

Evaluation of Topics in Utah's One-Hour Divorce Education Program

Olena Kopystynska

Joshua J. Turner

David G. Schramm

Brian Higginbotham

### Abstract

Divorce education programs are mandatory in most states. Despite the ongoing debate in the field regarding the appropriate duration of these programs, the goal of the current study was to identify the following five content areas in divorce education that may be most relevant for predicting favorable outcomes: (1) impact of divorce on children, (2) impact of divorce on family relationships, (3) financial responsibilities of divorcing parents for children, (4) benefits of positive coparenting, and (5) impact of domestic violence on children and family relationships. Using divorcing parents' self-reported data ( $N = 3,275$ ) from a one-hour online divorce education program in Utah, we examined participants' post-divorce intentions to treat each other respectfully, especially in front of the child(ren), and engage in positive coparental practices. The results showed that the program was effective in obtaining these objectives. We discuss these findings in depth and offer suggestions for future programs.

#### Key Points for the Family Court Community:

- As more states offer shorter, online divorce education programs, it is important that the most relevant and useful topics are adequately covered
- We evaluated the anticipated benefits of Utah's one-hour, online, divorce education course content
- Considering disagreements in the field regarding the appropriate length of divorce education programs, we provided an examination of child-centered content knowledge that has shown to be most relevant to the program's objectives and desired outcomes
- Despite the program's brevity, most individuals reported relatively high levels of knowledge related to the program topics following completion

**Keywords:** divorce; divorce education; course topics; coparenting; child adjustment

### Evaluation of Topics in Utah's One-Hour Divorce Education Program

The presence of divorce education programs has become commonplace in the United States (Blaisure & Geasler, 2006; Douglas, 2004). These programs are designed to promote productive post-divorce interparental and coparental relationships, especially for the benefit of the children involved. Nearly every state offers some form of divorce education (Mulroy, Riffe, Brandon, Lo, & Vaidyanath, 2013), and in most states, these programs have become court mandated for divorcing couples with dependent children (Cronin, Becher, McCann, McGuire, & Powell, 2017). Recently, many states have moved toward more streamlined delivery methods for their divorce education programs with the goal of making such programs more convenient and accessible to divorcing parties (Bowers, Ogolsky, Hughes, & Kanter, 2014).

The most common approach to streamlining divorce education programs is to provide shorter versions of traditional face-to-face courses in an online format (Becher, Cronin, McCann, Olson, Powell, & Marczak 2015; Choi, Hatton-Bowers, Brand, Poppe, & Foged, 2017; Schramm & McCaulley, 2012). The move toward offering shorter programs has been deemed necessary by courts and state legislatures due to issues related to attendance (e.g., convenience of taking an online course at the most suitable time for each participant) and funding (Choi et al., 2017; Cookston, Braver, Sandler, & Genalo, 2002). Shorter programs are also seen as beneficial because they are less demanding for divorcing couples who are already feeling the strain of the many issues involved in the divorce process (Brandon, 2006).

Given that shorter, online programs have become a more ubiquitous method by which divorce education programs are delivered, there are several important issues to consider (Bowers et al., 2014). Perhaps the most crucial of these issues is that of program content priorities. The topics covered can vary from program to program and state to state due to the lack of

standardization in divorce education (Schramm, Kanter, Brotherson, & Kranzler, 2018).

Considering the time constraints of shorter online programs, it is important to understand which topics are the most salient to supporting child adjustment and promoting respectful post-divorce interparental relationships in order to ensure the delivery of meaningful divorce education programs (Bowers et al., 2014; Schramm et al., 2018).

The purpose of this study was to examine whether a brief state-mandated one-hour online divorce education program achieved its program objectives, which included parents' plans to positively coparent and avoid exposing their child to unpleasant situations, such as arguing in front of the child, saying negative things about the other parent in front of the child, and questioning the child about the other parent. We tested the relations between topics covered in the course and the program's objectives (i.e., measured outcomes), which gauged participants' plans for handling family-related issues post-divorce listed above. In doing so, we applied structural equation modeling (SEM) techniques, allowing for a simultaneous analysis of all variables in the model (Kline, 2016).

### **Trends in Divorce Education**

Dating back to the early 1990s, there has been a stable increase in the implementation of divorce education programs in the United States, the goal of which is to educate and sensitize divorcing parents on the impact of divorce on children's well-being and to promote positive coparental practices (Blaisure & Geasler, 2006; Douglas, 2004; Schramm et al., 2018). These programs have largely shown to be successful in helping parents increase their knowledge of divorce-related matters, while also helping them develop the coparenting skills needed to ease the transition of the divorce process for children (Brandon, 2006; Crawford, Riffe, Trevisan, & Adescope, 2014; Criddle, Allgood, & Piercy, 2003). A recent review of divorce education

programs reveals that these programs are present in at least 46 states, and in 27 states such programs are court-mandated for couples with dependent children (Mulroy et al., 2013). It seems likely that the need for divorce education programs will continue to increase as more states move toward a mandatory participation model for couples with dependent children (see Schramm et al., 2018).

With the continued growth of divorce education programs, the composition of these programs has started to take on diverse formats. In an attempt to categorize the multiple types of divorce education programs, Blaisure and Geasler (2000) developed the Divorce Education Intervention Model. In this model, divorce education programs are categorized into three major groups (or levels) based on factors such as dosage levels (i.e., length), teaching methods, goals and objectives, and program content. Level 1 programs are shorter in length (e.g., single two-hour session) and require more passive involvement from participants. The goal of such programs is to equip parents with general knowledge on post-divorce adjustments and encourage participants to seek additional resources. Level 2 programs are longer in length and more intensive in terms of skill-building activities. These programs may require multiple sessions. Finally, Level 3 programs are characterized as being more targeted toward families with special circumstances, such as those that are viewed as being more at risk for chronic coparental or familial conflict (Blaisure & Geasler, 2000).

Of the three program types described in the Divorce Education Intervention Model, the most common is the shorter, less intensive Level 1 program (Blaisure & Geasler, 2000; Geasler & Blaisure, 1999; Pollet & Lombreglia, 2008). Such programs typically last four hours or less (Fackrell, Hawkins, & Kay, 2011) and it has been estimated that they comprise approximately 90% of divorce education programs (Brotherson, White, & Masich, 2010). The prevalence of

these programs may be a by-product of the continued increase in court mandated participation in divorce education programs, which tend to favor shorter programs due to a number of issues that include funding, attendance obstacles, and the possibility of placing fewer demands on parents who are already feeling the strain brought on by the divorce process (Brandon, 2006; Cookston et al., 2002; Fackrell et al., 2011).

Although theoretically it would make sense that more intense and time-consuming programs, such as the Level 2 and Level 3 programs, would lead to greater program effectiveness, a meta-analytic review revealed no such differences (Fackrell et al., 2011). Thus, it appears that minimal dosage programs may be just as effective in delivering divorce education. Perhaps, for this reason, the implementation of Level 2 and Level 3 programs has become less common, especially when considering the required time commitments. These programs typically consist of multiple sessions, which can stretch out over weeks and months (Blaisure & Geasler, 2000). Additionally, more intense divorce education programs require more resources, both for the parents (e.g., finding a babysitter) and the courts (e.g., staffing, coordinating teaching schedules) (Blaisure & Geasler, 2000; Salem, Sandler, & Wolchik, 2013; Winslow, Bonds, Wolchik, Sandler, & Braver, 2009).

In view of the aforementioned drawbacks of lengthy and time-intensive programs (i.e., Level 2 and Level 3), the introduction of shorter Level 1 divorce education programs, has coincided with the development of online options (Becher et al., 2015; Choi et al., 2017). Online options can be seen as a way to make programs more accessible to larger groups of people and audiences who live at a distance or in more isolated and rural areas (Dennis & Ebata, 2005; Elliott, 1999). Online programs were also designed with consideration for parents facing financial or transportation hardships, and parents with conflicting work and childcare schedules

(Dennis & Ebata, 2005; Schramm & McCaulley, 2012; Sigal, Sandler, Wolchik, & Braver, 2011). Online programs are also thought to minimize feelings of embarrassment that may accompany those required to attend public divorce education programs (Ferraro, Oehme, Bruker, Arpan, & Opel, 2018).

Although current research on the most appropriate length for online divorce education program is limited (Turner, Kopystynska, Schramm, & Higginbotham, 2019), it should be noted that with the growing implementation of online divorce education programs, course time in some instances has been reduced by half (Becher et al., 2015; Schramm & McCaulley, 2012). There are differing opinions as to whether such a reduction in course time is a benefit or a cause for concern. Advocates for shorter divorce education programs have argued that these programs can provide the same benefits as longer, more traditional programs (Fackrell et al., 2011). Conversely, professionals who are skeptical of shortened programs have expressed some level of doubt that lower dosage programs can sufficiently equip parents with the skills they will need to assist their children as both parties make important transitions during the divorce process (Salem et al., 2013). In view of this debate, in a recent study, Turner and colleagues (2019) considered participants' feedback on the appropriate length of the program and found that nearly three quarters of the sample believed that a one-hour program was sufficient to cover relevant divorce-related material. Importantly, individuals who expressed satisfaction with the program length reported greater benefits.

### **Program Content Priorities in Divorce Education**

Despite the ongoing debate over program length, many court-mandated programs tend to be of a minimal dosage, described as Level 1 programs that are administered in less than four hours (Blaisure & Geasler, 2000; Fackrell et al., 2011; Schramm et al., 2018). Many of these court-mandated programs are now offered online (Bowers, Mitchell, Hardesty, & Hughes, 2011).

Considering the migration toward shorter online divorce education programs, an important issue to consider is program content priorities. Specifically, in view of divorce education program objectives, a pressing concern is to ensure that these truncated programs are delivered in ways that allow parents to discern and follow best practices for cooperative coparenting that support child well-being (Douglas, 2004; Schramm et al., 2018). Scholars posit that strong theory and compelling scientific evidence are critical elements to establishing program credibility for online divorce education programs (Hughes, Bowers, Mitchell, Curtiss, & Ebata, 2012). To add to this body of literature, we examined the effectiveness of one such program.

Perhaps in the most comprehensive review to date, Schramm and colleagues (2018) applied the divorce-stress-adjustment model (see Amato, 2000) to establish three tiers of priority for content selection in divorce education programming. Tier 1 includes core topics that are focused on child-centered content, such as the impact of divorce on children, ways to reduce interparental conflict, positive coparenting skills, and parenting strategies during divorce. Tier 2 is comprised of adult-centered strategic content that covers topics related to the management of finances, self-care, and future family plans. Finally, Tier 3 focuses on supplemental and special topics that discuss unique circumstances, such as domestic violence or long-distance coparenting (Schramm et al., 2018). Because of the dual focus on child welfare and the benefits of effective coparenting, Tier 1 topics encompass the most crucial content in divorce education programming, especially those that are court-mandated. Importantly, these content areas are consistent with the original intent of divorce education programming, which centers around educating and sensitizing parents on the impact of divorce on children and the benefits of cooperative coparenting in the family reorganization process (Brotherson et al., 2010; Geasler & Blaisure, 1999).



## **The Current Study**

Given the transition to shorter, online formats for divorce education programs, it is important that the most relevant and useful divorce-related topics are sufficiently covered. In an effort to better understand which topics in the Utah's divorce education program are meeting their primary objectives, particularly those in a one-hour online format, the purpose of the current study was to explore anticipated outcomes as a result of program participation. We used cross-sectional data derived from Utah's one-hour online divorce education course to examine whether participants' knowledge of divorce-related topics is related to their future plans regarding positive coparenting practices and cooperative interpersonal relationships.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The data for this study came from Utah's online divorce education program. The data included in this study were collected from 3,275 participants who were surveyed between January and October of 2018. The approved post-course survey did not include questions about participants' demographics.

### **Program Description**

Per Utah legislation, divorcing parents with minor children are required to complete court-approved divorce education programming to receive a certificate of divorce. The goal of divorce education programming is to educate and sensitize parents to the needs of their children during and after the divorce process. Utah's online divorce education course is a one-hour course for divorcing parents with minor children. In compliance with legislative requirements, the course includes topics that cover the impact of divorce on child and family relationships,

financial responsibilities, domestic violence, coparenting skills, and ways to decrease child exposure to harmful interparental conflict (Utah State Legislature, 2018). The online course was developed by Extension Specialists at Utah State University through a contract with the Utah Administrative Office of the Courts. The course is available on demand through software linked to the Courts website. Course curricula consists of narrated PowerPoint slides, videos, vignettes, and checkpoint questions to ensure active participation and learning. Upon satisfactory completion of the course, a certificate of completion is generated, which participants submit to the Courts to move to the next step of the divorce process. Participation in the survey is encouraged but not required to receive a certificate of course completion. Nearly half of divorcing parents who have completed the course provided answers to the survey which gauged the effectiveness of the course. Responses were used for this study's purposes.

### **Measures**

The optional survey was administered immediately following the completion of the online divorce education course. The survey instrument captured both participants' knowledge of the impact of divorce on various areas of family relationships and child adjustment, as well as participants' intentions to create positive interparental relationship and coparental practices post-divorce. All survey items (please see the list of items below) were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

**The impact of divorce on child development and family relationships.** The first set of survey items were tied to the mandated topics that focused on whether the course improved participants' understanding of divorce-related topics. Specifically, participants were asked the following five questions: (1) This course helped improve my understanding of how divorce can impact children, (2) This course helped improve my understanding of how divorce can impact

family relationships, (3) This course helped improve my understanding of the financial responsibilities of divorcing parents for their children, (4) This course helped improve my understanding of the benefits to children of positive coparenting, and (5) This course helped improve my understanding of domestic violence and the harmful effect on children and family relationships. These items were loaded onto a latent construct that served as an exogenous latent indicator in our model.

**Participants' post-divorce plans.** The second set of survey items was related to future coparenting efforts and post-divorce parental relationships with the other parent post-divorce, especially in the presence of the child or children. These survey items included the following: (1) Now that I have completed this course, I plan to avoid arguing/fighting with my spouse in front of the children, (2) Now that I have completed this course, I plan to avoid saying negative things about my spouse in front of the children, (3) Now that I have completed this course, I plan to avoid questioning my children about their other parent, and (4) Now that I have completed this course, I plan to make efforts to positively coparent. These items were loaded onto a latent construct that served as an endogenous latent indicator in our model.

## **Results**

### **Preliminary Analyses**

Zero-order correlations among study variables, along with means and standard deviations for each variable, are presented in Table 1. All variables were significantly and positively correlated with each other. Importantly, correlations were strongest between items that assessed participants' future plans post-divorce. Additionally, individuals averaged a score of 4.09 or greater on all items, indicating an increased understanding of each topic that was covered in the course and plans to have a cooperative coparenting relationship post-divorce. Such high post-

program scores typically suggest program effectiveness (e.g., see Schramm & Calix, 2011 and Schramm & McCaulley, 2012).

### **Primary Analyses**

We used SEM in *Mplus* 8.1 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017) to evaluate whether the content covered in the one-hour online divorce education program is related to participants' intentions of observing positive coparenting practices and relationship functioning with the other parent. Model fit was examined through the comparative fit index (CFI), the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR). A model fit is considered to be good (or acceptable) when CFI is greater than or equal to .95 (or .90), and both RMSEA and SRMR are less than or equal to .05 (or .08) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). A small number of participants ( $n = 3$ ) did not provide data for any of the variables. However, to ensure unbiased parameter estimates, we handled missing data through the full information maximum likelihood procedure (Graham, 2009).

Factor loadings for the latent variables (i.e., participants' responses to survey items) were all significant and in the expected direction (i.e., all positive loadings; see Table 2). When testing the relations between the manifested variables, fit indices suggested that the model had acceptable fit to the data,  $\chi^2(26) = 504.82, p < .01$ ; RMSEA = .075 (90% CI = [.07, .08]); CFI = .989; SRMR = .013. Our results show that the topics covered in the course were significantly positively related to the program's objectives ( $B = .58, SE B = .01, \beta = .66, p < .01$ ). These findings also point to a strong effect size ( $\beta = .66$ ) of the program in achieving its objectives.

### **Discussion**

The divorce process has major implications on the well-being of family members, especially children, as many children show signs of maladjustment (Amato, Booth, Johnson, &

Rogers, 2007; Braver & Lamb, 2012). Divorce education programs, the goal of which is to help parents navigate through the common relational challenges associated with divorce, have become common and even mandatory in many states (Fine, Ganong, & Demo, 2010). Although programs vary in length, delivery method, and content, those that are state-mandated tend to favor brevity (Fackrell et al., 2011; Schramm et al., 2018). Given the trend toward mandatory completion of such programs by the courts, it is important to understand which topics are of most relevance to divorcing couples with children, while also fulfilling programmatic objectives. In doing so, we applied an SEM analysis, a comprehensive statistical technique that considers all variables in the model, allowing researchers to estimate potentially causal associations between constructs and determine whether proposed relations of the hypothesized model are rationally represented by the data (Byrne, 2013). The analysis included commands that enabled estimation of unbiased parameters that help with generalizability of model results (Kline, 2016).

In view of the ongoing debate in the field regarding appropriate length for divorce education programs and content-related challenges, the goal of this study was to examine if topics covered in Utah's one-hour online divorce education course contributed to participants' intentions to facilitate productive and respectful relationship with the other parent and efforts to positively coparent following their divorce. We analyzed self-reported survey data of divorcing parents with dependent children who had been court-mandated to complete a one-hour divorce education course. The online course focused on issues related to the impact of divorce on children and on family relationships, financial responsibilities of divorcing parents, benefits of positive coparenting, and the impact of domestic violence on children and family relationships. Upon completion of the course, the survey asked participants to report on whether the course improved their understanding of divorce-related topics, while gauging their intentions to work

efficiently with the other parent in their parenting responsibilities and to be cordial in their behavioral demeanor, especially in the presence of their children.

The results of our study do not confirm or dispel the debate about shorter or online divorce education programs. Rather, consistent with the study's goals, our findings provide a snapshot for the field, demonstrating that even a brief one-hour divorce education program can encourage parents to establish functional post-divorce interpersonal and coparental relationships. Specifically, we found that child-centered content is associated with building general knowledge on the impact of divorce and motivates parents to act in the best interests of the child. It appears that parents are highly interested in creating a nurturing environment that promotes child adjustment. As such, and consistent with Schramm and colleagues (2018), developers of court-mandated programs that are relatively short in length, may want to emphasize child-centered content as a key priority.

Considering the often-taxing process of divorce, practitioners and lawmakers are challenged with the selection of topics that are most appropriate to cover to ensure positive adjustment for the children involved. To that end, our findings suggest that research-based content on divorce-related matters can be packaged in succinct, yet meaningful ways that potentially promote parents' intentions to work together in ways that are conducive to family reorganization and child adjustment during and after the divorce process. Despite its relative brevity, Utah's one-hour online divorce education program was largely effective in delivering the message of the importance of positive coparenting and cordial interparental relationships, at least as reported in parents' intentions. While scholars in the field continue to investigate the appropriate length of divorce education programs, our study adds to the literature by outlining pieces of child-centered content that appear important to obtaining desired program outcomes.

The study's findings are particularly relevant for court-mandated programs that aim to promote civil interparental relationships and positive coparenting while using fewer public resources.

### **Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions**

The current study had several strengths, which included a large sample and the fact that we evaluated participants' feedback on the program immediately after they took the course, ensuring that the information was still fresh. Also worth noting is that we captured opinions of those participants who may have had unfavorable views of the divorce process, especially pertaining to mandatory education in order to receive a certificate of divorce. Despite this possibility, participants overall considered this course to be helpful as evidenced by relatively favorable ratings.

Although our findings show that Utah's one-hour online divorce education program that focused on child-centered content can be effective in meeting its objectives, at least as reported by parents' intentions, we acknowledge several limitations that relate to short online programs generally. A notable disadvantage of short divorce education programs, such as the one used in the current study, is that of time constraints. Information related to divorce and its effects is rather complex, which may be challenging to present sufficiently in a short timeframe.

Therefore, unlike participants of longer divorce education programs, participants of short programs may only get information that "scratches the surface" of particular content. Relevant to the delivery method (i.e., online versus face-to-face), courses completed online do not provide participants with the opportunity to ask questions and have rich discussions with the facilitator and course-mates about common or specific scenarios. Another drawback is that the number of survey questions or items is limited in scope allowing only for general evaluation of participants' responses to the few topics covered in the course, as opposed to an in-depth assessment. Other

limitations to short programs with minimalist evaluation designs include not knowing whether intentions translate into behavior change or if reported improvements in understanding reflect a positive response bias (i.e., feeling pressured or obligated to provide socially accepted responses) or confirmatory bias (i.e., confirmation of preexisting beliefs).

Pertaining to specific limitations of this study, we used data from an online court-mandated course, and thus, our results may not generalize to courses that are face-to-face or those courses that are based on voluntary participation. Moreover, our data did not include demographic information, such as parents' age, gender, financial difficulties, length of marriage, number of previous marriages, and number of children. Thus, future research is needed to replicate these findings while considering these key demographic characteristics in the analyses, as these characteristics may play a role in the internalization of information covered in the program. It might also be informative to include the reasons for divorce as some information may be more critical to their current situation. For example, parents who have experienced domestic violence might want to learn more about the community resources that are available to them or how to handle future encounters with the ex-spouse in greater depth (Choi, Hatton-Bowers, Burton, Brand, Reddish, & Poppe, 2018; Schramm & Calix, 2011). This could occur in a special consideration course (e.g., Level 3). Thus, the topics of divorce education programs could be adjusted to fit the divorcing parents' current needs.

Regarding study design shortcomings, we did not have pre-program data, which limits our ability to draw conclusions on how much knowledge was gained through program participation (i.e., to what extent participants' responses were influenced by prior knowledge) and whether participants had similar intentions (i.e., to create respectful interparental and coparental relationship post-divorce) before program participation. However, in other studies



(e.g., Schramm & Calix, 2011; Schramm & McCaulley, 2012) where researchers used similar methods to rate pre- and post-program outcomes, the average scores on the post-program outcomes were consistent with the scores reported in this study. Thus, although we are unable to confirm with certainty, it is likely that the program's content contributed to participants' knowledge gains. Lastly, the field would benefit from longitudinal data examining whether parents' actions followed their intentions.

### **Implications**

This study has implications for practitioners designing divorce education programs. As mentioned throughout this paper, currently, divorce education is offered in nearly every state and in the majority of these states, divorce education is court-mandated for divorcing parties with dependent children. A growing topic of concern surrounding divorce education programming is that the formats and lengths of these programs vary substantially. While scholars continue to research the appropriate length for divorce education programs, we encourage professionals to consider a greater emphasis on the selection of child-centered topics, especially those that are court-mandated, preserving these programs' original intent in ensuring a smoother adjustment process for children (Fine et al., 2010). If the need for more content is necessary, legislators who mandate programs and content could consider adjusting divorce education programs to fit the individual needs of the parent (or family). Rather than implementing a "one-size fits all" approach, it may be advantageous to develop/adapt programs that provide (a) core content for everyone and (b) additional detail and supplemental content for those who want more knowledge on specific divorce-related matters or have special considerations, such as those participants who have experienced domestic violence. Taking this approach could potentially bridge the gap

between professionals who advocate for longer, more intensive divorce education programs versus professionals who support shorter and more concise divorce education programs.

## References

- Amato, P. R. (2000). The consequences of divorce for adults and children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1269–1287. <https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01269.x>
- Amato, P. R., Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., & Rogers, S. J. (2007). *Alone together: How marriage in America is changing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Becher, E. H., Cronin, S., McCann, E., Olson, K. A., Powell, S., & Marczak, M. S. (2015). Parents forever: Evaluation of an online divorce education program. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 56(4), 261–276. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2015.1025900
- Blaisure, K. R., & Geasler, M. J. (2000). The divorce education intervention model. *Family Court Review*, 38(4), 501-513.
- Blaisure, K. R., & Geasler, M. J. (2006). Educational interventions for separating and divorcing parents and their children. In M. A. Fine & J. H. Harvey (Eds.), *Handbook of divorce and relationship dissolution* (pp. 575–602). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bowers, J. R., Mitchell, E. T., Hardesty, J. L., & Hughes, Jr., R. (2011). A review of online divorce education programs. *Family Court Review*, 49(4), 776-787. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2011.01413.x>
- Bowers, J. R., Ogolsky, B. G., Hughes Jr., R., & Kanter, J. B. (2014). Coparenting through divorce or separation: A review of an online program. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 55(6), 464–484. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2014.931760
- Brandon, D. J. (2006). Can four hours make a difference? Evaluation of a parent education program for divorcing parents. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 45(1-2), 171–185. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v45n01pass:\[\]09](https://doi.org/10.1300/J087v45n01pass:[]09)

- Braver, S. L., & Lamb, M. E. (2012). Marital dissolution. In G. W. Peterson & K. R. Bush (Eds.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (3rd ed., pp. 487–516). New York, NY: Springer.
- Brotherson, S. E., White, J., & Masich, C. (2010). Parents forever: An assessment of the perceived value of a brief divorce education program. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 51(8), 465–490. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2010.504095
- Byrne, B. M. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Choi, J.-K., Hatton-Bowers, H., Brand, G., Poppe, L. M., & Foged, J. (2017). Co-parenting for successful kids: Impacts and implications. *Journal of Extension*, 55(6), Article #6RIB1. Retrieved from: <https://www.joe.org/joe/2017december/rb1.php>
- Choi, J.-K., Hatton-Bowers, H., Burton, A., Brand, G., Reddish, L., & Poppe, L. M. (2018). A qualitative evaluation to improve co-parenting for Successful Kids Program. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, 6(3), 122–135. Retrieved from: [https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/c8fe6e\\_b8bb7f1454fc41d9b395ff77bf5b387a.pdf](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/c8fe6e_b8bb7f1454fc41d9b395ff77bf5b387a.pdf)
- Cookston, J. T., Braver, S. L., Sandler, I., & Genalo, M. T. (2002). Prospects for expanded parent education services for divorcing families with children. *Family Court Review*, 40(2), 190–203. doi:10.1111/j.174-1617.2002.tb00830.x
- Crawford, J. K., Riffe, J., Trevisan, D. A., & Adescope, O. O. (2014). Buffering negative impacts of divorce on children: Evaluating impact of divorce education. *Journal of Extension*, 52(4), Article 4RIB3. Retrieved from [https://www.joe.org/joe/2014august/pdf/JOE\\_v52\\_4rb3.pdf](https://www.joe.org/joe/2014august/pdf/JOE_v52_4rb3.pdf)

- Criddle, M. N., Jr., Allgood, S., & Piercy, W. K. (2003). The relationship between mandatory divorce education and level of post-divorce parental conflict. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 39(3-4), 99–111. doi:10.1300/J087v39n03\_05
- Cronin, S., Becher, E. H., McCann, E., McGuire, J., & Powell, S. (2017). Relational conflict and outcomes from an online divorce education program. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 62, 49–55. doi: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2017.02.008
- Dennis, S., & Ebata, A. (2005). Family life education on the technological frontier. In S. F. Duncan & H. W. Goddard (Eds.), *Outreach in family life: Principles and practices for effective family life outreach education* (pp. 180–219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Douglas, E. M. (2004). The effectiveness of a divorce education program on father involvement. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 40(3-4), 91–101. doi: 10.1300/J087v40n03\_06
- Elliott, M. (1999). Classifying family life education on the World Wide Web. *Family Relations*, 48(1), 7–13. doi: 10.2307/585676
- Fackrell, T. A., Hawkins, A. J., & Kay, N. M. (2011). How effective are court-affiliated divorcing parents education programs? A meta-analytic study. *Family Court Review*, 49(1), 107–119. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-1617.2010.01356.x
- Ferraro, A. J., Oehme, K., Bruker, M., Arpan, L., & Opel, A. (2018). The impact of videos on attitudes about parenting after divorce. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 59(7), 590–600. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2018.1466253
- Fine, M. A., Ganong, L. H., & Demo, D. H. (2010). Divorce: A risk and resilience perspective. In S. J. Price, C. A. Price, & P. C. McKenry (Eds.), *Families and change: Coping with stressful events and transitions* (4th ed., pp. 211-234). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Geasler, M. J., & Blaisure, K. R. (1999). The 1998 nationwide survey of court connected divorce education programs. *Family Court Review*, 37(1), 36–63.
- Graham, J. W. (2009). Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 549–576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085530>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Hughes, R., Jr., Bowers, J. R., Mitchell, E. T., Curtiss, S., & Ebata, A. T. (2012). Developing online family life prevention and education programs. *Family Relations*, 61(5), 711–727. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2012.00737.x
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Mulroy, M., Riffe, J., Brandon, D., Lo, Y., & Vaidyanath, H. (2013). Serving the needs of separating and divorcing families: A national survey of Extension parenting education programs and resources. *Journal of Extension*, 51(2), Article 2FEA4. Retrieved from: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2013april/a4.php>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998 –2017). *Mplus user's guide* (8th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Pollet, S. L., & Lombreglia, M. (2008). A nationwide survey of mandatory parent education. *Family Court Review*, 46(2), 375–394. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00207.x
- Salem, P., Sandler, I., & Wolchik, S. (2013). Taking stock of parent education in the family courts: Envisioning a public health approach. *Family Court Review*, 51(1), 131–148. doi:10.1111/fcre.12014

- Schramm, D. G., & Calix, S. (2011). Focus on kids: Evaluation of a research-based education program. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 52(7), 529–549. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2011.615662
- Schramm, D. G., Kanter, J. B., Brotherson, S. E., & Kranzler, B. (2018). An empirically based framework for content selection and management in divorce education programs. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 59(3), 195–221, doi: 10.1080/10502556.2017.1402656
- Schramm, D. G., & McCaulley, G. (2012). Divorce education for parents: A comparison of online and in-person delivery methods. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 53(8), 602–617. doi: 10.1080/10502556.2012.721301
- Sigal, A., Sandler, I., Wolchik, S., & Braver, S. (2011). Do parent education programs promote healthy postdivorce parenting? Critical distinctions and a review of the evidence. *Family Court Review*, 49(1), 120–139. doi:10.1111/fcre.2011.49.issue-1
- Turner, J. J., Kopystynska, O., Schramm, D. G., & Higginbotham, B. (2019). Is one hour enough? Evaluating Utah’s online divorce education course based on course length satisfaction. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 60(7), 537-551.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10502556.2019.1586231>
- Utah State Legislature. (2018, 30-3-11.2). *Mandatory educational course for divorcing parents – Purpose – Curriculum – Reporting*. Retrieved from [https://le.Utah.gov/xcode/Title30/Chapter3/30-3-S11.3.html?v=C30-3-S11.3\\_2018050820180508](https://le.Utah.gov/xcode/Title30/Chapter3/30-3-S11.3.html?v=C30-3-S11.3_2018050820180508)
- Winslow, E. B., Bonds, D., Wolchik, S., Sandler, I., & Braver, S. (2009). Predictors of enrollment and retention for preventive parenting intervention for divorced families. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 30(2), 151-172. doi: 10.1007/s10935-009-0170-3

## EVALUATION OF DIVORCE TOPICS

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics and Zero-order Correlations Between Study Variables*

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	
<b>Topics included in the course</b>										
1. Impact of divorce on children	-	.91**	.83**	.88**	.83**	.59**	.60**	.59**	.59**	
2. Impact of divorce on FR		-	.86**	.89**	.85**	.58**	.58**	.59**	.59**	
3. Fin Respon of divorcing parents for children			-	.85**	.85**	.56**	.56**	.57**	.57**	
4. Benefits of positive co-parenting				-	.85**	.61**	.61**	.61**	.62**	
5. Impact of DV on children and FR					-	.56**	.56**	.57**	.57**	
<b>Future plans</b>										
6. Avoid arguing/fighting IFC						-	.93**	.88**	.89**	
7. Avoid saying negative things about the spouse IFC							-	.92**	.89**	
8. Avoid questioning children about the other parent								-	.87**	
9. Efforts to positively coparent									-	
	<i>N</i>	3,269	3,262	3,267	3,266	3,257	3,268	3,270	3,266	3,266
	Possible Range	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5	1-5
	<i>M</i>	4.15	4.12	4.09	4.20	4.14	4.51	4.52	4.49	4.51
	<i>SD</i>	.90	.90	.92	.90	.93	.78	.78	.78	.79

Note: \*\* $p < .01$

FR = family relationships, Fin Respon = financial responsibilities, DV = domestic violence, IFC = in front of children



Table 2

*Standardized Factor Loadings*

<b>Manifested Variables</b>	Est. ( <i>SE</i> )
Exogenous variables: Topics included in the divorce education course	
Impact of divorce on children	.94 (.003)
Impact of divorce on family relationships	.95 (.002)
Financial responsibilities of divorcing parents for children	.91 (.003)
Benefits of positive coparenting	.94 (.003)
Impact of domestic violence on children and family relationships	.90 (.004)
Endogenous variables: Participants' post-divorce intentions	
Avoid arguing/fighting in front of children	.95 (.002)
Avoid saying negative things about the spouse in front of children	.98 (.001)
Avoid questioning children about the other parent	.94 (.002)
Make efforts to positively coparent	.92 (.003)

*Note.* Est. = estimate, *SE* = standard error. All factor loadings are significant at  $p < .001$ .