEGIN SEGMENT 1 -- 4:10 (4 minutes and 10 seconds)

This mirror shows <u>me</u> to <u>me</u>.

This TV set you are looking at shows <u>me</u> to <u>you</u>.

The way you see me is different from the way I see me. Probably your impression of me does not actually resemble very closely the person that I really am.

(Sample)
(Page 8)

Stop the tape and let yourself have time to think about what you are and what you want to <u>become</u>. Look at it and see what you've found out about yourself.

END SEGMENT 1

| TAPE OFF |
                    10 minutes

(Hand out self-inventory sheets and pencils to each participant.)

(Allow time for each person to complete the inventory individually--about 10 minutes.)

‖(Invite them to share their responses with their‖
‖ spouses and others if they wish.)‖

| TAPE ON | BEGIN SEGMENT 2 -- 9:30

You may have completed your self-inventory differently
than anyone else in the group, but you are still normal.
When you are doing something like this inventory to
gain self-understanding, there are just no right or
wrong answers, because this is a people world and peo-
ple are different. Look at your inventory while I
talk with Alice and Bob.

(Sample)
(Page 12)

IV. PREVENTING GOOD FEELINGS

The trouble is that at times we just don't realize
what we do to each other when we "cut each other apart"
that way--reactions influence our feelings and behaviors
and the feelings of others.

It is possible to better understand ourselves and in
turn help other people to better understand themselves
and us.

A final point: The skills we are talking about are
"people skills"--skills that can be learned.

V. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS ARE LEARNED

We know that skills such as bricklaying, making a dress,
designing a building can be learned. You can make the
"people skills" happen in your life on your way to becom-
ing the person you can be. Keep thinking about ways in
which you want to grow. Too often we have thought skills
are something you were lucky enough "to be born with,"
and you either have them or don't have them. But all
skills are acquired or learned as we want to develop them--
skills don't just happen.

THE SUBJECT IS BECOMING.

END TAPE

| TAPE OFF |

15 minutes

Too often we have thought skills are something you were lucky enough "to be born with," and you either have them or don't have them. But you can make these "people skills" happen in your life.

Now that the first tape is completed, you may discuss the things that "build you up" (remember the model on the tape) and "tear you down." Are there ideas you'd like to share with the group? This can be our sharing wrap-up time.

(Limit this segment according to the group interest and time schedule.)

In this first session, we have thought about you, me, and us becoming. We have focused on self-understanding.

During the next session, (give date, day, and time) we will be working on communication skills: learning how to express and understand our thoughts and feelings more easily. The next videotape will show couples practicing the skills; you will have an opportunity to work through some communication exercises with each other.

We will think further about why we act and react in certain ways and what makes us act as we do.

Later, we will think about <u>consensus</u>; that is, agreeing on enough major points so that there is not constant battling and nagging.

Finally, we will think about <u>commitment</u> to ourselves, commitment to others, and commitment to becoming you.

Since this group is made up of husbands and wives, couples working together, we will be thinking about these skills as a way to enrich your marriage. These skills are useful in every dimension of your lives.

Because each session builds on the ones presented before, it is important for you to attend each of the four sessions.

See you next time!

<u>LEADER NOTES</u>

(Space was allowed for leader to make notes before and/or during the class sessions.)

(Sample)
(Page 14)

BECOMING YOU, ME, AND US

CLASS/TAPE 2

<u>COMMUNICATION</u>

Reminder: Second class: hand for each participant

☐ Pencils and paper for couples to use if they wish

☐ Handouts outlining couple exercises

<u>SUMMARY--ACTIVITIES/TIME SEGMENTS</u>

Videotape Segments Agent Discussion <u>Couple Interaction</u>	Time in minutes <u>and seconds</u>
1. Introduction-----------	5
2. Tape Segment #1---------	4:00
3. Awareness Exercise------	25
4. Tape Segment #2---------	4:15
5. Communication Skills----	20
6. Tape Segment #3---------	4:15
7. Communication Styles----	20
8. Tape Segment #4---------	18
9. Couple Dialogues-------	25

5 minutes

(As the group comes together, allow couples to talk some and share any ideas they've had during the week.)

This tape deals with communication. You will learn communication skills and have time to practice what you have learned.

(Follow your script so that you will be ready to turn off the tape at the right time and lead the group in their learning experiences.)

┌──────────┐
│ TAPE ON │   BEGIN SEGMENT 1 -- 4:00
└──────────┘

If husband and wives are to develop a meaningful relationship, it is essential that they learn to understand one another's thoughts, feelings, intentions, gestures, and expressions which are communication skills that can be learned.

In this session we are thinking about you, me, and us, becoming good communicators.

Clear communication can be difficult, and there are reasons why. There are six people in every dialogue:

> The real Mary
> Mary's idea of Mary and
> John's idea of Mary
> The real John
> John's idea of John and
> Mary's idea of John

(Sample)
(Page 20)

> Think of a situation you would like to discuss. Let one couple talk together and the other listen. The listening couple will identify the different styles of communication used in the conversation. Couples are to take turns in doing dialogues for each other. You may also point out communication skills when you hear them used.
>
> Allow about 15-20 minutes for this exercise.

TAPE ON   BEGIN SEGMENT 4 -- 18:00

Our purpose as couples who are growing is to learn to communicate on the level of feelings. But after we learn a few of these communication skills, how do we practice?

How do we want to communicate on the level of feelings? Dialoguing is a technique for sharing feelings using communication skills.

When a couple dialogues, they turn and face each other. One of the couple starts the talk (or dialogue) on some chosen topics.

Let's watch: This couple is dialoguing about their recreation.
    (Couple dialogues about golfing and how it fits into their responsibilities with the children and what each other wants.)

As you noticed each person spoke for himself from a feeling level and speaking for themselves, almost all the time. The couple was not blaming nor judgmental; both partners were expressing honest feelings openly. They know each others' feelings--one likes to be alone sometimes and would just as soon be away playing golf. They have a much better understanding, especially with the children involved, than they've ever had before.

One kept quiet until the other had finished and then took his turn. How often have you listened to someone (maybe your spouse) and not really "heard"? "You were loading your gun" thinking about what you would say to "shoot him down" as soon as you got half the chance.

Very often we ask couples, "What do you win when you win an argument?" Often we just win loneliness or somebody being put down or feeling bad.

This couple really listened on a feeling level to what one another was saying. This couple has learned to listen by "checking out" to see if they were hearing what was actually meant.

How has this dialoguing helped you in your total marriage?

  (Conversation about how couple has benefited from dialogue, listening, checking out, etc.)

. The dialoguing helped the couple and family relationship because each one is aware of the other's needs. Knowing what each individual needs and wants to pursue avoids conflict and makes for a healthier home environment.

. In disagreements they have achieved a shared meaning, so that they know how to appreciate the other person's view.

. Through shared meaning they have learned how many times they had misinterpreted meanings of words.

(Sample)
(Page 22)

These same skills will help you communicate with your children, and with the people at work, your neighbors and friends, too.

END TAPE

TAPE OFF

25 minutes

(Arrange for couples to dialogue for about 25 minutes if enough time is left before the end of the session.)

(If couples have topics to be discussed, an agenda may be formed. Then one couple may dialogue a topic while other couples listen. Or individual couples may wish to dialogue. Let your group decide which procedure to follow.)

** Couple Dialogue **

(Urge couples to dialogue at home during the week giving particular attention to the skills for communication: (1) speak for yourself, (2) speak clearly and document when necessary, and (3) check with your partner to make sure you are understood and that you understand your partner.)

Next time we will be talking about "consensus."

Consensus means how to agree, how to disagree, and how to compromise. Good communication is an essential part of reaching consensus.

LEADER NOTES

(Sample)
(Page 23)

BECOMING YOU, ME, AND US

CLASS/TAPE 3

CONSENSUS

Reminder: Third class: Have on hand for each participant

☐ Resources for couples to use--Class 3
   . Rules for reaching consensus

☐ A copy of the marriage puzzle (Class 4) to use in making an assignment

☐ Pencils and paper

SUMMARY--ACTIVITIES/TIME SEGMENTS

Videotape Segments Agent Discussion Couple Interaction	Time in minutes and seconds
1. Introduction----------	5
2. Tape Segment #1-------	6:05
3. Discuss and Identify Issues-----------------	10
4. Tape Segment #2-------	9:02
5. Reaching Consensus about an Issue--------	20
6. Tape Segment #3-------	13:53
7. Relationship Circles--	10
8. Tape Segment #4-------	1:40
9. Sharing Wrap-up and Homework--------------	15
10. Mid-inventory--------	20

2 minutes

> Did you have a chance to practice dialoguing, express feelings, and speak for yourself, instead of speaking for someone else? Don't be discouraged if it wasn't very easy. You are improving your communication skills and such a process takes time.
>
> There are several new ideas and some long segments introduced in this tape. If you want some parts replayed, please let me know at the time you have questions.

| TAPE ON | BEGIN SEGMENT 1 -- 6:05 |

> In the second tape we discussed the topic of developing communication skills. We described the skills and listened to a couple dialoguing about their concerns, their problems, and their differences.
>
> Did you have a chance to practice dialoguing, express feelings, and speak for yourself, instead of speaking for someone else? and checking out? I'd like to encourage you not to be discouraged about dialoguing because sometimes it's very difficult. Improving your communication skills is a process that takes time.
>
> Now, we move to disagreements. Perhaps, in the time since your group was together, you and your spouse had some disagreements.

(Sample)
(Page 27)

> But remember that (1) disagreement is normal, (2) you make the issue clear, and (3) you try to see the other side and try to find some solution.
>
> Now turn off the tape and try to identify at least one item that's in your marriage that you may have "buried alive." Choose one item that you are willing to look at again, and see if you can reach a creative compromise.

| TAPE OFF |

20 minutes

> Creative compromise means change.
>
> Flexibility enables partners to accept the fact that decisions are not made once and forever, but change. The important thing is for both partners to be aware of changes.
>
> (Leader advise couples.)

Try to pick something that will not be too deep; you can learn principles from simpler things like tooth-paste tubes. Be sure you want to discuss an issue before mentioning it.

Take about 15 minutes for this exercise. Find a creative compromise for a behavior that you identify as one to which you have accommodated or "packed back"- "buried alive."

(Optional Section--You may wish to summarize conflict and the resulting alteration or comprimise by using the model below.)

It is possible to diagram marital conflict and the resulting consensus (or alteration of conflict) in some such way as this:

WIFE			Buy two
HUSBAND			tubes
Differences in the	Disagreement	Conflict	Resolution
way they squeeze	each wants		Alteration
tooth paste tubes	other to		or
	change habit		Creative
			Compromise

First, we see the difference between husband, and wife, illustrated by a square and a triangle. Next, we see some differences which lead to disagreement; each person is asking the other to yield.

If they continue to disagree, they may move into a clash of wills, a quarrel, a fight which is conflict.

(Sample)
(Page 30)

marriage, but you do not have to show it that way. Theirs was just one example. Draw yours like you want to--the way you see your marriage. You may even want to draw more than one set of circles. Remember, relationships are different; you do not have to be like the couple on the videotape.

Draw the marriage as you see it; then share with your spouse. You may decide to draw another picture together as you dialogue about your views. (Remind the group that the couple dialogued as they presented their circles.)

(Allow couples 5 minutes for this activity.)

(Sample)
(Page 31)

BECOMING YOU, ME, AND US

CLASS/TAPE 4

COMMITMENT

Reminder: Fourth class:
Have on hand for each
participant

☐ Resources for couples
to use--Class 4
. marriage puzzle
. questions about
their marriage
. marriage climate
chart (Hand out
with other pieces
in beginning of
meeting and make
couples aware that
it is to be used
as directed by
the leader)

☐ Postinventory envelopes

SUMMARY--ACTIVITIES/TIME SEGMENTS

Videotape Segments Agent Discussion Couple Interaction	Time in minutes and seconds
1. Introduction-------------	5
2. Tape Segment #1----------	7:30
3. Marriage Statements------	17
4. Tape Segment #2----------	18:00
5. Marriage Climate Chart---	10
6. Tape Segment #3----------	2:50
7. Ad for Marriage----------	8
8. Tape Segment #4----------	1:10
9. Sharing Wrap-up----------	15
10. Post Inventory-----------	30

5 minutes

|| Since this is our last class in this series we
will get right into the tape and have some time
for sharing as we proceed.

Are there any concerns or comments that you'd
like to share? ||

┌─────────┐
│ TAPE ON │   BEGIN SEGMENT 1 -- 7:30
└─────────┘

Before this meeting you drew a picture of your marriage
as you saw it. Undoubtedly there is no other picture
that other couples have drawn similar to yours. Probably
no couple produced pictures that were alike, even though
they may have some of the same parts that were similar.
These pictures are different because every marriage rela-
tionship is different.

You and your partner may have had a hard time deciding
how to picture your marriage because each of you may
have seen a different picture.

```
TAPE ON
```
BEGIN SEGMENT 4 -- 1:40

In the process of becoming there will always be a need for communication. The effort is worth it, because communication can lead to a new consensus, new understandings.

Each partner needs to feel that he understands the other as well as himself, that each can be counted on to make some adjustments, and that new consensus in light of new needs is always possible.

Therefore seeking consensus is a part of a continuing commitment to one another and to your growing relationship.

END TAPE

```
TAPE OFF
```

15 minutes

Before our next meeting, try reaching consensus with your partner about the way you see your marriage.

The presentation may be done in a variety of ways. You could use crayons and draw on a picture map of your marriage. Or you may see it as a puzzle. Here is a marriage puzzle developed by one couple to show the many dimensions of their marriage. (Show the puzzle labeled Class 4 in the resource section of your manual.)

At the next class you will hear the couple describe how this puzzle symbolizes their marriage. This puzzle is just one example of a way to show a marriage. The many parts of your marriage, as you see it, can be put together to make your marriage picture. You might show parts of your marriage in a presentation like a road map--or you could picture it in any way you wish and entitle it "Our Marriage Picture."

The assignment for next time is for you and your partner to draw your marriage presenting it in any way you would like to. Bring your picture with you to the next meeting.

LEADER NOTES

This studio couple has done a picture of their marriage in the form of a jigsaw puzzle. You have a copy of this puzzle-type picture they have drawn. You'll be looking at the same one as we will talk about it.

Now that you've drawn this picture of your marriage and perhaps thought about it a little, what are your reactions? Were you really satisfied with some of your actions and reactions and the way in which you got along--with each other, with your children, with your boss, or with your friends?

(Sample)
(Page 37)

about what you want to say to be convincing. When you have finished, those participants who wish may share their ads with the group.

You will have about 8 minutes for this exercise.

TAPE ON   BEGIN SEGMENT 4 -- 1:10

Sharing the good things about our marriages helps us to know that for the majority marriage can be a satisfying, happy relationship.

Marriage is also a challenge, a challenge at which husband and wife must work together as energetically as they are able to do.

Marriage as many see it today is for personal fulfillment and an experience for intimacy, companionship, closeness, and deep sharing.

We have looked at ways for becoming you, me, and us--through understanding, communication, consensus, and commitment.

END TAPE

TAPE OFF

10 minutes

   (Sharing wrap-up time: Allow couples to talk
     about whatever they want to share.)

30 minutes -- POSTINVENTORY
   (Thank them for their participation. Express a
     continued interest in their growth and develop-
     ment and invite them to use other resources avail-
     able to them through the extension service.

LEADER NOTES

(Sample)
(Page 38)

RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES

News Release

Radio Spot Announcement

Letter to Family Life Leaders in the Communities

Reservation Confirmation

AGENT NOTES:

☐ Publicity releases   Dates to appear
  submitted to: for each release:

  _____   _____

  _____   _____

  _____   _____

☐ Please keep a record of the number of inquiries in
  response to the publicity even if the callers do
  not make reservations. This record will be an
  indicator of interest.

(Sample)
(Page 39)

News Release

Couples are now being enrolled in a series of marriage
enrichment classes that will be taught by __(agent's name)__,
(county name)_____county home economics extension agent.

__(agent's name)__ said that four classes of about one
and one-half hours each will be offered, beginning __(date)__.

Each of the classes, __(agent's name)__ said, will be
designed to help couples develop interpersonal skills that
can lead to a richer, more enjoyable marriage. The skills,
she added, will not only enhance the couple's relationship,
but their effectiveness in relating to their children,
friends, and fellow workers.

A key part of each class will be a videotape presenta-
tion prepared by extension human development specialists at

North Carolina State University. Couples will practice the skills observed with assistance from the total group.

The first class will deal with self-understanding on how to value yourself and be able to relate positively to other people. The second class will cover communication, and especially how to listen and speak for yourself. The third class will center around consensus or the ability to handle conflict constructively. The final class will emphasize commitment to the goals of the marriage and how a couple can continue to learn and grow.

Each class will begin at __(time)__ at the __(name)__ building.

For further information and a reservation call __(agent's name)__ at __(# phone)__ .

(Sample)
(Page 40)

Radio Spot Announcement

Most fairy tales end "and they lived happily ever after." Sounds great, doesn't it? Unfortunately, that quotation is a fairy tale ending and not a real-life situation. You can learn to be a better listener, how to handle arguments fairly, and how to feel good about yourself and others who are important to you. A series of four classes for married couples will be taught by the __(county name)__ County home economics extension agent(s)__(agent's name)__; and human development specialists from the North Carolina Agricultural Extension Service. Get further information and make your reservations by calling__(# phone)__today.

```
Cooperative Extension Service Letterhead

                                    Date_____

Dear _____

Your place is reserved for the series of self-
learning classes:

              BECOMING, YOU, ME AND US

Dates  _____  _____  _____  _____
       1st class  2nd class  3rd class  4th class

Place and Address_____

Time_____
If you find that you cannot attend this series of
classes, please let us know in advance so that
your place can be offered to another couple.

                            Sincerely,

                  _____
```

(Sample)
(Page 41)

   (Letterhead used)

   Agricultural Extension Service

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

            SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND LIFE SCIENCES

Office of District Home Economics Agents

    Married couples now have the opportunity to learn more
about interpersonal skills. The following videotapes are
available for extension agents to show:

"Becoming--You, Me, and Us"

- Self-Understanding
- Communication
- Consensus
- Commitment

These tapes were filmed at North Carolina State University with Dr. Leo Hawkins, human development specialist, and include conversation with several couples. These dialogues give examples of the many issues that all couples experience at one time or another.

There have been requests for classes in interpersonal skills and knowledge. Couples need to know about this opportunity. Since we can offer this first series of classes to no more than ten (10) couples who can attend all sessions, <u>pre-registration</u> will be necessary. We are planning to hold our classes at the _____Building at _____ in the evening.

_____1st class:	"Understanding Yourself"
_____2nd class:	"How to Communicate More Effectively"
_____3rd class:	"How to Handle Conflict Constructively"
_____4th class:	"Commitment for Yourself and Your Partner to the Goals of Your Marriage"

There will be radio and newspaper publicity for these classes. Please talk about this series, invite couples to call me for further details, and suggest couples whom you think would like to take part.

Sincerely,

(Sample)
(Page 43)

RESOURCES FOR PARTICIPANTS

Class 1 -- Self Inventory

Class 2 -- Communication Skills

Class 3 -- Rules for Reaching Consensus

Class 4 -- Marriage Puzzle, Commitment to Marriage, Marriage Climate
Commitment to Marriage
Marriage Climate Chart

(Sample)
(Page 47)

Class 3 -- Consensus

Rules for reaching Consensus and handling conflict construc-
tively:

1. Accept disagreement as normal.

2. Make the issue clear and avoid side issues.

3. See the other person's side.

4. Find a solution.

Draw circles here to represent your present relationship as
you see it. (Remember, relationships are different on the
videotape. Also, you and your spouse may see your rela-
tionship differently. The important thing is to look at
your spouse's point of view along with yours.)

(Sample)
(Page 49)

Class 4 -- Commitment

Think about these statements and write your responses.

1. Three things about my marriage that I like better.
     (space for writing)
2. Three things about my marriage that can be better.
     (space)
3. Three things I can do to improve our marriage.
     (space)

****

Write an ad in 20 words to sell your marriage.

"Marriage for sale....(now write 20 words describing it...
remember the good things you liked about your marriage)

APPENDIX F

TABLES FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS

TABLE A

Total Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix
for All Groups (Pretest)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
1	.02523	-.09240	.82713	.00615	.14981	.17159	.14274
2	.75616	.02954	-.03374	-.13735	-.05096	-.11292	.10569
3	.57080	.19174	.05278	-.23162	.06399	-.07776	.20414
4	.75683	.02668	.26216	.07674	.22791	.10081	-.02231
5	.68390	.01551	.06918	.10707	.07662	.11961	-.31386
6	-.01375	.27736	-.08617	.21061	.17661	.56378	.08473
7	-.27742	-.01256	-.00673	.60917	.01272	.11881	-.00576
8	.08522	.02821	.02471	.47192	.06249	.11733	.22813
9	.26139	.28486	.02644	-.43995	.06074	-.15616	-.04545
10	.52208	.05705	-.01220	-.31597	-.04714	-.19400	-.01675
11	-.00782	.02842	.12782	.07356	-.00606	.23129	.37419
12	.02671	-.04241	-.02679	.12545	-.02268	.46533	.10622
13	-.37573	-.12220	.08911	.06649	-.15111	.63483	.24781
14	-.02216	.10988	.38449	.10191	-.28421	.56884	-.23524
15	.12746	.19384	.07020	.00249	.82840	-.05134	-.14425
16	.09128	.80146	-.03779	.03665	.07427	.07199	-.05583
17	.06977	.62287	.04428	-.05144	.04922	-.00080	.24055
18	.24802	.10385	.38974	-.11789	-.04064	-.15820	-.00231
19	-.02487	.14406	-.18797	.35246	-.24391	.11541	.07490
20	.00258	.16088	-.02698	.21041	-.18780	.05752	.47506

TABLE B

Factors, with Eigenvalue, Percentage of
Variance, and Cumulative Percentage
for All Groups (Pretest)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	3.31196	34.1	34.1
2	1.99716	20.6	54.7
3	1.31690	13.6	68.2
4	1.02954	10.6	78.8
5	0.91360	9.4	88.2
6	0.66973	6.9	95.1
7	0.47142	4.9	100.0

TABLE C

Total Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix for Experimental Group (Posttest)

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
1	.09091	.06082	-.11309	-.06331	.01459	.72206
2	.67654	-.11332	.08259	-.03394	.28442	.03417
3	.74221	-.01919	.09648	-.05968	.08692	-.06025
4	.80972	-.19705	.00780	.00967	.12658	.12388
5	.60707	-.06779	-.15121	.05707	.20521	.15502
6	-.04034	.47735	.41453	.21933	.06282	.00145
7	-.07300	.14952	.04224	.32309	.01890	.01377
8	.11904	.05204	.11156	.90119	.02231	-.06659
9	.13582	.02345	.06750	-.02921	.61083	-.02252
10	.43726	.00644	.31994	-.00356	.40022	-.21361
11	-.10352	.25352	.34441	.28929	-.19115	.35270
12	-.25140	.27516	-.04247	.22878	-.12870	-.26728
13	-.20275	.61572	.03309	.06496	-.25530	.12347
14	-.04879	.89248	-.03911	.14668	.02429	-.01886
15	.13357	-.23739	.02647	.12750	.53277	.16427
16	.14314	-.20955	.53649	-.00885	.22358	.00076
17	.26252	-.02725	.37970	.22058	.08347	-.21551
18	.26901	-.01929	-.00406	-.02572	.48078	-.07856
19	-.00941	.07689	.47223	.12235	-.06184	.03358
20	-.09306	.10618	.42586	-.15074	.05633	-.28423

TABLE D

Factors, with Eigenvalue, Percentage of
Variance, and Cumulative Percentage
for Experimental Group (Posttest)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	3.60158	39.0	39.0
2	2.09122	22.6	61.6
3	1.23648	13.4	74.9
4	0.88453	9.6	84.5
5	0.75956	8.2	92.7
6	0.67194	7.3	100.0

APPENDIX G

CODING CATEGORIES FOR RESPONSES

TO OPEN-END ITEMS

CODE CATEGORIES FOR RESPONSES
TO OPEN END ITEMS

No Response

Feelings and understanding--free exchange of feelings, be
          more understanding

Communication--includes varying degrees of listening,
          expressiveness, discussion, using communica-
          tion skills, and talking openly

Management--handling problems, working together, planning
          time schedules, helping with housework, setting
          priorities

Children--enjoyment of, love for

Personal growth--individual identity while being a couple,
          learning more tolerance and patience, more
          confidence in self and pursuits, self-expression,
          self-understanding

Group support--meeting other couples, feedback from group

Sex--involvement in lovemaking, extended periods of intimacy

Leisure & recreation--involvement in activities, time other
          than work

No improvement needed--couldn't be better, don't know of
          anything to improve

Mutual love--express love more often, mutuality, intimacy,
          closeness

Sharing experiences & companionship--more free time, more
          time together as a couple, sharing activities

Openness & honesty--work on being more open and trusting,
          trust

Security--financial freedom and financial planning, having
          a mate, a home, etc., not having to be alone,
          security from a lasting marriage

Fits expectations of role of spouse--spouse behaves or
          strives in expected way (be a better wife,
          "wife's housekeeping is good," "home-cooked
          meals," "husband spends time with children"),
          help spouse meet my expectations of him/her,
          life goals

Fits expectations of role of children--they do right,
          manner of child-rearing, code parallel to
          fitting expectations of role of spouse

Consensus, mutual decision-making--agreement in important
          matters, agree to disagree, communication
          in handling differences

Couple growth--focus on the couple relationship, attend to
          the marriage, mutual accomplishment

Compatibility--common interests, get along well together

Development of children--as personal growth in adults, etc.

Direct invitation--invited by agent, minister, etc.

Spouse suggested--also included one spouse strongly urging
          the other

Novelty of attending--interested, have not been to such a
          class before, see what course was like,
          curiosity

Dissatisfaction with marriage--concerns over lacks in
          marriage, specifics not iterated

Understand spouse better--need for insight in particulars
          concerning spouse

Understand others' problems--awareness of others' problems,
          how they cope

Interpersonal interaction with family--children & others
          ("improve relationship with inlaws," "less
          friction with son," "less tension, stress,
          anxiety")

Better physically--appearance/health & physical fitness

Increase knowledge of marriage--better understanding of
          married life ("learn how to be a better
          spouse"), gain skills

Commitment--couple commitment, self goals, expressed inten-
          tion

Apply things learned in classes--change own behavior

Want others to have classes--help involve others

Dialoguing--learning use of this specific skill and its
          meaningfulness

Religion--church life, more religious activities in home

APPENDIX H

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE A

Demographic Characteristics of Experimental
and Control Groups According to Sex

	Experimental A and B				Control C			
	W	H	Total		W	H	Total	
Age	N	N	N	%	N	N	N	%
21-25	5	4	9	11.5%	2	0	2	9.1%
26-30	8	7	15	19.2	1	2	3	13.7
31-35	7	8	15	19.2	4	3	7	31.9
36-40	5	3	8	10.3	3	3	6	27.3
41-45	4	4	8	10.3	0	1	1	4.5
46-50	5	4	9	11.5	0	1	1	4.5
51-55	4	6	10	12.8	1	0	1	4.5
56-61	1	3	4	5.2	0	1	1	4.5
	39	39	78	100.0%	11	11	22	100.0%
	Mean 38.22				Mean 35.82			

Education (in years)	N	N	N	%	N	N	N	%
0- 8	1	3	4	5.1%	0	0	0	0.0%
9-11	3	4	7	9.0	1	5	6	27.3
12	16	8	24	30.8	7	2	9	40.9
13-15	8	7	15	19.2	1	2	3	13.6
16	9	8	17	21.8	0	0	0	0.0
17+	2	9	11	14.1	2	2	4	18.2
	39	39	78	100.0%	11	11	22	100.0%
	Mean 13.72				Mean 12.91			
	Median 13.17				Median 12.06			

Occupation	N	N	N	%	N	N	N	%
Professional and Managerial	8	12	20	25.6%	0	3	3	13.6%
Clerical & Sales	6	10	16	20.5	4	1	5	22.7
Craftsman & Operative	3	6	9	11.5	1	3	4	18.2
Service & Laborer	1	4	5	6.5	0	3	3	13.6
Homemaker	21	0	21	26.9	0	1	1	27.3
Farmer	0	7	7	9.0	0	1	1	4.6
Totals	39	39	78	100.0%	11	11	22	100.0%

Table A (continued)

Number of Prior Meetings Attended	Experimental A and B				Control C			
	W	H	Total		W	H	Total	
	N	N	N	%	N	N	N	%
0	23	24	47	60.3%	2	5	7	31.8%
1	2	3	5	6.4	0	1	1	4.5
2	2	1	3	3.8	0	0	0	0.0
3	2	4	6	7.7	1	0	1	4.5
4	0	3	3	3.8	2	0	2	9.2
5	1	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0.0
6	0	0	0	0.0	1	1	2	9.1
9+ *	8	4	12	15.4	4	3	7	31.8
No Response	1	0	1	1.3	1	1	2	9.1
Totals	39	39	78	100.0%	11	11	22	100.0%

* Eight females had attended 9, 12, 15, 20, 40+ meetings;
  four males had attended 10, 12, 15, 21 meetings.

Number of Children	% Couples	% Couples
None	1	2
1	7	2
2	18	5
3	6	2
4	4	0
5	2	0
6	1	0
Totals	39*	11*
	Mean 2.40	Mean 1.68

Number years Married		
2- 5	6	1
6-10	11	2
11-15	4	7
16-20	6	0
21-25	3	0
26-30	1	0
31-35	5	0
36-40	3	1
Totals	39*	11*
	Mean 16.64	Mean 13.09

* Number of couples

APPENDIX H

TABLE B

Occupational Role and Educational Level Classified
According to an Index of Social Position

Category	Experimental		Control	
	N	%	N	%
I. Highest	5	6.4	0	0.0
II. Next to Highest	15	19.2	4	18.2
III. Middle	21	27.0	2	9.1
IV. Next to Lowest	13	16.7	7	31.9
V. Lowest	3	3.8	3	13.6
Additional Categories				
Housewife--college graduate	5	6.4	0	0.0
Housewife--partial college	4	5.1	0	0.0
Housewife--high school graduate	11	14.1	5	22.7
Housewife--partial high school	1	1.3	1	4.5
Total	78	100.0	22	100.0

The column header "Group" spans Experimental and Control.

APPENDIX H

TABLE C

Reasons for Attending the Series of
Group Meetings by Sex

Category	Experimental Group		
	W* N	H* N	Total %
Communication	2	1	3.9%
Personal Growth	4	1	6.4
Couple Growth	14	10	30.8
Direct Invitation	4	6	12.8
Spouse Suggested	3	8	14.1
Novelty of Attending	3	8	14.1
Dissatisfaction with Marriage	2	1	3.8
Increase Knowledge of Marriage	5	2	9.0
Wanted Others to Have Class	1	0	1.3
No Response	1	2	3.8
Total	39	39	100.0%
			N=78

* W=Wife, H=Husband

APPENDIX H

TABLE D

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Consensus Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NR %		Always Agree %		Almost Always Agree %		Occa- sionally Disagree %		Fre- quently Disagree %		Almost Always Disagree %		Always Disagree %	
	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C
1. Handling fam- ily finances.	1.3(---)+ 2.6(---)		15.4(45.5)* 16.7(45.5)*		38.5(31.8) 51.3(22.7)		38.5(22.7) 21.8(27.3)		5.1(---) 7.7(4.5)		1.3(---) ---(---)		---(---) ---(---)	
2. Matters of recreation.	3.8(---) 2.6(---)		9.0(18.2) 7.7(13.6)		38.5(45.5) 48.7(36.4)		34.6(31.8) 32.1(50.0)		11.5(4.5) 9.0(---)		2.6(---) ---(---)		---(---) ---(---)	
3. Religious matters.	1.3(---) 2.6(4.5)		25.6(50.0) 30.8(40.9)		52.6(18.2) 50.0(9.1)		9.0(18.2) 9.0(36.4)		5.1(4.5) 5.1(9.1)		2.6(---) ---(---)		3.8(9.1) 2.6(---)	
4. Friends.	5.1(---) 3.8(---)		25.6(31.8) 23.1(36.4)		53.8(54.5) 55.1(45.5)		11.5 (4.5) 14.1 (4.5)		1.3(9.1) 2.6(13.6)		2.6(---) 1.3(---)		---(---) ---(---)	
5. Conventional- ity (correct or proper behavior).	1.3(---) 2.6(4.5)		20.5(27.3) 14.1(27.3)		47.4(50.0) 52.6(31.8)		23.1(18.2) 28.2(27.3)		5.1(4.5) 2.6(9.1)		2.6(---) ---(---)		---(---) ---(---)	
6. Philosophy of life.	2.6(---) 6.4(---)		25.6(18.2) 19.2(22.7)		41.0(50.0) 44.9(50.0)		20.5(27.3) 21.8(22.7)		5.1(4.5) 6.4(4.5)		5.1(---) ---(---)		---(---) 1.3(---)	
7. Ways of deal- ing with par- ents or in- laws	2.6(---) 2.6(---)		20.5(18.2) 20.5(31.8)		35.9(59.1) 39.7(45.5)		28.2(22.7) 30.8(13.6)		9.0(---) 5.1(9.1)		3.8(---) 1.3(---)		---(---) ---(---)	

N = 78 experimental group; N = 22 control group.
* preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second.
+ control group in parentheses.

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Consensus Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NR		Always Agree		Almost Always Agree		Occasionally Disagree		Frequently Disagree		Almost Always Disagree		Always Disagree	
	%		%		%		%		%		%		%	
	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C	E	C
8. Aims, goals, and things believed important.	1.3(---)+		23.1(22.7)*		50.0(54.5)		19.2(13.6)		5.1(9.1)		1.3(---)		---(---)	
	2.6(---)		24.4(27.3)*		53.8(40.9)		14.1(27.3)		5.1(4.5)		---(---)		---(---)	
9. Amount of time spent together.	1.3(---)		11.5(22.7)		43.6(45.5)		28.2(22.7)		12.8(9.1)		1.3(---)		1.3(---)	
	2.6(---)		9.0(22.7)		48.7(40.9)		28.2(36.4)		11.5(---)		---(---)		---(---)	
10. Making major decisions.	1.3(---)		25.6(50.0)		47.4(27.3)		21.8(18.2)		2.6(4.5)		1.3(---)		---(---)	
	3.8(---)		21.8(54.5)		56.4(27.3)		15.4(18.2)		2.6(---)		---(---)		---(---)	
11. Household tasks.	2.6(---)		6.4(31.8)		44.9(31.8)		30.8(31.8)		10.3(4.5)		5.1(---)		---(---)	
	2.6(---)		2.6(27.3)		42.3(36.4)		38.5(31.8)		14.1(4.5)		---(---)		---(---)	
12. Leisure time interests and activities.	1.3(---)		5.1(22.7)		46.2(50.0)		34.6(22.7)		10.3(4.5)		2.6(---)		---(---)	
	2.6(---)		7.7(22.7)		52.6(40.9)		28.2(31.8)		6.4(4.5)		2.6(---)		---(---)	
13. Career Decisions.	1.3(---)		29.5(40.9)		53.8(36.4)		10.3(18.2)		3.8(4.5)		1.3(---)		---(---)	
	2.6(---)		30.8(40.9)		51.3(31.8)		11.5(27.3)		2.6(---)		1.3(---)		---(---)	

N = 78   experimental group; N = 22   control group.
* preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second.
+ control group in parentheses.

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Communication Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	Experimental Group (E) N=78 Control Group (C) N=22	3 % E	C	2 % E	C	0 % E	C	NR % E	C
1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation?		**71.8(68.2)+ **78.2(68.2)		16.7(18.2) 15.4(18.2)		10.3(13.6) 6.4(13.6)		---(---) ---(---)	
2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask the person to explain what he means?		78.2(77.3) 74.4(72.7)		15.4(18.2) 16.7(18.2)		6.4(4.5) 9.0(9.1)		---(---) ---(---)	
3. When you are trying to explain something, do other persons have a tendency to put words in your mouth?		70.5(68.2) 59.0(81.8)		*19.2(22.7) *23.1(18.2)		10.3(9.1) 16.7(---)		---(---) 1.3(---)	
4. Do you assume the other person knows what you are trying to say without your explaining what you really mean?		37.2(54.5) 39.7(63.6)		*25.6(18.2) *26.9(13.6)		35.9(22.7) 33.3(22.7)		1.3(4.5) ---(---)	
5. When in a discussion, do you attempt to find out how you are coming across by asking for feedback?		42.3(50.0) 44.9(27.3)		20.5(9.1) 19.2(18.2)		37.2(40.9) 33.3(54.5)		---(---) 2.6(---)	
6. Is it difficult for you to converse with other people?		67.9(77.3) 69.2(72.7)		*16.7(18.2) *17.9(22.7)		15.4(4.5) 12.8(4.5)		---(---) ---(---)	
7. Do you find it very difficult to become interested in other people?		75.6(72.7) 79.5(72.7)		*17.9(22.7) *15.4(18.2)		6.4(4.5) 5.1(4.5)		---(---) ---(4.5)	
8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from those around you?		46.2(54.5) 48.7(40.9)		24.4(36.4) 24.4(40.9)		29.5(9.1) 25.6(18.2)		---(---) 1.3(---)	

 * Weight is 1 instead of 2
** Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second for each item
 + Control group in parentheses

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Communication Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	Experimental Group (E) N=78 Control Group (C) N=22	3 % E C	2 % E C	0 % E C	NR % E C
9.	In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person's shoes?	**64.1(50.0)+ 76.9(54.5)	21.8(18.2) 15.4(13.6)	14.1(31.8) 7.7(31.8)	---(---) ---(---)
10.	In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than the other person?	46.2(68.2) 56.4(68.2)	*23.1(13.6) *19.2(13.6)	30.8(18.2) 24.4(13.6)	---(---) ---(4.5)
11.	Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others?	67.9(81.8) 74.4(63.6)	16.7(13.6) 11.5(13.6)	15.4(4.5) 14.1(22.7)	---(---) ---(---)
12.	When you are angry, do you admit it when asked by someone else?	71.8(50.0) 69.2(36.4)	12.8(27.3) 16.7(31.8)	15.4(22.7) 12.8(31.8)	---(---) 1.3(---)
13.	Is it very difficult for you to accept constructive criticism from others?	42.3(45.5) 48.7(59.1)	*26.9(27.3) *17.9(27.3)	30.8(27.3) 33.3(13.6)	---(---) ---(---)
14.	In interacting with others, do you have a tendency to jump to conclusions without having facts?	41.0(63.6) 48.7(72.7)	29.5(27.3) 23.1(9.1)	29.5(9.1) 26.9(18.2)	---(---) 1.3(---)
15.	Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt?	76.9(63.6) 78.2(72.7)	11.5(22.7) 12.8(22.7)	11.5(13.6) 7.7(4.5)	---(---) 1.3(---)
16.	Does it upset you a great deal when someone disagrees with you?	62.8(63.6) 67.9(72.7)	*21.8(22.7) *19.2(13.6)	15.4(13.6) 12.8(9.1)	---(---) ---(---)

 * Weight is 1 instead of 2
** Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second for each item
 + Control group in parentheses

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Communication Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	Experimental Group (E) N=78 Control Group (C) N=22	3 % E C	2 % E C	0 % E C	NR % E C
17.	When someone has hurt your feelings do you discuss the matter with that person?	**29.5(9.1)+ 26.9(9.1)	28.2(31.8) 35.9(31.8)	42.3(59.1) 37.2(59.1)	---(---) ---(---)
18.	Do you avoid expressing disagreement with others because you are afraid they will get angry?	44.9(31.8) 53.8(18.2)	*26.9(36.4) *23.1(45.5)	28.2(31.8) 23.1(36.4)	---(---) ---(---)
19.	When a problem arises between you and another person, are you able to discuss it without losing control of your emotions?	67.9(54.5) 62.8(77.3)	16.7(36.4) 21.8(13.6)	15.4(9.1) 15.4(9.1)	---(---) ---(---)
20.	Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with others?	60.3(59.1) 65.4(72.7)	24.4(18.2) 14.1(18.2)	15.4(22.7) 20.5(9.1)	---(---) ---(---)
21.	Do you postpone discussing touchy subjects with others?	26.9(36.4) 25.6(22.7)	*25.6(18.2) *34.6(22.7)	45.5(46.2) 54.5(39.7)	---(---) ---(---)
22.	In meaningful conversation, are you aware of how you are feeling and reacting to what the other person(s) is saying?	75.6(68.2) 79.5(72.7)	20.5(13.6) 14.1(13.6)	18.2(3.8) 13.6(6.4)	---(---) ---(---)
23.	Do you have difficulty trusting other people?	60.3(54.5) 62.8(63.6)	*29.5(18.2) *24.4(13.6)	22.7(10.3) 18.2(11.5)	---(4.5) 1.3(4.5)
24.	In attempting to settle a misunderstanding, do you remind yourself that the other person could be right?	83.3(63.6) 83.3(72.7)	11.5(9.1) 9.0(9.1)	27.3(5.1) 18.2(7.7)	---(---) ---(---)

* Weight is 1 instead of 2
** Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second for each item
 + Control group in parentheses

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Communication Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	Experimental Group (E) N=78 Control Group (C) N=22	3 % E	C	2 % E	C	0 % E	C	NR % E	C
25.	Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from others?	**47.4(59.1)+ 52.6(59.1)		19.2(13.6) 15.4(27.3)		27.3(33.3) 13.6(32.1)		---(---) ---(---)	
26.	Do you help others to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe?	66.7(59.1) 73.1(59.1)		19.2(22.7) 11.5(22.7)		18.2(12.8) 18.2(14.1)		---(---) 1.3(---)	
27.	Do you confide in people?	15.4(22.7) 12.8(31.8)		*26.9(40.9) *24.4(18.2)		36.4(57.7) 50.0(62.8)		---(---) ---(---)	
28.	Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion?	65.4(68.2) 59.0(68.2)		*19.2(4.5) *25.6(9.1)		27.3(15.4) 22.7(15.4)		---(---) ---(---)	
29.	In conversation, do you let the other person finish talking before replying to what he says?	76.9(86.4) 79.5(86.4)		14.1(4.5) 15.4(4.5)		9.1(7.7) 9.1(5.1)		---(---) ---(---)	
30.	Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversation with others?	47.4(45.5) 43.6(59.1)		30.8(54.5) 41.0(40.9)		0.0(20.5) 0.0(14.1)		1.3(---) 1.3(---)	
31.	Do you ever try to listen for meaning when someone is talking?	85.9(63.6) 84.6(72.7)		10.3(27.3) 12.8(18.2)		9.1(2.6) 9.1(2.6)		---(---) ---(---)	
32.	Do others seem to be listening when you are talking?	79.5(81.8) 85.9(86.4)		12.8(18.2) 10.3(13.6)		0.0(6.4) 0.0(3.8)		1.3(---) ---(---)	

  * Weight is 1 instead of 2
 ** Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second for each item
  \+ Control group in parentheses

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Communication Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	Experimental Group (E) N=78 Control Group (C) N=22	3 % E C	2 % E C	0 % E C	NR % E C
33.	In a discussion is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view?	**69.2(54.5) 75.6(59.1)	*24.4(31.8) *19.2(22.7)	13.6(6.4) 18.2(5.1)	---(---) ---(---)
34.	Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not really listening?	48.7(63.6) 42.3(63.6)	*42.3(31.8) *43.6(36.4)	4.5(9.0) 0.0(14.1)	---(---) ---(---)
35.	In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying (his words) and what he may be feeling?	57.7(59.1) 65.4(59.1)	30.8(31.8) 26.9(31.8)	9.1(10.3) 9.1(6.4)	---(---) 1.3(---)
36.	While speaking, are you aware of how others may be reacting to what you are saying?	84.6(72.7) 79.5(68.2)	9.0(22.7) 14.1(31.8)	4.5(6.4) 0.0(6.4)	---(---) ---(---)
37.	Do you feel that other people wished you were a different kind of person?	57.7(90.9) 60.3(90.9)	*25.6(4.5) *23.1(4.5)	4.5(16.7) 4.5(16.7)	---(---) ---(---)
38.	Do other people fail to understand your feelings?	48.7(54.5) 44.9(72.7)	*34.6(40.9) *35.9(22.7)	4.5(15.4) 4.5(16.7)	1.3(---) ---(---)
39.	Can you tell what kind of day another person may be having by observing him?	83.3(63.6) 80.8(77.3)	15.4(18.2) 14.1(13.6)	18.2(1.3) 9.1(5.1)	---(---) ---(---)
40.	Do you admit that you are wrong when you know that you are wrong about something?	88.5(72.7) 89.7(72.7)	11.5(18.2) 9.0(18.2)	9.1(0.0) 9.1(1.3)	---(---) ---(---)

 * Weight is 1 instead of 2
** Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second for each item
 + Control group in parentheses

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Information Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NF	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		%	%	%	%	%
1. Some differences between husbands and wives must be put up with in order to have a good relationship.	2.6(---)*+ 1.3(---)*	26.9(22.7) 23.1(31.8)	61.5(63.6) 65.4(59.1)	3.8(---) 5.1(---)	2.6(9.1) 3.8(9.1)	2.6(4.5) 1.3(---)
2. Being aware of and accepting your own feelings can help you to understand better the feelings of other people.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	47.4(31.8) 53.8(40.9)	51.3(50.0) 44.9(40.9)	---(18.2) ---(18.2)	---(---) ---(---)	---(---) ---(---)
3. For marriage to work, it takes the efforts of both partners.	---(---) 1.3(---)	84.6(63.6) 78.2(68.2)	15.4(31.8) 20.5(27.3)	---(4.5) ---(4.5)	---(---) ---(---)	---(---) ---(---)
4. People can be different and still normal.	---(---) 1.3(---)	52.6(27.3) 52.6(31.8)	46.2(68.2) 43.6(63.6)	---(4.5) ---(4.5)	---(---) ---(---)	---(---) ---(---)
5. Disagreement in a marriage does not mean it is a failure.	---(---) 2.6(---)	47.4(27.3) 46.2(27.3)	51.3(68.2) 51.3(68.2)	---(---) ---(---)	---(---) ---(---)	---(---) ---(---)

 * Preinventory listed first; post inventory listed second.
** Items scored in reverse (1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Disagree; and 5 = Strongly Disagree.
 + Control group in parentheses.

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Information Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NF	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%	%
**6. The ideal marriage is one in which the man and woman should satisfy all needs of each other.	5.1(4.5)*+ 3.8(---)*	11.5(4.5) 11.5(9.1)	33.3(31.8) 34.6(31.8)	3.8(9.1) 6.4(18.2)	25.6(40.9) 29.5(31.8)	20.5(9.1) 14.1(9.1)
**7. People treat you as you really are.	2.6(---) 3.8(---)	---(9.1) ---(13.6)	17.9(22.7) 14.1(13.6)	17.9(13.6) 10.3(18.2)	53.8(50.0) 66.7(45.5)	7.7(4.5) 5.1(9.1)
**8. What a person says is what s/he means.	2.6(---) 2.6(---)	5.1(9.1) 3.8(13.6)	53.8(50.0) 57.7(36.4)	16.7(18.2) 17.9(27.3)	19.2(22.7) 16.7(22.7)	2.6(---) 1.3(---)
9. Speaking for yourself helps others know how you think and feel.	---(---) 1.3(---)	19.2(4.5) 15.4(13.6)	73.1(77.3) 79.5(68.2)	3.8(13.6) 2.6(13.6)	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	1.3(4.5) ---(4.5)
10. There are skills in communicating with others that can be learned.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	43.6(22.7) 39.7(27.3)	53.8(63.6) 56.4(59.1)	1.3(13.6) 1.3(13.6)	---(---) 1.3(---)	---(---) ---(---)
**11. Telling in your own words what you heard another person say shows you understand.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	3.8(---) 6.4(---)	30.8(13.6) 15.4(13.6)	15.4(31.8) 12.8(27.3)	39.7(50.0) 50.0(45.5)	9.0(4.5) 14.1(13.6)

 * Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second.
 ** Items scored in reverse (1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Undecied; 4 = Disagree; and 5 = Strongly Disagree.
 + Control group in parentheses.

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Information Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NF	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%	%
*12. Decisions between partners should hold once they are made.	3.8(---)*+ 5.1(---)*	1.3(---) ---(---)	21.8(13.6) 19.2(27.3)	12.8(31.8) 20.5(18.2)	50.0(36.4) 41.0(36.4)	10.3(18.2) 14.1(---)
*13. Fulfilling your partner's needs in marriage leads to marital fulfillment.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	---(4.5) 1.3(---)	17.9(13.6) 5.1(27.3)	5.1(9.1) 7.7(4.5)	46.2(68.2) 64.1(50.0)	29.5(4.5) 20.5(18.2)
*14. In marriage husbands and wives should spend their leisure time together whenever possible.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	1.3(---) ---(---)	15.4(---) 15.4(9.1)	6.4(22.7) 9.0(22.7)	48.7(45.5) 61.5(40.9)	26.9(31.8) 12.8(27.3)
15. Couples can have workable marriages even though they may have different points of view.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	16.7(9.1) 23.1(4.5)	69.2(72.7) 70.5(81.8)	10.3(13.6) 5.1(9.1)	2.6(4.5) ---(4.5)	---(---) ---(---)
*16. Debating an issue is never helpful.	1.3(---) 1.3(---)	26.9(22.7) 23.1(22.7)	60.3(59.1) 60.3(63.6)	5.1(9.1) 5.1(13.6)	2.6(4.5) 7.7(---)	3.8(4.5) 2.6(---)

 * Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second.
** Items scored in reverse (1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Disagree; and 5 = Strongly Disagree.
 + Control group in parentheses.

Percentage of Responses to Items in the Information Measure for
the Experimental and Control Groups

Items	NF	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	%	%	%	%	%	%
17. When you are very dissatisfied with your marriage, there is little you can do about it.	2.6(---)*+ 1.3(---)*	37.2(50.0) 43.6(40.9)	52.6(45.5) 43.6(54.5)	5.1(4.5) 2.6(4.5)	1.3(---) 3.8(---)	1.3(---) 5.1(---)
18. Different ways of talking are used for different purposes.	5.1(4.5)*+ 3.8(4.5)*	11.5(9.1) 17.9(13.6)	66.7(59.1) 71.8(50.0)	9.0(18.2) 3.8(13.6)	7.7(9.1) 2.6(18.2)	---(---) ---(---)
*19. Some feelings are wrong.	3.8(---) 5.1(---)	5.1(4.5) 12.8(4.5)	19.2(40.9) 26.9(40.9)	12.8(13.6) 7.7(22.7)	48.7(31.8) 43.6(31.8)	10.3(9.1) 3.8(---)
*20. A self-confident person can live effectively no matter what other people who are important to him or her say.	1.3(---) 2.6(---)	15.4(4.5) 11.5(4.5)	41.0(54.5) 44.9(50.0)	11.5(22.7) 11.5(22.7)	25.6(13.6) 25.6(18.2)	5.1(4.5) 3.8(4.5)

 * Preinventory listed first; postinventory listed second.
** Items scored in reverse (1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Disagree; and 5 = Strongly Disagree.
 + Control group in parentheses.

TABLE G

Things about Marriage That Please
by Group and Sex

Category	Experimental			Control			
	W* N**	H* N	Total %	W N	H N	Total %	Total %
No Response	4	5	5.8	1	2	6.8	6.0
Feelings and Under-standing	2	3	3.9	0	1	2.3	3.0
Management	5	3	5.1	1	0	2.3	4.5
Leisure & Recreation	2	0	1.3	0	0	0.0	1.0
Mutual Love	7	10	10.9	0	3	6.8	10.0
Sharing Experiences & Companionship	8	14	14.1	4	0	9.1	13.0
Openness & Honesty	3	3	3.9	0	0	0.0	3.0
Security	7	4	7.0	4	1	11.4	8.0
Fits Expectation of Role of Spouse	13	20	21.1	6	8	31.8	23.5
Communication	4	2	3.9	0	1	2.3	3.5
Children	5	6	7.1	1	1	4.5	6.5
Personal Growth	4	1	3.2	0	0	0.0	2.5
Sex	3	1	2.6	0	1	2.3	2.5
Consensus	3	0	1.9	0	1	2.3	2.0
Couple Growth	1	1	0.6	2	0	4.5	2.0
Compatibility	4	1	3.2	3	3	13.6	5.5
Religion	1	2	1.9	0	0	0.0	1.5
Fits Expectation of Role of Children	1	2	1.9	0	0	0.0	1.5
Interpersonal Inter-action in Family	0	1	0.6	0	0	0.0	0.5
Total**	78	78	100.0	22	22	100.0	100.0

 * W = Wife, H = Husband
** N = Total number of responses; each person could answer
   with two responses; N = 39 wives and 39 husbands for
   experimental group and 11 wives for control group; total
   number of responses, 200.

TABLE I

Things Couple Members Thought They Could Improve about Their Marriage

	Group						
	Experimental			Control			
	W* N**	H* N	Total %	W N	H N	Total %	Total %
No Response	16	15	19.9	3	4	15.9	19.0
Communication	11	8	12.2	1	3	9.1	11.5
Management	3	6	5.8	7	5	27.3	10.5
Personal Growth	17	9	16.7	3	0	6.8	14.5
Sex	2	1	1.9	0	0	0.0	1.5
Share Experiences & Companionship	6	10	10.3	1	3	9.1	10.0
Security	1	4	3.2	3	3	13.6	5.5
Fits Expectations of Role of Spouse	6	5	7.0	0	0	0.0	5.5
Feelings and Understanding	9	6	9.6	2	1	6.8	9.0
Leisure and Recreation	1	4	3.2	1	2	6.8	4.0
No Improvement	0	1	0.6	1	1	4.6	1.5
Mutual Love	1	1	1.3	0	0	0.0	1.0
Openness & Honesty	1	1	1.3	0	0	0.0	1.0
Consensus	1	2	1.9	0	0	0.0	1.5
Interpersonal Interaction in Family	3	3	3.9	0	0	0.0	3.0
Fits Expectation of Role of Children	0	1	0.6	0	0	0.0	0.5
Better Physically	0	1	0.6	0	0	0.0	0.5
Total**	78	78	100.0			100.0	100.0

*W = Wife, H = Husband

** N = Total number of responses; each person could answer with two responses; N = 39 husbands and 39 wives for experimental group and 11 each for control group; total number of responses, 200.

TABLE J

Concerns into which the Experimental Groups Gained Greater
Insight and Concerns into which the Control Group Would
Like to Gain More Insight by Group and Sex

	Group					
	Experimental			Control		
	W* N**	H* N	Total %	W N	H N	Total %
No Response	55+	63	50.5	26	24	75.8
Feelings and Understanding	14	15	12.5	0	0	0.0
Communication	22	27	20.9	1	2	4.6
Personal Growth	5	3	3.4	1	0	1.5
Fits Expectation of Role of Spouse	3	0	1.3	0	0	0.0
Mutual Love	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Consensus	5	6	4.7	0	0	0.0
Dialoguing	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Aware of Others' Problems	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Yes, Gained Insight; No Specifics	1	0	0.4	1	1	3.0
No Improvement	0	0	0.0	2	2	6.0
Security	0	0	0.0	1	2	4.6
Development of Children	0	0	0.0	1	1	3.0
Openness and Honesty	2	0	0.9	0	0	0.0
Understand Spouse Better	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Increase Knowledge of Marriage	1	2	1.3	0	0	0.0
Sex	0	0	0.0	0	1	1.5
Management	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Couple Growth	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Compatibility	1	0	0.4	0	0	0.0
Commitment	2	0	0.9	0	0	0.0
Apply What Learned	0	1	0.4	0	0	0.0
	117	117	100.0	33	33	100.0

* W = wife, H = husband
** N = Total number of responses; each person should answer
with three responses; N = 39 couples.
+ Respondents could list up to three gains; number includes
"no responses" for all three.

TABLE K

Concerns of Couple Members Not
Adequately Dealt With in Group Sessions

	Experimental Group		
	W* N**	H* N**	Total %
No Response	89+	81	72.6
Feelings and Understanding	3	3	2.6
Management	3	4	3.0
Personal Growth	1	3	1.7
Mutual Love	0	1	0.4
Security	4	3	3.0
Fits Expectation of Role of Spouse	2	0	0.9
Communication	1	2	1.3
Sex	4	7	4.7
Leisure and Recreation	1	0	0.4
Share Experiences and Companionship	1	2	1.3
Interpersonal Interaction in Family	4	0	1.7
Apply What Learned	0	2	0.9
Religion	1	2	1.3
Early Years of Marriage	0	1	0.4
Deep Problems Cannot be Dealt with in Group	0	1	0.4
No Concerns Not Dealt With	2	3	2.1
Fits Expectations of Role of Children	1	1	0.9
Couple Growth	0	1	0.4
Total**	117	117	100.0

 * W = wife, H = husband
.** N = Total number of responses; each person could answer
    with three responses; N = 39 couples.
 + Respondents could list up to three concerns.

TABLE L

Cross-Tabulations between Things about Our Marriage That Could be Better
and Concerns into Which Insight Was Gained

	Concerns into Which Insight Was Gained Post																					
Things About Our Marriage That Could Be Better Pre	Feelings & Understanding	Communication	Personal Growth	Couple Growth	Consensus	Development of Children	Mutual Love	Dialoguing	Openness & Honesty	Aware of others' Problems	Sex	Security	Management	Fits Expectations of Role of Spouse	Understand Spouse Better	Increase Knowledge of Marriage	No Improvement Needed	Compatibility	Commitment	Apply What Learned	Yes, gained insight, no specifics	No Response
Feelings & Understanding	*4	10	3		1	1		1	1		1			1				1			1	22
Communication	8	*18	3	1	3				1	1	1					1		1				50
Personal Growth	7	5	*2	1	1									1	1		1	1			1	21
Couple Growth							1															5
Consensus	2	3	1		*2			1	1							1						7
Leisure & Recreation	4	2	1																			11
Share Experiences & Companionship	9	22	3		5	2		1				2	1	1	1	2			2		2	55
Openness & Honesty	1	2																				3
Sex	3	6	2		2					1						1				1		11
Security	2	4	2									*3		1		1						29
Management	6	11			4	1	1		1			1										29
Fits Expectation of Role of Spouse	4	7	1		1	1							1	*1		1	1		1			12
Interpersonal Interaction in the Family	4	8	1		3								1						1	1		12
No Improvement Needed																	*2					7
No Response	4	5															2					53

TABLE M

Cross-Tabulations between Concerns That Could Be Improved and Concerns into Which Insight Was Gained

Things That I Would Like To Do To Improve Our Marriage (Pre) — rows
Concerns into Which Insight Was Gained (Post) — columns

Pre ↓ \ Post →	Feelings & Understanding	Communication	Personal Growth	Couple Growth	Consensus	Development of Children	Mutual Love	Dialoguing	Openness & Honesty	Aware of others' Problems	Sex	Security	Management	Fits Expectations of Role of Spouse	Understand Spouse Better	Increase Knowledge of Marriage	No Improvement Needed	Compatibility	Commitment	Apply What Learned	Yes, gained insight, no specifics	No Response
Feelings & Understanding	*5	11	3	1	2									1		1					2	29
Communication	6	*16	6		4						1			1					1			33
Personal Growth	9	20	*6		6		1	1	2	1			1	1		2			2			37
Consensus	2	2			*1										1							4
Leisure & Recreation	4	3																				11
Mutual Love	2	1			1	2						1				1				1		2
Share Experiences & Companionship	7	13		1	4				1		1				1							32
Openness & Honesty		1																				5
Sex			1																			7
Security	1	3								1		*4					1				1	23
Management	6	4			1	2		1				1					4				2	41
Fits Expectation of Role of Spouse	3	8			1									1		1			1			19
Interpersonal Inter-action in the Family	2	4	1				1	1								1						9
No Improvement Needed	1	1	1														*1					6
No Response	9	16	1		3				1				1	3			1	2		1	1	*74

268

TABLE N

Changes in Experimental Groups' Perception of Self, Spouse,
and Marriage in Pre-Post Percentages and Percentage of Increase

Self			Items	Spouse		
Pre %	Post %	Increase %		Pre %	Post %	Increase %
			1.			
91.0%+	97.4+	6.4	Understanding thoughts,	82.1	94.9	12.8
9.0*	2.6		feelings, and intentions	16.7	2.6	
			2.			
87.2	98.7	11.5	Communicating thoughts,	80.8	93.6	12.8
11.5	1.3		feelings, and intentions	16.7	3.8	
			3.			
79.5	92.3	12.8		62.8	89.7	26.9
20.5	7.7		More positive view of self	35.9	7.7	
			4.			
78.2	100.0	20.5		57.7	93.6	35.9
20.5	0.0		More positive view of others	41.0	3.8	
			5.			
69.2	89.7	18.7	Marriage is dynamic	73.1	88.5	15.4
30.8	10.3		Marriage is static	25.6	10.3	
			6.			
88.5	96.2	7.7	Better marriage than most cou-ples	83.3	91.0	7.7
10.3	3.8		Worse marriage than most cou-ples	14.1	6.4	
			7.			
84.6	91.0	6.4	Periodic marital check-up would be helpful	75.6	83.3	7.7
15.4	9.0		Periodic marital check-up would not be helpful	23.1	14.1	

+ Indicates the perceived self-spouse need or gain; appears first in each category
* Indicates the perception that the individual or the spouse does not have a
   need or has not gained in this area; appears in each category

Changes in Control Group's Perception of Self, Spouse, and
Marriage in Pre-Post Percentages and Percentages of Increase

Self			Items	Spouse		
Pre %	Post %	Increase %		Pre %	Pos %	Increase %
			1.			
72.7+	72.7	0.0	Understanding thoughts, feelings,	68.2	68.2	0.0
27.3*	27.3		and intentions	31.8	31.8	
			2.			
77.3	63.6	-13.7	Communicating thoughts, feelings,	72.7	68.2	-4.5
22.7	36.4		and intentions	22.4	31.8	
			3.			
63.6	63.6	0.0	More positive view of self	45.5	68.2	22.7
36.4	36.4			54.5	31.8	
			4.			
63.6	72.7	9.1	More positive view of others	54.5	72.7	18.2
36.4	27.3			45.5	27.3	
			5.			
100.0	100.0	0.0	Marriage is dynamic	95.5	100.0	4.5
0.0	0.0		Marriage is static	4.5	0.0	
			6.			
100.0	100.0	0.0	Better marriage than most couples	100.0	100.0	0.0
0.0	0.0		Worse marriage than most couples	0.0	0.0	
			7.			
59.1	59.1	0.0	Periodic marital check-up would be helpful	54.5	50.0	-4.5
40.9	40.9		Periodic marital check-up would not be helpful	45.5	50.0	

+ Indicates the perceived self-spouse need or gain; appears first in each category
* Indicates the perception that the individual or the spouse does not have a need
  or has not gained in this area; appears second in each category

Means ($\bar{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Response Category Percentages
for Group Experience Evaluation Items

Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	Response Category Percentages+					
			% CI	% SI	% NC	% SD	% CD	% NR
1. Ability to communicate with your spouse. (N=77)	4.03	0.79	24.4	56.4	16.7	–	–	1.3
2. Amount of behaviors or activities by which you communicate your love. (N=78)	3.71	0.74	9.0	56.4	33.3	–	–	1.3
3. Amount of behaviors or activities by which your spouse communicates his/her love for you. (N=78)	3.71	0.71	12.8	46.2	39.7	1.3	–	–
4. Tendency to take things for granted in your marriage. (N=76)	2.75	1.03	3.8	21.8	26.9	35.9	9.0	–
5. Feeling of being understood by your spouse. (N=78)	3.91	0.71	15.4	65.4	14.1	5.1	–	–
6. Feeling of understanding your spouse. (N=77)	4.03	0.65	20.5	61.5	15.4	1.3	–	–

+ CI = Considerable Increase; SI = Slight Increase; NC = No Change; SD = Slight
Decrease; CD – Considerable Decrease; NR = Not Relevant to my Experience

Means ($\overline{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Response Category Percentages
for Group Experience Evaluation Items

| | | | Response Category Percentages+ | | | | | |
Items	$\overline{X}$	SD	% CI	% SI	% NC	% SD	% CD	% NR
7. Feelings that you do not do enough to communicate his (her) love. (N=78)	3.64	1.12	21.8	41.0	21.8	12.9	-	2.6
8. Feeling that your spouse does not do enough to communicate his (her) love. (N=78)	3.40	1.02	10.3	41.0	32.1	14.1	-	2.6
9. Frequency of expressing positive feelings to your partner. (N=77)	3.92	0.62	15.4	60.3	23.1	-	-	-
10. Feeling of closeness to your partner. (N=78)	4.05	0.68	25.6	53.8	20.5	-	-	-
11. Feeling of personal individuality and independence within your marriage. (N=77)	3.81	0.69	14.1	52.6	30.8	1.3	-	-
12. Involvement in your marriage. (N=78)	3.97	0.68	21.8	53.8	24.4	-	-	-

+ CI = Considerable Increase; SI = Slight Increase; NC = No Change; SD = Slight
  Decrease; CD = Considerable Decrease; NR = Not Relevant to my Experience

Means ($\overline{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Response Category Percentages
for Group Experience Evaluation Items

| | | | | Response Category Percentages+ | | | | | |
				% CI	% SI	% NC	% SD	% CD	% NR
Items		$\overline{X}$	SD						
13.	Strength of your marriage. (N=78)	4.08	0.68	26.9	53.8	19.2	–	–	–
14.	Time spent with your partner. (N=77)	3.51	0.60	3.8	43.6	50.0	1.3	–	–
15.	Feeling of similarity be- tween you and other couples. (N=76)	3.95	0.65	15.4	64.1	15.4	2.6	–	–
16.	Ability to express your feelings. (N=76)	4.04	0.62	20.5	60.3	16.7	–	–	–
17.	Feeling of being valued, loved, appreciated by your partner. (N=76)	3.97	0.65	19.2	56.4	21.8	–	–	–
18.	Efforts to make your mar- riage better. (N=76)	4.16	0.59	25.6	61.5	10.3	–	–	–
19.	Time spent talking together with your spouse. (N=76)	3.93	0.68	19.2	52.6	25.6	–	–	–
20.	Personal self-confidence. (N=76)	3.70	0.67	10.3	48.7	37.2	1.3	–	–

+ CI = Considerable Increase; SI = Slight Increase; NC = No Change; SD = Slight
Decrease; CD = Considerable Decrease; NR = Not Relevant to my Experience

Means ($\bar{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Response Category Percentages
for Group Experience Evaluation Items

Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	% CI	% SI	% NC	% SD	% CD	% NR
			Response Category Percentages+				
21. Emphasis on positive aspects of your marriage.	3.97	0.67	19.2	57.7	19.2	1.3	—	—
22. Emphasis on problems in your marriage.	3.43	1.00	12.8	37.2	29.5	15.4	2.6	—
23. Things which you do to meet your partner's needs.	3.99	0.58	15.4	65.4	16.7	—	—	—
24. Things which your partner does to meet your needs.	3.95	0.63	16.7	59.0	21.8	—	—	—
25. Uncomfortableness while being told positive things about yourself.	2.87	0.97	1.3	20.5	51.3	16.7	3.8	3.8
26. Feeling of having more in common with spouse.	3.79	0.64	11.5	53.8	32.1	—	—	—
27. Ability to cope with problems in your marriage.	3.91	0.68	15.4	60.3	19.2	2.6	—	—
28. Honesty with your spouse.	3.92	0.18	21.8	50.0	21.8	3.8	—	—

N = 76 for items 21-28

+ CI = Considerable Increase; SI = Slight Increase; NC = No Change; SD = Slight
Decrease; CD = Considerable Decrease; Nr = Not Relevant to my Experience

TABLE Q

Means ($\bar{X}$), Standard Deviations (SD), and Response Category
Percentages for Amount of Change in Marital Experience

Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	Response Category Percentages			
			% NC	% SC	% MC	% CC
1. General sensitivity to or awareness of your marriage. (N=77)	2.36	0.86	12.8	48.7	25.6	11.5
2. Awareness of the meanings of your spouse's behavior. (N=77)	2.39	0.98	16.7	44.9	19.2	17.9
3. Awareness of your partner's qualities. (N=76)	2.49	0.95	12.8	42.3	24.4	17.9
4. Awareness of your partner's deficiencies. (N=77)	1.99	0.93	33.3	42.3	14.1	9.0
5. Awareness of your own positive qualities. (N=77)	2.18	0.93	24.4	42.3	21.8	10.3
6. Awareness of your own deficiencies. (N=77)	2.36	0.99	20.5	38.5	23.1	16.7
7. Awareness of what is positive in your marriage. (N=77)	2.65	0.96	10.3	37.2	28.2	23.1
8. Awareness of what is lacking in your marriage. (N=77)	2.34	0.95	17.9	44.9	20.5	15.4

+ NC = No Change; SC = Slight Change; MC = Moderate Change;
CC = Considerable Change

TABLE R

Helpfulness of Techniques
in Understanding Ideas Presented

		Very Helpful		Somewhat Helpful		Not Very Helpful		No Response
		N	%	N	%	N	%	
1.	Videotapes in general	39	50.0	33	42.3	3	3.8	3.8
2.	Discussions with other couples	56	71.8	13	16.7	5	6.4	5.1
3.	Leader on the videotapes	37	47.4	31	39.7	6	7.7	5.1
4.	Dialogues with spouse	50	64.1	23	⅃.5	1	1.3	5.1
5.	Resources used by couples during video "tape off"	42	53.8	27	34.6	4	5.1	6.4

TABLE S

Means and Number Responding for Items Relating to Agents' Attitudes
Toward Videotape Teaching Methods

Items		X̄	N SA	N A	N U	N D	N SD	Change
					Response Category Numbers+			
1. I feel/felt comfortable using videotapes as resource materials.	pre	4.0	1	8	1	–	–	0.6
	post	4.6	7	2	1	–	–	–
2. I feel/felt comfortable leading the discussion groups.	pre	4.0	2	6	2	–	–	–
	post	4.0	3	5	1	1	–	–
3. I feel/felt reasonably well prepared to conduct these sessions about marriage.	pre	3.4		6	3	–	1	0.1
	post	3.5	2	5	2	–	–	–
4. I feel/felt comfortable with this subject matter related to interpersonal relationships.	pre	3.7		7	3	–	–	0.3
	post	4.0	4	3	2	1	–	–
5. I feel/would have felt more comfortable working with one married couple at a time than with the group of married couples.	pre	3.6	1	5	3	1	–	0.2
	post	3.8	1	7	1	1	–	–
6. I feel/felt comfortable working with married couples in a group setting.	pre	3.4	–	5	4	1	–	0.5
	post	3.9	3	5	2	–	–	–

+ SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE S (continued)

Means and Number Responding for Items Relating to Agents' Attitudes
Toward Videotape Teaching Methods

Items	$\overline{X}$	Response Category Numbers+				
		N SA	N A	N U	N D	N SD
7. Teaching with videotapes is better than other resources I've used in the human development area.	3.9	3	4	2	1	-
8. Without the videotape learning package, I would not have attempted to organize a series of classes to teach the subject matter.	4.5	6	3	1	-	-
9. I would recommend this videotape learning package to other agents.	4.6	6	4	-	-	-
10. I think I will use this videotape learning package again.	4.5	6	3	1	-	-
11. The videotapes interfered with my interaction with the group members.	4.0	3	5	1	1	-
12. I think I could have done a better job of teaching these classes without using the videotapes.	4.4	4	6	-	-	-
13. I was familiar with the subject matter dealt with in the tapes prior to the training.	3.5	-	7	2	-	1

+ SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

TABLE S (continued)

Means and Number Responding for Items Relating to Agents' Attitudes
Toward Videotape Teaching Methods

Items	$\overline{X}$	N SA	N A	N U	N D	N SD
		Response Category Numbers+				
14. Preparing for the classes (getting ready to lead them) took more time than I usually spend in preparation for 4 classes of the same length.	4.0	1	8	1	-	-
15. Preparing for the classes took too much time.	4.3	4	5	1	-	-
16. The "Program Procedures for Agents" was essential to my planning and conducting the four classes.	4.0	2	7	-	1	-

+ SA= Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

TABLE T

Agents' Attitudes Toward Videotape Teaching Methods:
Pre, Post, Change, and Total Values by Training Group

Agent	Group	Pre*	Post*	Change	Post°	Total+
1.	1	24	27	3	44	71
2.	1	26	29	3	41	70
3.	1	24	26	2	44	70
4.	2	24	22	-2	46	68
5.	2	19	21	2	37	58
6.	2	21	24	3	42	66
7.	2	23	28	5	45	73
8.	2	22	26	4	43	69
9.	2	21	17	-4	39	56
10.	2	17	18	1	35	53
Mean		22.1	23.7	3.4	41.6	65.4

* Total Possible = 30; items 1-6 on agent evaluation
+ Total Possible = 80; items 1-16
° Items 7-16 (post)