The primary objective of this investigation was to offer a marriage enrichment workshop enabling the participants to increase their communication and problem solving skills, and the prevention of future marital distress through an educational experience.

Marital communication and marital adjustment scores were obtained from an experimental group consisting of 16 married Indian couples living in the United States who attended a marriage enrichment workshop. These scores were compared with those scores derived from 16 married Indian couples living in the United States who participated in a marriage enrichment workshop at a later date.

Nineteen hypotheses were generated which assumed that couples participating in a marriage enrichment workshop would experience a significant increase in their level of marital communication and marital adjustment.
The five-session workshop was conducted on five consecutive Saturdays, the duration of each session being three hours. The format for the workshop included the exercises designed by Hendrix (1988) to improve communication skills and practice new relationship skills. The importance of creating a more loving and supportive relationship was emphasized in the workshop.

The instruments used to study the dependent variables were the Marital Communication Inventory and the Marital Adjustment Test. The statistical treatment applied was Analysis Of Variance with repeated measures. Subjects were tested on the first day of the workshop, the last day of the workshop, and finally five weeks after the marriage enrichment workshop.

The results indicated that the marriage enrichment workshop had moderately significant positive effect on marital communication and marital adjustment. The level of communication and adjustment showed consistent statistically significant increase over time (five week delay) after the workshop. In addition, the results established positive correlation between marital communication and marital adjustment. Finally, the content of the workshop designed by Hendrix (1988) was much appreciated by all participants and they identified remarkable similarity between the Western thought and the Eastern culture.
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In Indian culture marriage is considered a pious duty and is deeply related to the emotions of Indian women. Sinha and Mukherjee (1989) stated that although social changes are taking place and Indian women are achieving equal positions with men in many areas, middle class women still have traditional ideas about marital life. In addition to their outside duties, they want to be called worthy wives by fulfilling their domestic duties and their husband's desires, and by being good mothers, even if their husbands sometimes treat them poorly and there is much dissatisfaction between them. Swaminadhan (as cited in Sinha & Mukherjee, 1989) reported that in Indian society women are brain-washed from childhood that they are inferior to men, that marriage and duty to one's husband is the ultimate goal, and that the husband is a god, who must be obeyed and believed unquestioningly. Even though the marital roles in a traditional Indian society are now undergoing significant political, legal, and social changes, the traditional values continue to influence the marital behavior of Indian spouses in that the husbands do not see their superior status being threatened by the influence of modernization (Ramu, 1987). However, Berger and Berger (as cited in Siddiqi & Reeves, 1986) have suggested that the individual in the modern situation
can be "modern" at work and "traditional" at home, alternating between these two worlds in his/her life in a manner that is not only quite comfortable but actually productive. This observation seems to apply, in part, to Indian nationals in the United States, who appear to be incorporating certain contemporary patterns with their traditional ways. Their "creative schizophrenia" is reflected, on the one hand in their eagerness to adopt modern technological devices readily in their lives and, on the other hand, in their reluctance to accept basic American values of equality, democracy, and secularism. The attitudes of Indian nationals in the U.S. seem to be undergoing a process of modernization in that they alternate between the worlds of the traditional and the modern, sometimes using the modern criteria and sometimes preferring traditional criteria in making decisions in their married life (Siddiqi & Reeves, 1986).

Statement of the Problem

While recent data suggests that divorce rates may have peaked, current projections indicate that four out of ten marriages occurring today in the U.S. will end in divorce (Norton & Miller, 1992). Levels of marital stress based on measures of marital quality and stability give evidence of substantial decline during the 1970s and 1980s (Glenn, 1991).
In addition to validating the need for practitioners specializing in marital therapy, this abundance of marital difficulties would seem to underscore the need for preventive interventions that address potential trouble spots in relationships before they reach a point of crisis. One such approach is marriage enrichment, which seeks to address potential issues before they become problems and to equip couples with necessary skills and insights to handle future difficulties. The underlying purpose of many marital enrichment programs is to help stable marriages become even stronger, although evidence exists that a substantial number of troubled couples are attracted to enrichment as a perceived alternative to therapy (Powell & Wampler, 1982).

The need for well-designed and empirically validated interventions to prevent marital distress is evident both from current divorce statistics and from studies of relationship development. These studies have indicated that factors of poor communication and problem-solving skills, and dissatisfaction with interactions, when they are present early in marriage can predict the development of relationship distress later in marriage (Markman, 1981). Despite the empirical rationale for preventive intervention, the standard approach to marital distress has been to offer help after problems develop. Markman, Floyd, Stanley, and Stroraasli (1988) stated that a viable alternative to treating the problems of divorce and marital distress is to provide preventive interventions while the couple is still happy or at least in the early stages of distress. In a preventive approach, it is best to intervene at times
when couples are looking for habits and new skills to form (Markman, Renick, Floyd, Stanley, & Clements, 1993). Renick, Blumberg, and Markman, (1992) reported that the primary prevention of marital distress differs from therapy in that it is based on the identification and intervention of variables most predictive of later distress as well as relationship satisfaction.

Research on the effectiveness of marital enrichment has been guardedly optimistic. Hof and Miller (1981), and Zimpfer (1988), reviewing outcome studies on enrichment, found programs to be generally effective, particularly among those that emphasize communication training and behavioral exchange. In their decade review of marital enrichment, Guerney and Maxson (1990) concluded that, "there is no doubt that, on the whole, enrichment programs work and the field is an entirely legitimate one" (p. 1133).

Despite these positive reviews, a number of concerns exist regarding the utility of enrichment programs. Levant (1986) cautioned that enrichment programs are sometimes oversold, noting that claims made about the efficacy outstrip empirical support. Hof and Miller (1981) tempered their positive conclusions by noting that much of the outcome research is methodologically flawed. Gurman and Kniskern (1977) raised questions about the long-term effectiveness of enrichment programs, suggesting that change may be illusory. Doherty and colleagues (Doherty & Walker, 1982; Doherty et al., 1986; Lester & Doherty, 1983), in a series of studies evaluating Marriage
Encounter, raised concerns over deterioration effects, which are not generally measured in research on marriage enrichment (Hawley & Olson, 1995).

Meaning and Significance of Marriage Enrichment

According to Garland (1983) marriage enrichment refers to a philosophy of marriage and its functions for persons and societies. It also implies an educational model of couple and group services offered by the helping professions, and to a number of specific programs for providing these services.

Within the framework of the family is reflected the rapid change that characterizes modern society. The marriage enrichment movement helps couples respond to these changes. Diskin (1986) contended that enrichment programs teach partners interpersonal skills and build empathetic respect between individuals within the marital relationship. Zimpfer (1988) saw marriage enrichment as a systematic effort to improve the functioning of marital couples through educational and preventive means.

Generally, marriage enrichment services are considered most appropriate for couples who are committed to their marriages and who are not in the midst of marital crisis; marriage enrichment is designed to “make good marriages better,” not to patch up shaky ones. Although marriage enrichment is often conceptualized as a preventive service by the helping
professions, it really moves beyond the dichotomy between prevention and treatment to the overarching belief that teaching persons the knowledge, attitudes, and skills they can use to develop relationships unique to their needs serves not only the functions of treatment and prevention but also enhances and enriches the lives of many who are not at risk or in need of preventive or therapeutic services (Garland, 1983).

Marriage enrichment programs help couples enhance their relationship by developing their ability to initiate changes in their relationship (Mace & Mace, 1975). Helping couples communicate, negotiate, make decisions, and solve problems is viewed as preventive rather than therapeutic (L’ Abate, 1985).

Marriage enrichment is therefore an approach to the use of professional knowledge about marriage and the family which potentially is applicable to all marriages. It gives couples the opportunity to define the nature of their commitment to one another, to determine the purposes of their relationship, and to develop the skills, knowledge, and attitudes they need to accomplish these purposes. When spouses are equipped in this manner, they can develop a strong, flexible relationship that changes over time as their needs change and that enhances the personal growth of each partner within the marriage (Garland, 1983).

Two aspects of marriage enrichment- - its time limited nature and its structured approach - - generally distinguish it from marital therapy. By way of analogy, counseling services are like a required university course, and
marriage enrichment services are like a course with a prerequisite— one must have a good marriage or "instructor permission" to participate (Garland, 1983).

The Use of Group Dynamics

The validity of group procedures used and the conception of the group forces that underlie treatments are of great concern in group-based treatment. Much group work adopts the simplest and easiest rationale, whereby the aggregation of like-minded participants produces its own momentum and cohesiveness. This basis for treatment characterizes marriage encounter along with those other treatments in which the leader is the guide who sets the structure but does not catalyze, intervene, or modulate the experience. Marriage enrichment programs are typically conducted in groups, thus benefitting from the assembly effect, which builds cohesiveness and fosters the realization among participants that they are not alone in their struggles (Zimpfer, 1986). Some of these groups are highly structured, and some change with the experience of the leader or the composition of the couples group. There are group sessions with couple interaction, while some programs are designed so that the partners will only encounter with each other. There are even leaderless group experiences intended to be guided by readings or cassette tapes made for this purpose (Diskin, 1986).
Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to determine whether a marriage enrichment program could effectively improve marital communication and adjustment of Indian couples. Positive results in this study would suggest the applicability of this approach as a relationship growth experience.

Previous studies have failed to use appropriate control groups for evaluating treatment effects. Namely, it is necessary to use either no-treatment or alternate treatment control subjects in order to evaluate the long-term outcome of the intervention. Second, most studies have relied on measures of skills taught in the program and have paid little or no attention to the reliability and validity of the outcome measures used. Third, several studies have failed to assess couples' perceptions of relationship quality and satisfaction, which is the ultimate outcome measure for any couple's intervention (Markman et al, 1988). The present study improved on previous evaluations of prevention programs by including a no-treatment control group matched on important pretreatment variables. A comparison of the results were made between an experimental group and a control group. Each group consisted of married Indian couples who saw themselves basically as having good and effective marriages, or at least their relationships were not dysfunctional and requiring therapy. Participants were solicited through the Hindu temple, and the India Association in Louisville, Kentucky.
The primary goal of this enrichment program was to provide an educational experience for couples that would enable them to increase their communication and problem solving skills, skills associated with effective marital functioning and the prevention of future marital distress. The objectives of this program were the development and guided practice of constructive communication and conflict resolution skills; the clarification and modification of relationship beliefs and expectations; the maintenance and enhancement of fun and friendship in intimate relationships; having the couples leave the program equipped with a set of ground rules for handling disagreements; and the development of skills to enhance, understand, and experience commitment.

Need for the Study

Indian society is undergoing significant political, legal, and social changes. Modernization and industrialization might transform family life, marital role structure, and the status of women within different cultural context (Ramu, 1987). Indian nationals in the U.S. appear to be incorporating certain contemporary patterns with their traditional ways (Siddiqi & Reeves, 1986). There is no shortage of indicators suggesting that marriage in American society is a troubled institution. While recent data suggest that divorce rates may have peaked, current projections indicate that four of 10
marriages occurring today will end in divorce (Norton & Miller, 1991).
Observing the importance of the marital relationship to the family as well as society, there seems to be a definite need to add to the quality of the marital relationship and to help reduce the chances of being influenced by an escalating divorce rate in the U.S.

Approach to the Problem

There is a growing realization that the strategy of remediation which has been provided by traditional marriage counseling is inadequate to curtail the rising incidence of divorce and marital dysfunction. Couples seldom seek marriage counseling until the relationship has deteriorated almost beyond help. By that time one or both parties are so hurt and discouraged that it is a major task to sustain the necessary motivation to repair the damage. So, considerable energy needs to be devoted to the design and implementation of programs intended to prevent marital dysfunction before it occurs (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990).

Enrichment is a growth model that stresses the basic philosophy of the human potential movement. Therefore enrichment programs usually contain an underlying belief that most of what is present psychologically in humans can be accepted and enhanced to produce a higher level of health and functioning; that is, one can more fully develop what is already healthy rather
than attempt to remedy interpersonal and intrapersonal deficits. Thus psychological growth is the major emphasis and philosophy underlying enrichment (L’Abate & McHenry, 1983).

The main objectives of a marriage enrichment program include awareness of needs and expectations, improved communication, enhanced problem solving and negotiating skills, and increased overall adjustment and satisfaction within the marriage (Zimpfer, 1988). It is assumed that if married couples with no serious dysfunction could be provided the appropriate skills and growth experiences, not only would their immediate marital communication and marital satisfaction be heightened, but they would be able to develop long-term skill maintenance.

There have been a number of investigations comparing the interactions of distressed and nondistressed couples (e.g., Gottman et. al., 1976). However, outcome studies are needed to provide evidence of effectiveness which can be understood by the allied health profession as well as lay public. Well-conducted outcome studies make the dissemination of effective techniques and approaches easier by providing proper documentation (Beach & O’Leary, 1985). However, the status of marriage enrichment research reflects a minimal degree of verifiable successful outcome. This deficiency in adequate outcome research makes it important to institute research designs which permit the delineation of valid outcome results (Meadors, 1994).

Two common methodological flaws which pervade studies as identified by Hammonds and Worthington (1985) are the lack of control
groups and inadequate follow-up. These flaws prevent the studies of marriage enrichment from satisfying the demands of scientific rigor, and these deficiencies were addressed in the research design of the present study.

Contribution of the Study

Most of the studies on marriage enrichment reported in the literature were either religious based or culture based. Most of the research was developed in a particular church or particular Christian Organizations. The present study represented a secular approach, and it was designed to appeal to a different culture.

This research addressed the deficiencies in the literature, a lack of an adequate control group and utilization of a follow-up. The control group included those who were interested in participating in a marriage enrichment program but treatment was delayed five weeks during which control group subjects completed two assessments -- Marital Communication Inventory and Marital Adjustment Test. A five week follow-up was included to measure the long-term effects of the intervention program. The results of this study add to the field of marriage enrichment in that it was tested on a population drawn from a different culture. This pioneer project sought to verify the effects of an enrichment program on Indian population and hence is opening up an avenue for future research. This study also helped to verify
the replicability of the content and procedures of an enrichment program that taught basic communication and conflict resolution skills. The results of the study add to the field of marriage enrichment research which will help couples build long-term fulfillment and protect their relationship from naturally occurring storms.

Definition of Terms

Marital communication is defined by Bienvenu (1969) as the exchange of feelings and meanings as husbands and wives try to understand one another and to see their problems and differences from both a man’s and woman’s point of view. Thus communication is not limited to words, “It occurs through listening, silences, facial expressions, and gestures” (p. 1).

Marital adjustment is defined as a marriage in which patterns of behavior of the two persons are mutually satisfying. Burgess, Locke, and Thomas (1971) defined a well-adjusted marriage as:

A union in which the husband and wife are in agreement on the chief issues of marriage...; in which they have come to an adjustment on interests, objectives, and values; in which they are in harmony on demonstration of affection and sharing confidences and in which they have few or no complaints about their marriage. (p. 321).

Marriage enrichment programs are structured, time-limited, educational experiences, usually conducted with groups of participants. The
program structure usually consists of alternating didactic and experiential exercises (L’Abate & Mc Henry, 1983).

Research Questions

This study asked the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the individuals’ participation in the marriage enrichment workshop and their marital communication?

2. Is there a relationship between the individuals’ participation in the marriage enrichment workshop and their marital adjustment?

3. Does the effect of the marriage enrichment program remain constant over time?

4. Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of the experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI)?
5. Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of the experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT)?

6. Does a significant correlation exist between Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment?

7. Do differences exist in the mean responses of husbands and wives within group?

Summary

Chapter I introduced the research subject providing an overview of the proposed study, including a statement of the problem and the objectives of the study. The importance of the study is described and the purpose of conducting a marriage enrichment workshop is outlined. A list of terms utilized in this study is defined to facilitate clarification of the terms used in this study. A review of the literature, which explores the research in this field and which supports the need for and relevance of this study, follows.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Many marriages survive in spite of the fact that one or both partners are unhappy (Olson, 1990). The challenge is to make resources widely visible and to help the couples become involved in moving toward a bright, enriched, and energized marriage (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1986). Marriage enrichment programs help couples enhance their relationships by developing their ability to initiate changes in their relationship (Mace & Mace, 1987). Helping couples communicate, negotiate, make decisions, and solve problems, is viewed as preventive rather than therapeutic (L'Abate & Weinstein, 1987). Montgomery (1981) defined quality communication in successful marriage as the interpersonal, transactional, symbolic process by which marriage partners achieve and maintain understanding of each other. Dale and Dale (1978) stated, "we believe every marriage relationship can grow and be enriched" (pp. 17). Mace and Mace (1975) suggested that Eastern marriages are weak in the development of the interpersonal relationships between husband and wife. The Indian wife, for instance, has been trained from childhood to look up to her husband as the head of the house. Individuals in Eastern cultures are thus influenced by long-standing traditions which promote institutional communication patterns in the marital system (Yelsma, 1988).
Indian society is extremely complex, and its social and economic structures are significantly different from those in the Western industrial societies (Nathawat & Mathur, 1992). In spite of vast changes in education and employment, the criteria for marriage in India, are traditionally upheld. A large percentage of arranged marriages occurs between members of the same castes and religions. Although many changes have occurred in education, politics and employment, the folk-ways of long-established tradition prevail and most of the marriages are arranged by the youths’ parents when the youth reach the age of about 18 to 25 years. The people in India accept certain important criteria for selecting marriage partners. They are, religion, character, education, dowry amount, appearance (applies to females), employment, caste or subcaste, financial status, locality or geographical distance from the families, and family tradition and reputation. The philosophy behind arranged marriage lies in the effective matching of the general characteristics mentioned above. In spite of the effective matching, the particular candidates are mostly unknown to each other until marriage (Yelsma, 1988). In India, however, not all marriages are arranged. In urban areas young people occasionally choose their own spouses through a “self-selection” process, similar to the dating process in the United States. These conjugal unions are frequently referred to as “love marriages.” These marriages might occur between people of different religions, and they may occur between partners of different castes, social, economic, or educational backgrounds. When two people love each
other before marriage, problems may occur later between parents and caste brothers. In some religions, and castes, family support is sometimes completely withdrawn, and fellow religious and caste members may create employment difficulties for the couple by refusing to recommend them for jobs. If the family is unable to dissuade partners who love each other from marrying, the parents may begrudgingly patronize the union and attempt to convince relatives to accept the marriage. A major difference between the Indian arranged and American companionate marriage is the manner in which people begin their marriages. Typically, conjugal love comes after marriage with Eastern couples, whereas romantic love comes before marriage for Western couples (Yelsma, 1988).

Many Indian researchers have studied the area of marital adjustment; Sinha and Mukherjee (1989) studied the effect of personal space orientation on marital adjustment, Nathawat and Mathur (1992) determined the correlation between marital adjustment and subjective well-being in Indian educated women and working women, and certain personality correlates of marital adjustment were investigated by Kumar and Rohatgi (1984). Disturbance in communication and marital disharmony in neurotics was studied by Mayamma and Sathyavathi (1985), and marital disharmony in neurotics was researched by Mayamma and Sathyavathi (1988). But there was no study done in India investigating the effects of an enrichment program on marital communication and marital adjustment. Hence the present study aimed at finding out the effects of a
marriage enrichment program on marital communication and marital adjustment because even though such programs are in vogue in the United States for more than thirty years, it is relatively a new concept in India.

Family Communication

In an early landmark study conducted by Bateson, Jackson, Haley, and Weakland (1956), the communication process of schizophrenics in a VA hospital was observed as were the communication patterns of their families. The researchers were able to identify a common communication pattern in the families of schizophrenics which was labeled the "double bind." The double bind was defined specifically as a situation in which three conditions were always present: (a) an intense interpersonal relationship; (b) one person in the relationship expressing two orders of messages, one of which denied the other; and (c) the "bound" individual's inability to comment on the messages to correct the discrepancy (Weakland, 1976). Although the Bateson study was considered significant in that it focused on the family as a whole, it was not without its weaknesses. No details of the research methodology or design were explicitly reported, meaning that the credibility of the study would rest on the fact that it was a longitudinal study conducted by a reputable research
team. Several related studies, however, based on Bateson’s assumptions, have demonstrated scientific evidence of the double bind and its relationship to family dysfunction (Landis & Landis, 1970; Friedman & Friedman, 1970; Hey & Mudd, 1971; Knox, 1971). Because of this early research in family systems, family communication became the focus of researchers and clinicians who were seeking to find ways of improving family functioning in order to create more stable individual members.

A variety of studies have been conducted to determine the effects of the communication process on the family system. In one such study, Cheek and Anthony (1970) observed family communication and found that normal families would be distinguished from schizophrenic members by observing their use of personal pronouns. In the study, a total of 123 families were sampled, with sixty-seven pathological families and fifty-six normal families. The data were collected by a questionnaire developed by the researchers and a taped interview which was rated by the researchers. The parents of schizophrenics were found to be high on the accusatory, second-person singular pronoun, “you” statements, and low on third-person singular statements. The parents in the normal families were higher on first-person singular pronouns, and much lower on the second person singular pronouns. The authors suggested that the schizophrenic family operated within a restrictive climate, relying heavily on authority. The absence of first-person or third-person pronouns, which would lead to an internal locus of control in their children, seemed to account for the
schizophrenics attitude that standards and behaviors of others are simply not applicable to their situation. The findings gave credence to the assumption that the communication process is of great importance in the family system. However, the small number of families studied and the special context of the family discussions require further investigation.

Watzlawich, Beavin, Sikorski, and Mecia (1970) investigated family communication in the form of protection and scapegoating. The sample included forty-eight white, middle class families all of whom contained at least one schizophrenic member. Each family participated in a video-taped interview. Even though the raters were trained to identify blaming and critical statements, and the receipt of such statements was tallied for each member, this method looks very limited in its scope and would not have permitted them to distinguish which was the cause of inaccuracy in that the target was made clear by the interviewer and any distortion from that target would have created a very implausible alternative for the subject. This situation thus would demand the subjects to report what they were told. There is a possibility that even pathological families would probably respond to the demand characteristics of this situation. Another possibility might be the use of all arbitrary items, so that they could not be accurately perceived, but only assigned. There are several faults in this procedure: (a) It eliminates information about specific distortions; (b) there are serious questions of what to tell the family about where the questions come from? and (c) what the experimenter intended as arbitrary and equiprobable need
not have been so for the family. The findings of the study showed that the schizophrenic members were less protected and more scapegoated than other family members. To further substantiate this finding, the family members were asked to write a statement about each of the other family members present at the interview. The result was that the schizophrenic members tended to be more accurate in identifying items written to them by other family members and significantly more open and vulnerable in items they wrote to other members. The study concluded that schizophrenic members did give and receive different types of communication than did the other members of the family.

Friedman & Friedman (1970) used a projective technique of joint story telling to study the clarity of communications within families. Participating in the study were forty families matched according to parents' age and education. The twenty control group families were considered to be normal, average families, while the experimental families contained at least one schizophrenic member. Each family was given ten minutes to jointly develop a story based on a picture stimulus. Trained observers watched the family interaction process as the members joined together in the story telling task. The observers' ratings of the story content served as the measurement criterion. Findings revealed that the experimental families experienced significantly greater conflict, failure, and confusion than did the control families. These findings were supported by "blind" independent ratings of tape recordings of the family discussions and
interactions. These results could not be attributed to the immediate impact of the presence of the schizophrenic offspring because the effects on the rest of the family of having lived with a schizophrenic member for a number of years could not be ruled out.

Approaching family systems research from the case study method, Meissner (1970) sought to identify factors of psychological communication in a family containing two schizophrenic daughters and one normal daughter. After compiling an extensive history of the family, it was concluded that both the parents in the family had personality deficiencies that were exhibited in their verbal interaction with the oldest daughter from the time of her birth. Consequently, this first born child was drawn into the family system pathology and later became schizophrenic. The middle daughter did not develop schizophrenia which caused Meissner to conclude that the system was stable at the time she was born. However with the birth of the third daughter, the system became unbalanced, causing her to be "required" to develop pathological responses in order to restore stability to the family system. Based on this case study, Meissner concluded that family pathology is a function of the interaction between parental pathologies including unbalanced, unclear communication.

Beck (1975) conducted a large survey at a family service agency to test the hypothesis that communication is a major problem in family functioning. He studied case reports of 1,919 cases presented as family problems at the clinic, making note of the therapist's opinion of each of the
family’s primary dysfunction. Of the cases surveyed 1,257 actually had communication as a primary dysfunction within the marital unit. Although there are weaknesses to such a survey, such as the therapists' biases and subjective case reporting methods, the survey lends credence to Satir's (1967) presupposition that communication is a vital factor in the family system.

Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment

During the past twenty years research on the relationship between marital communication and marital satisfaction has been the subject of continued study. Positive relationships were noted between marital satisfaction and various measures of marital communication. Gordon and Waldo (1970) argued that to view a marital partner's behavior in isolation results in inaccurately placing emphasis on the symptoms to the exclusion of their effects on the spouse and inversely on the spouse's involvement in them. Gordon and Waldo (1970) went on to say that, "if the contextual field is to be expanded, then a shift from symptoms to the marital relationship may be necessary" (p.34).

Reviews of literature suggest that the quality of the couple’s communication is significantly a better predictor of future marital satisfaction. Bolte (1975) is one of many writers who emphasized the
importance of communication between spouses to the satisfaction each gains from the marital relationship. According to Bolte (1975) the communication system of the couple is a vital force, determining much of their happiness together. Navran (1967) concluded that any attempt at improving marital relationships must start with working on the communication between husband and wife. Craddock (1980) found that therapists he surveyed commented on the fact that couples experiencing marital difficulties either fail to attempt to communicate, or the attempts they do make prove unsatisfactory, often leading to arguments. Noller (1982) found that wives low in marital adjustment wanted their husbands to communicate with them more, and particularly to start more interesting conversations with them, to show more appreciation for the things they did well, to express their emotions more clearly, and to give them more attention.

Snyder (1979) showed that the best indicators of overall marital satisfaction were the couple’s ability to discuss problems effectively. Snyder suggested that communication skills are important not only because they provide the means for solving problems and differences, but make an increased level of intimacy possible. Lewis and Spanier (1979) in setting up their model of marital satisfaction and stability emphasized a group of variables which they labeled rewards from spousal interaction, and which included affective expression and problem-solving ability. Behaviors affecting marital satisfaction are self disclosure (Boyd & Roach, 1977;
Noller, 1982), being sensitive to each other's feelings (Navran, 1967),
listening and responding (Miller, Nunnally & Wackman, 1975),
confirmation (Fisher & Sprenkle, 1978; Montgomery, 1981), and expressing
Gottman (1994) stated that "what counts in making a happy marriage is
not so much how compatible you are, but how you deal with
incompatibility" (p.19).

Marital communication can be analyzed in different ways. Most
communication consists of talk, of conversation. Couples have to learn
how to talk openly and constructively, sharing more and more of
themselves as time goes by. Communication is also non verbal in which
partners try to communicate feelings or thoughts without using words.
Sometimes the non verbal and verbal messages are in conflict with one
another, leading to confusion in and between the spouses. More disturbed
husbands and wives consult friends and relatives for help than they do
other sources (Skidmore A, Garret, & Skidmore, J. 1956).

Katz, Goldstein, and Stucker (1963), conducted a study to determine
whether an individual's feeling of marriage satisfaction would influence
the quality of interaction within the marriage. Fifty-nine paid volunteer
couples who had no children and were under thirty years of age were used
in the experiment. Initially each subject was administered the Edward's
Personal Preference Schedule, a twenty item self disclosure questionnaire,
and an eighty-five item adjective check list. The test instruments were
given in order to determine each couple's level of need satisfaction. Each couple was then instructed to participate in a "test" of two-person coordination, which actually was the experimenter's way of setting up a situation in order to provide a chance to observe the couple's interaction skills. The couple's interaction skills were rated by a panel of judges, though no interrater reliability coefficient was reported and their interaction scores were compared with their need satisfaction scores. The experimenters found that achievement on the two person coordination task was significantly higher for those couples who experienced high satisfaction in their marital needs, and there was more acceptance among these couples of the suggestions made to each other during task. The experimenter concluded that their results supported the general hypotheses that the degree to which personality needs are satisfied in marriage is reflective in one's ability to interact effectively in marriage. But these relationships were not observed in wives. An inherent limitation of this investigation might be its inability to yield information about the causal direction of predicted relationships between the need satisfaction and behavior with the spouse, namely, about whether the level of satisfaction influenced the ability to cooperate, or vice versa. The data for men strongly supported the hypothesis that the degree to which personality needs are satisfied in marriage is reflected in one's evaluation of, and ability to interact effectively with the spouse; whereas the data from
women did not support the same hypothesis. The reason for this was not explored further by the authors of this study.

A survey was conducted by Petersen (1969), to investigate the nature of husband-wife communications and its relationship to their problem solving abilities. The analysis was based upon data obtained by questionnaires administered to 116 married couples who were students living in a university housing area. Only students under thirty years of age were surveyed. The instruments used were the Hobart-Klausner communication scale and a role specific problem list developed by Brim. The problem list was designed to measure the couple's ability to cope with child-rearing, husband-wife relations, style of life, community involvement and religion. The couples were divided into "high" and "low" communication families based on their questionnaire responses, and their scores from problem solving checklist were correlated with the communication scores. The results showed that effective communications were significantly related to the low incidence of 14 (41%) of the family problems listed on Brim's checklist. The categories relating to husband-wife relations and child-rearing problems were most closely related to the couple's effectiveness in communicating. Petersen concluded that this study indicated that there is a relationship between husband-wife communication and problem-solving and problem occurrence in the family setting. It was hypothesized that this could also mean that husband-wife communication would have a strong influence on marital
satisfaction. The testing of the hypotheses indicated certain problems to be significantly related to husband-wife communication, while others were not. The data of this study has indicated that communication is related to the elimination of only some problems from family life. This study, however, cannot provide a conclusive answer to the problem of why some problems in family life are handled by communication between husband and wife and others are not. Moreover the results of this study merely delineate the problem, they do not solve it. In addition, the authors instructed the male participants to fill out the questionnaire, with help from their spouses on certain items. Further, husbands and wives were not used as separate informants. This would have allowed the authors to determine to what extent high communication families agreed on what were the problems, even though those problems might not have been solved. Although the findings of this study point out the importance of communication for the recognition and interpretation of problems, they are certainly restricted in that the authors had obtained information on only those problems recognized as such by the subjects. While such subjective and personal data are certainly useful for many purposes, they cannot be said fairly to reflect the total set of blockage between the family and successful performance of its functions.

In an attempt to identify an area which would be directly related to marital satisfaction, Luckey (1966) studied 80 couples to determine the relationship between disclosure and marital happiness. A questionnaire
developed by Luckey was used to gather the needed information and direct observations were made of the interaction styles of each couple. In analyzing the questionnaire scores and the direct observations, Luckey found two clusters of disclosure items associated with marital satisfaction: "shared activities" and "children and careers." The strongest positive association was between marital satisfaction and disclosure and was directly related to a couple's discussion of desired time spent together and the kinds of activity in which they wished to engage. The second cluster was associated with disclosure on approaches to child-rearing and on future plans and personal goals. Luckey concluded that not only does disclosure per se in a marriage have a direct relationship to marital satisfaction, but disclosure in a few key areas such as the nature of the relationship and the methods of child-rearing are vital for marital satisfaction to occur.

In one of the few studies of marital communications using a large number of subjects Navran (1967) examined the relationship between marital communication and marital adjustment using 228 subjects. In order to delineate two groups of subjects each individual was administered the marital relationship inventory (MRI). To be considered happily married the subject would have to score 110 or higher on the MRI. The mean score for the happily married group was 113.8. The unhappily married individuals were selected on the basis of consecutive visits for marriage counseling at the psychiatric clinic. Their mean MRI score was 75.0. The critical ratio of difference of 38.8 proved to be significant at the
An analysis of the MRI responses was made to determine the factors necessary for both good communication and marital adjustment. Navran found that happily married couples talked more to each other, conveyed the feeling that they understood what was being said to them; had a wide range of subjects available to them; preserved communication channels and kept them open; showed more sensitivity to each other's feelings; made more use of supplementary non-verbal techniques of communication. Navran concluded that it would be reasonable to expect that any damage to the couple's ability to communicate effectively would operate to damage their relationship to each other. The reduction of verbal and non-verbal communication could conceivably promote misunderstandings which would cause greater attention and start a circular reaction which could eventually lead to marital difficulty.

Marital stability is defined as whether or not a given marriage is intact (Witteman & Fitzpatrick, 1986). The measurement of stability is relatively straightforward; one can be classified as married, divorced, separated, or never married. Satisfaction, however, refers to how a husband and wife describe and evaluate the quality of their marriage. Marital satisfaction is a subjective evaluation of a marital relationship as good, happy, or satisfying (Lewis & Spanier, 1979).

In an attempt to understand the marital adjustment between male alcoholics and their wives, Gorad (1971) studied the communication process as a function of their marital system. Two groups were drawn for
this study. The experimental group consisted of twenty alcoholic males and their wives. The two groups were demographically matched in terms of age, length of marriage and education. An interaction game was devised by Gorad in order to observe each couple's communication patterns which could be judged as either “win,” “share,” or “secret win.” Each couple played the game for approximately thirty minutes which allowed fifty attempts at a winning situation. Each couple was rated by two judges who were observing their communication style during this process. Control group couples were found to use cooperation in order to win significantly more times than experimental couples. Communication between experimental couples tended to be more rigid and lacked spontaneity than displayed by control groups. Gorad concluded that at least part of the marital breakdown in the experimental couples was due to the lack of ability to communicate properly with one another. The similarity of ethnic background (Irish descent) and religion (Catholics) do not allow for extrapolation of the findings of this study.

Attempts have also been made to teach communication skills to married couples desiring improvement or enrichment in their marriage. Patterson, Hops, and Weiss (1975) examined the effects of communication training on the marital satisfaction of ten couples who were experiencing conflict to the extent that divorce had been considered. However none of the couples at the time of the experiment were separated or divorced. But the fact that in at least half the couples, one or more members had
previously received therapy, plus the fact that several of the couples had separated suggest that the authors have not attempted carefully to screen out more difficult cases altogether. Six and one-half hour training sessions were designed to teach the couples to use non-aversive vocabulary to negotiate behavior changes and to engage in "love days" where one spouse would triple the positive reinforcement given to the other on a specific day. The instructors made special use of video-tapes for the purpose of feedback and evaluation. The findings which were the results from ratings of the video tape showed a significant improvement in facilitating behavior in eight of the couples. In addition, a two year follow-up report showed that of the five couples located, four seemed to be happier. Patterson's conclusion was that communication skills can be effectively taught and when learned appropriately, they can have a positive effect on marital satisfaction. However, the author's finding that "most of the couples seemed to be happier" (pp. 301), cannot be generalized due to the fact that already the sample was statistically limited in size (ten couples) and out of that small sample only 50% (five couples) were located by him for follow-up.

In an attempt to clarify the assumption that self disclosure in the marital relationship is directly related to marital satisfaction, Gilbert (1976) conducted a literature search which lead her to bring together ideas that had been theoretically proposed and ideas that had been empirically validated. In her research she discovered that conflicting reports exist
regarding the influence that self disclosure or communication is likely to exert on a relationship. On one hand some professionals were advocating that all aspects of life regardless of topic or affect should be openly communicated if the greatest amount of satisfaction was to be felt in the relationship. On the other hand a conflicting body of information suggested that effective communication in marriage was rare and while communication was helpful to a good marriage, it was not the only avenue by which marital adjustment could be achieved. Her conclusion based on the findings of specific empirical reports in the literature was that the relationship between self disclosure and marital satisfaction may be curvilinear. By combining the results and conclusions of others who had studied relationship adjustments, she surmised that there exists a point at which increased disclosure actually reduces satisfaction within the marriage. Furthermore Gilbert stated that she believed that couples refrain from expressing their feelings because they are insecure about their marriage. Based on these deductions she suggested that if a couple desires to go beyond a conventional marital relationship, they would be committing themselves to intimacy. Because intimacy requires a great capacity to risk it would indicate that the couple would need to transcend curvilinear cautions. Presumably the ability to achieve a totally intimate marriage depends on whether each marital partner has sufficient self esteem to take risks. The strength of Gilbert's study lies in the fact that it was an attempt to combine the conclusions of other studies which have
focused on relationships. The weakness of her study was that the conclusions could not be empirically validated.

Not all researchers will conclude that risky communication in marriage is good. Rutledge (1966) followed ten young newly wed couples in a case method to determine the effects of the intensity of their love relationship on their communication. After observing and interviewing each couple systematically over a period of one year, Rutledge noted that as the intensity of love increases following marriage, restraints tend to be released, manners forgotten, truth emerges, and frankness overrides tact. As the total interaction intensifies and continues it may become intolerable. In his study he noted that this process began to take place in some of the young couples under observation. He concluded that a disclosure balance is necessary for a marriage to become mutually satisfying without being threatening or unpleasant. In his estimation too much emphasis on communication could lead to a downfall in the stability of the marriage.

Epstein and Jackson (1978) conducted a study involving fifteen couples who were randomly assigned to three groups of five to compare changes in marital relationships using communication training, interaction insight-training, and no treatment. Subjects in the two treatment groups attended five one and one-half hour sessions over a three week period. All three groups completed a pre- and post-test assessment using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory which
indicates the degree of empathy, congruence, and unconditional positive regard generally received from the spouse.

The communication treatment focused on practicing specific assertive requests, expression of opinions and statement of feelings. Using Alberti & Emmons' (1976) arguments positing assertive rights, the sessions included a male and female co-trainer modeling assertive communication, in vivo practice by the couple dealing with specific issues in their own relationship, and behavioral feedback to each subject by the trainers and other group members. When communication was disjointed or unclear, the trainer intervened with alternative ways to self-expression, and the participant couples increasingly coached each other to express messages precisely and directly.

The focus of the insight group was to pinpoint the particular interaction patterns of each couple that confused or frustrated the spouses. The same co-trainers of the communication group instructed the group to observe the verbal and nonverbal messages that contributed to the conflicts. The major goal of the insight group was to improve each participant's awareness of the impact that his/her behavior had on their spouse's feelings and behavior. Although extensive feedback regarding interaction patterns was offered by the trainers and other group members, delineation and practice of alternate modes of clear communication were minimal.
Results revealed a significant decrease in disagreements of couples in the two treatment groups compared to the non-treatment groups. The communication training proved more effective in reducing attack behaviors than the interaction insight training. A significant increase in both assertive requests and spouse-perceived empathy was also noted in the communication group indicating that “a short-term structured intervention involving both partners can have a measurable impact on both overt interactions and spouses’ experience of each other's communication (Epstein & Jackson, 1978, p.210). Furthermore, the overall findings indicated that communication training produced greater changes in some categories of couples' behaviors than the interaction insight training. The authors queried whether treatment of longer duration than three weeks would have produced more changes in the various communication categories or whether certain classes of behavior would be particularly resistant to change with this intervention. The authors concluded that it appears that it may be easier to implement behavioral changes than attitudinal changes in close interpersonal relationships. However, the lack of significant change in other categories of verbal behavior (e.g., disqualification, self-revelation) and in spouse-perceived congruence and unconditional positive regard suggest the ineffectiveness of this communication training for couples. Moreover the question whether or not training in the assertive expression of disagreement along with decreased attacking would lead to greater conflict resolution than
insight training in the long run remain unanswered by the authors. Although careful selection of the sample was done, the treatment formats were different for the two groups.

In a paper that focused on the relationship of assertiveness training on marital relations, Russel (1981) reviewed the results of nine studies in which one or both partners received assertiveness training to improve their marital relationship. Although Russel (1981) acknowledged mixed results, he cited positive correlations are more frequently reported between assertiveness and marital satisfaction. Conversely Epstein and Jackson (1978) pointed out that poor communication and marital dissatisfaction mutually reinforce each other. A number of theories support this hypothesis. Many authorities have advanced the thesis that good communication is the key to family interaction as well as the lifeblood of the marriage relationship. It has been found that when a couple makes deliberate and frequent efforts to converse, a successful marriage is more likely to follow (Locke, 1951 & Ort, 1950).

Marriage Enrichment Programs

Since the early 1970s there has been an increase in both the development and utilization of programs designed to “enrich” marital and family relationships. The term “marital enrichment” refers to those
experiences designed to induce psychological "growth" in couples whose interactions are considered basically sound but who are seeking ways to make their relationships more psychologically satisfying (L’Abate & McHenry, 1983).

Enrichment programs are structured, time-limited, educational experiences, usually conducted with groups of participants. The program structures usually consist of alternating didactic and experiential exercises. The focus of almost all such marital programs is the enhancement of communication skills, the broadening and deepening of emotional and/or sexual lives, and the reinforcing and fostering of existing marital strengths (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977). Enrichment per se is therefore primarily a movement toward preventive rather than remedial work with couples.

The term “enrichment” includes a variety of programs, such as “encounter,” communication, and relationship enhancement (L’Abate & McHenry, 1983). Hof and Miller (1981) have listed at least 50 different existing enrichment programs, which have attracted from a handful to thousands of couple participants.

The first marital enrichment programs in the United States were developed by Mace, who began to conduct weekend retreats for the Quakers in 1961 (Mace & Mace, 1975); Otto, who began the Family Resource Development Program (Otto, 1975); Antoinette and Smith, who in 1966 began to train leader couples in the United Methodist Church (L’Abate, 1977); and the Catholic Marriage Encounter movement, which was brought
to the United States from Spain in 1967 (Doherty, et al., 1978). Thus the first sources of enrichment were primarily nonprofessional and religious in nature. Since the early 1970s, however, the majority of enrichment programs have not been religious in nature, but instead, have been developed within the field of professional psychology (L’Abate, & McHenry, 1983).

Enrichment defines a particular approach that is unique from other types of marital intervention. L’Abate (1977) defined enrichment as “a process of intervention based on prearranged, programmed lessons and exercises dealing with interpersonal relations between and among members” (p.5). This process emphasizes the systematic arrangement of exercises and lessons in a gradual hierarchical sequence that is assumed to be helpful to the family or to family members. It is neither primarily educational nor primarily therapeutic, but combines a preventive educational/therapeutic model, presumably administered to non clinical couples. Its practitioners can also be individuals with less extensive training than marriage therapists.

Otto (1976, p.13) defined marriage enrichment as “programs for couples who have what they perceive to be well functioning marriages, and who wish to make their marriages even more mutually satisfying.” In general, enrichment may be conceptualized as an affirmative educational process (Otto, 1975; Satir, 1975) that attempts to teach couples skills by
which they can develop the full potential of their relationships (Mace & Mace, 1976).

Enrichment is a growth model that stresses the basic philosophy of human potential movement. Therefore enrichment programs usually contain an underlying belief that most of what is present psychologically in humans can be accepted and enhanced to produce a higher level of health and functioning; that is, one can more fully develop what is already healthy rather than attempt to remedy interpersonal and interactional deficits (L'Abate, & McHenry, 1983).

Finally, the enrichment movement seeks to reconceptualize marriage, not as a static institution, but as a dynamic dyadic relationship in which increased intimacy enhances the individual's freedom within the relationship (Mace & Mace, 1975). Thus psychological growth is the major emphasis and philosophy underlying enrichment.

Hammonds and Worthington (1985) reported that the best known programs in marriage enrichment were the Minnesota Couples Communication Program (Miller, Nunnaly, & Wackman, 1979); the Conjugal Relationship Enhancement Program (Guerney, 1977); the Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment (Mace & Mace, 1976), the Pairing Enrichment Program (Travis & Travis, 1975); the Marital Enrichment Program (Adam & Gingras, 1982), and The Systems Marriage Enrichment Program (Elliot, & Saunders, 1982). However, there are other programs like Training In Marital Enrichment program (Dinkmeyer &
Carlson, 1986), and The Prevention and Relationship Program (Markman, Floyd, Stanley & Storaasli 1988), McKeon Communication Skills Workshop (McKeon & McKeon, 1983), Couples Growing Together (Christensen, 1977), The Marital Enrichment Group (Clarke, 1969), and Marriage Encounter (Bosco, 1973). These are the twelve marriage enrichment programs that will be discussed below followed by a conclusion that specify which program is favorable to Indian culture.

**Minnesota Couple Communication Program**

The Minnesota Couple Communication Program (MCCP) was conceived in 1968 by a small group of family theorists, researchers, and therapists from the University of Minnesota Family Study Center and the Family and Children's Service of Minneapolis. The intent of the group was to create a program that would achieve the following goals (Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1976. p.11):

The first was to increase each couple's ability to reflect on and accurately perceive their own dyadic processes by refining each member's private self-awareness, heightening each partner's awareness of his/her own contribution to interaction and helping couples explore their own rules of relationship particularly concerning their rules for conflict situations and their patterns of maintaining self and other's esteem. The
second goal was to increase each couple's capacity for clear, direct, open metacommunication, especially communication about their relationship.

The MCCP includes a didactic approach to enable both married and pre-married couples to learn communication and negotiation skills. With a commonly understood set of learning procedures that ensure a constructive groundwork to discuss their relationships, couples can then "integrate and utilize the cognitive, emotive, and behavioral aspects of their life more usefully" (Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1976; p.12).

Recognition and expression of thoughts, feelings, and intentions are also stressed in the MCCP training. The authors of the program point out that partners who can be self-expressive as well as empathic interact more supportively than couples without these traits. They suggest that "the ingredients of effective communication can be discovered, taught, and used by couples to improve their ability to communicate directly, congruently, and supportively together" (Miller, Nunnally, & Wackman, 1976: p.13).

Voluntary participation in the program results in personal initiative to achieve the goals of both the program and the attending couple. The MCCP is presented in a group setting, whose function is to "create a safe learning environment where couples can discover that exploring and experimenting with their own pattern of relationship can be interesting and rewarding" (p.14).
Conjugal Relationship Enhancement

Guerney (1977) developed a marital format for his multi-purpose relationship modification programs, with at least three couples per group, in which two co-leaders aid spouses in replacing vicious communication cycles with more direct and open cycles. Relationship enhancement draws from Rogers' approach (Rogers, 1951) in terms of unconditional acceptance and respect for feelings of others, as well as from social learning theory, especially in terms of modeling and power (L' Abate, 1977).

The rationale and therapeutic philosophy underlying the CRE program states that husband and wife can be trained to utilize client-centered skills of communication within their own relationship (Rappaport, 1976). The process involves separating the communicating process into distinct components or "modes." Participants are systematically taught each mode: (a) to express feelings and thoughts clearly (b) to emphasize and accept the expressions of another (c) to facilitate and criticize their own communication skills from moment to moment and (d) to discuss the constructive resolution of conflicts.

The format varies according to the facilitator. One program entailed eight to ten-hour training sessions along with practice and readings at home (Ely, Guerney & Stover, 1973). Another program reported by Rappaport (1976) consists of two four-hour and two eight-hour sessions
over a two-month period. Collins (1977) reports on a program which appears to be open-ended, with weekly sessions of undetermined length. L'Abate (1977) claims that CRE programs are generally 24 hours in length although in various formats.

The Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment

ACME is both a comprehensive national organization for married couples and the name associated with a particular type of marriage enrichment group. As a national organization which was established in 1974 ACME invites its member couples to support four objectives: (a) to work for the enrichment of their own marriages (b) to unite with other couples for mutual support by planning programs together for marriage enrichment (c) to initiate and support more adequate community services designed to help marriages, and (d) to improve the public image of marriage as a relationship(L'Abate, 1977).

ACME recognizes all patterns of group interaction that demonstrably produce marriage enrichment. They have identified three models, graduated in terms of the depth of group interaction which takes place. First is the marriage encounter pattern, in which the group interaction as such normally occurs. The second model is loosely referred to as a marriage communication lab. Normally this is a structured program
which offers pre planned content. Intensive use is made of exercises which facilitate dynamic interaction both at intra couple and inter couple levels.

The third model is unstructured and is associated with Mace and Mace (1975) who labeled the ACME program.

ACME as a couple enrichment program involves a minimum of structure and no preplanning. The program is allowed to take shape around the expressed need of the particular group or couple; the understanding being that there shall be no exchange of opinions, but only a sharing of experiences and an attempt by the group to understand and interpret them. Experiences are not reported directly to the group but communicated as the marriage partners dialogue directly with each other (Mace & Mace, 1975). The perceived setting is a weekend retreat and there is a strong argument for the intensive format compared with a weekly meeting (Mace & Mace, 1975).

The Pairing Enrichment Program

The Pairing Enrichment Program (PEP) has two equally important objectives. One objective encourages the establishment of authentic open lines of communication between couples and the other encourages improving and sustaining an effective meaningful sexual intimacy (Travis & Travis, 1975). The program is an eclectic approach to marital health and
PEP consists of five sessions in two possible formats. Each format is organized into discrete escalating steps toward effective communication. One is a weekend session where each three-hour session is separated by a three-hour period in which each couple can privately follow the suggested intimate encounter exercise in their motel room. At the end of the weekend each couple is given a manual containing suggestions for enrichment at home which are to be followed for the next three weeks. The other is a three-week format where couples meet for six three-hour sessions. The intimate exercises are carried out at home. Although the sessions are held in group setting, each couple is separated by space in the room so that the communication is only shared by the couple.

The authors of the PEP program are also its only researchers. In one pilot study which did not include a control group, significant gains were made on the Personal Orientation Inventory. This measure purports to establish the degree of self-actualization which is seen by many as being the goal of a growth experience (Travis & Travis, 1975). These gains were maintained over a three month period for both spouses on subscales of inner-directedness, spontaneity, self-acceptance and capacity for intimate contact. Wives evidenced the greatest gains on self-actualizing values and existentiality while husbands made the greatest gain on feeling reactivity. The researchers also noted that their data indicated a definite trend toward
greater self and partner understanding, interpersonal intimacy and appreciation following the PEP experience.

**Marital Enrichment Program**

Adam and Gingras (1982) set out to establish a marriage enrichment program built upon the view that marital difficulties and conflicts derive from a gap between the individual's needs and expectations, on the one hand, and the failure of the marital relationship to meet each partner's desires and needs, on the other. In their search for a conceptual frame of reference, three models stood out: the psychoanalytical model, the systemic model, and the behavioral model.

The program consisted of eight weekly sessions offered to groups of four or five couples. Each session lasted approximately two and a half hours. The sessions consisted of didactic presentations; individual, couple, and group experiences; and group discussions. Home assignments were a part of most sessions. The first four sessions focused on awareness and communication skills while the last four sessions were aimed at negotiation and problem-solving abilities.

Adam and Gingras (1982) research of the marital enrichment program demonstrated that it was effective in improving marital-communication and problem-solving skills as well as global couple
satisfaction. Of the two major components of the program, communication and negotiation may be sufficient by themselves to promote healthier marital functioning. For most of the criterion variables that yielded positive outcome results, the experimental couples maintained their mean score gains for a period of two months following completion of the program. These gains were also maintained at a one-year follow-up assessment. The persisting effects of the program were explained by the facts that, after treatment, the couples functioned as a more dynamic and open system and that the ever-continuing process of renegotiation of the interactional contract started during the program was pursued after the end of the sessions.

The Systems Marriage Enrichment Program

Until 1982, none of the marriage enrichment programs had been developed based on the systems theoretical framework. Three core concepts from system theory formed the basis for the Systems Marriage Enrichment Program (SMEP). The first is the concept of circular causality; the second assumption is that the communication and interaction patterns presented by a couple system have been organized into a predictable pattern; and the third assumption is that a marital system has both a morphogenetic tendency and a morphostatic tendency. Although the
SMEP shares the assumptions and concepts of relationship enrichment with other semi-structured programs the critical difference marking the uniqueness of the program is the conceptual clarity and experience of the group leaders in system thinking (Elliot & Saunders, 1982).

The SMEP has five phases. The first and second are orientation and defining goals, the third phase is labeled "raising intensity in the system" and is the point at which the difference from other programs becomes markedly clear. The goals of the phase are to provide each couple with experiences which actively clarify the circular, reciprocal nature of their marital interaction, to provide each couple with several experiences of observing various marital relationships in process; to bring out the strengths and areas of improvement for each couple; and to raise the emotional intensity within each marital system in order to promote positive adaptive change (Elliot & Saunders, 1982). The fourth phase focuses on problem-solving with the goals of formalizing and maintaining the systemic changes developed in phase three, enhancing the communication and problem-solving skills of the participant couples and promoting the generalization of problem-solving principles. The fifth phase deals with closure. Elliot and Saunders have presented a detailed outline of the systems a marriage enrichment program with the hope that it will generate carefully planned comparative studies.
Training In Marriage Enrichment

A more recent marriage program in marriage enrichment is Training In Marriage Enrichment (TIME) (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984). Dinkmeyer and Carlson (1986) described TIME as an educational program designed to help married couples learn the skills they need to build a loving, and supportive relationship. In TIME groups, couples develop skills that enable them to enrich their marriage and to deal with particular challenges that they experience. Couples define the marriage they want and develop and retain the skills to maintain that relationship.

Participation in a TIME group does not imply that a couple has an ineffective marriage or marriage problems. Rather, a couple's participation is an indication that they want to grow and desire to strengthen their relationship.

TIME is an educational program designed to help married couples learn the skills they need to build a loving, supportive relationship. In TIME groups, couples develop skills that enable them to enrich their marriage and to deal with particular challenges that they experience. Couples define the marriage they want and develop and retain the skills to maintain that relationship. Participation in a TIME group does not imply that a couple has an ineffective marriage or marriage problems. Rather a
couple's participation is an indication that they want to grow and want to strengthen their relationship.

The TIME Theory. TIME primarily reflects an Adlerian (Adler, 1931; Dreikurs, 1945; Dreikurs, 1950) or sociopsychological approach to human relations. The basic assumption underlying Adlerian theory is that "people are indivisible, social, decision making beings whose actions and psychological movement has a purpose" (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984, p.139).

TIME is based upon the following principles:

1. Developing and maintaining a good relationship requires a time commitment.
2. Specific skills essential to a healthy marriage can be learned.
3. Change often takes time, but changes begins with the individual.
4. Feelings of love and caring that have diminished or disappeared often return with behavior changes, and
5. Small changes are very important in bringing about big changes (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984).

Marriage Skills. The TIME Program is organized systematically. Each of the ten sessions is designed to present basic principles and provide opportunities to practice the necessary skills for enriching a marriage. The goal is to help couples apply and integrate the ideas and skills into their marriage relationship. This goal is achieved through reading, meaningful
discussions, and application of the ideas and activity assignments and exercises (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984).

In TIME sessions, couples learn and apply the following skills: accept responsibility for their behavior, identify and align goals, encourage each other, identify factors that influence a marriage relationship and understand their responsibility in creating a desired relationship, communicate honestly and congruently, make choices that support marriage goals, learn a process for resolving conflict, apply the conflict resolution to common marital challenges such as children, money, in-laws, friends, sex, religion, recreation, and alcohol and drug abuse, and commit to the process of maintaining an equal marriage (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984).

The Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program

The Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP) assumes a primary prevention focus in working with couples and maintains that improving the skills couples have for handling conflict greatly reduces the levels of marital distress and divorce. The program consists of 5 sessions designed to teach couples effective communication and conflict management skills. The central messages in PREP are that constructive handling of disagreements can prevent later distress and that
couples can change their communication behavior and take control of conflicts (Markman, Renick, Floyd, & Clements, 1993).

Markman et al. (1993), reported the results of a 4- and 5-year follow-up evaluating the effects of PREP. The intervention program appeared to give couples a significant advantage in communication and conflict management up to 4 years later. Specifically, intervention couples showed greater use of communication skills, greater positive affect, more problem-solving skill, and more support and validation than did control couples. They also showed less withdrawal, less denial, less dominance, less negative affect, less conflict, and less overall negative communication than did control couples at the same time. By the 5-year follow-up, the groups generally were not significantly different on these dimensions except for communication skill usage by men and a trend on negative escalation. Markman et al. (1993) stated that this attenuation of statistical effects may have been due to attribution on sample size, as well as the possibility of the diminishing effect of the intervention over time.

**McKeon Communication Skills Workshop**

McKeon Communication Skills Workshop (MCSW) developed by McKeon and McKeon in 1983, is a six-week, two-hour weekly session presented by a male and female professional team trained in McKeon
methodology. Although McKeons allow individuals to participate in their program, stress is made that conjoint attendance is optimal since "wherever people are interacting with one another, there is the possibility of problems arising" (McKeon & McKeon, 1983, p.4). The MCSW is a compilation of methodologies that include cognitive, behavioral, metaphorical, and systemic theoretical principles. Participation is limited to a maximum, of thirty individuals. Included in the MCSW are brief explanations, rationale, and demonstration of such skills to be learned as free information, self-disclosure, nonverbal communication using "I" statements, active listening habits, and home assignments. Participants are assigned to small groups led by either one of the presenters. During this small group meetings participants report their successes during the previous week. All participants are encouraged to keep a log of their week in order to record their progress.

**Couples Growing Together**

The Couples Growing Together (CGT) was developed to assist couples in moving away from the competitive marriage, which is often the result of unresolved issues of male and female equality and toward a cooperative marriage, where there is no need for subtle background of male supremacy where women either subjugate themselves or fight back
(Christensen, 1977). The basic format of CGT was established by 1975, although over the years there have been many minor revisions in response to informal follow-up evaluations of the program. The content was patterned after that of Marriage-Education Centers (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1984), where specific techniques were taught which would enhance communication and cooperation. However, the format was different in that in the Marriage-Education Centers volunteer couples are interviewed in a public group setting and function as co-educators with the co-counselors.

The Marital Enrichment Group

The Marital Enrichment Group (MEG) technique developed by Clarke (1969) utilizes many procedures similar to Otto's (1975) group techniques and sensitivity groups. The MEG is conducted on a weekly basis for six sessions. The group consists of five or six married couples. These couples are grouped in a variety of ways during the six sessions in order to achieve varying group interactions. Sometimes the group sits in a circle, sometimes husbands and wives in different circles, either concentrically or separately, and occasionally couples separate and interact individually. One special grouping, which is generally considered to achieve the most intense involvement and interaction is the "sharing seat" procedure. In
this procedure, the whole group sits in the “sharing seat” facing one another, very close together, communicating on a given topic and sharing feelings as the group shares in their experience by silently listening to the couple’s interaction.

The content of each session concerns some positive aspects of marriage. Some of the topics include goals for the marriage, ways of communicating love, the positive qualities of oneself and one’s spouse, and ways in which partners meet each other’s needs.

One of the most important processes of the MEG is the sharing of feelings. Throughout every session there is frequent alternation between discussion of the assigned topics and expression of the feelings evoked during this interaction. While the topics are all positively oriented, negative as well as positive feelings may be expressed. This process was designed to sensitize persons to their feelings, and to promote the ability to express feelings. In general, participants tend to be more sensitized to the positive qualities of their marriage.

Marriage Encounter

Another program existing in 1973 was “Marriage Encounter” which has split into two separate groups, “The National Marriage Encounter,” an ecumenical organization, and “Worldwide Marriage Encounter,” a more
tightly structured Catholic group. Marriage Encounter, which is still the
title in idiomatic use was designed for weekend retreats and is usually
under the auspices of the Catholic church or religious organizations (Bosco,
1973). The religious orientation is made evident by the fact that a priest or
a clergyman is a part of the leadership team, and that the four general
themes focused on the weekend are: the “I” theme, the “We” theme, the
“We-God” theme, and the “We-God-World” theme. It may be assumed
then, that couples who share religious values may be drawn to Marriage
Encounter rather than couples who do not have a religious attitude or
affiliation.

Conclusion

Out of the twelve enrichment programs described, I find that the
Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP) is most suited
to Indian couples because of the following reasons: it uses techniques and
exercises which are culturally appropriate for Indian couples to adopt. In
addition, PREP focuses on practicing communication and conflict
management, adopting the attitudes and actions of strong relationships,
and establishing and enhancing relationship for the long term.

PREP also focuses on aspects such as commitment and dedication,
forgiveness, friendship, and fun. The techniques and strategies used by
PREP are based on the most up-to-date research in the field of marriage. As a result, PREP does not just assume what may help couples but uses research and testing to see what really works. Moreover, PREP does not emphasize problems and patterns that can destroy relationships; instead, it helps couples find specific things they can do to achieve and maintain a successful and satisfying relationship.

Outcome Studies on Marriage Enrichment

Nadeau (1971) investigated the effectiveness of a Marital Enrichment Group (MEG) involving communication exercises designed to help couples focus on the positive qualities of their relationship. The study consisted of 13 couples in the experimental group and 13 couples in the control group. The treatment was a seven-week experience lasting two hours each week. Results suggested that participation in the marital enrichment group increased nonverbal communication skills. A one-tailed, t-test analysis between the mean scores for the experimental and control groups showed the differences to be significant (t=1.78, p<.05). Five comparison scales were used to measure the increase in communication skills. Although only one of the five Marital Roles Scale subscales showed a significant difference between groups, all five showed differences in the predicted direction,
lending support to the contention that the MEG does positively affect one's view of one's marriage.

Nadeau's research differed in that those who voiced a need for some type of counseling due to marital difficulties were not accepted, but were referred to other sources. Couples who were married for less than a year were not allowed to participate, but were assigned to the control group. This seemed to distort the similarities needing to exist between experimental and control group for valid comparisons.

Bruder (1972) found a significant change in the perceived acceptance and trust of the spouse after conducting a retreat with 15 Roman Catholic couples (N=30). Comparisons were made with a control group (N=44). The program consisted of communication and relationship exercises. Four dependent variables were measured which included communication; degree of harmony (acceptance and trust); agreement, satisfaction, and companionship; and interaction of warmth, intimacy, satisfaction and sensitivity. For the experimental group, changes were statistically significant on three of the scales used to measure change in the dependent variable: Conjugal Life Questionnaire (CLQ) (p=<.001), Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) (p=<.007), and Relationship Change Scale (RCS) (p=<.01). The CLQ is a scale developed to measure the degree of harmony (acceptance and trust) in a marital relationship. The inventory consists of 24 items related to marital satisfaction. Each spouse indicates agreement or disagreement on a four-point Likert scale. The MAT covers three major areas related to
marital adjustment. These areas are consensus or agreement, satisfaction and companionship. The RCS measures marital adjustment change or general relationship improvement over a period of time. The scale is sensitive to change within the interpersonal relationship in different areas of interaction, such as warmth, intimacy, satisfaction, communication, sensitivity, and trust.

This research encountered sampling problems that restricted inferential conclusions. The researcher did not assign couples randomly to experimental and control groups. Of the 22 control groups, 14 had refused participation in the enrichment program; only 8 were true controls. Combined groups were used to form the experimental sample, and there were fluctuations in the program according to time, place, and size of group participating. These would have presented threats to the internal validity of the experiment.

Davis, Hovestadt, Piercy, and Cochran (1973), compared selected psychological indices of married couples (N=34) who attended marriage enrichment programs. Results revealed that participants in the five-week group showed more improved adjustment than those in the weekend group.

Resick, Barr, Sweet, Kieffer, Ruby, and Spiegel (1982) conducted a study determining if empirically derived dependent variables could be used to differentiate typical conflict and accord discussions in marital communication. Four verbal categories were selected by a large group of
people (N=180) as being the most indicative of conflict. However, it should be noted that it is also possible that the construct conflict be composed of certain negative behaviors plus an absence of more positively valued behaviors. Item analysis produced volume of speech, criticism, disagreement, and sarcasm as significant discriminators. These four behavior categories differentiated conflict from accord discussions. Each discriminator was significant at p<.001. The findings emphasized the need for these content areas to be incorporated into the format of marriage enrichment programs. Even though this study demonstrated that it was possible to stage a moderately typical discussion of relevance to the participants in a laboratory setting there is a danger that such an artificial atmosphere would hinder a naturalistic interaction of the participants. In addition, the influence of other variables such as age, socio-economic factor, and culture was not investigated.

Glander, Locke, and Leonard (1987) presented workshops on couple communication and found a positive impact of structured workshops designed to teach couples new ways of communicating. Effects of a 12-hour Couple Communication Program (CCP) were measured. The general goal of the CCP was to "encourage personal and relationship growth by increasing competence in interpersonal communication" (p.84). Participants learned new "cognitive frameworks" or conceptual tools, and learned specific communication skills for aiding self-disclosures.
The CCP workshop consisted of six couples taught either by one certified leader or by a couple with both partners certified as leaders. Only couples who expressed a commitment to their relationship were included in the CCP program.

The findings showed reduced levels of overt disharmony, and amenable resolutions of differences in the relationship. The diminishing of overt disharmony was statistically significant (p=.005) as measured by the Problem Solving Communication Scale (PSCS). However, among the six couples who participated in this study only three were married, two were not married, and the remaining couple was engaged but not married at the time of the study. The lack of homogeneity in the sample would have had some remarkable influence upon the validity of the findings of this study.

Doherty and Walker (1982) conducted an exploratory study using a deliberately selective sample to investigate the relation between participation in Marriage Encounter and subsequent marital or family distress. There was a segment of participants who emerged from their Marriage Encounter weekend, either immediately or later, damaged and in need of assistance. According to the authors the reported most troublesome feature of the Marriage Encounter weekend was its intensity. Moreover the program was designed to create rapid change in a marriage by inducing open communication on sensitive marital issues and by dramatically altering a couple's expectations for marriage. But the data obtained by the authors of this study do not create a clear picture of what
kind of couples were likely to be harmed by a Marriage Encounter Weekend; some were previously distressed, and some were not; some were in their 20s and some in their 40s; some went for therapy, some for enrichment; some were immediately enthusiastic about the weekend, others were immediately upset.

Doherty, Lester and Leigh (1986) reported that even though therapy itself can create dramatic changes, there still remains a fundamental difference between therapy and Marriage Encounter. The study by Doherty et al (1986) examined interview and essay data for 50 married couples who had the most positive or most negative reactions in a larger sample of participants in Marriage Encounter weekends. According to the findings of the study, about one in eight couples were strongly affected by Marriage Encounter, with about half of this number harmed or half helped. The majority of those strongly affected either way were distressed prior to the weekend. Beyond that, the rest of the couples experienced moderately beneficial weekends or no effect at all. Even though the authors were sure of the fact that the "intense pressure of Marriage Encounter weekends can be unsettling to individuals who are psychologically fragile" (p. 58) no previous screening was undertaken by them. The conclusions drawn from this study depended on its retrospective self-report design. There were no control groups drawn from other enrichment programs. Moreover the authors themselves acknowledged that they "introduced a positive bias
through the sponsorship of the Marriage Encounter Organization" (p. 187). All these add to the inconclusiveness of the findings of this study.

In an earlier study, Lester and Doherty (1983) conducted a retrospective survey to determine how couples felt about their Marriage Encounter experience an average of four years later. Results of the study showed that 80% of the couples reported a totally positive experience. The most frequently cited positive aspect of the program was the "dialogue" or communication technique designed to encourage the expression of feelings. The most frequently cited negative effect was that needs were identified on the weekend but were not subsequently fulfilled, resulting in greater frustration for the respondent. On the basis of this study Lester and Doherty (1983) concluded evasively that Marriage Encounter was viewed as a helpful experience by most couples, but a significant majority of couples may have experienced negative consequences of the program. However, the conclusion drawn from this study lacked validity due to its retrospective self-report design, and the absence of a control group of couples from other enrichment programs. Moreover a potential positive bias was also introduced by the authors in order to obtain a representative sample which might have had some influence on the results.

Witteman and Fitzpatrick (1986), who presented themselves as communication scholars, were interested in evaluating Marriage Encounter because it advertised itself as a communication intervention program. They found that the program devoted no time to the teaching
and modeling of specific communication and problem-solving skills.
While team leaders talked about their marriages, they were not disclosing about specific communication interaction that had taken place in their relationship, and they did not model effective marital communication.

Confer (1980) determined the effects of a four week training group with an instructor in couple communication followed by the six-week self help study. Only ten percent (one couple) in the experimental group completed the total marital enrichment program during the time frame set aside for the experimental phase of the study. No significant difference was found between experimental and control groups on most measures; a significant difference was found between distribution of ranks on the relationship change scale. The author employed self-report instruments which would not have given a true picture. Moreover, the sample size was very small (10 couples). Hence the findings could not be extrapolated.

Meadors (1989) studied marriage enrichment as an emerging specialty in the field of marital counseling. Marital communication and marital adjustment measures were taken from an experimental group consisting of 45 married couples who volunteered to participate in a marriage enrichment program. They represented a particular Christian organization. Hence the findings if generalized to any population beyond the representative sample would be invalid and inconclusive. The results were compared with results derived from 25 couples who were on a waiting list to attend a future marriage enrichment program. Fourteen
hypotheses were generated, which stated that couples participating in marriage enrichment would experience a significant increase in their level of marital communication and marital adjustment. The treatment for this study was a 3-day residential workshop experience. A didactic and experiential approach was utilized to strengthen the marriage relationship. Meadors used the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI), and the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT). Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was applied as the main statistical treatment, which adjusted for pre-existing individual differences brought into the study. When the assumption of ANCOVA was not met, he utilized analysis of variance (ANOVA). Subjects were tested two days prior to the marriage enrichment program, immediately following the program, and finally six weeks after the marriage enrichment experience. The results indicated that the marriage enrichment program had a significant positive effect on marital communication and marital adjustment. The husbands and wives had significantly higher levels of communication and adjustment right after the program. The level of communication and adjustment showed sustained statistically significant increase over time (six week delay) after the program. However, there is still skepticism regarding marriage enrichment treatment being exclusively responsible for positive change in marital communication and marital adjustment. The possibility exists that any number of environmental changes for the couple could produce identical results apart from the treatment.
Breen (1989) examined the effects of McKeon communication skills workshop on dyadic adjustment in marital relationships. The study also measured the effects of the workshop on marital communication skills. Twenty-six subjects (thirteen couples) were randomly assigned to a treatment group who attended a six-week communication skills workshop and thirty subjects (fifteen couples) were randomly assigned to the control group. The sampling procedure was not explained by the author. A pre-test and post test evaluations were conducted. The results indicated that the treatment group demonstrated significant gain in dyadic adjustment; however, the gain measured in marital communication skills was not considered significant. This study failed to demonstrate that the McKeon communication Skills workshop can significantly improve married couples' dyadic adjustment and communication skills.

Ladner (1984) validated the marriage enrichment program, "Couples Growing Together." This is an Adlerian based program which exists in two formats, one is a short course and the other is a long one. Twenty-four couples volunteered for this program. Eight couples were in the long course and fourteen provided the wait list control group, then later received treatment as the short course. All participants were administered pre and post-tests. No significant improvements in communication were shown for the short course.

Carter (1980) sought to determine the correlations among three factors of self-esteem, marital communication, and marital adjustment,
and to determine if their relationships were consistent among a wide range of marriages. The investigation was conducted as a survey, and the subjects for the survey were selected by six individuals who were designated to be selectors. Each selector was instructed to choose fifty individuals of varying backgrounds who would be willing to participate in a study about typical marriages. The results from the Pearson product-moment correlations showed that there were positive correlations between self-esteem and marital communication. Based on the study it was concluded that marital adjustment was dependent on self-esteem and the ability to communicate effectively. It was also concluded that if there was a high level of either self-esteem, marital communication or marital adjustment, the other factors would also be at a high level. But while explaining the consistency of the relationships among marital adjustment, marital communication, and self-esteem the researcher did not take into account the influence of demographic factors.

Meadors (1994) assessed marital communication and marital adjustment between an experimental group and control group, each consisting of 15 married couples in a marriage enrichment program. Twelve hypotheses were generated which stated that participants of the marriage enrichment experiment would experience a significant increase in their level of marital communication and adjustment. The treatment for this study was a 3-day residential workshop experience. The program contained a didactic and experiential approach presented from a Christian
Marriage enrichment is a relatively new concept as a trend of marriage counseling with an emphasis on growth rather than pathology. Marriage counseling basically deals with pathology while marriage
enrichment is concerned with preventive measures before a relationship deteriorates. The marriage enrichment movement has been recognized as embodying three broad concepts: a) prevention is better than cure, b) changes in behavior and relationships are much more likely to occur through experiencing than through didactic programs, and c) married couples can do a great deal to promote healthy growth in each other (Mace & Mace, 1976).

Marriage enrichment can be described as a systematic effort to improve the functioning of marital couples through educational and preventive means. This model emanated from the belief that prevention is more effective and less costly than the cure of problems after they have emerged.

Marriage enrichment programs are typically conducted in groups, thus benefiting from the assembly effect, which builds cohesiveness and fosters the realization among participants that they are not alone in their struggles. In addition, participants may benefit from the effects of modeling.

In conclusion the marital skill-training programs which have come to be known as marriage enrichment grew out of the very positive desire to improve marriages. The programs presented here provide a broad range of approaches which have attracted public attention as well as linked themselves to evaluation (L'Abate, 1985).
In summary the literature seems to have a fairly large range of evidence to substantiate the fact that communication plays a key role in the marriage relationship. However research has still not confirmed what factors influence the couple's ability to learn communication skills. Marital adjustment has been a topic of human concern for many years, but it has only been in the past two decades that much research has been conducted to study the factors that influence marital adjustment. The majority of investigation of marital adjustment have been correlational in nature and have generally focused either on communication or on self esteem or related concepts. There seems to be a sufficient body of research that demonstrates that communication is a significant factor in marital adjustment.
This chapter presents a description of the subjects and setting of the study, assessment, instrumentation, the design of the study, the research questions, and statistical analysis applied. This study focused on the effects of a marriage enrichment program (e.g., treatment) on marital communication and marital adjustment for an experimental group that received five three-hour marriage enrichment sessions and a wait-list control group. Three assessments were taken: (a) a pre-test administered to both groups prior to the treatment for the experimental group; (b) a post-test administered to both groups five weeks later at the close of the treatment for the experimental group and prior to treatment for the controls; and (c) a follow-up assessment five weeks following treatment for the experimentals and at the beginning of treatment for the controls (See Appendix I).

Assumptions Regarding Marriage Enrichment Program

The assumptions made regarding this study are as follows:

1. A good marriage can be made better;
2. Good marital communication will lead to better marital adjustment; and
3. Conflict resolution skills and communication skills can be learned.

Subjects

The trustees of the Hindu Temple at Louisville were contacted to solicit the members to participate in a marriage enrichment workshop. Participants were solicited through letters and phone messages. In addition, the India Association in Louisville, Kentucky was contacted to solicit members to participate in the workshop.

Prospective participants were asked to register with an understanding that limited facilities are available. The goal was to get at least 30 couples to register for the enrichment program. Random numbers were used to decide the participants who would constitute the experimental group and who would serve as the control group. The control group participants were provided a marriage enrichment program following a time delay and after completing a second assessment battery.

The enrichment program was conducted for five weeks from the last Saturday of November, 1996. No fee was collected from the participants.
Procedure

The enrollment list of couples registered for the enrichment program was reviewed by the researcher. Random partition of subjects was done by utilizing the following procedure:

Step 1: The 30 couples were numbered from 1 to 30 (couple #1 to couple #30).

Step 2: A random number table was obtained and the first 15 random numbers which were within 01-30 were found.

Step 3: The 15 couples that corresponded to the 15 random numbers generated were chosen and they formed group 1.

Step 4: The other 15 couples formed group 2.

Step 5: group 1 was designated as the experimental group and group 2 was the control group.

Randomization of subjects for placement in experimental and control groups enhanced the probability of inclusion of all marital types, and added strength to the generalizability of the research results. Verification of a normalized distribution was determined through comparison of Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) scores of the experimental and control groups to Marital Adjustment Test normative data. The MAT has a high validity coefficient in distinguishing healthy and fragmented marriages.
The five-session workshop for the Experimental Group was conducted on five consecutive Saturdays, the duration of each session being three hours. The format for the enrichment workshop included the exercises designed by Hendrix (1988) to improve communication skills and to acquire and practice new relationship skills (see Appendix A). The importance of creating a more loving and supportive relationship was emphasized in the workshop.

The control group received copies of the MCI and MAT by mail and were asked to complete these instruments in their home on the same date that the experimental group would be taking the instruments. Results were mailed to the researcher. Five weeks later, the control group received a second set of assessment (MCI and MAT) which they were again asked to complete and mail to the researcher.

Five weeks later, the wait-list control group met for the first time in order to participate in an abbreviated marriage enrichment workshop (five hours in length). At the beginning of the shortened workshop, members of the control completed the Follow-up tests (MCI and MAT) in the presence of the researcher.

The first session's format included introduction of husband/wife, setting goals, taking the pretests, and a lecture on improving listening skills and practical application focusing on minimal verbal interaction between husband
and wife. This session did not provide opportunities for extended, isolated, one-on-one communication in order to prevent couples from engaging in highly charged emotional verbal communication before laying the foundation to negotiate sensitive areas of verbal exchange.

The second session provided skill building in verbal communication through refining one’s ability to clearly send and receive verbal messages and receive feedback. Couples were also helped to see the potential in their relationships by taking them back into their past. This session’s activities were designed to refresh the participants’ memories of their caretakers and other influential people so that they can construct their imago.

The third session provided new information to the couples. They were informed that most people are attracted to mates who have their caretakers’ positive and negative traits, and typically, the negative traits are more influential (Hendrix, 1988). Couples were given a chance to clarify their major childhood frustrations and describe the way they reacted to them. Instructions and exercises on day three centered on defining things they liked and didn’t like about their partners and compare their partners’ traits with their imago traits.

The fourth session was utilized to suggest effective methods of solving problems. Even though there is no single best method for solving problems research in group problem-solving has suggested that any strategy is better than no strategy (Noller, 1982). The method by Beebe and Masterson (1986) consisting of the following five steps i.e., defining the problem, establishing criteria for solutions, proposing solutions, evaluating the proposed solutions and selecting
and implementing a solution was explained to the participants. In this session the couples were given an opportunity to share specific information about what pleased them and they would agree to please their partners on a regular consistent basis.

The last session’s activities included “seeing-the-good” exercise, watching a video on “getting the love you want” (Hendrix, 1988) and filling out the posttests (MAT & MCI). On the whole this session was utilized to increase intimacy between husband and wife.

This concluding session focused particularly on helping the couples become aware of certain discrepancies they identified in their marital relationship, and bring closure to sensitive areas that had not been completely resolved. Positive changes from the first four days were accentuated, and changes were attributed to the couples’ commitment to increase their awareness of themselves and each other and having acquired new relationship skills. For a more detailed description of the marriage enrichment workshop see Appendix A.

An abbreviated marriage workshop (five-hours in length) was conducted for the control group participants which included the exercises designed by Hendrix (1988) to improve communication skills and to acquire and practice new relationship skills (see Appendix A). The first hour provided opportunity for the participants to introduce themselves, setting goals, taking the follow-up tests (MCI and MAT), and a brief lecture on improving listening skills. During the second hour of the workshop couples were helped to see the potential in their
relationship by taking them back to their past. In the third hour couples were
given a chance to clarify their major childhood frustrations and describe the way
they reacted to them. Problem solving method by Beebe and Masterson (1986)
was explained to the participants during the fourth hour. And the last hour of
the workshop was utilized to help couples become aware of certain discrepancies
in their marital relationship and bring closure to sensitive areas that had not been
completely resolved.

Design of the Study

The pretest-posttest control group design (Campbell & Stanley, 1966, p. 13) was utilized with a five week follow-up with the experimental and control
group participants to measure lasting effects of the marriage enrichment
intervention. The design controlled for the eight factors that potentially
jeopardize internal validity namely, history, maturation, testing, instrumentation,
statistical regression, selection bias, and experimental mortality (Campbell &
Stanley, 1966, p. 8). Controlling the threats to internal validity helped resolve the
question regarding the extent to which the workshop experience alone was
responsible in bringing about any noted changes in marital adjustment and
marital communication. The special nature of the group, namely belonging to a
particular culture (Indian couples), and being motivated to volunteer for
participation in the workshop limit generalizability to a similar group.
Instrumentation

This section describes the instruments used in this study. The Marital Communication Inventory (MCI) was used to measure the level of communication existing in the marriage relationship (see Appendix B). The Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) was used to measure marital adjustment in the relationship (see Appendix C).

Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

This instrument was developed to give spouses better insight into the degree and patterns of communication in their marriage. The inventory consisted of 46 items, and agreement or disagreement to each item was measured on a four-point Likert scale. The 46-item inventory was concerned with patterns, characteristics, and styles of communication. For example, the inventory examined the couple's ability to listen, to understand each other, to express themselves, and also examined the couple's manner of expression. The MCI produced one total score for each of the spouses. Individually, each was required to describe some aspect of marriage with the term "usually," "sometimes," "seldom," or "never." Responses were scored from 0 to 3 with a
favorable response given the higher score. Possible MCI scores ranged from 0 to 138 with a low score indicating poor marital communication and a high score indicating good marital communication. The higher the cumulative score on the MCI, the more successful the individual was considered to be in marital communication (Bienvenu, 1978). The MCI was found to discriminate successfully between couples who were not known to be having marital distress and couples currently in marriage counseling (Bienvenu, 1978).

The Items for the MCI were derived from a review of the literature and from Bienvenu’s experience in marriage and family counseling. Face validity was established through sociologists, social workers, and psychologists agreeing that the items were relevant to marital communication.

In a study of 172 married couples (Bienvenu, 1970), using the chi-square test, 45 of the 46 items discriminated between the upper and lower qualities at the .01 level of confidence with one degree of freedom. One item discriminated at the .05 level. For cross validation of the items retained, the mean score of 105.78 earned by the experimental group was comparable to the mean score (105.68) of the experimental group in another study of 60 couples (Bienvenu, 1969). Further evidence of the validity of the MCI was offered from data derived from a study of two groups of 23 subjects each (Bienvenu, 1970). The first group was receiving marital counseling; the second group was without apparent marital problems, but was comparable to the first in terms of age, length of marriage, and education. Using the Mann-Whitney U test to establish validity,
Bienvenu (1970) found a significant difference ($u=117$, $p<.01$) in marital communication in favor of the group with no apparent problems.

Using the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula, Bienvenu (1969) reported a split-half correlation coefficient of .93 on the scores of 60 subjects. In a study of 20 couples, Rappaport (1971) established a test-retest scores with a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation formula ($r$). Rappaport hypothesized that the experimental group would improve in marital communication as measured by the MCI. This was strongly confirmed with repeated measures ($F=19.86$, $p<.001$)

Marital Adjustment Test (MAT)

The instrument used was the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT). The original test developed by Locke (1951) contained 51 items. The revised edition of the MAT consisted of 15 items. The authors chose those items which had the highest level of discrimination in the original studies, and would cover the area of marital adjustment. These items covered three major areas relating to marital adjustment. They were consensus or agreement, satisfaction, and companionship. The choice of answers differed with each question. Scores ranged from 2 to 158. The higher the score, the better the marital adjustment. One form was used for both husbands and wives. The reliability coefficient of Locke and Wallace’s short form was .90, computed by the Spearman-Brown formula.
The validity of the test was established by Locke and Wallace (1959) using 236 subjects. Out of these 236 subjects, 48 were maladjusted in marriage. The test discriminated significantly between the adjusted and maladjusted groups. The mean adjustment score for the adjusted marriage was 135.9, and the mean adjustment score for the maladjusted marriage was 71.7. Through the statistical properties of inference, the cut-off score of 100 was established on the MAT to differentiate between adjusted and maladjusted marriages.

Bruder (1972) found a test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 established for the control group when comparing the pretest and posttest scores with the Pearson Product-Moment correlation formula. Fredman and Sherman (1987) stated that the items of the Locke and Wallace (1959) were still a good view of the research on marriage stability. In fact, 11 items of MAT were used in Spanier’s (1986) new Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS).

Data Collection

A letter was sent by the researcher to the experimental group and control group asking for their voluntary participation in the study (see Appendix D & E). The purpose and design of the study was explained and confidentiality was assured in protecting their identity. The last four digits of their social security number was the only identifying marks and their names did not appear on the inventories or any other demographic forms. This method was used so that the
participants were not personally identified. The subjects in the experimental group were informed of the goals, techniques, procedures, limitations, potential risks and the benefits of the workshop. Moreover, the treatment procedure including both didactic and experiential activities designed to enhance communication and positive adjustment in the marital relationship were explained to the participants of the experimental group. The subjects in the experimental group were requested not to discuss the activities in the workshop with the subjects in the control group as it will have some contaminating effects on the findings of the study.

The letters to the experimental and control group were followed by a phone call from the researcher. This phone call confirmed each couple's willingness to participate in the study.

After recruiting potential members, Informed consent forms (Appendix F) were sent to members of the experimental and control group to be signed and sent back immediately to the researcher in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. In addition, their rights to discontinue at any time with no obligation was explained. The participants were assured that a summary of the data for the group scores will be made available to them through contacting Dr. Brooke Collison, Professor of Counseling, OSU, (541)-737-5968 or O.Vijayalakshmi, research investigator, (541)-753-7224. The participants were also ensured that additional help will be offered to those who might develop any problem due to their participation in the program. A pregroup screening was conducted by the
researcher to determine whether the participants were to be included or excluded from the group.

Arrangements were made by the investigator to get regular peer supervision from the faculty of Counseling, Department of Education, University of Louisville, KY. It was informed to the participants that if as a result of participation in the workshop it becomes necessary for them to consult with a counselor, they will be referred to Dr. Sandhu, a licensed therapist with the Charter Louisville Behavioral Health System, Louisville, KY, or their physician and they will assume responsibility for costs involved in such treatment. They were also informed that the Oregon State University will not support the research subjects for their medical treatment. The participants were also assured of the safety and confidentiality of the records. The participants were informed that the records will be stored in a private locked location with only the investigators allowed access to the information. The participants were informed that the records will be kept for another five years after publication of results after which they will be destroyed.

The experimental group participants were asked to fill in the MAT and the MCI forms on the first day of the marriage enrichment program under the supervision of the investigator. The Marital Communication Inventory took an average of 15 to 20 minutes and the Marital Adjustment Test took about 8 to 10 minutes. Instructions were given for husbands and wives to complete the pretests separately without consulting each other, while the control group
participants were asked to mail their forms back to the researcher in a self-addressed, stamped envelope, provided by the investigator.

At the conclusion of the marriage enrichment program, experimental group participants were instructed to complete the post test for MCI and MAT. They were asked to respond according to their feelings without recalling how they responded previously. Five weeks after responding to the first assessment, posttests were mailed to the control group with instructions to complete and mail them back immediately to the investigator in the self addressed envelope provided.

The five-week follow-up assessment was explained to the experimental group in the last session of the workshop. The same MCI and MAT were mailed to them asking them to fill them out once again to help the researcher measure the long-term effects of the enrichment experience. A letter (see Appendix G) accompanied the inventories after five weeks, asking them to mail them back to the researcher in furnished envelopes.

The intense and abbreviated workshop particulars and the five-week follow-up inventories to be completed by the control group during the workshop were explained to the control group participants in a letter explaining the importance of attending the workshop and completing the follow-up tests on the first session of the program (see Appendix H).
Research Questions

This section will review the research questions generated after a careful review of the literature, the formation of subsequent hypotheses for statistical testing followed by the statistical approach to test the hypotheses empirically.

The first dependent variable was marital communication as measured by the MCI.

The second dependent variable was marital adjustment as measured by the MAT.

Research Question I

Is there a relationship between the individuals' participation in the marriage enrichment workshop and their marital communication?

Hypothesis 1. There will be no difference in the means of the participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypothesis 2. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).
Hypothesis 3. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Research Question II

Is there a relationship between the individuals' participation in the marriage enrichment workshop and their marital adjustment?

Hypothesis 4. There will be no difference in the means of the participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment test (MAT).

Hypothesis 5. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment test (MAT).

Hypothesis 6. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment test (MAT).
Research Question III

Does the effect of marriage enrichment program remain constant over time?

Hypothesis 7. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the participants' scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants and the control group participants.

Hypothesis 8. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the male participants' scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants and the control group participants.

Hypothesis 9. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the female participants' scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants and the control group participants.
Research Question IV

Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of the experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI)?

Hypothesis 10. There will be no difference in the means of the participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypothesis 11. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the male participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypothesis 12. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the female participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).
Research Question V

Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT)?

Hypothesis 13. There will be no difference in the means of the participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 14. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the male participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 15. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the female participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).
Research Question VI

Does a significant correlation exist between Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment?

Hypothesis 16. Following a participation in a marriage enrichment program there will be no significant correlation between husbands' perception of Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment on the posttest for experimental group and control group.

Hypothesis 17. Following a participation in a marriage enrichment program there will be no significant correlation between wives' perception of Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment on the posttest for experimental group and control group.

Research Question VII

Do differences exist in the mean responses of husbands and wives within group?

Hypothesis 18. There will be no significant difference in the responses of husbands and wives within group on any of MCI measures of experimental and control group participants.
Hypothesis 19. There will be no significant difference in the responses of husbands and wives within group on any of MAT measures of experimental and control group participants.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Experimental group participants were administered MCI and MAT at pretest, posttest, and follow-up intervals. Hence, Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) design with repeated measures was utilized. A single between factor and a single within factor with repeated measures design with marital communication as the dependent variable was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. The between factor was Gender (Husband, Wife), and the within factor was time (Pretest, Posttest, & Follow-up).

A similar single between and a single within factor with repeated measures design with marital adjustment as the dependent variable was used to test hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. The between factor for this design was Gender (Male, Female), and the within factor was Time (Pretest, Posttest, & Follow-up).

Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 were addressed using a two factor ANOVA, where treatment and gender were the factors. A test of the main effect for treatment corresponded to hypothesis 7, and hypotheses 8, and 9 were answered by examining the interaction between treatment and gender accompanied by the appropriate pairwise comparisons.
A two between factors and a single within factor with repeated measure design was used to test hypotheses 10, 11, and 12. The dependent variable was marital communication. Group (Experimental, Control) and Gender (Male, Female) were the between factors and Time (Pretest, Posttest, & Follow-up) was the within factor. For testing hypotheses 13, 14, and 15 similar two between factors and a single within factor with repeated measure design was used. Group (Experimental, Control) and Gender (Male, Female) were the between factors and Time (Pretest, Posttest, & Follow-up) was the within factor. The dependent variable was marital adjustment.

For testing hypotheses 16 and 17 the following statistical procedure was used: The Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation formula was utilized (one for husbands and one for wives in each group [4 total]). For testing hypotheses 18 and 19 the matched t-test was utilized with pre-, post-, and follow-up test data from the experimental group to determine if there were differences existing between husbands and wives within-group.

For purposes of interpretation the significance level was set at .05 or < .05. Based on this significance level the hypotheses were accepted or rejected.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The pretest-posttest and a five week follow-up design was utilized with the experimental and control group participants to measure the effects of the marriage enrichment program on marital communication and marital adjustment. Responses obtained from the subjects were analyzed to determine if significant changes in marital communication and marital adjustment have occurred as a result of participation in the marriage enrichment program. Statistical analyses were done for the seven research questions and nineteen hypotheses which explored the effects of the marriage enrichment program on marital communication and marital adjustment. This chapter presents the results of the data analyses.

Results obtained from the subjects of the experimental group were compared with the results of the subjects of the control group. Sixty four subjects, with a mean age of 33.6 ranging from 24 to 55 years, participated in this study.

The experimental group consisted of 32 subjects (16 married Indian couples). The average age of the experimental group subjects was 32.3 years, with a high of 50 years and a low of 24 years. The average length of marriage was 7.5 years, with a high of 25 years to a low of 3 months. There were 6 couples who had been married less than 5 years. Seven couples had been
married 5 to 10 years. There were two couples who had been married 10 to 15 years and one couple had been married 25 years. None of them had ever been divorced. Two couples’ marriages were “love marriages” (chose their spouses through a “self selection” process) and fourteen couples had their marriages “arranged” by their parents. The average number of children was 1. Their educational qualifications were as follows: Twenty-two subjects were graduates, eight subjects were undergraduates, one subject was a post-graduate and one had completed 10th grade. The subjects had varied occupations. Eleven subjects were software consultants/computer engineers. Four subjects were graduate students, two were professors, one was a physician, two were managers, one was an auditor, one was a nutritionist, one was an accountant, one was a real estate sales person, one was a research assistant, and seven were housewives. The problems cited by the subjects were uncertainty about the future in the US, job insecurity, lack of communication, finance, and lack of quality time together. Twenty-three subjects rated their marriages to be perfectly happy, seven of them reported happy marriages and two of the subjects stated that their marriages were below happy on a scale of 0 to 35 (see Table 4.1).

The control group consisted of 32 subjects (16 married Indian couples). The average age of the control group subjects was 35 years, with a high of 55 years and a low of 25 years. The average length of marriage was 9.2 years, with a high of 25 years to a low of 1 year. There were 3 couples who had been married less than 5 years. Nine couples had been married 5 to 10 years. There
were 3 couples who had been married 15 to 20 years and one couple had been married 25 years. None of them had ever been divorced. All the 16 couples had their marriages arranged by their parents. The average number of children was 1.2.

Their educational qualifications were as follows: Twenty-one subjects were graduates, 6 were undergraduates, 4 subject were post-graduates, and one had completed the first year of college. The subjects had varied occupations. Twelve subjects were software consultants/computer engineers, three subjects were graduate students, three were professors, one was a physician, one was a scientist, one was a preschool teacher, one was a company executive, one was a medical technologist, and nine were housewives. The problems cited by the subjects were uncertainty about the future, career, lack of communication, finance, in-laws, child-care, physical appearance, increased dependence of aged parents, frequent travel, losing temper, stress, and lack of fun time. Eight subjects rated their marriages to be perfectly happy, twenty of them reported happy marriages, and four of the subjects stated that their marriages were below happy on a scale ranging from 0 to 35 (see Table 4.1).

The two dependent variables were marital communication and marital adjustment. The instrument used to measure marital communication was the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI) and the instrument used to measure marital adjustment was the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT). The experimental group participants were asked to fill in the MCI and MAT forms
on the first day of the marriage enrichment program under the supervision of the researcher. The control group participants were asked to fill in the MCI and MAT forms on the same day when the experimental group participants were filling in the forms (the first day of the program) and mail their forms back to the researcher in a self-addressed, stamped envelope, provided by the researcher. At the conclusion of the marriage enrichment program, experimental group participants were instructed to complete the post test for MCI and MAT. Five weeks after responding to the first assessment, posttests were mailed to the control group with instructions to complete and mail them back immediately to the researcher in the self-addressed envelope provided. The five-week follow-up assessment was explained to the experimental group in the last session of the workshop. The same MCI and MAT were mailed to them asking them to fill them out once again to help the researcher measure the long-term effects of the enrichment experience. The marriage enrichment program was organized for the control group participants during a week-end, five weeks after the experimental group finished their marriage enrichment program. Sixteen couples attended the program and they were asked to fill in the follow-up assessment forms of MCI and MAT on the first session of the program. Mean scores were investigated for each of the two dependent variables, marital communication and marital adjustment at pre, post and the five-week follow-up for both experimental and control group participants.
Table 4.1 Demographic Variables of Experimental and Control group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years Married</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been divorced</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year of college</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritionist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool teacher</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Executive</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technologist</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectly Happy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Happy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural Adaptability of the Content of the Marriage Enrichment Program

The focus of the workshop was on improving communication skills and relationship skills. The exercises developed and tested on large populations for more than twenty years by Hendrix (1988) were used in the workshop. The exercises included mirroring, relationship vision, childhood wounds, imago work-up, childhood frustrations, partner profile, and reromanticizing. The exercises were very much appreciated by all participants. When the researcher was leading the discussion on childhood wounds and how childhood frustrations affect couples' marital relationship, one man said that it was very true. He added that Hindu philosophy strongly believes in karma which is the vital force that enables a man to be spirited and dynamic to reach the goal of human existence. He proceeded to state that karma makes us the architects of our own future, and it is interesting to know how our childhood experiences influence our marital behavior and communication. All participants agreed upon his statement by nodding their heads and some by shouting "yes, yes."

When the video on relationship skills by Hendrix (1988) was shown, in one of the exercises a woman was seated and her husband went around her telling some nice things about her like "I like your pink dress, I like your short hair" and so on. One woman could not tolerate the idea of a woman being seated and her husband going around her. She exclaimed "is she a deity to be seated like this and making a man go around her?" All women laughed and
agreed with her statement by nodding their heads. This reflected their deep
rooted faith in the Hindu religious values which display many paradoxes and
shifts in the status of women whereas that of men has remained relatively
stable. Desai (1957) aptly summarized the status of women as prescribed by
the shastras (codes) thus: “ideologically, woman was considered completely
inferior species, inferior to the male, having no significance, no personality;
socially she was kept in utter subjection; denied all rights, suppressed and
oppressed.” The husband’s moral and domestic dominion over his wife was
unquestionable in the shastras, and this continues today, although in a
modified form.

Research Questions

Research Question I

Is there a relationship between the individuals’ participation in the
marriage enrichment workshop and their marital communication?
Hypothesis 1. There will be no difference in the means of the participants’
scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as
measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).
Hypothesis 2. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypothesis 3. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

A single between factor and a single within factor with repeated measures design with marital communication as the dependent variable was used to test Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. The between factor was Gender (Male, and Female), and the within factor was Time (Pretest, Posttest, and Follow-up).

Table 4. 2 Pretest, Posttest, and Follow-up. Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental Group Participants for Marital Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104.563</td>
<td>17.750</td>
<td>111.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.500</td>
<td>16.889</td>
<td>113.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for Male/ Female
N = 32 for Total

From Pretest to Posttest to Follow-up, males had mean scores of 106.438 (SD = 16.508), 115.938 (SD = 15.558), and 113.438 (SD = 14.873).

Corresponding female mean scores were 104.563 (SD = 17.750), 111.125 (SD = 19.127), and 109.500 (SD = 19.442). The means and standard deviations for
total participants (males and females combined) from Pretest to posttest to follow-up were: 105.500 (SD =16.889 ), 113.531(SD = 17.324 ), and 111.469 (SD = 17.145) (Table 4.2).

Table 4.3 Mean Change Scores for Experimental Group Participants for Marital Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-4.220</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>8.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pretest</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>8.031</td>
<td>14.314 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-0.314</td>
<td>5.969</td>
<td>12.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Tukey significance (F= 30.59, p= .0317)  
N = 32 for each cell

As shown in Table 4.3 the mean change score between Pretest and Posttest was 8.031, and it ranged from 1.749 to 14.314 (95% CI). Similarly, the mean change score between post and follow-up test was 2.06 units, and the change tended to be between -4.220 and 8.345 units (95 % CI). The mean change scores between pretest and Follow-up was 5.969 units and the change score tended to be between -0.314 and 12.251 units (95% CI). Moderately significant difference was found in the means of the participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (Figure 1). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 1.
Table 4.4 Mean Change Scores for Male Participants in the Experimental Group for Marital Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-10.919</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>15.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pretest</td>
<td>-3.919</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>22.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-6.419</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>20.419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for each cell
(F = 1.58, p = .22)

As shown in Table 4.4 on the average, male participants scored from -3.919 units to 22.920 more units on post than pretest. The mean difference between pre and posttest for male participants was 9.50 units. The mean difference between pre and follow-up test for male participants was 7.00 units. There is no evidence of a statistically significant change in test scores over time for male participants. Hence hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected.

Table 4.5 Mean Change Scores for Female Participants in the Experimental Group for Marital Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-14.474</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>17.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pre test</td>
<td>-9.536</td>
<td>6.563</td>
<td>22.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-11.161</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>21.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for each cell
(F = .53, p = .5925)
As shown in Table 4.5 the mean change score between Pretest and Posttest was 6.563, but it ranged from -9.536 to 22.661 (95% CI). Similarly, the mean change score between post and follow-up test was 1.63 units, and the change tended to be between -14.474 and 17.724 units (95% CI). The mean change scores between pretest and Follow-up was 4.938 units and the change score tended to be between -11.161 and 21.036 units (95% CI). Since no significant difference was found in the means of the female participants’ scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory, hypothesis 3 was not rejected.
Figure 1. MCI Scores at Pre, Post, and Follow-up Tests for Experimental and Control Group Participants

$T_{ME}$ Treatment, Experimental Group Male
$T_{FE}$ Treatment, Experimental Group Female
$T_{MC}$ Treatment, Control Group Male
$T_{FC}$ Treatment, Control Group Female
Research Question II

Is there a relationship between the individuals’ participation in the marriage enrichment workshop and their marital adjustment?

Hypothesis 4. There will be no difference in the means of the participants’ scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 5. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants’ scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 6. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants’ scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Table 4.6 Pretest, Posttest, and Follow-up. Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental Group Participants for Marital Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114.063</td>
<td>21.076</td>
<td>126.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112.250</td>
<td>23.739</td>
<td>122.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for Male/ Female
N = 32 for Total
(For total score F= 24.43, p = .0393, for male F= 2.68, p = .0793, for female F = .46, p = .6749)
A single between factor and a single within factor with repeated measures design with marital adjustment as the dependent variable was used to test Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. The between factor was Gender (Male, and Female), and the within factor was Time (Pretest, Posttest, and Follow-up). From Pretest to Posttest to Follow-up, males had mean scores of 114.063 (SD = 21.076), 126.500 (SD = 11.249), and 122.625 (SD = 12.414). Corresponding female mean scores were 110.438 (SD = 26.711), 118.688 (SD = 25.956), and 116.125 (SD = 26.565). The means and standard deviations for total participants (males and females combined) from Pretest to posttest to follow-up were: 112.250 (SD = 23.739 ), 122.594 (SD = 20.074), and 119.375 (SD = 20.663) (Table 4.6).

Table 4.7 Mean Change Scores for Participants in the Experimental Group for Marital Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-5.703</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>12.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pre test</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>10.344</td>
<td>19.265 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-1.796</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>16.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for each cell
*** Tukey significance (F= 24.43, p= .0393)

As shown in Table 4.7 the mean change score between Pretest and Posttest was 10.344, and it ranged from 1.422 to 19.265 (95% CI). Similarly, the mean change score between post and follow-up test was 3.219 units, and the change tended to be between -5.703 and 12.140 units (95% CI). The mean
change scores between pretest and Follow-up was 7.125 units and the change scores tended to be between -1.796 and 16.046 units (95% CI). It was found with moderate evidence that the mean MAT scores changed over time (Figure 2). The change was seen between the pre test and posttest, and this mean change was 10.34 units (95% CI (1.422, 19.265). There was a little change between the posttest and the follow-up, and this change was 3.219 units (Table 4.7). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 4.

Table 4.8 Mean Change Scores for Male Participants in the Experimental Group for Marital Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-9.444</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>17.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pre test</td>
<td>-0.882</td>
<td>12.438</td>
<td>25.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-4.757</td>
<td>8.563</td>
<td>21.882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for each cell

It was found with suggestive but inconclusive evidence that the MAT scores changed over time for male participants (F = 2.68, p = .0793). The difference occurred between the pre and posttests. The mean change score between Pretest and Posttest was 12.438, and it ranged from -0.882 to 25.757 (95% CI). Over time, they seemed to lose a little knowledge which was evidenced by the mean change score of 3.875 units, and the change tended to be between -9.444 and 17.194 units (95% CI). The mean change scores between pretest and follow-up was 8.563 units and the change scores tended
to be between -4.757 and 21.882 units (95% CI), (Table 4.8). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 5.

Table 4.9 Mean Change Scores for Female Participants in the Experimental Group for Marital Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post - Follow-up</td>
<td>-20.070</td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>25.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post - Pre test</td>
<td>-14.382</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>30.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Follow-up</td>
<td>-16.945</td>
<td>5.688</td>
<td>28.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for each cell  
(F= .46, p = .6749)

There was no evidence that the scores on the MAT were statistically different over time for the female participants of the experimental group. For female participants in the experimental group the mean change score between Pretest and Posttest was 8.250, and it ranged from -14.382 to 30.882 (95% CI). Over time, they seemed to lose further knowledge which was evidenced by the mean change score of 2.563 units between post and follow-up tests, and the change tended to be between -20.070 and 25.195 units (95% CI). The mean change scores between pretest and follow-up was 5.688 units and the change scores tended to be between -16.945 and 28.320 units (95% CI), (Table 4.9). As a result hypothesis 6 was not rejected.
Figure 2. MAT Scores at Pre, Post, and Follow-up Tests for Experimental and Control Group Participants

T_{ME}  Treatment, Experimental Group Male
T_{FE}  Treatment, Experimental Group Female
T_{MC}  Treatment, Control Group Male
T_{FC}  Treatment, Control Group Female
Research Question III

Does the effect of marriage enrichment program remain constant over time?

Hypothesis 7. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the participants’ scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants to the control group participants.

Hypothesis 8. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the male participants’ scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants to the control group participants.

Hypothesis 9. Five weeks after participation in a marriage enrichment program the means of the female participants’ scores as measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) will not differ for the experimental group participants to the control group participants.

Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 were tested to determine if the marriage enrichment program had a significant effect after a five-week interval when comparing the MAT scores of the experimental group with that of the control group. Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 were addressed using a two factor ANOVA, where treatment and gender were the factors. A test of the main effect for
treatment corresponded to hypothesis 7, and hypotheses 8, and 9 were answered by the appropriate pair-wise comparisons.

It was found that the pre-test MAT scores for the experimental and control groups were significantly different. Hence ANCOVA (Analysis Of Covariance) was used for the MAT analysis with the covariate = pre-test score because the mean pre-test score of the control group was not equal to the mean pre-test score of the experimental group.

The covariate, pre-test, controls for pre-existing differences of the subjects. And it adjusts all of the corresponding means.

Table 4.10 Marital Adjustment Follow-up Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental and Control Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119.13</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>108.03</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113.68</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>15.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102.51</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for Male/ Female  
N = 32 for Total

The means of the total experimental group participants at follow-up as measured by the MAT was 113.68 (SD = 12.65). For the total control group participants, the means at follow-up as measured by the MAT was 102.51(SD = 11.43).
The means of the experimental group male participants at follow-up as measured by the MAT was 119.13 (SD = 7.94). For control group male participants, the means at follow-up as measured by the MAT was 106.25 (SD = 12.43). The means at follow-up for experimental group female participants as measured by the MAT was 108.03 (SD = 19.43). The follow-up means and corresponding standard deviation for control group female participants were: (M = 98.97, SD = 15.93) (see Table 4.10).

Table 4.11 Mean Change Scores for the Experimental Group and Control Group Participants for Marital Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>17.17 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Tukey significance (F = 14.53, P=.0003)
N = 32 for Total
N= 16 for Male (F = 12.1, p = .0016)
N = 16 for Female (F = 4.17, p = .0504)

After accounting for difference in the predisposition of the grouped subjects (i.e., difference in pre-test scores), it was found that there was strong evidence to support that the mean follow-up score for experimental group was different from the mean follow-up score for the control group. The total mean difference was 11.16 units, and it ranged from 5.15 to 17.17 units (95% CI). This result revealed that the experimental group tended to score 11.16 more
units than did the control group. These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 7.

The mean difference for the male participants of the experimental group tended to be 12.88 units and it ranged from 3.34 to 22.32 units (95% CI). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 8.

The mean difference for the female participants of the experimental group tended to be 9.07 units and it ranged from -1.03 to 19.04 units (95% CI) (see Table, 4.11). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 9.

Research Question IV

Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of the experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI)?

Hypothesis 10. There will be no difference in the means of the participants’ scores of the experimental group and the means of the participants’ scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypothesis 11. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants’ scores of the experimental group and the means of the male participants’ scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).
Hypothesis 12. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the female participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Communication Inventory (MCI).

Hypotheses 10, 11, and 12 were tested to determine if the marriage enrichment program had a significant effect after a five-week interval when comparing the scores of the experimental group with that of the control group. To analyze hypothesis 10, 11, and 12 the pretest and follow-up means of male and female participants were analyzed by using a two between factors and a single within factor with repeated measure design. The two between factors were Group (Experimental, Control) and Gender (Male, Female). The within factor was Time (Pretest, Follow-up). The dependent variable was marital communication.

Table 4.12 Marital Communication Pretest and Follow-up Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental and Control Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Follow-up Mean</th>
<th>Follow-up SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104.562</td>
<td>17.750</td>
<td>109.500</td>
<td>19.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.500</td>
<td>16.889</td>
<td>111.469</td>
<td>17.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100.250</td>
<td>13.219</td>
<td>98.000</td>
<td>10.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95.750</td>
<td>15.750</td>
<td>95.000</td>
<td>16.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98.000</td>
<td>14.485</td>
<td>96.500</td>
<td>13.965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32 for Total
N= 16 for Male, N = 16 for Female
For total participants F = 24.93, p = .0378, for male F = 15.42, p= .0591, and for female F = 46.79, p = .0207
The means of the experimental group males from pretest to follow-up were 106.438 (SD = 16.508), and 113.438 (SD = 14.873) respectively. For control group male participants, the means of pretest to follow-up were 100.25 (SD = 13.219), and 98.000 (SD = 10.893) respectively. The means for pretest and follow-up for experimental group female participants were 104.562 (SD = 17.750), and 109.500 (SD = 19.442) respectively. The means and standard deviations for control group female participants were: Pretest (M = 95.750, SD = 15.750) and follow-up (M = 95.000, SD = 16.721). The pretest and follow-up means for total participants of the Experimental group were 105.500 (SD = 16.889), and 11.469 (SD = 17.145) respectively. The pretest and follow-up means for total participants of the control group were 98.000 (SD = 14.485) and 96.5000 (SD = 13.965) respectively (see Table 4.12).

Table 4.13 Mean Change Scores for the Experimental Group and Control Group Participants for Marital Communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental to Control</td>
<td>Total 1.731</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>23.290 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-1.203</td>
<td>12.583</td>
<td>26.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.614</td>
<td>12.438</td>
<td>20.261 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32 for Total  
N= 16 for Male, N = 16 for Female  
*** Tukey significance  
(For total participants F = 24.93, p = .0378, for male F = 15.42, p=.0591, p = .0591, for female F = 46.79, p = .0207)
There is moderately strong evidence to suggest that the mean MCI score for the experimental group differed from the mean MCI score of the control group from the pre to post to follow-up tests. The difference was 12.51 units and it ranged from 1.731 to 23.290 units (95% CI). Based on these results hypothesis 10, was rejected.

The mean difference for the male participants of the experimental group tended to be 12.58 units and it ranged from -1.203 to 26.369 units (F = 15.42, p= .0591). Based on these results hypothesis 11 was rejected.

The mean difference for the female participants of the experimental group tended to be 12.438 units and it ranged from 4.614 to 20.261 units (F = 46.79, p= .0207) (see Table, 4.13). Based on these results hypothesis 12 was rejected.
Research Question V

Is there a difference between the scores of the participants of experimental group and the scores of the control group as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT)?

Hypothesis 13. There will be no difference in the means of the participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 14. There will be no difference in the means of the male participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the male participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypothesis 15. There will be no difference in the means of the female participants' scores of the experimental group and the means of the female participants' scores of the control group from pretest to posttest to follow-up as measured by Marital Adjustment Test (MAT).

Hypotheses 13, 14, and 15 were tested to determine if the marriage enrichment program had a significant effect after a five-week interval when comparing the scores of the experimental group with that of the control group. For testing hypotheses 13, 14, and 15, pretest and follow-up means of male and female participants were analyzed by using two between factors and
one within factor with repeated measure design. The two between factors were Group (Experimental, Control) and Gender (Male, Female) and the within factor was Time (Pretest, Follow-up). The dependent variable was marital adjustment.

It was found that the pre-test MAT scores for the experimental and control groups were significantly different. Hence ANCOVA (Analysis Of Covariance) was used for the MAT analysis with the covariate = pre-test score for the reasons stated elsewhere.

Table 4.14 Marital Adjustment Pretest and Follow-up Means and Standard Deviations for Experimental and Control Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Follow-up Mean</th>
<th>Follow-up SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>110.13</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>118.70</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>102.02</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>107.71</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>108.18</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>106.68</td>
<td>13.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>99.29</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 16 for Male
N = 16 for Female
For Total participants F= 4.37, p = .011,
For Male F = 24.90, p < .0001, and
For Female, F = 6.84, p = .0103

The means of the experimental group males from pretest to follow-up were 110.13 (SD = 9.35), and 118.70 (SD = 8.61) respectively. For control group male participants, the means of pretest to follow-up were 108.18 (SD = 12.85), and 106.68 (SD = 13.01) respectively. The means for pretest and follow-up for experimental group female participants were 102.02 (SD = 16.01), and
107.71 (SD = 15.51) respectively. The means for pretest and follow-up for control group female participants were 100.6 (SD = 13.37), and 99.29 (SD = 12.49) respectively (see Table (4.14).

Table 4.15 Mean Change Scores for the Experimental Group and Control Group Participants for Marital Adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Comparison</th>
<th>Lower Confidence Limit</th>
<th>Difference Between Means</th>
<th>Upper Confidence Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>17.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 16 for Male (F = 24.90, p = <.0001)  
N = 16 for Female (F = 6.84, p = .0103)  

After accounting for difference in the predisposition of the grouped subjects (i.e., difference in pre-test scores), it was found that there is strong evidence to suggest that the mean MAT score for the experimental group differed from the mean MAT score of the control group, from the pre to post to follow-up tests (F = 4.37, p = <.011). These results led to the rejection of the hypothesis 13.

The mean difference for the male participants of the experimental group tended to be 9.2 units and it ranged from 0.86 units to 17.54 units showing strong evidence (F 24.90 =, p = <.0001). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 14.

The mean difference for the female participants of the experimental group tended to be 5.30 units and it ranged from 1.21 to 9.39 units showing
strong evidence ($F = 6.84, p = .0103$) (see Table, 4.15). These results led to the rejection of hypothesis 15.

Research Question VI

Does a significant correlation exist between Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment?

Hypothesis 16. Following a participation in a marriage enrichment program there will be no significant correlation between husbands' perception of Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment on the posttest for experimental group and control group.

Hypothesis 17. Following a participation in a marriage enrichment program there will be no significant correlation between wives' perception of Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment on the posttest for experimental group and control group.

Hypotheses 16, and 17 were tested to see if there was a significant correlation existed between husbands' and wives' perception of Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment following a participation in a marriage enrichment program. For testing the hypotheses 16, and 17 Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation formula was utilized (one for husbands and one for wives in each group [4 total]).
Table 4.16. Correlation between Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment for Male Participants of Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.69806</td>
<td>.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.50187</td>
<td>.00476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32 for each cell

Table 4.17. Correlation between Marital Communication and Marital Adjustment for Female Participants of Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.74284</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>.85483</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 32 for each cell

It was found that there was a positive correlation existed between husbands' perception of marital communication and marital adjustment on the posttest for experimental and control groups (see Table 4.16). Based on these results hypothesis 16 was rejected.

It was found that there was a positive correlation existed between wives' perception of marital communication and marital adjustment on the posttest for experimental and control groups (see Tables 4.17). Based on these results hypothesis 17 was rejected.
Research Question VII

Do differences exist in the mean responses of husbands and wives within group?
Hypothesis 18. There will be no significant difference in the responses of husbands and wives within group on any of MCI measures of experimental and control group participants.
Hypothesis 19. There will be no significant difference in the responses of husbands and wives within group on any of MAT measures of experimental and control group participants.

For testing hypotheses 18, and 19 matched t-test was utilized with pre-, post, and follow-up data from the experimental group to determine if there were differences existed between husbands and wives within-group.

There was no evidence that the experimental group differed from the control group \((t = .3729, p = .7119)\). That is, the difference between husbands and wives for the control group was the same as the difference between husband and wives for the experimental group on MCI measures. So, hypothesis 18 was not rejected.

There was no evidence that the experimental group differed from the control group \((t =.1434, p = .8869)\). That is, the difference between husbands and wives for the control group was the same as the difference between
husband and wives for the experimental group on MAT measures. As a result of these findings, hypothesis 19 was not rejected.

Discussion

Before conducting the marriage enrichment program, it was hypothesized that improvement in communication and relationship skill would lead to better adjustment in marriage and that a good marriage can be made better by learning conflict resolution skills and communication skills. The marriage enrichment program presented in this research focused on communication and relationship skills as vehicles for change. Measured changes in communication skills were observed for combined male and female participants in experimental group in this study. This finding corroborates with the findings by Meadors (1989; 1994), who found similar changes in communication as a result of participation in a marriage enrichment program. Even though there was significant difference in the communication scores of the experimental group participants from pre to posttests, no significant difference was found when considering the scores of male participants of experimental group and the scores of female participants of experimental group separately.

Historical circumstances (e.g., the British presence in India, the movement under Gandhi's leadership for independence from British rule, a
movement that included women from elite background) and secular forces (e.g., education and Western values, especially those pertaining to equality) have undermined the traditional position of Indian women. Perhaps the crucial changes have been in the legal status of women, such as granting of the franchise, equality ensured by the Constitution, the rights to abortion and divorce, and property rights (Ramu, 1987). But such a right has little relevance for the majority of Indian women because from childhood they had been taught to look up to a man as the head of the family-- to her father during her childhood, to her husband when married and to her son when she got old. Also because of the continuing influence of traditional gender roles, women may not be eager to push for changes in the communication patterns. Although educated husbands may be pressured to alter their traditional roles because of the influence of the surrounding American culture which stresses equality and openness, they may at the same time resist changes due to the continuing influence of persistent conventional gender role orientations. In light of these considerations the ineffectiveness of the study in establishing significant changes in communication when considering the scores of male participants of experimental group and the scores of female participants of experimental group separately could be understood.

The results of the study with respect to measures of marital adjustment supported the hypothesis that participation in the enrichment program promotes adjustment but non-participation does not foster a significant level of increase. The experimental group participants showed significant gains in
areas as measured by MAT, while the control group participants showed no gain at all. This was evidenced by the difference in the mean follow-up score for the experimental group participants from that of the control group participants.

The long-term effects of participation in a marriage enrichment program over time was established in this study. Collins (1971) suggested that most marriage enrichment research utilizing the MCI and MAT inventories reported a positive correlation between the two instruments. Meadors (1989) and Meadors (1994) also supported that strong positive correlation existed between marital communication and marital adjustment. The strong positive correlation between marital communication and marital adjustment in this study supported the assumption that communication is a dependent variable strongly influencing positive adjustment in marriage relationship.

Limitations of the Study

It must be noted that the sampling used in this study consisted of Indian couples who voluntarily attended a marriage enrichment workshop and agreed to participate in the study. The results of the present research should only be generalized to relate to a similarly motivated population. Hence, generalizing the findings beyond the representative sample would be inconclusive.
The experimental-control group design for scientific research helped assure that internal validity was not jeopardized. However, there is still skepticism regarding marriage enrichment treatment being exclusively responsible for positive changes in marital communication and marital adjustment. There is a possibility that any number of environmental changes for the couple could produce identical results apart from the participation in the marriage enrichment workshop. This possible threat to internal validity is acknowledged.

The experimental group participants were tested in the presence of the researcher. The control group participants took the tests in their homes. Hence, the difference in testing conditions may account for the differences in the MCI and MAT scores (See Figure 1 & 2). The high education level of the participants might have confounded with the results of this study (See Table 4.1). In addition, redundant use of data for analysis is a generally cited disadvantage by researchers with repeated measures design. Finally the number of participants (N = 32 for Total and N= 16 for Males/females) may not be large enough to produce significant results.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS/REFLECTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Marital discord is a pervasive problem affecting many adults. Marital dissatisfaction has been reported to be a single major precipitating condition in about one-half of first admissions to state psychiatric hospitals, a factor in murders occurring among disputing family members, police intervening in family quarrels, and a factor producing severe behavioral and emotional problems in children of divorced couples and unhappy marriages (Boland, Follingstad, 1987).

Lederer and Jackson (1968) researched the different types of marriages and estimated that the happy marriages represent about 5-10% of all marriages. The tide of divorces seems to continue relentlessly. At the same time, it is apparent that we now have more and more resources available to prevent these broken relationships. Now it appears that the challenge is to make the resources widely visible and to help the couples become more motivated, become involved in moving toward a bright, enriched and energized marriage.

In the last few decades an increasing amount of attention has been paid to the development of programs designed to "enrich" marriage and family
relationships, that is, to offer growth-inducing experiences to couples and families whose interactions are basically sound but who wish to make these relationships even more satisfying. The focus of almost all such marital programs is on the enhancement of communication skills, broadening and deepening emotional and/or sexual lives and reinforcing and fostering existing marital strengths (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977).

Marriage enrichment programs are aimed at couples who are not experiencing serious difficulties in their relationships, but who wish to improve them. There is a paucity of quality research indicating whether or not these programs actually produce the intended effects on the couple’s relationship (Gurman & Kniskern, 1977).

After presenting their survey of research, Gurman and Kniskern (1977), recommended several improvements in marital communication research. They suggested the following: (a) the study should include both a treatment group and a control group, (b) random assignment to the experimental and control groups, (c) rigorous methods to code the behavioral data, (d) behavioral as well as self-report measures, and (e) a follow-up (Wampler & Sprenkle, 1980).

Despite the exciting and popular developments in educational and quasi-therapeutic interventions for the enrichment of well-functioning couple relationships, research documenting the effects and efficacy of marital enrichment programs is still in its infancy. Perhaps the best researched approach is the communication training model in which couples are taught
skills for enhanced communication through structured training exercises (Ford, Bashford, & De Witt, 1984).

The need for marital communication enrichment has been accelerated because of the move toward democratic relationships. Divorce statistics suggest that one out of two marriages will dissolve as a result of the marriage experience. This is not to mention the large numbers of marriages which continue even though unhappiness and lack of satisfaction abound (Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1986).

Most of the field research studies which have focused on couple’s marital satisfaction and communication, have been conducted with predominantly white, middle class, North American married couples (Yelsma, 1988). The study of marital communication from another cultural perspective may provide insight into the ways couples from other cultural orientations interact with each other in achieving marital satisfaction.

A major difference between the Indian arranged and American companionate marriages is the manner in which people begin their marriages. Typically, conjugal love comes after marriage for Indian couples, whose marriages are arranged by their parents, whereas romantic love comes before marriage for western couples. Another difference between the two cultures is the number of couples that terminate their marriages. The divorce rate in India, is approximately one and one-half percent (Yelsma, 1988). The common solution to an unhappy marriage chosen by nearly fifty percent of all American couples and one and a half of Indian couples, is to divorce and start
all over again with a new and hopefully a better spouse. Unfortunately the only alternative that many choose is to stay together, and put up with a disappointing relationship for the rest of their lives. They learn to cope with an empty marriage by filling themselves with food, alcohol, drugs, outside activities, work, television, and romantic fantasies, resigned to the belief that their longing for an intimate love will never be realized (Hendrix, 1988). This is true of nearly 99% of Indian married couples because many Indian couples are not aware that Indian marriage, mostly arranged by parents, is not just staying together unhappily but it is a psychological and spiritual journey that begins with the wedding ceremony, stretches through a lot of adjustments and culminates in the creation of an intimate, joyful, and lifelong union.

The present research project included a marriage enrichment workshop. The format of the workshop utilized most of the exercises designed by Hendrix (1988) to improve communication skills and to acquire and practice new relationship skills. The importance of creating a more loving and supportive relationship was emphasized in the workshop. The specific purpose of the research was to determine if a particular marriage enrichment workshop devised and conducted by the researcher would have a positive effect upon individuals who participated in the workshop on five consecutive Saturdays, the duration of each session being three hours. The results would contribute to the field of research in the area of marriage enrichment, particularly in India since it is a new area for Indian researchers. This research carried out the recommendations of previous researchers by including both a
treatment group and a control group, and random assignment to the experimental and control groups. Additionally, this research project sought to address the limitations of previous researches by utilizing adequate follow-up assessments.

Marital communication and marital adjustment were the dependent variables measured in this study. The effects of the marriage enrichment workshop were examined to determine if the marriage enrichment workshop intervention influenced the marital communication and marital adjustment of the participants. Pretests and posttests were administered to experimental group participants, and a five-week follow-up test was utilized to measure the consistency of effects. A control group consisted of those who were interested in a workshop experience but treatment was delayed. Control group participants were administered a pretest, posttest, and a five-week follow-up to compare with the results of the experimental group.

Measurable changes in the scores of the experimental group were compared with the measurable changes in the scores of the control group, utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures procedures. Marital communication was measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI), and marital adjustment was measured by the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT). Both marital communication and marital adjustment significantly increased as a result of participating in the marriage enrichment workshop. Moderately significant difference was found in the means of the participants' scores in the experimental group from pretest to posttest to
follow-up as measured by the Marital Communication Inventory (F= 30.59, p= .0317). It was found with moderate evidence that the mean MAT scores changed over time (F= 24.43, p= .0393). The change was seen between the pretest and posttest, and this mean change was 10.34 units (95% CI (1.422, 19.265). There was a little change between the posttest and the follow-up, and this change was 3.219 units (CI -5.703, 12.140).

Conclusions/Reflections

In the last few years an increasing amount of attention has been paid to the development of programs designed to “enrich” marriage and family relationships, that is, to offer growth-inducing experiences to couples and families whose interactions are basically sound but who wish to make these relationships even more satisfying. Lack of durability and generalizability of enrichment induced change, absence of the potential participants demonstration of change through non-participant rating sources, and missing of salient change inducing components were reported to be major deficiencies in the literature of the marriage enrichment movement. The present research adapted a true experimental design necessitating randomization of participants for assignment to both the experimental and control groups. This is a way to help protect from most threats to external validity. To ensure scientific rigor the pretest-posttest control group design was utilized with a
five week follow-up with the experimental and control group participants to measure the consistency of effects of the marriage enrichment intervention. Analysis of variance with repeated measures design was used to investigate the significance of differences between subjects.

In the literature, there is skepticism about the attributing factor of the program itself toward better marital communication and marital adjustment. It could be expected that there were many contributing factors other than the workshop experience itself. In this research project, an increased perception of marital communication and marital adjustment at the conclusion of the workshop affirmed a positive experience by the participants. A major factor would have been the environment itself, because such experiences were offered in a very accepting, even loving atmosphere. There is a real possibility that changes reported at the end of the workshop, represented global "halo" or "placebo" effects. But the consistency of effects established in this research evidenced that such "peak" experiences were equivalent to enduring change and by themselves, demonstrated program's effectiveness.

Some of the difficulties encountered in this research may be typical of any effort to "enrich" marriages, namely generation of an adequate sample necessary to ensure scientific rigor. A special difficulty faced by the researcher was with helping Indian men and women participants of this study focus on changes in the communication patterns.

In our Indian family system, the husband is still supposed to play the role of the head of the family, whereas, the wife has to play a secondary role in
the management of family affairs. Hence, for the management of these traditionally-defined family roles, the husband is expected to be dominant the wife somewhat submissive. It may, therefore, be expected that any reversal of these socially-accepted familial roles would lead to difficulty in marriage. The researcher was not surprised when the women in the experimental and control groups did not welcome the idea of a woman being seated and a man going round her saying some positive things about her. It is accepted only in the case of deities where the followers could praise them and not in any other context should a woman be honored by a man. It is accepted and approved by researchers like Kumar and Rohatgi (1984). They stated that the husband should be dominating, whereas, the wife should be somewhat submissive in keeping with the expected cultural role for a better adjustment in marriage.

The enthusiasm and the positive attitude of the participants toward the enrichment experience and the researcher, the author of this study, are acknowledged. Moreover, the researcher had contact with all the attendees of the Hindu temple and the members of India Association through many social events for the past three years. The participants belonged to a culture which was cohesive. In addition, the researcher's persistence in calling participants and reminding them of the workshop sessions and participants' interest in the enrichment program as well as the researcher's study should also be recognized. Finally, the researcher had full support from her family members and friends in Louisville, Kentucky. All these factors helped not only in getting high rate of attendance but also full participation of the participants.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the results of this study, recommendations for future research are presented below:

1. The present study included a marriage enrichment workshop for 16 couples conducted by the investigator. Replication of this workshop is recommended to be led by a team of two. Two facilitators could provide more time and attention to each couple to ensure complete training experiences.

2. More attention could be given to specific skill training exercises on communication.

3. More emphasis could be placed on the selected topics through follow-up sessions on a weekly basis for a specified number of weeks.

4. A combination of an intense week-end program with a five-week marriage enrichment workshop is recommended in order to benefit from both methods.

5. Selected topics could be presented in an advanced marriage enrichment workshop. This advanced workshop would be a reunion which would function as a support group.

6. An additional recommendation would be to conduct the same workshop with large samples of Indian couples living in India.
7. Other means of measuring differences in marital communication and marital adjustment could be considered. At present, the Marital Communication Inventory (MCI) and the Marital Adjustment Test (MAT) are among the best inventories in the field in measuring marital communication and marital adjustment because of their reported reliability and validity. However, it would be interesting to devise other measuring instruments and correlate them with the present instruments in the field of marriage enrichment.

8. To date, a majority of research focuses on marital communication, which is certainly a vehicle for attaining marital adjustment and marital satisfaction. Identification of other skills which are highly correlated with good marital relationship is highly recommended.

9. It is recommended that other exercises devised by Hendrix (1988) could be utilized on Indian population in India to establish cultural adaptability of his valuable relationship skill exercises.

10. Finally, the Western concepts of egalitarian marriage could be introduced in some segmentation of Indian society.
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Appendix A

A five-week workshop on marriage enrichment
Workshop goals and objectives:

The primary goal of this workshop is to provide an educational experience for couples that will enable them to increase their communication and problem-solving skills, skills associated with effective marital functioning and the prevention of future marital distress.

The five main objectives for the program from the leader's perspective are:
(a) helping the couple realize that their love relationship has a hidden purpose- the healing of childhood wounds, (b) creating responsibility for communicating their needs and desires to their partners, (c) becoming more intentional in their interactions, (d) learning to value their partner's needs and wishes as highly as they value their own, and (e) accepting the difficulty of creating a good marriage (adapted from Hendrix, 1988).
The couples who participate in this workshop will learn safe and effective communication so that they:

1. share what needs to be shared
2. increase and maintain closeness
3. handle the conflict areas in their relationship effectively, and let not these areas handle them
4. learn structures (rules) to be tried to increase and maintain openness, safety, and positiveness of their relationships.

**Description of marriage enrichment workshop**

**First-week**

Required time: 3 hours

Topics: Introduction, setting ground rules, establishing goals both for individual and for group as a whole. This is followed by a lecture on communication and coupleness, becoming a better listener, and a concluding session.

(30 minutes). The marriage enrichment workshop will begin with a short prayer in Sanskrit. As couples enter the room they are asked to sit in circles (five couples in each circle) with couples they least know to make them feel comfortable in disclosure in the presence of those they do not know well. The leader will give an introduction about the pattern of the four-week workshop. The directions will include the following: the necessity of group confidentiality; punctuality; wearing comfortable and decent dressing and using decent language. The concept of marriage enrichment will be presented focusing on the positive impact of enrichment. It will be clearly explained that
marriage enrichment is a growth and psychoeducational model for marriage relationship; not a therapeutic or a counseling model.

(30 minutes). Introduction of husband/wife. The husband and wife will stand in close proximity with each other. The husband will introduce his wife with positive comments, and convey to the group what she is to him personally. This should not be used to launch an assault, or to utilize negative descriptors. The one being introduced is to receive it and is not supposed to judge or evaluate what is being said both verbally and non-verbally. Then the wife introduces her husband in the same manner. Each couple in the circle takes a turn in introducing their partners to the group following the same procedure.

(10 minutes). Break for restroom and drinks

(30 minutes). Sharing of expectations by each member as perceived by him/her. The expectations are accepted by the group without analysis or judgment. The expectations will represent “why I have come for this workshop,” “what I want to work on,” and “what I hope to receive.” Husband and wife are encouraged to individually state their expectations. Thus differences in expectations are honored. They are not allowed to get into a communication impasse at this time.

(30 minutes). Filling out the two inventories (MAT & MCI). The instructions that accompany the inventories will be as follows:

1. Please follow the instructions while responding to the inventories. Don’t ponder over the questions for a long time. Your first thoughts, and the
way you feel at the moment are very important in filling out the inventory. There are no right or wrong answers. So, feel free to answer as you think that would have been your way of feeling, thinking, and acting.

2. Do not discuss with your spouse while responding. You do not need their input, you need to respond only as it applies to you personally at the moment.

(50 minutes). The leader explains ways of improving listening skills, feedback skills, and empathic listening skills.

**Suggestion for improving listening skills**

a. Try to determine your listening objectives; try to concentrate on the information that is most useful to you.

b. Try not to be distracted by an emotion-arousing word or phrase; for some people cursing and obscenities reduce listening efficiency.

c. Adapt to the speaking situation; as much as possible control the communication environment.

d. Practice your listening skills; practice focusing on the talking-listening process.

e. Listen to the total person-- both the verbal and nonverbal channels.

f. Try to interpret the message according to the sender's code systems, not yours; the superior listener does a good job of empathizing with whom s/he is talking.

g. Try to identify a general pattern of meaning; the listener can look for thoughts and feelings which the sender emphasizes by repeating, exclaiming, showing increased feelings, and other cues.
h. Be aware of gender-based differences in approaches to listening; males are likely to look for a new structure or organized pattern to the attention style. Female attention style is characterized by more subjectivity, passivity, impressionism, empathy, and emotion.

Suggestions for improving feedback skills:

Feedback should be descriptive, rather than evaluative.
Feedback should be specific, rather than general.
Feedback should take into account the needs of both the receiver and the sender.
Feedback should be directed toward behavior that the receiver can do something about.
Feedback should be well-timed.
Feedback should be constructive.

Suggestions for developing empathic listening skills.

Listen for both feeling and content of the message.
Don’t just parrot everything back to a person in exact words.
Try to paraphrase the message of another to make sure you understand what s/he is saying.

(Adapted from Beebe and Masterson, 1986).

Homework: Keep a diary in which you record your observation about your own family listening skills. Note both strengths and weaknesses of your listening skills.

Second week

This is the first half of the second-week session, marking the beginning of intense didactic/experiential processing. From this point, the process of the marriage workshop experience will include a series of presentations followed
by the practical application (experiential technique) of the material in a "hands-on" approach.

Required time: 3 hours

Topics/activities: Role-play, Mirroring, relationship vision, and childhood wounds.

(40 minutes). The participants divide into small groups and role-play situations that illustrate both effective and ineffective methods of providing feedback to others.

Mirroring (40 minutes) The individual couples are asked to practice this exercise by communicating a simple, neutral statement, choosing one person as the sender and the other the receiver. The sender has to say a simple statement that begins with the word "I" and describe a thought or feeling. If the sentence appears too complex, the receiver can ask for simplification. Once a clear and simple sentence has been sent, the receiver paraphrases the message and asks for clarification. This process continues until the sender acknowledges that what was said and thought and felt had been accurately communicated. Then roles are switched and the couples are asked to practice this technique until they become familiar with the procedure.

A video tape on mirroring exercise by Hendrix (1988) will be used.

Relationship vision (40 minutes). Each participant is asked to write a series of short sentences that describe his/her personal vision of a deeply satisfying love relationship. Included are qualities that they already have that they want to keep and qualities they wish they had. Then they can share their
sentences with their partners. If their partners have written sentences that they agree with but had not thought of themselves they can add them to their lists. Now each can turn to his/her expanded list and rate each sentence with a number from 1 to 5 according to the importance to him/her. They are asked to circle the two items that are most important to them. Now they are asked to put a check beside those items that they think would be most difficult for the two of them to achieve. Now they are asked to work together to design a mutual relationship vision similar to the following example:

**Our Relationship Vision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ravi</th>
<th>Sathya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 We have fun together</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 We settle our differences peacefully</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 We communicate easily and openly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 We trust each other</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 We feel safe with each other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 We have similar political views</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10 minutes). Break for restroom and drinks.

**Childhood wounds** (50 minutes). The couples are asked to do some stretching exercises to help them relax. When they are feeling peaceful, they are given the following instructions: “close your eyes and imagine your childhood homes. Try to see the rooms from the perspective of a small child. Now wander around the house and find the people who influenced you most deeply as a child. Note their positive and negative traits. Tell them what you enjoyed being with them. Tell them what you did not like about being with them. Finally tell them what you wanted from them but never got. Do not
hesitate to share your angry, hurt, or sad feelings. In your fantasy, your care
takers will be grateful for your insights.”

Homework: List the things that you wish your partner would
give you. List your feelings when your needs are
not met. State the ways you would respond when
your needs are not met.

Third week

Required time: 3 hours

Topics/activities: Imago workup, Childhood frustrations, Partner profile,

Imago workup (60 minutes). The participants are given papers and
pencils and are asked to draw a large circle, leaving about three inches below
the circle. They are asked to divide the circle in half with a horizontal line,
and put a capital “B” above the line on the left side of the circle, and a capital
letter “A” below the line on the left side of the circle.
They are asked to list on the top of the top half the positive characteristics of their mother, father, and any other people who influenced them strongly when they were young, and the negative traits of these key people on the bottom half next to the “A”. The positive and negative traits that affected them most were circled. Below the circle the participants are asked to write down a capital letter “C” and complete this sentence: What I wanted most as a child and did not get was. . . Then they are asked to write down a capital letter “D” and complete this sentence: As a child, I had these negative feelings over and over again: . .”

Childhood frustrations (60 minutes). The participants are given the following directions:

1. On a sheet of paper list the frustrations you had as a child.

2. Next to the frustrations, briefly describe the way you reacted to the situations. Put the capital letter “E” above your reactions.

(10 minutes). Break for restroom and drinks.

Partner profile (50 minutes). The participants are asked to draw a circle on a piece of paper provided by the leader. They are asked to divide the circle in half with a horizontal line, and put the capital letter “F” above the line on the left side of the circle, and put the capital letter “G” below the line on the left side of the circle
Now they are asked to list on the top half of the circle (beside the “F”) their partners’ positive traits, and list beside “G” on the lower half of the circle their partners’ negative traits. Then they are asked to circle the positive and negative traits that seem to affect them most. They can now compare their imago traits with their partners’ traits, and star the traits that are similar. On the bottom of the page they are asked to write the letter “H” and complete this sentence: “What I enjoy most about my partner is . . .” Then they can write the letter “I” and complete the sentence: What I want from my partner and do not get is . . .”

Fourth-week

Required time: 3 hours

Topic: Conflict resolution- sources of conflict, areas of potential conflict, teaching an effective process of resolving conflict through role-play and a short lesson on how to deal with anger romanticising exercise and silent forgiveness exercise

Conflict resolution (30 minutes).

I. The leader teaches basic lessons on conflict resolution
II. The members are asked to make an anger log

Date                Anger Level: Irritation  1  2  3  4  5  out of control

What was the situation?

What did you do?

What were your emotions?

Evaluate how you handled the situation

III. A volunteer couple is asked to come forward to role-play a particular conflict situation. Each couple is asked to solve the problem using skills taught.

(10 minutes). Break for restroom and drinks

(30 minutes). Silent forgiveness exercise. The couples are instructed to get in touch with an area they could forgive their spouses. They are told that there is no way for them to be fair in a relationship if they are holding unforgiveness toward each other. If it is too emotionally painful for them to forgive a big offense, they are asked to go down to the list to a level they could forgive. It could be on a scale of 1-10 (moving up the scale as far as one can forgive).

Reromanticizing (60 minutes).

The participants are given the following directions:

1. Identify what your partner is already doing that pleases you. Get out separate sheets of paper and complete this sentence in as many ways as
possible, being specific and positive and focusing on items that happen with
some regularity:

I feel loved and cared about when you . . .

2. Now recall the romantic stage of your relationship. Are there any caring
behaviors that you used to do for each other that you are no longer doing?
Once again, take out separate sheets of paper and complete this sentence: I
used to feel loved and cared about when you . . .

3. Now think about some caring and loving behaviors that you have always
wanted but never asked for, and complete this sentence: I would like you to..

4. Now combine all three lists and indicate how important each caring
behavior is to you by writing a number from 1 to 5 beside each one. 1
indicates “very important” and 5 indicates “not so important.”

5. Exchange lists. Examine your partner’s lists and put an “X” by any items
that you are not willing to do at this time. All the remaining behaviors should
be conflict free. Starting from tomorrow, do at least two of the nonconflicted
behaviors each day for the next two months, starting the ones that are easier
for you to do. When your partner does a caring behavior for you,
acknowledge it with an appreciative comment.

6. If either partner experiences some resistance with this exercise, keep on
doing the caring behaviors until the resistance is overcome.

A video on reromanticizing by Hendrix (1988) is shown (50 minutes).
Homework:  
Surprise list: Make a list of things that you could do for your partner that would be especially pleasing. Keep your list hidden from your partner at all times. Select one item and surprise your partner with it this week.
Fun list: Make a list of fun and exciting activities that you would like to do with your partner. Choose one activity from the list and do it each week.

Fifth-Week

Required time:  3 hours

Topic:  Seeing-the-good exercise, video show on getting the love you want, and filling out the posttest forms (MAT and MCI).

Seeing the good exercise (60 minutes).

Exercise 1. The group members are allowed to offer his/her own meaning for “seeing the good.” The members are encouraged to discuss the similarities and differences among each other's proposed meanings.

Exercise 2. Sensing the interference

It will be made certain that everyone feels it difficult in seeing good in others.

Exercise 3. Practicing good

The wife is asked to look at her husband right in the face and tell him about a good trait/quality he possesses and the husband is asked to do the same with his wife.
Exercise 4. Both sides of a coin

First the wife is asked to tell about a situation that has both good and bad aspects, then the husband is asked to tell the same about his wife.

A video tape on getting the love you want by Handrix (1988) is shown (60 minutes).

(30 minutes). Filling out the posttest forms (MAT and MCI).

(30 minutes). Concluding remarks by the investigator.
## Appendix B

### Marital Communication Inventory (MCI)

Female/Male Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you and your husband/wife discuss the manner in which the family income should be spent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does s/he discuss his/her work and interests with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have a tendency to keep your feelings to yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is your husband’s/wife’s tone of voice irritating?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does s/he have a tendency to say things which would be better left unsaid?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are your mealtime conversations easy and pleasant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you find yourself keeping after him/her about his/her faults?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does s/he seem to understand your feelings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does your husband/wife nag you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Does s/he listen to what you have to say? ____________________________

11. Does it upset you to a great extent when your husband/wife is angry with you? ____________________________

12. Does s/he pay you compliments and say nice things to you? ____________________________

13. Is it hard to understand your husband’s/wife’s feelings and attitudes? ____________________________

14. Is s/he affectionate toward you? ____________________________

15. Does s/he let you finish talking before responding to what you are saying? ____________________________

16. Do you and your husband/wife remain silent for long periods when you are angry with one another? ____________________________

17. Does s/he allow you to pursue your own interests and activities even if they are different from his? ____________________________

18. Does s/he try to lift your spirits when you are depressed or discouraged? ____________________________

19. Do you avoid expressing disagreement with him/her because you are afraid s/he will get angry? ____________________________
20. Does your husband/wife complain that you don’t understand him/her/?

21. Do you let your husband/wife know when you are displeased with him/her?

22. Do you feel s/he says one thing but really means another?

23. Do you help him/her understand by saying how you think, feel, and believe?

24. Are you and your husband/wife able to disagree with one another without losing your temper?

25. Do the two of you argue a lot over money?

26. When a problem arises between you and your husband/wife are you able to discuss it without losing control of your emotions?

27. Do you find it difficult to express your true feelings to him/her?

28. Does s/he offer you cooperation, encouragement, and emotional support in your role (duties) as a wife/husband?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your husband/wife insult you when angry with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your husband/wife engage in outside interests and activities together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your husband/wife accuse you of not listening to what s/he says?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does s/he let you know that you are important to him?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it easier to confide in others rather than in your husband/wife?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does s/he confide in others rather than in you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that in most matters your husband/wife knows what you are trying to say?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does s/he monopolize the conversation very much?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your husband/wife talk about things which are of interest to both of you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your husband/wife sulk or pout very much?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you discuss sexual matters with him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your husband/wife discuss your personal problems with each other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Can your husband/wife tell what kind of day you have had without asking?

42. Do you admit that you are wrong when you know that you are wrong about something?

43. Do you and your husband/wife talk over pleasant things that happen during the day?

44. Do you hesitate to discuss certain things with your husband/wife because you are afraid s/he might hurt your feelings?

45. Do you pretend you are listening to him/her when actually you are not listening?

46. Do the two of you ever sit down just to talk things over?
Appendix C

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

1. Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your marriage. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in marriage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unhappy</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Perfectly Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please check each column.

AA= Always Agree, AAA= Almost Always Agree, OD= Occasionally Disagree, FD=Frequently Disagree, AAD= Almost Always Disagree, AD=Always Disagree

2. Handling family finances

3. Matters of recreation

4. Demonstrations of affection

5. Friends

6. Sex relations

7. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct)
8. Philosophy of life

9. Ways of dealing
with in-laws

10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in: Husband giving
in 0, wife giving in 2, agreement by give and
take 10.

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of
them 10, some of them 8, very few of them 3,
none of them 0.

12. In leisure time do you generally prefer: "to be on the go" ______, to
stay at home______? Does your mate generally prefer: to be "on the
go" ______, to stay at home______? (Stay at home for both, 10 points;
"on the go" for both, 3 points; disagreement, 2 points)

13. Do you ever wish you had not married?
Frequently 0, occasionally 3, rarely 8, never 15.

14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the
same person 15, marry a different person 0, not marry at all 1?

15. Do you confide in your mate: almost never 0, rarely 2, in most things 10, in everything 10?

Locke, H., & Wallace, K. (1959). Short marital adjustment and prediction tests:
Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 251-257.
Appendix D

Letter to the Experimental Group

Dear Friends:

I am a doctoral student in counseling at Oregon State University. I am involved in a dissertation research in the field of marriage enrichment, and I would like to solicit your voluntary participation in the marriage enrichment workshop. The purpose of this letter is to provide you information about the upcoming marriage enrichment workshop at Hindu Temple, Louisville, Kentucky, in November, 1996. The objective of the project is to determine the extent to which marriage enrichment enhances the communication pattern, and marital adjustment in a marital relationship. My research question is “as a result of participation in a marriage enrichment workshop will the Indian married couples learn to communicate more effectively?” Your responses will assist me in answering this question.

The five session workshop will be conducted from 5:00 p.m to 8:00 p.m. on five consecutive Saturdays. There will be no remuneration or compensation for your participation in the workshop. The format for the workshop will include exercises designed by Hendrix, (1988) to improve communication skills and practice new relationship skills. The emphasis of the workshop will be on creating a more loving and supportive marriage relationship.
Indian married couples will be participating in this study at different times. I request you not to discuss your experiences in the marriage enrichment workshop with the other Indian couples who are going to participate in the workshop at a later date since it could influence the findings of the study.

There will be a pre-screening interview to determine whether the group is right for you. This is also the time for you to get to know me and develop a feeling of confidence. During this interview feel free to ask any question that will help you determine whether you want to join this group. My decision will be final in determining whether you are to be included or excluded from the group.

The Marital Adjustment Test and Marital Communication Inventory (pre-test) will be administered to you on the first day of the workshop. Your voluntary response to these two inventories will add to the validity of this research. It requires approximately 15 to 20 minutes on your part, but your responses are vital for research of this kind.

Your anonymity will be maintained in this study. You will be identified only by zip code and the last four digits of your social security number. Your name will not appear on the inventories. Your identifying code will be used to match the results of the pre-test inventories with the post-test inventories, which you will be asked to fill out on the last day of the workshop. All information will remain confidential. After results have been matched, the numbers will be obliterated.
Five weeks following your completion of the workshop you will be asked to again complete the MCI and MAT.

The results of this research will provide valuable information to the counseling profession. Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Thanking you

Sincerely yours

O. Vijayalakshmi
Appendix E

Letter to the Control Group

Dear Friends,

I am a doctoral student in counseling at Oregon State University. I am involved in a dissertation research in the field of marriage enrichment, and I would like to solicit your voluntary participation in the marriage enrichment workshop. The purpose of this letter is to provide you information about the upcoming marriage enrichment workshop at Hindu Temple, Louisville, Kentucky, in November, 1996. The objective of the project is to determine the extent to which marriage enrichment enhances the communication pattern, and marital adjustment in a marital relationship. My research question is “as a result of participation in a marriage enrichment workshop will the Indian married couples learn to communicate more effectively?” Your responses will assist me in answering this question.

The five session workshop will be conducted from 5:00 p.m to 8:00 p.m. within a ten week period from November, 1996. Two groups of subjects will be asked to participate in this study. One group will have their workshop scheduled on five consecutive Saturdays from November 30, 1996. The other group will be conducted in a more intensive time period in February, 1997. I request you not to inquire about the experiences of the Indian couples in the other group since it could influence the findings of the study.
There will be no remuneration or compensation for your participation in the workshop. The format for the workshop will include exercises designed by Hendrix, (1988) to improve communication skills and practice new relationship skills. The emphasis of the workshop will be on creating a more loving and supportive marriage relationship.

There will be a pre-screening interview to determine whether the group is right for you. This is also the time for you to get to know me and develop a feeling of confidence. During this interview feel free to ask any question that will help you determine whether you want to join this group. My decision will be final in determining whether you are to be included or excluded from the group.

Your anonymity will be maintained in this study. You will be identified only by zip code and the last four digits of your social security number. Your name will not appear on the inventories. Your identifying code will be used to match the results of the pre-test inventories with the post-test inventories, which you will be asked to fill out on the last day of the workshop. All information will remain confidential. After results have been matched, the numbers will be obliterated.

The Marital Adjustment Test and Marital Communication Inventory (pre-test) will be mailed to you to fill them out on the first day of the workshop. Your voluntary response to these two inventories will add to the validity of this research. It requires approximately 15 to 20 minutes on your part, but your responses are vital for research of this kind.
Another set of inventories (MCI and MAT) will be mailed to you asking you to fill them out on the last day of the workshop. Five weeks after filling out the post-tests you will be asked to participate in the workshop and complete the follow-up test batteries (MCI and MAT) in the first session of the workshop.

The instructions that accompany the inventories will be as follows:

1. Please fill out the inventories on the first day of the workshop, which will be the last Saturday of November, 1996.

2. Please follow the instructions while responding to the inventories. Don’t ponder over the questions for a long time. Your first thoughts, and the way you feel at the moment are very important in filling out the inventory. There are no right or wrong answers. So, feel free to answer as you think that would have been your way of feeling, thinking, and acting.

3. Do not discuss with your spouse while responding. You do not need their input, you need to respond only as it applies to you personally at the moment.

4. Your zip code and the last four digits of your social security number will be the only identifying marks. This is used so that you will not be personally identified. Your name will not appear on the inventories. I need this identification to match the results of the first inventories with those of the second set of inventories which you will be asked to fill out in the last day of the workshop. This information remains confidential. After results have been matched, the numbers will be obliterated.
The results of this research will provide valuable information to the counseling profession. Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Thanking you

Sincerely yours

O. Vijayalakshmi
Appendix F

Informed Consent Document

Research project: Enriching marital communication and marital adjustment of couples from India living in the United States

Investigators: Olaganatha P. Vijayalakshmi, doctoral student in Counselor Education, Department of Education, OSU. Dr. Brooke Collison, Professor, Counselor Education, Department of Education, OSU.

Purpose of the research project:
The purpose of the research is to determine if the marriage enrichment program enhances the communication patterns in a marital relationship. Do married Indian couples learn to communicate, negotiate, and solve their problems more effectively as a result of participating in a marriage enrichment group?

Procedures: I have received an oral and written explanation of this study and I understand as a participant in this study that the following things will happen:
(a) My participation in this research is voluntary and no compensation or remuneration is offered
(b) I will be asked to respond to a pre, post and delayed post inventory to accumulate communication data.
(c) My participation in the workshop will include five sessions within a ten week period.
(d) The program will be conducted in the Hindu Temple, Louisville.
(e) I will not be identified by name in any thesis, publication or presentation prepared by the researcher.
(f) All research records will be kept in a private locked location, with only the investigators allowed access to the information.
(g) I have a right to discontinue participation at any time, with no obligation.
(h) A summary of the data for the group scores is available to me and may be obtained through contacting the investigators.
(i) I am aware that additional help will be offered to me by the investigator if there is any problem due to my participation in the program.

(j) I have been informed that the investigator is being supervised by Dr. Daya Singh Sandhu, Ed.D. NCC, NCSC, NCCC, a licensed therapist with the Charter Louisville Behavioral Health System, Louisville, KY.

(k) I have been informed that there are specific exceptions to the general norm of confidentiality. I understand that it is required of the leader to report group member's threats to harm themselves or others and this requirement also covers cases of child abuse or neglect, incest, or child molestation.

(l) I have been informed that if as a result of the marriage enrichment activities that are a part of this project, it becomes necessary for me to consult with a counselor, I will be referred to Dr. Daya Singh Sandhu or my own physician and I will assume responsibility for costs involved in such treatment. I also understand that the Oregon State University does not provide a research subject with compensation or medical treatment.

My signature below indicates that I have read and understood the procedures described above and give my informed and voluntary consent to participate in this study. I understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

Name of subject ___________________________ Signature of subject ___________________________

Subject's phone number ___________________________ Date signed ___________________________

Subject's Present Address ___________________________

Name of researcher ___________________________ Signature of researcher ___________________________

Researcher's phone number ___________________________ Date signed ___________________________

Questions about this research should be directed to Dr. Brooke Collison, Professor, Counselor Education, Department of Education, Oregon State University, (541) 737-5968 or O. Vijayalakshmi, research investigator, (541) 753-7224. Any other questions should be directed to Mary Nunn, OSU Research Office, (541)737-0670.
Appendix G

Five-Week Follow-Up Letter to Experimental Group

Dear Friends,

Enclosed you will find Marital Adjustment Scale and the Marital Communication Inventory I told you I would be sending five weeks after your participation in the marriage enrichment workshop at the Hindu Temple, at Louisville, Kentucky in November, 1996. I appreciate your attendance at the workshop and am extremely thankful to you for your willingness to voluntarily participate in this research. These inventories complete the process, and it is vital that you take the time to respond to the final administration of these forms, because the first two administrations will be otherwise meaningless. Please spare some of your valuable time in responding to the inventories and return them to me immediately in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

The objective of this follow-up administration is to help determine the long-term effects of the marriage enrichment experience. Your response will add greatly to the validity of the present research and will help answer the research question related to long-term effects.

The following instructions apply for responding to the enclosed inventories:

1. Please follow the instructions while responding to the inventories. Don’t ponder over the questions for a long time. Your first thoughts, and the way you feel at the moment are very important in filling out the inventory.
There is no right or wrong answers. So, feel free to answer as you think that would have been your way of feeling, thinking, and acting.

3. Do not discuss with your spouse while responding. You do not need their input, you need to respond only as it applies to you personally at the moment.

4. Your zip code and the last four digits of your social security number will be the only identifying marks. This method is used so that you will not be personally identified. Your name will not appear on the inventories. After these inventories are matched with the first two, the numbers will be obliterated.

Please fill out the inventories as soon as you receive them or shortly thereafter. It is extremely important that everyone who filled out the inventories five weeks ago do so now. Otherwise, the research will not be complete.

Thank you once again for your enthusiasm in participating in this research. Best wishes for a long rewarding marriage relationship.

Sincerely yours

O. Vijayalakshmi
Dear friends,

Five weeks ago I informed you that I will be announcing the workshop particulars. Now the time has come and I have arranged a workshop for 5 to 6 hours on the first Saturday of February, 1997. Your participation is highly appreciated. In the workshop you need to fill out the follow-up tests (MCI & MAT).

The objective of this follow-up administration is to help determine the long-term effects of the marriage enrichment experience. Your response will add greatly to the validity of the present research and will help answer the research question related to long-term effects.

The following instructions apply for responding to the inventories:

1. Don’t ponder over the questions for a long time. Your first thoughts, and the way you feel at the moment are very important in filling out the inventory. There is no right or wrong answers. So, feel free to answer as you think that would have been your way of feeling, thinking, and acting.

3. Do not discuss with your spouse while responding. You do not need their input, you need to respond only as it applies to you personally at the moment.
4. Your zip code and the last four digits of your social security number will be the only identifying marks. This method is used so that you will not be personally identified. Your name will not appear on the inventories. After these inventories are matched with the first two, the numbers will be obliterated.

It is extremely important that everyone who filled out the inventories five weeks ago do so now. Otherwise, the research will not be complete.

Thank you once again for your enthusiasm in participating in this workshop and research.

Sincerely yours

O. Vijayalakshmi
### Appendix I

**Treatment Calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30-Nov</td>
<td>7-Dec</td>
<td>14-Dec</td>
<td>21-Dec</td>
<td>28-Dec</td>
<td>4-Jan</td>
<td>11-Jan</td>
<td>18-Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Treatment 1</td>
<td>Treatment 2</td>
<td>Treatment 3</td>
<td>Treatment 4</td>
<td>PostTest</td>
<td>Treatment 5</td>
<td>PostTest</td>
<td>FollowUp</td>
<td>FollowUp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>