

Engaging in coparenting changes in couple therapy: Two contrasting cases.

Cindy Eira Nunes¹, Jean-Philippe Antonietti², and Joëlle Darwiche²

¹Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

²University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Cindy Eira Nunes, PhD, Developmental and Family Psychology Service, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Jean-Philippe Antonietti, PhD, FAMily and DevelOpment research center (FADO), Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Joëlle Darwiche, PhD, FAMily and DevelOpment research center (FADO), Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Acknowledgment: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under the Grant SNF 159437.

Correspondence to: Cindy Eira Nunes, Campus du Solbosch-CP122, Av. F.D. Roosevelt 50, 1050 Brussels, Belgium, email: cindy.eira.nunes@ulb.be

This version may differ from the final article published in *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* at <http://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12591>.

The exact reference is: Eira Nunes, C., Antonietti, J-P., & Darwiche, J. (2022). Engaging in coparenting changes in couple therapy: Two contrasting cases. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*. 48(4), 998-1016 doi: 10.1111/jmft.12591

Engaging in coparenting changes in couple therapy: Two contrasting cases.

Cindy Eira Nunes¹, Jean-Philippe Antonietti², and Joëlle Darwiche²

¹Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

²University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Cindy Eira Nunes, PhD, Developmental and Family Psychology Service, Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Jean-Philippe Antonietti, PhD, FAmily and DevelOpment research center (FADO), Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Joëlle Darwiche, PhD, FAmily and DevelOpment research center (FADO), Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Acknowledgment: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under the Grant SNF 159437.

Correspondence to: Cindy Eira Nunes, Campus du Solbosch-CP122, Av. F.D. Roosevelt 50, 1050 Brussels, Belgium, email: cindy.eira.nunes@ulb.be

Abstract

Following the task analysis method, this study aimed to confirm the relevance of our model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction to differentiate between two contrasting couples undergoing couple therapy. The model under study described the steps through which couples resolve coparenting issues in couple therapy for parents. Two contrasting couples were selected from a sample of parents undergoing systemic couple therapy. We analyzed videotaped discussions about the couple's coparenting relationship to select one couple whose interaction quality improved after therapy and one couple who worsened. Records of therapy sessions were rated by two independent coders to verify whether the model of coparenting change was present. Results showed that the couple that improved after therapy presented almost all the steps of the model whereas the couple that worsened after therapy presented only two steps. This study supported the relevance of the model and its various components to discriminate between two contrasting cases.

Keywords: Coparenting, Couple, Parents, Therapy, In-session Process

Engaging in Coparenting Changes in Couple Therapy: Two Contrasting Cases.

Over the years, several researchers have called for more external validity in couple psychotherapy research, raising concerns about the research–practice gap in the field (e.g., Safran et al., 2011). Process research has the potential to reduce this gap as it explores why and how change occurs in couple therapy (Hardy & Llewelyn, 2015) and provides findings more proximal to what happens in clinical practice (Kazdin, 2009). This kind of research has thus received growing attention in couple psychotherapy research (Heatherington et al., 2015), focusing on processes of change related to common factors, such as therapeutic alliance (e.g., Bartle-Haring et al., 2012) and communication (e.g., Doss et al., 2015) or to specific factors related to working on marital issues, such as establishing relational safety (e.g., Welch et al., 2019).

Process studies are more frequent. However, they still largely overlook couples of parents. Studies generally tend to focus on processes related to the marital relationship (e.g., Welch et al., 2019). Nonetheless, couples of parents should be considered as a specific subgroup of couples because becoming parents transformed their relationship. Parents are bound not only by their romantic engagement but also by the responsibilities they share as coparents. Parents are thus engaged in a romantic relationship as well as in a coparenting relationship (Talbot & McHale, 2004). Coparenting encompasses the level of support and solidarity between the adults responsible for the care and upbringing of children (McHale & Lindahl, 2011). The coparenting relationship may create concerns related to, for example, parents' desire to find harmony in coparenting and to work effectively in the care and upbringing of their children. These concerns may influence the quality of the romantic relationship (e.g., Cho et al., 2020) and induce issues related to functioning as both parents and partners. Indeed, research has broadly shown the impact of the coparenting relationship on couple's functioning (e.g., Cho et al., 2020; Morrill et al., 2010), but also on the whole

family well-being (e.g., Lam et al., 2018; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2016). Despite the importance of coparenting in the family literature, little research has addressed coparenting changes within couple therapy.

Process studies have used a broad range of methods that includes both quantitative and qualitative methods (Gelo & Manzo, 2015; Mörtl & Gelo, 2015), such as lagged analysis (e.g., Doss et al., 2015) or grounded theory (e.g., D'Arrigo-Patrick et al., 2020). The task analysis method applied to psychotherapy research by Greenberg (1984) was also frequently used because it offers a mixed method articulating both qualitative and quantitative approaches (e.g., Welch et al., 2019). In this process study, we used the task analysis method to explore the process through which couples improve their coparenting issues.

Task Analysis

In psychotherapy research, the task analysis method aims to identify steps through which clients, therapists, or groups of people (for example couples) successfully completed a specific emotional–cognitive therapeutic task (Greenberg, 1984; Pascual-Leone et al., 2014) such as emotionally processing distress (Pascual-Leone & Greenberg, 2007), repairing alliance rupture (Aspland et al., 2008), and forgiving an unfaithful partner (Woldarsky Meneses & Greenberg, 2011). This method provides a detailed and sequential understanding of the subject's performance within therapy sessions. For example, within couple therapy, task analysis studies have demonstrated the importance of sharing and processing deeper emotions to enhance reconciliation after an attachment injury (Zuccarini et al., 2013). The task analysis method proposes a mixed method program composed of two phases of research: the *discovery* and *validation* phases (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014).

The discovery phase aims to build a model of change, using a bottom-up approach. The model of change is based on qualitative observation of the process as experienced within therapy sessions and analysis of its plausible theoretical meaning (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014).

A sample of cases presenting good and poor performances of the task is compared to discover the essential components of change (i.e., the steps of the process). Components that are included in the model correspond to process steps that are observed in the sessions of the cases with good performances and that are not observed in the cases with poor performances. Within this first phase, researchers also operationalize their model of change into measurement criteria to allow further validation of the model in the second phase. The creation of steps within the model is contingent upon defining observational cues that describe these steps (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014).

During the second phase, the validation phase, researchers measure and test the model of change previously discovered using a separate sample. This phase aims to verify the predictive value and external validity of the model. It should verify both the steps of the model and the relation between the presence or absence of the steps and good or poor independent outcomes (i.e., treatment outcomes which are distinct from and broader than the process under study). In this phase, the researcher verifies the steps of the model which are essential to achieve the task under study and that the steps were only observed in good outcome cases and not in poor outcome cases. Coders, blind to outcomes, use the observational cues of the steps to examine this new sample (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014).

The validation phase is conducted on cases presenting the problem state under study (e.g., in our case coparenting dissatisfaction). The cases also need to be contrasted according to independent outcome as some cases report positive development after therapy and others do not. For example, in their task analysis study Pascual-Leone & Greenberg (2007) selected 34 cases (17 with good outcomes and 17 with poor outcomes). Cases were discriminated based on a self-report questionnaire assessing the degree to which clients orient to and symbolize their internal experience and a clinical judgment of the session as good or poor. This contrast allowed the researchers to test the ability of the model measured based on the

measurement developed in the first phase, to discriminate between cases with good and poor outcomes. Coders should thus find that cases with good therapy outcomes presented the steps of the model whereas cases with poor therapy outcomes did not (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014). When selecting a measure of independent outcome, several approaches and instruments may be considered such as self-report questionnaires or observation. Observational data have been broadly overlooked despite their relevance for the study of couple functioning and couple therapy (Friedlander et al., 2019; Wampler & Harper, 2017). To our knowledge no previous task analysis used observational data as independent outcome.

Observational Data as Outcome

Using observation to evaluate pre–post therapy development appears valuable to both research and clinical practice. First, it offers the opportunity to assess couples' interactions, which is relevant to understanding therapeutic changes and couples' functioning (Feinberg et al., 2009; Friedlander et al., 2019). In contrast to questionnaires, observational methods provide evidence of change that is not only dependent on the partners' and the therapist's reports and perceptions (Wampler & Harper, 2017). Observational data may reflect changes that partners did not perceive because of their limited ability to observe their own communication (Hahlweg et al., 2004).

Furthermore, observational data relies on independent judges who are not subject to social desirability (Oka et al., 2015). Self-report questionnaires may be biased by social desirability as partners may tend not to report behaviors that are perceived as undesirable (Oka et al., 2015; Shapiro & Gottman, 2005).

Collecting observational data allows assessment of the couple's immediate behaviors within their real context in a specific moment. It thus focuses on the actual behaviors that could potentially be observed in real life situations, whereas questionnaires focus on the respondent's internal and subjective experience (perceptions and attitudes) in such situation

(Kerig & Baucom, 2004). Partners' answers to questionnaires may not reflect their actual behaviors (Wampler & Harper, 2017). To complete questionnaires, partners have to look back or forward in time (Wampler & Harper, 2017). The data collected through observation and self-report questionnaires may not reflect one another (Oka et al., 2015). In this study, we focused primarily on observational data to contrast our cases. Indeed, observations of couple's interactions as outcomes are more time-consuming than self-report questionnaires but provide a more complete and direct approach to evaluating the couple's relationship or their development over therapy.

Present Research

In this study, we focus on couples of parents as in the empirical literature little is known on parents in couple therapy (e.g., the existence of specific interventions targeting parents, the impact of couple therapy on parents, etc.). More particularly, we propose to study the process related to changes on coparenting, which is one important dimension of the parents' everyday interactions. Exploring coparenting processes within couple therapy seems essential to gaining a better understanding of how coparenting changes unfold within couple therapy and to what extent they can drive changes at different levels of couple and family functioning. Therefore, we focused our investigation on coparenting process within a specific couple therapy for parents, the Integrative Brief Systemic Intervention (IBSI). This therapy approach particularly addresses the importance of articulating work on both the romantic and the coparenting relationships within systemic couple intervention (Darwiche et al., in press). Consequently, it presumably produces changes in both relationships. In this study, we focused on couples' changes related to the coparenting relationship even though couples also worked on and potentially resolved their romantic issues within IBSI sessions. More precisely, we focused on the process that unfolded when parents resolved their coparenting dissatisfaction within IBSI.

In this study, we conducted a preliminary validation of a task analysis project investigating in-session change in IBSI. The discovery phase of the task analysis project was conducted previously and presented elsewhere (Eira Nunes et al., 2021). In this previous study, we intensively analyzed six couples undergoing IBSI who reported coparenting dissatisfaction. We selected three couples who successfully overcame their dissatisfaction over the course of therapy and three who did not. Analysis of these six couples (discovery phase) resulted in a model of change derived from the observation of the process through a specific lens based on IBSI clinical assumptions and relevant empirical literature (Buehlman et al., 1992; Oppenheim & Koren-Karie, 2002). The model comprised six steps: awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction, reflection on negative coparenting dynamics, insightfulness, innovation, validation, and coparenting we-ness. As part of the task analysis, we developed a rating system of the above steps. This system described the observational cues that characterized each step and therefore corresponded to the essential criteria on which to judge if a couple was displaying a specific step of the model.

Objectives. We aimed to expand upon the previous discovery phase and conduct a preliminary verification of the resulting model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction. We aimed to verify the relevance of the model to discriminate between outcomes in two contrasting cases undergoing IBSI. According to the task analysis method, the verification of the model should be based on cases presenting good and poor outcomes on an independent measure (Pascual-Leone et al., 2014). As independent measure, we selected the development of interaction quality (interaction quality improved for one couple and worsened for the other) as assessed through videotaped discussions about coparenting agreement and disagreement. We focused on independent observational measures as they appeared more clinically relevant (Kerig & Baucom, 2004), less likely to be biased, and more likely to detect therapeutic changes (Oka et al., 2015).

We hypothesized that the couple that improved their interaction quality after therapy would present the six steps of the model, whereas the couple that worsened their interaction after therapy would not. We expected that better interaction quality would be related to resolving coparenting dissatisfaction (process under study), because parents who are more satisfied of their coparenting relationship may experience more quality interaction within their coparenting relationship.

Method

Participants

This contrasting case study was part of an ongoing randomized controlled trial evaluating the efficacy of IBSI and was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant SNF 159437). All couples were the parents of at least one child under 16 years old and requested couple therapy. Couples were heterosexual couples, predominantly European (93.5%). When seeking therapy, couples had been in a relationship for an average of 11 years ($M = 11.22$, $SD = 6.94$) and reported being in difficulty for more than 3 years in average ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 2.70$). Couples allocated to the IBSI group completed 6 IBSI sessions in average ($M = 5.83$, $SD = 0.59$). From the available RCT sample of 37 couples of parents who had completed IBSI, we selected two contrasting cases based on their observational measures of interaction quality. To protect the couples' identities, names and personal information were changed.

The bonding couple. The first couple was composed of Kate (38 years old) and Alan (39 years old), both Europeans. Kate was an accountant and Alan was employed in a telecommunications company. They were married and had been together for 12 years. They had two daughters of 7 and 10 years old. Alan also had a 14-year-old son from a precedent marriage that spent a weekend every 14 days with them. Before starting therapy sessions, the couple reported having relational difficulties for five years. They had been in couple therapy

in the past. Kate and Alan were consulting because they felt their children were invading their romantic relationship. According to Kate, it was difficult to feel close to her husband while he failed to support her with the children and was barely engaged in coparenting decisions. For Alan, the main issue was his perception that Kate's overinvestment in her parental role weakened her commitment to their romantic relationship. He wished their romantic relationship could be a strength and a resource in their coparenting difficulties.

The struggling couple. The second couple, a married couple, Victoria (45 years old) and Roger (44 years old), both Europeans, had been together for 23 years. Victoria worked as a dental assistant and Roger was a music teacher. They had two daughters of 5 and 8 years old, and the youngest daughter had ADHD. In their pre-therapy assessment, they reported having undergone couple therapy in the past and Victoria had recently started an individual psychotherapy. At the time of the study, the couple reported having relational difficulties for ten years. Their request for therapy appeared global. They reported encountering various difficulties and distancing within their relationship related to lack of time for their romantic relationship, miscommunication, strong emotional reactions, unspoken tensions, and exhaustion from parenting. Parenting difficulties were quickly brought into the picture by the couple.

Treatment

Both couples underwent IBSI: seven sessions for Kate and Alan (the bonding couple) and six for Victoria and Roger (the struggling couple). All sessions were audio- or videotaped. IBSI is a manualized brief couple intervention for parents (Carneiro et al., 2012). It is integrative as it relies on the systematic articulation of therapeutic work on the coparenting and romantic relationships. It is brief as it generally comprises six sessions of 1—1.5 hr each over six months. However, the therapist and the couple may decide to end therapy before the sixth session or to schedule a seventh session. The brief framework implies setting

concrete objectives achievable within the timeframe of the therapy. In IBSI, therapists are free to choose their techniques from various systemic models such as the structural, strategic, and transgenerational models (Bowen, 1984; Haley, 1963; Minuchin, 1974).

IBSI is characterized by three main therapeutic principles (Darwiche et al., in press): therapist aims to (a) engage partners as romantic partners and as a coparenting team from the start of the therapeutic process; (b) support the parents in increasing their awareness regarding their children's behavior and emotional experiences when facing their parents' conflicts; and (c) work on the spill- and crossover effects between coparenting and romantic relationships (i.e., explore how negativity or positivity spills from one relationship to the other or from one partner to the other).

Procedure

Couples were assessed before starting therapy and after the end of therapy. Several measures were taken through self-report questionnaires and videotaped discussions. The videotaped discussions were conducted by the research team at the consultation center or at the couple's house. Couples were asked to talk about agreement and disagreement in their coparenting relationship for 10 minutes (i.e., two discussions of five minutes). Based on observational data, we selected two contrasting couples from the available RCT sample (37 couples): one that improved its interaction quality and another that did not (see the Analytic Plan for the selection procedure). To further document this selection, we compared pre-post changes on observed interaction quality to pre-post changes on self-report coparenting support. Finally, we analyzed the couples' therapy sessions according to the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction previously developed (Eira Nunes et al., 2021).

Instruments

Interaction quality. Based on videotaped discussions realized before and after therapy, we assessed the couples' interaction quality according to a coding system

synthesizing several scales used in other studies (e.g., Baker et al., 2010; McHale et al., 2001). This coding system evaluates the frequency, quality, and intensity of 10 interaction variables, such as endorsement, agreement, competition, and defensiveness, on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 10. We used principal component analysis (Cazes, 2004) to summarize the 10 interaction variables into one principal component corresponding to interaction quality.

A team of three independent coders (two researchers in psychology and one master student in psychology) was engaged in coding. Interrater reliability was controlled on 25% of the total sample of videotaped records. The computation of Krippendorff's alpha (Krippendorff, 1980) revealed a good reliability of .81 on average for the 10 variables (from $\text{ordinal}\alpha = .71$ to $\text{ordinal}\alpha = .90$). Coefficients were calculated with the irr package (Version 0.84.1: Gamer et al., 2019) on R software (R Core Team, 2013).

Coparenting support. Coparenting support was assessed with the Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM; Abidin & Konold, 1999). This 20-item self-report questionnaire assessed coparenting support before and after therapy. Composite scores range between 20 and 100, with higher scores corresponding to higher coparenting support. For our total sample, the internal consistency of the measure was excellent ($\alpha = .95$ for both mothers and fathers). According to the Jacobson and Truax method (1991), we computed both the clinical cut-off and the reliable change index (RCI). Using our data for the clinical dataset and Delvecchio et al. (2015) data for the nonclinical dataset, we found a cut-off at 80.39 for mothers and at 82.65 for fathers. Scores below these cut-offs were considered to reflect clinical distress. The RCI based on our RCT sample was of 9.22 for mothers and 8.91 for fathers, and changes in pre- to post-therapy scores equal to or greater than the RCI were considered clinically significant.

Analytic Plan

Preliminary analysis on interaction quality. As a preliminary analysis, we conducted a non normalized principal component analysis (Cazes, 2004) on the various interaction variables presented above. We used the FactoMineR package (Le et al., 2008) on R software (R Core Team, 2013). We conserved the variance of each variable and therefore assessed their respective contribution to the principal component (unstandardized data). The principal component analysis aimed to summarize 10 interaction variables into a principal component. We based our analyses on the pre- and post-therapy data of 37 couples. We were able to identify one principal component for each discussion that explained between 46% and 57% of the variance. This principal component contrasted positive interaction variables (e.g., agreement and endorsement) with negative interaction variables (e.g., defensiveness and competition). Therefore, couples who improved their interaction quality moved towards a higher score on the principal component.

Selection of the two couples. We then selected two couples that had developed in opposite ways after therapy. One couple improved their interaction quality in the two discussions from pre- to post-therapy whereas the other worsened their interaction quality. To contrast our two couples, we selected couples respectively presenting the largest positive (bonding couple) and negative deltas (struggling couple) between pre- and post-therapy scores on the principal component. Selecting only two couples allowed us to identify extreme cases developing in completely opposite ways. Focusing on two extreme cases allowed us to conduct in-depth investigation and potentially capture how each case's experience of therapy was so different. Table 1 presents the *z-scores* of each couple's pre- and post-therapy interaction quality in the discussions about coparenting agreement and disagreement. Negative *z-scores* signal lower interaction quality (high levels of negative interaction variables) compared with the whole group and positive *z-scores* signal higher interaction

quality (high levels of positive interaction variables) compared with the whole group. We also explored self-report data on coparenting support. In the preliminary results section, we compared results from self-report questionnaires with results from observation of videotaped discussions.

Qualitative analysis of sessions. Following the task analysis method, we first verified that both couples presented the problem state. In this study, the problem state that couples had to present is coparenting dissatisfaction. Coparenting dissatisfaction was signaled by one partner expressing negative emotions regarding the coparenting relationship and/or the other coparent's behaviors or attitudes. Not all couples undergoing IBSI express coparenting dissatisfaction, and, by extension, they may not experience the process under study. Identification of coparenting dissatisfaction during therapy sessions was thus a prerequisite for a couples' inclusion in our contrasting case analysis.

Two independent coders, blind to outcomes, assessed the therapy sessions of both couples for the presence or absence of the six steps of the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction: awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction, reflection on negative coparenting dynamic, insightfulness, innovation, validation, and coparenting we-ness. One coder was a researcher in psychology (first author) and the other was a psychotherapist specialized in systemic couple therapy. Only the second coder was blinded to the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction when coding sessions. Indeed, the systemic psychotherapist had no previous knowledge on the model and no specific training on coparenting intervention. The first coder watched the therapy sessions and identified 42 segments (24 for the bonding couple and 18 for the struggling couple) related to the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction. Coding was based on a coding manual that operationalized each step into observational cues (Eira Nunes et al., 2021). On all segments, coders achieved an agreement of 77%; agreement for the struggling couple (68%) was lower than for the bonding couple

(83%). However, agreement for both couples was satisfying. Coders resolved all disagreements to obtain consensus on every coded segment.

Results

In the result section, we first present our preliminary results regarding changes in interaction quality. We then report the main results related to the verification of our model. We thus provide a detailed description of the steps that were present for both contrasting couples.

Preliminary Analysis on Interaction Quality

The bonding couple. Partners improved their interaction quality from before to after therapy for both coparenting agreement and disagreement discussions (see Table 1). More precisely, they shared a more similar perspective regarding their children's needs, were more affectively connected when exchanging about their children's chores and education (Baker et al., 2010), and expressed increasing approval of their mutual parenting practices (McHale et al., 2001) at post-therapy. Partners also displayed less competition for the role of child expert (Baker et al., 2010), less defensiveness, and less perceived pressure to change as they showed decreasing tendencies to ward off criticism or protect themselves in the discussion (Gordis et al., 1996), and they put less implicit or explicit pressure on their partners to change their behaviors or personality (Sevier et al., 2004).

Self-report data corroborated the observed improvement. The couple reported coparenting support below the clinical cut-offs before therapy—Kate's score of 52.00 was below the cut-off of 80.39 and Alan's score of 29.00 was below the cut-off of 82.65. Their scores increased after therapy, surpassing the clinical cut-off (Kate = 81.00; Alan = 94.00). Their pre-post change was also clinically significant as they respectively exceeded the RCIs of 9.22 for the mother and of 8.91 for the father.

The struggling couple. In contrast, the struggling couple moved from positive to negative interaction quality on the coparenting discussions (see Table 1). This couple displayed a good interaction quality before therapy when discussing coparenting agreements and disagreements. However, after therapy, the quality of their interactions declined. In contrast to the bonding couple, the struggling couple demonstrated less agreement, shared emotion, and endorsement than before therapy. After therapy, they shared fewer similar perspectives regarding their children's needs and appeared less emotionally connected and less supportive of each other's interactions with the children. Their interactions were also characterized by more defensiveness, competition, and pressure on their partner to change.

Regarding their perception of coparenting support, self-report data revealed that Victoria's scores remained in the normal range as the score was above the clinical cut-off of 80.39 before therapy and did not significantly change from pre- to post-therapy (pre-therapy score = 88.00; post-therapy score = 85.00). On the other hand, Roger's report of coparenting support revealed clinical distress before therapy, with a PAM score of 75.00 below the clinical cut-off of 82.65. However, after therapy, he reported a clinically significant improvement as his score surpassed the clinical cut-off (post-therapy score = 90.00), with an increase of 15.00 (RCI of 8.91). For this couple, self-report data did not reflect the decrease that we detected in the observational data based on the videotaped discussions.

Qualitative Analysis of Sessions

In the next sections, we illustrate each step displayed by the bonding couple and the struggling couple. Coders looked for the presence and absence of the steps of the model, from the expression of coparenting dissatisfaction to the end of the last session; more particularly, from Sessions 1 to 7 for the bonding couple and from Sessions 2 to 6 for the struggling couple as coparenting dissatisfaction was not expressed in Session 1. At the end of the next section, Table 2 offers an overview of the results.

The bonding couple. Kate and Alan expressed their coparenting dissatisfaction within the first therapy session. Kate deplored Alan's impatience toward their children and his lack of engagement in coparenting.

In the first session, shortly after Kate expressed her dissatisfaction, both partners were able to display some *awareness of their coparenting dissatisfaction* and thus were both engaged in exchanges about the concrete aspects of Kate's coparenting dissatisfaction. They clearly identified the behaviors that were the source of dissatisfaction and the efforts that they should make. Kate also expressed her wishes and expectations in relation to their coparenting issues.

In Sessions 2 and 3, the couple continued exploring their coparenting issues. More particularly, in Session 2, some observational cues of *coparenting we-ness* were identified but some important criteria were not met. Kate referred to the couple as a coparenting team and highlighted their ability to be flexible and adjust to each other. However, she also outlined the need for coparenting changes to achieve a long-term balance and truly be a coparenting team. She was thus relying on future changes to identify herself as part of a coparenting team. Moreover, coparenting we-ness implies the engagement of both parents and Alan was not significantly involved in the exchanges. Session 3 was characterized by discussions about Alan's son (Kate's stepson).

Session 4 could be presented as a key session as many steps of the model were coded. First, in Session 4, the couple engaged in *reflection on their negative coparenting dynamics*. Kate highlighted the actions and reactions that triggered their coparenting dissatisfaction. More particularly, she outlined that, as she was generally more involved with the children, she was triggered by the fact that her husband tended to be less engaged. His approach appeared less effective to her even if she acknowledged that her way might not always be the right way either. Alan recognized that he was less proactive than Kate and validated Kate's view of their

coparenting dynamic (i.e., dynamics of *over- and under-investment*). They extended their reflection within the fifth session.

Then, already in Session 3, but mostly in Session 4, Kate displayed *insightfulness*. In Session 3, Kate's insightfulness mainly focused on her stepson's decision to stop coming to their house and the reasons behind this decision. Nonetheless, insightfulness was mostly present in Session 4, as Kate reflected extensively on their children's (stepson included) emotional experience of their negative coparenting dynamic: how they experience Alan's passivity and her overinvestment. For instance, regarding her stepson's decision to take some distance with their family, she tried to understand the reasons behind this decision and how their respective reactions to this decision (Alan's distancing and her requests for more explanations) may have impacted his emotional experience (he may have felt left out of their family and pressure by her). She was able to challenge her parenting style and attitude with her stepson as she acknowledged that he may have experienced her desire to be invested and present for him as intrusiveness.

The *innovation* and *validation* steps were also present in the fourth session. Alan was the one primarily engaged in the innovation step, and Kate validated his efforts. Alan revealed that he was trying to be more involved with the children and had, for example, been sending old family pictures to his older son. He explained that he tried to maintain the connection between them even when they were apart and let his son know that he missed him. This new behavior corresponded to the innovation step and appeared to be a response to Kate's wishes for more emotional involvement from Alan toward their children. Kate validated Alan's new behaviors. Alan continued innovating regarding coparenting through therapy sessions.

By the end of therapy, the couple looked back at their request for therapy and shared their satisfaction regarding their therapeutic journey. They agreed on the improvements that were made even if Kate highlighted the fragility of those changes. They both shared their

intention to be careful to maintain a positive dynamic regarding both their coparenting and romantic relationships.

As shown in Table 2, only the *coparenting we-ness* step was not observed in the sessions. Five steps out of six were displayed over the course of therapy.

The struggling couple. For this couple, the session 1 was not coded as the task marker (coparenting dissatisfaction) was only identified in Session 2. In Session 1, the couple mainly talked about their romantic relationship without expressing coparenting dissatisfaction. In Session 2, Victoria highlighted that Roger was often unavailable for coparenting tasks such as putting the children to bed and helping children with homework.

From Session 2 to Session 4, before the couple engaged in any step of the model, their interaction was characterized by minimization of the importance of their coparenting issues. For instance, Victoria appeared uncomfortable and nervous when talking about her coparenting dissatisfaction. When the therapist asked Victoria what she expected from Roger in those moments when he was unavailable, she was not able to answer. Both partners tended to change the subject when the therapist tried to explore concrete aspects of their disagreements and dissatisfaction.

Despite this dynamic of avoidance and confusion, coders identified the *innovation* step for Roger—this step does not require the engagement of both partners. In Session 4, Roger explained that they had adopted a new coparenting behavior and tried to divide their responsibilities differently. He presented this new behavior as a solution to Victoria's timid complaints about coparenting. Victoria did not validate the innovation. She judged the change too fragile and irrelevant. Therefore, the *validation* step was not coded for this couple.

Near the end of therapy sessions (Session 5), coders identified *awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction*. Victoria and Roger were able to directly address a conflict situation and authentically confront each other with very few withdrawals. Both partners were

engaged in the awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction and identified which behaviors of the other parent were upsetting in this situation. Victoria blamed Roger for being selfish and disengaged, while Roger blamed Victoria for being unwilling to compromise and unreasonable.

Globally, over the sessions, Roger appeared active and motivated whereas Victoria was mainly passive and rarely validated Roger's input. At times, she did not appear ready to engage and even appeared resistant to change. By the end of therapy, according to coders' observation of the process, the couple main improvement was the ability to directly approach difficulties, at least regarding their coparenting issues. They appeared not yet on the same page as, for example, Roger described their relationship as improved with more relief and closeness. He appeared quite positive regarding their therapeutic progress. In contrast, Victoria's perspective was substantially different. She expressed doubt about their progress. She emphasized their difficulties and her remaining dissatisfaction regarding Roger's lack of availability for coparenting as if they were moving backwards.

As shown in Table 2, Roger and Victoria displayed only two steps of the model throughout their therapy sessions.

Discussion

This study aimed to verify the applicability and relevance of the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction for discriminating between two contrasting cases. The model was partially verified in this study. Our main hypothesis was that the couple whose interaction had improved after therapy would present the steps of the model whereas the couple whose interactions had worsened after therapy would not. Coding of sessions revealed the presence of five out of six steps of the model for the bonding couple and of two steps for the struggling couple. Only the step of coparenting we-ness was not observed by coders in either case and was therefore not verified in this study. Our findings may signal that, to overcome their

dissatisfaction, couples do not need to identify themselves as part of a new coparenting team within the therapy sessions (as defined in Eira Nunes et al., 2021). We could postulate that for some couples, such as the bonding couple, this step would be displayed later when coparenting changes had been installed and had deeply modified the coparenting dynamic. Future verification studies should investigate the presence or absence of coparenting we-ness in the therapy sessions of couples who resolve their coparenting dissatisfaction to verify the essential nature of this step for resolving coparenting dissatisfaction. Nonetheless, it is common that validation studies fail to systematically observe some steps of the model in the resolved cases (e.g., Pascual-Leone & Greenberg, 2007; Zuccarini et al., 2013). For example, Zuccarini et al. (2013) verified the attachment injury resolution model even though some of the couples considered as resolved did not present some of the steps; five steps out of eight were not consistently presented by all resolved couples.

In task analysis studies, unresolved cases frequently present fewer steps than do resolved cases (e.g., Pascual-Leone & Greenberg, 2007) and also present earlier steps of the model (e.g., Zuccarini et al., 2013). In line with this literature, we found that the couple whose interaction quality worsened after therapy (the struggling couple) presented only two steps of the model: the awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction and innovation steps. We initially postulated these steps would not normally be presented by unresolved couples. Displaying awareness of coparenting dissatisfaction by the end of therapy was identified by coders as a key moment for the struggling couple. Indeed, coders overall impression when watching the struggling couple's sessions was of confusion and lack of focus on the concrete issues. Nonetheless, from the fifth session onwards, the couple's exchanges featured more authenticity. Benson et al. (2012) have identified emotional avoidance as a common target of couple therapy. They highlighted how avoidance may limit the couple's ability to experience emotional intimacy and thus to feel close to each other. Mutually avoidant partners avoid

topics that are too emotionally distressing. Consequently, important issues remain unresolved, exacerbating their relational issues and decreasing both partners' satisfaction (Benson et al., 2012). In light of the literature, overcoming their initial avoidance appeared to be an important therapy outcome for this couple. We may postulate that this key moment was possible because both partners focused on the same specific situation. The discussion on this situation appeared to reactivate their negative emotions, which they were then able to share in an authentic way. For the first time in session, they confronted each other with little withdrawal. However, this study revealed that this first step of the model did not differentiate our two cases. The main difference was that to achieve deeper changes in coparenting, couples needed to overcome the awareness step at some point. They needed to stop blaming each other for their dissatisfaction and reflect on their respective contribution to the coparenting dynamic to change further.

Regarding the innovation step, innovation without subsequent validation appeared to compromise the couple's resolution. For the struggling couple, the lack of validation after the husband displayed innovation appeared to offset the progress that the innovation should represent in the process under study. Roger explained that both parents had adopted new coparenting behaviors. However, Victoria did not validate this innovation and even refuted the change, presenting it as exceptional and irrelevant. We may postulate that Roger's engagement in the innovation step signaled his attempts to improve the situation and make a difference. Nonetheless, the partners were not on the same page. These changes that were not validated failed to contribute to the resolution of coparenting dissatisfaction.

We also highlighted that Roger and Victoria were not on the same page regarding their perception of coparenting support before and after therapy. Self-report data revealed that for Victoria coparenting support remained in the normal range from before to after therapy, whereas Roger reported an improvement from before to after therapy (his scores moved from

below to above the clinical cut-off). Consequently, for the struggling couple, observational and self-report data were divergent, contrarily to the bonding couple for whom we identify an improvement of outcomes on both observational and self-report data. Note that observational data assessed interaction quality when discussing coparenting topics, whereas self-report data assessed partners' perception of coparenting support. Discrepancies between observational and self-report data could be expected. Indeed, the literature on these two methods of assessment underscores their differences and the likelihood of obtaining different and potentially complementary information from them (e.g., Kerig & Baucom, 2004).

Each method focuses on different objects. While observational methods focus on actual behaviors at a moment and in a specific context, questionnaires focus on the respondent's perceptions and attitudes regarding those behaviors that requires looking back or forward in time (Kerig & Baucom, 2004; Wampler & Harper, 2017). Therefore, for the struggling couple, observational data may reflect negative changes that partners did not perceived because of their limited ability to observe their own communication (Hahlweg et al., 2004). Moreover, we could also postulate that the absence of negative changes on the struggling couple's questionnaires was due to social desirability (Oka et al., 2015). Because they decided not to pursue therapy, Victoria and Roger might expect improvement or at least stability compared to before therapy. Observational data are less subject to social desirability than self-report data.

Finally, in both cases, we observed a greater investment on the part of one parent—the mother in the bonding couple and the father in the struggling couple. This imbalance between partners has been previously noted and discussed in the literature, particularly concerning men's engagement in couple therapy (e.g., Englar-Carlson & Shepard, 2005). However, we observed that for the couple that declined after therapy (the struggling couple), the imbalance was accompanied by passivity and a lack of validation from the partner who was generally

less invested. She appeared to be uncomfortable and not ready to engage in the process. This passivity was not observed for the couple that improved after therapy (the bonding couple), as the wife was more involved, but the husband cooperated and validated her. One parent may be more invested than the other; they may be more engaged in exchanges and adopt new behaviors while the other sits on the sidelines offering occasional validation of the more engaged parent. This imbalance nevertheless may enhance changes for the couple provided that it is not characterized by the motivation and commitment of one partner and the resistance to change of the other.

Limitations

The primary limitation of this study was that we described the relation between outcomes and the process under study without considering the potential influence of external factors. For example, children's characteristics, the initial agreement on the therapeutic objectives, or family characteristics more largely, might have influenced couples' improvement. Given that one of the daughters of the struggling couple presented ADHD, they might have faced specific coparenting challenges (e.g., Cook et al., 2009; Mendez et al., 2015). These challenges support the importance of addressing coparenting within couple therapy but may require further therapeutic work to disentangle their difficulties as parents and as romantic partners. The struggling couple had also been in a relationship for longer and reported difficulties for a longer period compared to the bonding couple. We could therefore postulate that their coparenting dynamics were more entrenched. Moreover, the couple appeared to have several therapeutic objectives and to be ambivalent regarding the nature of their issues. These characteristics may have made it difficult for the struggling couple to work on their difficulties within the brief framework of IBSI (Biesen & Doss, 2013). Moreover, the bonding couple was a stepfamily. Because stepfamilies encounter specific coparenting challenges (Papernow, 2018), we may postulate that the bonding couple perceived therapeutic

work on coparenting as more relevant than the struggling couple. Future studies should thus investigate potential covariates such as therapeutic objectives and child and family characteristics (e.g., parents' age, race and ethnic identities, individual symptomatology, and type of family) that may explain differences in outcomes or that may hinder or facilitate resolution of the coparenting issues.

This preliminary verification study was based on the coding of two judges. One of the judges (the psychotherapist) was blind to the model and had no specific training on coparenting. The other judge (first author) participated in the discovery phase. Coding might thus have been biased by the coder's (first author) expectations regarding the model. However, both coders were blind to the outcome, and the double coding enabled verification of the reliability of the coding of sessions and prevented any further biases.

Finally, the preliminary nature of this study implies some limitations related primarily to the characteristics of our sample: two European heterosexual couples. For example, coparenting in Non-Western cultures (e.g., East Asia, Turkey) may more intensively engage other caregivers such as grandparents, older children, and extended family members (e.g., McHale et al., 2014; Salman-Engin et al., 2018). Therefore, for these couples, working on coparenting in couple therapy may involve other processes. Therapies such as IBSI may also be less relevant because working on coparenting requires the inclusion of other caregivers in addition to the parents. However, future studies are needed to test our results in other populations (e.g., other cultures, other family forms, etc.), larger samples, and other interventions.

Conclusion

This preliminary verification study partially confirmed the applicability of the model of resolving coparenting dissatisfaction in two contrasting couples. Based on the model, we were able to differentiate the couple that improved after therapy and the couple that declined.

The partners who increased their ability to actively listen to each other, be supportive, find compromises, and bond over coparenting discussion outside of their therapy sessions also resolved their coparenting dissatisfaction through specific steps of change related to insight and behavioral changes. As we conducted our study on only two cases, we were able to select extreme cases that had developed in opposite ways after therapy. This approach allowed us to discuss how a couple who benefited from therapy and one who did not—at the coparenting level, at least—experienced very different in-session processes. This limited sample allowed in-depth analysis and subsequent hypotheses on the characteristics of the observed processes that were particularly different for each couple and that may have contributed or prevented resolution. Therefore, future studies should extend this first verification of the model on a larger sample to, for example, verify our findings regarding the necessity of coparenting wellness or of the dependence between the innovation and validation steps.

References

- Abidin, R. R., & Konold, T. R. (1999). *Parenting Alliance Measure professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Ressources.
- Aspland, H., Llewelyn, S., Hardy, G. E., Barkham, M., & Stiles, W. (2008). Alliance ruptures and rupture resolution in cognitive-behavior therapy: A preliminary task analysis. *Psychotherapy Research*, 18(6), 699-710.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300802291463>
- Baker, J., McHale, J., Strozier, A., & Cecil, D. (2010). Mother-grandmother coparenting relationships in families with incarcerated mothers: A pilot investigation. *Family Process*, 49(2), 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01316.x>
- Bartle-Haring, S., Glebova, T., Gangamma, R., Gafsky, E., & Delaney, R. O. (2012). Alliance and termination status in couple therapy: A comparison of methods for assessing discrepancies. *Psychotherapy Research*, 22(5), 502-514.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2012.676985>
- Benson, L. A., McGinn, M. M., & Christensen, A. (2012). Common principles of couple therapy. *Behaviour Therapy*, 43(1), 25-35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2010.12.009>
- Biesen, J. N., & Doss, B. D. (2013). Couples' agreement on presenting problems predicts engagement and outcomes in problem-focused couple therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(4), 658-663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033422>
- Bowen, M. (1984). *La différenciation du soi*. ESF.
- Buehlman, K. T., Gottman, J. M., & Katz, L. F. (1992). How a couple views their past predicts their future: Predicting divorce from an oral history interview. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 5(3), 295-318. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.5.3-4.295>

Carneiro, C., Vaudan, C., Duc-Marwood, A., Darwiche, J., de Roten, Y., & Despland, J.-N.

(2012). *Manuel psychothérapeutique: L'intervention systémique brève intégrative* [*Psychotherapy manual: The integrative brief systemic intervention*] (version 1.0).

Centre hospitalier universitaire vaudois.

Cazes, P. (2004). Quelques methodes d'analyse factorielle d'une série de tableaux de donnees. *Revue MODULAD*, 31, 1-31.

Cho, S., Cui, M., & Claridge, A. M. (2020). Perceived coparenting support and later relationship status among cohabiting parents. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 48(2), 177-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2019.1684852>

Cook, J. C., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Buckley, C. K., & Davis, E. F. (2009). Are some children harder to coparent than others? Children's negative emotionality and coparenting relationship quality. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 23(4), 606-610. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015992>

D'Arrigo-Patrick, E., Samman, S. K., & Knudson-Martin, C. (2020). Moving from "I" to "We": A grounded theory analysis of couple therapy with liver patients and their partners. *Family Process*, 59(4), 1517-1529. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12528>

Darwiche, J., Carneiro, C., Vaudan, C., Imesch, C., Eira Nunes, C., Favez, N., & de Roten, Y. (in press). Parents in couple therapy: An intervention targeting coparenting and romantic relationships. *Family Process*.

Delvecchio, E., Sciandra, A., Finos, L., Mazzeschi, C., & Di Riso, D. (2015). The role of co-parenting alliance as a mediator between trait anxiety, family system maladjustment, and parenting stress in a sample of non-clinical Italian parents. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01177>

- Doss, B. D., Mitchell, A., Georgia, E. J., Biesen, J. N., & Rowe, L. S. (2015). Improvements in closeness, communication, and psychological distress mediate effects of couple therapy for veterans. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 83(2), 405-415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038541>
- Eira Nunes, C., Pascual-Leone, A., de Roten, Y., Favez, N., & Darwiche, J. (2021). Resolving coparenting dissatisfaction in couples: A preliminary task analysis study. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 47(1), 21-35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12450>
- Englar-Carlson, M., & Shepard, D. (2005). Engaging men in couples counseling: Strategies for overcoming ambivalence and inexpressiveness. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 13(4), 383-391. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1066480705278467>
- Feinberg, M. E., Kan, M. L., & Goslin, M. C. (2009). Enhancing coparenting, parenting, and child self-regulation: Effects of family foundations 1 year after birth. *Prevention Science*, 10, 276-285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-009-0130-4>
- Friedlander, M. L., Lee, M., & Escudero, V. (2019). What we do and do not know about the nature and analysis of couple interaction. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 8(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cfp0000114>
- Gamer, M., Lemon, J., Fellows, I., & Singh, P. (2019). Irr: Various coefficients of interrater reliability and agreement <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=irr>
- Gelo, O. C. G., & Manzo, S. (2015). Quantitative approaches to treatment process, change process, and process-outcome research. In O. C. G. Gelo, A. Pritz, & B. Rieken (Eds.), *Psychotherapy research: Foundations, process, and outcome* (pp. 247-272). Springer-Verlag Wien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-1382-0_13

Gordis, E. B., Margolin, G., & Garcia, H. (1996). *Marital coding system*.

Greenberg, L. S. (1984). Task analysis: The general approach. In L. N. Rice & L. S.

Greenberg (Eds.), *Patterns of change* (pp. 126-184). Guilford.

Hahlweg, K., Kaiser, A., Christensen, A., Fehm-Wolfsdorf, G., & Groth, T. (2004). Self-report and observational assessment of couples' conflict: The concordance between the communication patterns questionnaire and the KPI observation system. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(1), 61-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00061.x>

Haley, J. (1963). *Strategies of psychotherapy*. Grune & Stratton. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14324-000>

Hardy, G. E., & Llewelyn, S. (2015). Introduction to psychotherapy process research. In O. C. G. Gelo, A. Pritz, & B. Rieken (Eds.), *Psychotherapy research: Foundations, process, and outcome* (pp. 183-194). Springer-Verlag Wien. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-1382-0_9

Heatherington, L., Friedlander, M. L., Diamond, G., Escudero, V., & Pinsoff, W. M. (2015). 25 years of systemic therapies research: Progress and promise. *Psychotherapy Research*, 25(3), 348-364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2014.983208>

Jacobson, N. S., & Truax, P. (1991). Clinical significance: A statistical approach to defining meaningful change in psychotherapy research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 59(1), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.59.1.12>

Kazdin, A. E. (2009). Understanding how and why psychotherapy leads to change. *Psychotherapy Research*, 19(4-5), 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300802448899>

- Kerig, P. K., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). *Couple observational coding systems*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage.
- Lam, C. B., Tam, C. Y. S., Chung, K. K. H., & Li, X. (2018). The link between coparenting cooperation and child social competence: The moderating role of child negative affect. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 32(5), 692-698. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000428>
- Le, S., Josse, J., & Husson, F. (2008). FactoMineR: An R package for multivariate analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 25(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v025.i01>
- McHale, J., Dinh, K. T., & Rao, N. (2014). Understanding coparenting and family systems among East and Southeast Asian-heritage families. In H. Selin (Ed.), *Parenting across cultures: Childrearing, motherhood and fatherhood in Non-Western cultures* (Vol. Science across cultures: The history of Non-Western science, pp. 163-173). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7503-9_12
- McHale, J. P., Kuersten-Hogan, R., & Lauretti, A. (2001). Evaluating coparenting and family-level dynamics during infancy and early childhood: The coparenting and family rating system. In P. K. Kerig & K. M. Lindahl (Eds.), *Family observational coding systems: Resources for systemic research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McHale, J. P., & Lindahl, K. M. (2011). *Coparenting: A conceptual and clinical examination of family systems*. American Psychological Association.
- Mendez, L. R., Loker, T., Fefer, S., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Mann, A. (2015). "Either come together or fall apart": Coparenting young children with challenging behaviors. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 4(2), 74-91. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/cfp0000039>

- Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy*. Harvard University Press.
- Morrill, M. I., Hines, D. A., Mahmood, S., & Cordova, J. V. (2010). Pathways between marriage and parenting for wives and husbands: The role of coparenting. *Family Process*, 49(1), 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01308.x>
- Mörtl, K., & Gelo, O. C. G. (2015). Qualitative methods in psychotherapy process research. In O. C. G. Gelo, A. Pritz, & B. Rieken (Eds.), *Psychotherapy research: Foundations, process and outcome* (pp. 381-424). Springer-Verlag Wien.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7091-1382-2_20
- Oka, M., Whiting, J., & Reifman, A. (2015). Observational research of negative communication and self-reported relationship satisfaction. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 43, 378-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2015.1052311>
- Oppenheim, D., & Koren-Karie, N. (2002). Mothers' insightfulness regarding their children's internal worlds: the capacity underlying secure child-mother relationships. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 23(6), 593-605. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.10035>
- Papernow, P. L. (2018). Clinical guidelines for working with stepfamilies: What family, couple, individual, and child therapists need to know. *Family Process*, 57(1), 25-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12321>
- Pascual-Leone, A., & Greenberg, L. S. (2007). Emotional processing in experiential therapy: Why "the only way out is through". *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75, 875-887. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.6.875>
- Pascual-Leone, A., Greenberg, L. S., & Pascual-Leone, J. (2014). Task analysis: New developments for programmatic research on the process of change. In W. Lutz & S.

- Knox (Eds.), *Quantitative and qualitative methods in psychotherapy research* (pp. 249-272). Routledge.
- R Core Team. (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Safran, J., Abreu, I., Ogilvie, J., & DeMaria, A. (2011). Does psychotherapy research influence the clinical practice of researcher-clinicians? . *Clinical Psychology : Science and Practice*, 18(4), 357-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2850.2011.01267.x>
- Salman-Engin, S., Sümer, N., Sagel, E., & McHale, J. (2018). Coparenting in the context of mother-father-infant versus mother-grandmother-infant triangular interactions in Turkey. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27, 3085-3095. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1094-4>
- Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Settle, T., Lee, J.-K., & Kamp, C. M. (2016). Supportive coparenting relationship as a haven of psychological safety at the transition to parenthood. *Research in Human Development*, 13(1), 32-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427609.2016.1141281>
- Sevier, M., Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2004). Observational coding of demand-withdraw interactions in couples. In P. K. Kerig & D. H. Baucom (Eds.), *Couple observational coding systems* (pp. 159-172). Routledge.
- Shapiro, A. F., & Gottman, J. M. (2005). Effects on marriage of a psycho-communicative-educational intervention with couples undergoing the transition to parenthood, evaluation at 1-year post intervention. *The Journal of Family Communication*, 5, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327698jfc0501_1

- Talbot, J. A., & McHale, J. P. (2004). Individual parental adjustment moderates the relationship between marital and coparenting quality. *Journal of Adult Development*, 11(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JADE.0000035627.26870.f8>.
- Wampler, K. S., & Harper, J. M. (2017). Observational research. In R. B. Miller & L. N. Johnson (Eds.), *Advanced methods in family therapy research: A focus on validity and change* (pp. 230-246). Routledge.
- Welch, T. S., Lachmar, E. M., Leija, S. G., Easley, T., Blow, A. J., & Wittenborn, A. K. (2019). Establishing safety in emotionally focused couple therapy: A single-case process study. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 45(4), 621-634. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12398>
- Woldarsky Meneses, C., & Greenberg, L. S. (2011). The construction of a model of the process of couples' forgiveness in emotion-focused therapy for couples. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 37(4), 491-502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2011.00234.x>
- Zuccarini, D., Johnson, S. M., Dalglish, T. L., & Makinen, J. A. (2013). Forgiveness and reconciliation in emotionally focused therapy for couples: the client change process and therapist interventions. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 39(2), 148-162. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2012.00287.x>

Z-Scores of Interaction Quality for Each Coparenting Discussion at Pre- and Post-Therapy

Note. Numbers in the table correspond to the Z-scores of the couples' interaction quality according to the coparenting discussion (agreement or disagreement) in time. Deltas correspond to the difference between pre- and post-therapy z-scores.

Summary of the Steps Coded in the Two Contrasting Cases

[illegible]