

Prevention Work: A Professional Responsibility for Marriage and Family Counselors

By: [Christine E. Murray](#)

Murray, C. E. (2005). Prevention work: A professional responsibility for marriage and family counselors. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 13(1), 27-34.

Made available courtesy of Sage Publications: <http://www.sagepub.com/>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Sage Publications. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Abstract:

Although ethical codes encourage marriage and family counselors to undertake prevention work, many practitioners do not include prevention within the scope of their practice. Prevention work includes a number of professional functions that address multiple family issues. Within a developmental framework, marriage and family counselors can bring a unique set of skills and experience to preventive work, and a family systems theoretical orientation helps to inform the practice of preventive efforts designed to enhance familial relationships. Marriage and family counselors can be involved in the practice, theory development, and research of prevention work. Effective prevention work by marriage and family counselors incorporates a consideration of barriers to effective prevention work, professional collaboration, and ethical considerations.

Keywords: prevention; professional identity; marriage development; family development

Article:

The Code of Ethics of the International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (2002) states that marriage and family counselors (MFCs) “should pursue the development of clients’ cognitive, moral, social, emotional, spiritual, physical, educational, and career needs, as well as parenting, marriage and family living skills, in order to prevent future problems” (Section I, Standard L). Although counselors strive to promote the welfare of their clients, many MFCs do not consider prevention work to be a part of their practice (Kiselica, 2001). The emerging field of family distress prevention presents many possibilities for MFCs to expand their realms of practice and further support family growth. In addition, preventive approaches offer opportunities for MFCs to promote mental health across diverse populations. Through the incorporation of preventive work into their scope of practice, marriage and family counseling professionals can help individuals, couples, and families to develop positive skills and competencies that will enhance future development. The purpose of this article is (a) to explore the need for MFCs to undertake developmental prevention work, (b) to describe the unique contributions of MFCs to the field of family-focused prevention, and (c) to outline practical considerations for MFCs who are interested in prevention work.

In this article, the term *marriage and family counselor* refers to practitioners who represent diverse professional backgrounds. This definition includes, but is not limited to, professionals who identify themselves as counselors, counselor educators, marriage and family therapists, social workers, and psychologists. Each of these professional groups holds diverse, albeit related, opinions on helping families and makes a unique contribution to the practice of marriage and family counseling. All practitioners who counsel couples and families in their professional roles may expand the scope of their professional practices through prevention work.

THE NEED FOR MARRIAGE AND FAMILY COUNSELORS TO UNDERTAKE PREVENTION

Fraenkel, Markman, and Stanley (1997) described prevention efforts aimed at enhancing family relationships as “the wave of the future” (p. 257). Albee (1995) advocated for mental health professionals to engage in prevention work to promote widespread, positive societal changes in mental health. Indeed, psychotherapy and individual counseling have limits to the degree to which they can reduce mental health and relationship

disorders in the general population, as these interventions are aimed at small numbers of individuals or groups of individuals. Although counseling can certainly assist clients in making positive changes, the degree to which counseling alone can produce large-scale improvements in societal mental health is limited by the number of available mental health professionals in any given population (Albee, 1990, 1999). Therefore, prevention programs aimed at reducing mental health disorders and relationship distress represent an advance in the scope of mental health intervention.

Many MFCs do not work in preventive capacities (Stahmann, 2000). Despite the increased need for prevention, the science and practice of prevention as it relates to families and relationships remains underdeveloped (Sayers, Kohn, & Heavey, 1998). Many MFCs function primarily in a crisis intervention capacity (Tiesel & Olsen, 1992), and a vast majority (94.1%) treat clients whose problems they describe as catastrophic, extremely severe, severe, or moderately severe (Doherty & Simmons, 1996). Counselors often view prevention work as the duty of other professionals, such as clergy, nonprofit agencies, and family life educators (Bredehoft, 2001). Indeed, Stahmann (2000) argued that many mental health professionals are uncomfortable with the shift from psychotherapist to prevention worker, as their training and experience typically embrace an emphasis on reducing dysfunction rather than promoting health. However, shifting the focus from dysfunction to health in prevention work may provide an opportunity for MFCs to enhance the effectiveness and range of their practice.

Premarital counseling is a widely implemented prevention activity that is aimed at enhancing marital relationships (Sayers et al., 1998). The author recently conducted a research study involving a survey of a representative sample of premarital counseling providers in the state of Florida (Murray, 2004). In Florida, couples who attend premarital counseling with a provider who is registered in the county in which they will marry are eligible to receive a discount on their marriage license fee and a waiver of the waiting period to receive their license. An approved premarital counseling program must address the following four topics: communication skills, conflict resolution skills, finances, and parenting. These incentives were established as part of the Florida Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act (Florida Statutes, 1998, Section 741.0305), which was implemented in an effort to prevent marital distress and reduce the state's divorce rate. The Florida law states that the following groups of people are eligible to become registered premarital counseling providers: licensed psychologists, licensed clinical social workers, licensed marriage and family therapists, licensed mental health counselors, representatives from religious institutions, and any other providers who gain approval from the judicial system. Based on the findings of the author's investigation, only 3.4% of premarital counseling providers in Florida identify their primary professional affiliation as a marriage and family therapist. In sharp contrast, 81.5% of respondents identified their professional affiliation as clergy. These findings provide evidence that MFCs may be significantly less likely to engage in premarital counseling than other professional groups.

Preventive efforts assume that family and marital problems arise through a developmental process over time (Hoopes, Fisher, & Barlow, 1984). For example, researchers have examined several trends in the development of marital distress. The development of marital distress and breakup is a complex process that is influenced by a number of factors, and early relationship characteristics influence subsequent marital outcomes (Holman et al., 2001). As Stahmann and Hiebert (1980) stated, "Marriage begins before the wedding" (p. 29). Also, Stanley (1995) asserted that divorce might be related to premarital factors, such as sociodemographic characteristics, communication skills, conflict resolution skills, and family-of-origin factors. Most researchers agree that there is a complex interaction of factors that contributes to the development of marital distress (Holman et al., 2001). Existing evidence about the development of relationship distress confirms the importance of early preventive intervention in family relationships.

In addition, existing research suggests that it is possible to predict the likelihood that a relationship will endure. Researchers can predict divorce in premarital couples with an accuracy rate of between 77% and 90% (Olson, 1990). For example, Lindahl, Clements, and Markman (1998) developed a predictive model that factors in measures of premarital communication, problem ratings, satisfaction, and demographic characteristics; this model predicts 90% of divorces in the first 9 years of marriage. Because one half of all divorces occur in the

first 7 years of marriage (Gottman, 1998), early intervention can maximize the likelihood that couples will build enduring, satisfying relationships. Although it is not possible to identify with complete accuracy those marriages that will likely end in divorce, these predictive models can serve as a foundation for identifying risk factors that can become focal points in targeted preventive interventions.

Prevention work aims to intervene early in the relationship developmental process to improve client outcomes. In contrast, therapy and counseling interventions typically occur once problems have been well established. Perhaps due to the severity of problems that MFCs often treat, research on the effectiveness of couples and family therapy produces mixed support for its effectiveness (Fraenkel et al., 1997). Marital therapy typically results in more improvements in relationships compared to no-treatment controls, and a small amount of research indicates that marital therapy is effective at reducing divorce (Bray & Jouriles, 1995). Similarly, family therapy clients tend to experience positive outcomes (Shadish et al., 1993). However, some models of family therapy have no empirical research to demonstrate their effectiveness (Sandberg et al., 1997), clinical significance of outcome research findings varies, and minimal research supports the long-term effectiveness of marital and family counseling (Bray & Jouriles, 1995). These findings suggest that interventions that occur late in the development of relationship and family distress may have a limited ability to produce significant, enduring improvements in the functioning of families and relationships. Certain types of clients undoubtedly benefit from marriage and family counseling. Preventive work, through its emphasis on early intervention, can enhance the scope of practice and professional effectiveness of MFCs.

Definition of Prevention in Relation to Marriage and Family Counseling

Prevention work includes programs that strive to enhance strengths and minimize or manage weaknesses of clients (Sayers et al., 1998). Prevention work includes such efforts as premarital counseling, relationship enrichment programs, and educational programs aimed at various aspects of family life (Stahmann & Salts, 1993). For example, programs may address issues related to the marital relationship, parenting, the extended family, or family/community involvement. Programs are offered through individual, couple, family, group, and community-wide initiatives (Stahmann, 2000). Preventive initiatives may also focus on issues of social and political change (Albee, 1986). Prevention programs assume a number of formats (Silliman & Schumm, 1999) and focus on such issues as communication, sexuality, conflict management, substance abuse, and family violence. The flexibility of this type of work allows MFCs to focus their preventive efforts to their area of interest.

Prevention efforts that target families focus on improving the quality and stability of family relationships (Stahmann & Salts, 1993). For example, in terms of marital and other intimate relationships, quality generally refers to partners' levels of satisfaction within the relationship, and stability generally refers to whether the relationship endures or terminates. In general, lower levels of marital satisfaction are associated with greater marital distress (Sullivan & Bradbury, 1997). Although marital satisfaction is related inversely to relationship distress, this distress does not necessarily produce divorce. Although levels of marital satisfaction are not the sole contributing factor to divorce, higher levels of marital happiness are generally associated with lower levels of divorce (White & Booth, 1991). Prevention efforts do not attempt to eliminate completely all forms of distress from relationships and families, as some degree of distress is inevitable in all relationships (Fraenkel et al., 1997). Also, all families move through periods of positive and negative interactions (Kurdek, 1998; Lindah et al., 1998). Consequently, the goals of prevention programs include identifying and reducing precursors to distress, minimizing the harmful consequences of distress, and preventing distress from increasing to unmanageable levels.

Corresponding to these goals, there are three major categories of prevention: universal, selective, and indicated (Gordon, 1987; National Institute of Mental Health, 1998; Tebes, Kaufman, & Chinman, 2002). Universal prevention focuses on preventing the development of problems in the general population. An example of universal prevention is a media campaign that promotes families spending time together. Selective prevention aims to intervene with targeted higher-risk groups to prevent problems. An example of selective prevention is parenting classes for parents whose children have demonstrated behavior problems in school. Indicated

prevention focuses on minimizing the harmful impact of serious problems in the early stages of their development. Many MFCs already function unofficially in indicated prevention roles, although clearly remedial in focus. Counseling clients with moderate to severe problems is similar to indicated prevention. As such, MFCs help clients to prevent existing problems from further deterioration. For example, a counselor helps a couple whose marriage is ending in divorce minimize the harmful consequences for their children. MFCs' efforts often strive to enhance their clients' strengths to prevent relapses. In addition, training clients in skills (e.g., communication skills, conflict management skills, and stress management techniques) is a form of prevention. Within this framework, prevention activities vary across the level of intervention. MFCs can employ preventive strategies appropriate to the level of intended prevention for a particular issue. Increased attention to universal and selective prevention efforts presents the most significant opportunities for MFCs to expand their practices. Thus, the various levels of prevention work can occur at appropriate stages of the development of relationship and/or family distress.

MARRIAGE AND FAMILY COUNSELORS' ROLE IN PREVENTION

Although prevention efforts are undertaken already by a number of other professionals, MFCs can make a unique contribution to prevention work with couples and families based on their theoretical framework and professional experience. Many MFCs operate using a family systems theory framework (Becvar & Becvar, 2000; Nichols & Schwartz, 1998), and this framework readily applies to prevention work with families. In family systems theory, the health of the family system influences the health of the individuals within that system and vice versa. Family systems theory also operates on the premise of circular causality, the notion that individual and relationship problems arise through relational processes (Becvar & Becvar, 2000). This premise verifies the importance of preventive interventions aimed at enhancing the family environment and relationship health. Family systems theory and family-focused prevention work are consistent with one another through their underlying theoretical assumptions. The family systems theoretical orientation of MFCs provides a unique framework through which MFCs can approach developmental prevention work. The systemic framework allows MFCs to understand the contextual, developmental influences on family dynamics (i.e., social problems, career, extended family, etc.; Becvar & Becvar, 2000). This perspective is particularly relevant for prevention work as it provides a more thorough understanding of the contextual factors that may influence the effectiveness of prevention programs. MFCs also understand the dynamics of working with families together, which allows for efficient delivery of programs that intervene with the family as a unit.

In addition to the theoretical framework from which MFCs practice, the training and experience of MFCs include knowledge and skills that readily translate to prevention work. Basic counseling skills are invaluable to prevention work. Also, MFCs demonstrate knowledge related to family dynamics, relationship functioning, and social and contextual issues that influence family life. This knowledge base allows MFCs to incorporate relevant topics into prevention programs.

Based on their theoretical framework, training, experience, and skills, MFCs can provide a unique perspective to developmental family life prevention. Because MFCs often work with clients who experience rather severe problems (Doherty & Simmons, 1996), counselors have an extensive understanding of the development of relationship problems. MFCs have witnessed firsthand the harmful consequences of certain maladaptive relationship behaviors and attitudes, and therefore they can verify the importance of positive family interactions. In addition, MFCs develop extensive experience in identifying minor problems that have severe consequences. In identifying these points of possible early preventive intervention, seemingly minor changes can have immeasurable positive consequences for families (O'Connell, 1998). Therefore, MFCs possess a wealth of knowledge and experience related to the development and prevention of relationship and family distress.

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Prevention work offers an opportunity for MFCs to expand their practice within the mental health field. Prior to engaging in preventive work, MFCs should also consider the following issues: (a) barriers to effective prevention work, (b) the role of collaboration with other professionals, (c) ethical considerations related to prevention work, and (d) opportunities in the practice, theory, and research of prevention.

Barriers to Effective Prevention Work

Although opportunities exist for MFCs to become involved in prevention work, practitioners should be prepared for numerous potential barriers to effective prevention work, including (a) a lack of adequate training in prevention modalities, (b) economic barriers, and (c) cultural and family attitudes that do not support preventive initiatives.

Lack of Adequate Training in Prevention Modalities

Many counseling professionals are not prepared to become involved in prevention work through their professional training. Generally, although prevention is a core value of the counseling profession, training programs have not focused on prevention work (Kleist & White, 1997). Although many educators of MFCs support the value of prevention, the lack of emphasis on training practitioners to function in preventive capacities has contributed to a discrepancy between the values and practice of the profession (Kiselica, 2001; Kiselica & Look, 1993; Kleist, 1996; Kleist & White, 1997). In order for MFCs to obtain adequate training in prevention work, graduate and postgraduate training programs may include didactic and experiential opportunities for their students to learn about general principles of prevention work as well as to receive training in specific prevention programs. In addition, a number of existing prevention programs offer training workshops for professionals who are interested in incorporating specific programs into their practice. For example, the developers of one widely researched program, the Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP; Markman, Floyd, Stanley, & Lewis, 1986), offer a number of training opportunities (see <http://www.prepinc.com>). A listing of numerous other relationship distress prevention program training opportunities can be found at the Smart Marriages Web site (see <http://www.smartmarriages.com>).

Economic Barriers

Despite some recent advances, a general lack of funding exists for family-related prevention programs (Fraenkel et al., 1997). Both private organizations and government agencies seem hesitant to fund prevention programs that are not backed by empirical research. Although a number of existing programs have been subject to empirical scientific inquiry (e.g., the PREP program; Renick & Blumberg, 1992), more methodologically sound research is needed to demonstrate the effectiveness of prevention programs to funding agencies. Despite the lack of funding, prevention work tends to be time- and cost-effective (Fincham & Bradbury, 1990). From an economic standpoint, preventive efforts may reduce the costs of treating couples in the long term (Fincham & Bradbury, 1990). Thus, MFCs should advocate for funding sources to support prevention work. This advocacy should include efforts aimed at informing representatives of managed care organizations of the benefits of including prevention programs into the continuum of care for which they provide reimbursement.

Prevention programs are typically less expensive than therapy, particularly when they occur in group settings (Hoopes et al., 1984), which may render prevention programs more affordable for clients to pay providers directly without the involvement of managed care. One course of treatment in couples therapy is estimated to cost approximately \$600 to \$1,000 on average per couple (based on approximately 10 sessions per course of treatment), and more than one course of therapy is often necessary to produce a satisfying, durable marriage (Bray & Jouriles, 1995). In contrast, consider a 10-session prevention program that involves 10 couples, with each couple paying \$100 for the entire program. The provider earns the same amount of money in the same amount of time, costing each couple less money overall and reaching a larger number of clients at once.

Cultural and Family Attitudes That Do Not Support Preventive Initiatives

Finally, cultural and family attitudes may prevent families from participating in prevention programs. Prevailing cultural attitudes devalue the importance of prevention (Fraenkel et al., 1997). Couples and families may view family matters as private concerns, which may render them less likely to seek preventive help (Fincham & Bradbury, 1990). Also, couples and families may be especially unlikely to seek out assistance when they do not perceive themselves to be experiencing problems. Thus, couples and families who are in the early stages of distress may be particularly unlikely to participate in prevention programs. However, participation in prevention programs may actually decrease the stigma of receiving professional help at a later time (Hoopes et al., 1984; Stanley, 2001). Therefore, MFCs may need to educate their clients and communities about the benefits of a

preventive approach to their relationships. Considering the potential barriers addressed in this section, MFCs can enhance the success of their prevention work through collaboration with other professionals.

Collaborating With Other Professionals

MFCs can collaborate with other prevention professionals to produce the most beneficial preventive efforts (Albee, 1995). Counselors need not undertake prevention work in isolation, and they can become involved in a number of preexisting programs. Each subset of family professionals can make a unique contribution to the overall effort. MFCs are able to link with other professionals whose functions are complementary to the counseling profession. For example, MFCs can collaborate with family policy makers to establish family policies that are amenable to preventive efforts (Sporakowski, 1992; Tiesel & Olsen, 1992). Policies that would enhance prevention work could include increased funding for family-focused prevention programs and the provision of incentives for families to participate in prevention programs. A number of such policies already exist in several states across the country (Gardiner, Fishman, Nikolov, Laud, & Glosser, 2002). As new policies are introduced in states and communities across the country, MFCs can lend their support to programs and policy makers that support family promotion.

In addition, there has been a call for increased advocacy in the mental health fields (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Myers, Sweeney, & White, 2002), and MFCs can collaborate with other professionals to increase advocacy efforts for prevention. In addition, MFCs can also play a role in training other prevention professionals in understanding the dynamics of families and relationships (Williams, 1992). Currently, prevention work training programs are in existence in fields such as public health and education (Perry, Albee, Bloom, & Gullotta, 1996), and MFCs can contribute to the focus on family issues in these programs. Finally, educators and supervisors of MFCs can incorporate a focus on prevention in the training of emerging counselors (Tebes et al., 2002). All practice in the field of prevention work, including collaboration with other professionals, should be informed by relevant ethical guidelines.

Ethical Considerations

MFCs should conduct prevention work in an ethically responsible manner (Bond & Albee, 1990). Three major ethical considerations related to prevention work include (a) values, (b) competency, and (c) dual relationships. Prevention programs must be sensitive to the values of the diverse populations served (Arcus & Daniels, 1993; Fincham & Bradbury, 1990). Practitioners must use caution in assessing the health of relationships according to their own assumptions about family health (Larson & Holman, 1994). MFCs who undertake prevention work should be respectful of diverse family forms (e.g., single-parent households, parents who are gay or lesbian, and grandparents raising their grandchildren) and should consider contextual factors that influence family relationships. The goals of prevention programs should not be limited by a single, rigid definition of family health. Participation in prevention programs should be voluntary (Stahmann, 2000), and practitioners should develop an understanding of the limitations of existing practices in prevention work. The imperative for MFCs to be respectful of client values (American Counseling Association, 1997; International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, 2002) is equally relevant in prevention work.

MFCs should also consider the types of prevention work for which they are most qualified and should ensure that they are competent to move into prevention work (American Counseling Association, 1997; International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, 2002). Prevention programs may not be suitable for clients who have severe problems (Senediak, 1990), and practitioners should avoid providing services without considering the unique needs of clients. MFCs must demonstrate competence to work with clients who enter prevention programs. Supervision, training, and consultation can help MFCs develop the competency to do prevention work.

Finally, MFCs should carefully consider whether involvement with clients in both prevention and counseling capacities constitutes an unethical dual relationship (American Counseling Association, 1997; International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors, 2002). An example of a dual relationship that may arise for MFCs who undertake prevention work is a counseling client who wishes to become a participant in a group

prevention program run by the same counselor. In this situation, the counselor should be aware of issues of client confidentiality regarding information learned about the client during counseling sessions. If an unethical dual relationship becomes a possibility, appropriate referrals should be made for the client to receive counseling or prevention services elsewhere (Gladding, Remley, & Huber, 2001). Overall, the ethical fundamentals of counseling practice correspond with the ethical imperatives of prevention work.

Opportunities in Prevention Work

MFCs can inform practice, theory, and research related to preventive interventions. This section contains suggestions for MFCs who wish to incorporate preventive interventions into their practices. On many levels, MFCs can become involved in the practice of prevention work with families. Counselors may expand their practices to include such services as premarital counseling, relationship education to children and adolescents, or programs in the community. Counselors can design and implement programs based on their clinical knowledge and professional experience. Currently, a need exists for more prevention programs that are targeted to specific at-risk populations, such as couples at risk for domestic violence and families with adolescents who are at risk for substance use (Bradbury, Cohan, & Karney, 1998; Christensen & Heavey, 1999; Stahmann & Salts, 1993; Sullivan & Bradbury, 1997). Program design should occur in a systematic, organized manner (Hoopes et al., 1984), and MFCs can seek out opportunities to promote prevention programs for families and couples within the community. Prevention efforts may occur in a wide range of settings, including community agencies, schools, religious organizations, and private practice. MFCs can also focus on prevention in their work with individual families in counseling.

In addition to practical experience, the systemic framework of marriage and family counseling can inform the theoretical development of prevention programs for families. Some prevention programs lack a theoretical framework (Senediak, 1990; Silliman & Schumm, 2000), and family systems theory can inform the development and implementation of prevention programs. Viewing prevention efforts within a systemic context allows practitioners to move away from blaming individuals or families for the problems they encounter. This shift allows for a more context-sensitive approach to developmental family-focused prevention. As described earlier, multiple factors influence the development of family and relationship problems (Holman et al., 2001). Expanding the scope of prevention to include multiple systemic contexts allows prevention workers to develop a more accurate representation of the goals of their program.

Beyond opportunities for MFCs to be involved in the practice and theoretical development of prevention programs, practitioners may contribute to the growing body of research on family-focused prevention. Research on the effectiveness of prevention programs is limited, and there is a need for more methodologically sound studies to examine how and why prevention programs can be effective. Existing research demonstrates that prevention programs are effective at producing positive outcomes for families in the short-term (Christensen & Heavey, 1999; Fraenkel et al., 1997), although research into the long-term effectiveness is limited (Bray & Jouriles, 1995). Increased research is needed to help increase public attention to the need for prevention. MFCs can become involved in prevention research in all stages of the process: assessing the needs of a population, designing appropriate interventions, and evaluating the effectiveness and the generalizability of specific components of prevention programs. In particular, research is needed to determine the stage of relationship development during which preventive intervention is most effective.

MFCs should ensure that research on prevention programs follows sound methodological practice. Christensen and Heavey (1999) recommended that researchers assess both relationship and individual outcomes, conduct adequate follow-up investigations, and include diverse populations in research. Sayers et al. (1998) added that prevention research should incorporate control groups, random assignment, and longitudinal research. In addition to quantitative methodologies, the use of qualitative methodologies—such as ethnographic research (Newfield, Sells, Smith, Newfield, & Newfield, 1996), grounded theory research (Rafuls & Moon, 1996), and focus group research (Piercy & Nickerson, 1996)—can provide rich information to enhance the quality of prevention research (Sells, Smith, & Sprenkle, 1995). More research is needed to determine the effects of prevention programs for specific populations (Stanley, 2001). As recent government legislation has provided

federal funding for prevention and enrichment programs that target family life (Cassidy, 2003), opportunities will increase for MFCs to become involved in the practice, theory, and research of prevention work.

CONCLUSION

The involvement of MFCs in prevention work benefits families, society, the professional community, and the counselors themselves. Through expanding opportunities to promote client growth and development, preventive interventions can minimize the costs of major psychological and relational problems for individuals, couples, and families. In addition, prevention work affords a way to expand counselors' realm of practice within the existing managed care economic climate. Increasing MFCs' networks with other professionals through prevention work can expand referral bases and increase the presence of the profession within the current mental health community. Prevention work allows MFCs to diversify their services in a manner that serves clients in a cost- and time-effective manner. Existing research on the development of relationship and family distress validates the need for early intervention with couples and families, and MFCs can play an important role in expanding the practice of developmental prevention work that enhances family relationships. Overall, MFCs have a professional responsibility to undertake prevention work.

REFERENCES

- Albee, G. W. (1986). Toward a just society: Lessons from observations on the primary prevention of psychopathology. *American Psychologist*, *41*, 891- 898.
- Albee, G. W. (1990). The futility of psychotherapy. *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, *11*, 369-384.
- Albee, G. W. (1995). Counselling and primary prevention. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *8*, 205-211.
- Albee, G. W. (1999). Prevention, not treatment, is the only hope. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *12*, 133-146.
- American Counseling Association. (1997). *American Counseling Association code of ethics and standards of practice*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arcus, M. E., & Daniels, L. B. (1993). Values and family life education. In M. E. Arcus, J. D. Schvaneveldt, & J. J. Moss (Eds.), *Handbook of family life education, Volume 1*(pp. 77-105). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Becvar, D. S., & Becvar, R. J. (2000). *Family therapy: A systemic integration*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bond, L. A., & Albee, G. W. (1990). Training preventionists in the ethical implications of their actions. *Prevention in Human Services*, *8*,111-126.
- Bradbury, T. N., Cohan, C. L., & Karney, B. P. (1998).In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The developmental course of marital dysfunction* (pp. 279-311). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bray, J. H., & Jouriles, E. N. (1995). Treatment of marital conflict and prevention of divorce. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *21*, 461-473.
- Bredehoft, D. J. (2001). The framework for lifespan family life education revisited and revised. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, *9*, 134-139.
- Cassidy, D. (2003, March). Up to \$300 million in grant money available to promote healthy marriages; CFLEs in position to provide needed services. *National Council on Family Relations Report*, pp. 7-9.
- Christensen, A., & Heavey, C. L. (1999). Interventions for couples. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*, 165-190.
- Doherty, W. J., & Simmons, D. S. (1996). Clinical practice patterns of marriage and family therapists: A national survey of therapists and their clients. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *22*, 9-25.
- Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1990). Preventing marital dysfunction: Review and analysis. In F. D. Fincham & T. N. Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage: Basic issues and applications* (pp. 375-401). New York: Guilford.
- Florida Statutes, Sections 741.0305 and 741.04. (1998). *The Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act of 1998*. Retrieved December 3, 2002, from http://www.flsenate.gov/Statutes/index.cfm?mode=View%20Statutes&SubMenu=1&App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=CH0741/SEC04.HTM
- Fraenkel, P., Markman, H., & Stanley, S. (1997). The prevention approach to relationship problems. *Sexual and Marital Therapy*, *12*, 249-258.

- Gardiner, K., Fishman, M., Nikolov, P., Laud, S., & Glosser, A. (2002). *State policies to promote marriage*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved May 12, 2003, from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/hspparent.htm>
- Gladding, S. T., Remley, T. P., & Huber, C. H. (2001). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in the practice of marriage and family therapy*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gordon, R. (1987). An operational classification of disease prevention. In J. Steinberg & M. Silverman (Eds.), *Preventing mental disorders: A research perspective* (DHHS Publication No. ADM 87-1492, pp. 20- 26). Rockville, MD: Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration.
- Gottman, J. M. (1998). On the etiology of marital decay and its consequences: Comments from a clinical psychologist. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The developmental course of marital dysfunction* (pp. 423-426). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holman, T. B., Birch, P. J., Carroll, J. S., Doxey, C., Larson, J. H., & Linford, S. T. (2001). *Premarital predication of marital quality or breakup: Research, theory, and practice*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Hoopes, M. H., Fisher, B. L., & Barlow, S. H. (1984.) *Structured family facilitation programs*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems Corporation.
- International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors. (2002). *Ethical codes*. Retrieved February 10, 2003, from <http://www.iamfc.org/ethicalcodes.html>
- Kiselica, M. S. (2001). Overcoming barriers to the practice of primary prevention: An agenda for the mental health professions. *Prevention & Treatment, 4*. Retrieved July 11, 2003, from <http://80-journals.apa.org>
- Kiselica, M. S., & Look, C. T. (1993). Mental health counseling and prevention: Disparity between philosophy and practice? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15*, 3-14.
- Kiselica, M. S., & Robinson, M. (2001). Bringing advocacy counseling to life: The history, issues, and human dramas of social justice work in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 79*, 387-397.
- Kleist, D. M. (1996). Counselor educators' explanations for a disparity between a philosophy of prevention in mental health and prevention training and practice in counselor education. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(2-A), 588. (UMI No. 9620264)
- Kleist, D. M., & White, L. J. (1997). The values of counseling: A disparity between a philosophy of prevention in counseling and counselor practice and training. *Counseling and Values, 41*, 128-140.
- Kurdek, L. A. (1998). Developmental changes in marital satisfaction: A 6- year prospective longitudinal study of newlywed couples. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The developmental course of marital dysfunction* (pp. 180-204). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Larson, J. H., & Holman, T. B. (1994). Premarital predictors of marital quality and stability. *Family Relations, 43*, 228-238.
- Lindah, L., Clements, M., & Markman, H. (1998). The development of marriage: A 9-year perspective. In T. N. Bradbury (Ed.), *The developmental course of marital dysfunction* (pp. 205-236). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Markman, H. J., Floyd, F., Stanley, S., & Lewis, H. (1986). Prevention. In N. Jacobson & A. Gurman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marital therapy* (pp. 174-194). New York: Guilford.
- Murray, C. E. (2004). *An empirical investigation of the relative importance of client characteristics and topics in premarital counseling*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Myers, J. E., Sweeney, T. J., & White, V. E. (2002). Advocacy for counseling and counselors: A professional imperative. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 394-402.
- National Institute of Mental Health. (1998). *Priorities for prevention research at the National Institute of Mental Health: A report by the National Advisory Mental Health Council* (NIH Publication No. 96- 4093). Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health.
- Newfield, N., Sells, S. P., Smith, T. E., Newfield, S., & Newfield, F. (1996). Ethnographic research methods: Creating a clinical science of the humanities. In D. H. Sprenkle & S. M. Moon (Eds.), *Research methods in family therapy* (pp. 25-63). New York: Guilford.
- Nichols, M. P., & Schwartz, R. C. (1998). *Family therapy: Concepts and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- O'Connell, B. (1998). *Solution -focused therapy*. London: Sage.

- Olson, D. H. (1990). Marriage in perspective. In F. D. Fincham & T. N. Bradbury (Eds.), *The psychology of marriage: Basic issues and applications* (pp. 402-419). New York: Guilford.
- Perry, M. J., Albee, G. W., Bloom, M., & Gullotta, T. P. (1996). Training and career paths in primary prevention. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 16*, 357-371.
- Piercy, F. P., & Nickerson, V. (1996). Focus groups in family therapy research. In D. H. Sprenkle & S. M. Moon (Eds.), *Research methods in family therapy* (pp. 173-185). New York: Guilford.
- Rafuls, S. E., & Moon, S. M. (1996). Grounded theory methodology in family therapy research. In D. H. Sprenkle & S. M. Moon (Eds.), *Research methods in family therapy* (pp. 64-82). New York: Guilford.
- Renick, M. J., & Blumberg, S. L. (1992). The Prevention and Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP): An empirically-based preventive intervention program for couples. *Family Relations, 41*, 141-148.
- Sandberg, J. G., Johnson, L. N., Dermer, S. B., Gfeller-Strouts, L. L., Siebold, J. M., Stringer-Siebold, T. A., et al. (1997). Demonstrated efficacy of models of marriage and family therapy: An update of Gurman, Kniskern, and Pinsof's chart. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 25*, 121-135.
- Sayers, S. L., Kohn, C. S., & Heavey, C. (1998). Prevention of marital dysfunction: Behavioral approaches and beyond. *Clinical Psychology Review, 18*, 713-744.
- Sells, S. P., Smith, T. E., & Sprenkle, D. H. (1995). Integrating qualitative and quantitative research methods: A research model. *Family Process, 34*, 199-218.
- Senediak, C. (1990). The value of premarital education. *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 11*, 26-31.
- Shadish, W. R., Montgomery, L. M., Wilson, P., Wilson, M. R., Bright, I., & Okwumabua, T. (1993). Effects of marital and family psychotherapies: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 992-1002.
- Silliman, B., & Schumm, W. R. (1999). Improving practice in marriage preparation. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 25*, 23-43.
- Silliman, B., & Schumm, W. R. (2000). Marriage preparation programs: A literature review. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 8*, 133-143.
- Sporakowski, M. J. (1992). Enhancing family life in the future: A potential for family therapists. *Family Relations, 41*, 394-398.
- Stahmann, R. F. (2000). Premarital counseling: A focus for family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy, 22*, 104-117.
- Stahmann, R. F., & Hiebert, W. J. (1980). *Premarital counseling*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Stahmann, R. F., & Salts, C. J. (1993). Educating for marriage and intimate relationships. In M. E. Arcus, J. D. Schvaneveldt, & J. J. Moss (Eds.), *Handbook of family life education, Volume 2* (pp. 33-61). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stanley, S. M. (1995). Strengthening marriages and preventing divorce: New directions in prevention research. *Family Relations, 44*, 392-402.
- Stanley, S. M. (2001). Making a case for premarital education. *Family Relations, 50*, 272-280.
- Sullivan, K. T., & Bradbury, T. N. (1997). Are premarital prevention programs reaching couples at risk for marital dysfunction? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 24-30.
- Tebes, J. K., Kaufman, J. S., & Chinman, M. J. (2002). Teaching about prevention to mental health professionals. In L. A. Jason & D. S. Glenwick (Eds.), *Innovative strategies for promoting health and mental health across the lifespan* (pp. 37-62). New York: Springer.
- Tiesel, J. W., & Olsen, D. H. (1992). Preventing family problems: Troubling trends and promising opportunities. *Family Relations, 41*, 398-404.
- White, L. K., & Booth, A. (1991). Divorce over the life course. *Journal of Family Issues, 12*, 5-22.
- Williams, L. M. (1992). Premarital counseling: A needs assessment among engaged couples. *Contemporary Family Therapy, 14*, 505-518.