

Descriptive Evaluation of Real Relationships in 9 Counties of Central  
Pennsylvania Final Descriptive Evaluation Report for Children's Aid Society  
in Clearfield County, Pennsylvania

November 5, 2020

Prepared by

Cathy Kassab, Ph.D., By The Numbers

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this collection is 0970-0356; this number is valid through 6/30/2021. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 hours, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, reviewing the collection of information, and revising it. This collection of information is voluntary for individuals, but the information is required from Grantees.

Recommended Citation:

Kassab, Cathy. Descriptive Evaluation of Real Relationships in 9 Counties of Central Pennsylvania. Final Descriptive Evaluation Report for Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County, Pennsylvania. 2020.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to acknowledge the David Abler, Ph.D. for assistance in coding qualitative data, Bonnie Floro, Executive Director of Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County, and Teresa Guaglianone, Assistant Director of Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County, for their help in preparing this report, and the staff of Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County for being dedicated to implementing Real Relationships with fidelity, collecting data in a scientifically sound manner, and to working to collect data from all participants.

Disclosure:

None.

This publication was prepared under Grant Number 90FM0104-00 from the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U. S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS). The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the policies of HHS, ACF, or OFA.

**Structured Abstract:** “Descriptive Evaluation of Real Relationships in 9 Counties of Central Pennsylvania”

Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County (CAS) provides a comprehensive marriage and relationship education and skills training program, referred to as Real Relationships, to residents of Clearfield County and eight adjacent counties. The descriptive local evaluation addressed two implementation research questions (RQ) and one outcome RQ. The two implementation RQs are: 1) What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program? and 2) How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it? The RQ for the outcome study was: How do outcomes, in terms of (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills, and (c) parenting and co-parenting skills for participants who completed their Real Relationships workshop differ by format of the workshop? The local evaluation enrolled 1,357 community adults. The implementation studies relied on three separate sources of data: administrative records maintained by the CAS, personal interviews, and analysis of data from the Applicant Characteristics Survey, an ACF-sponsored survey of potential participants in ACF-funded Healthy Marriage programs. Data from each of these sources were analyzed separately. The outcome study also used the ACF-sponsored entrance and exit surveys and the local follow-up survey. A limitation of the research is there are statistically significant differences between the analytic sample and those not included in the analytic sample on key baseline measures, making the analytic sample not representative of all participants and the results not generalizable.

Analyses from administrative records maintained by the CAS of inquiries about the program suggest that the most common potential barrier to participation was the potential participant's contact information changing. Interviews of a small sample of non-participants (n=15) indicated that the primary reason for not participating in a scheduled workshop was due to unexpected situations. Analyses of 1,119 respondents to the Applicant Characteristics Survey indicated that only 10% did not participate in the program. Non-participants were more likely to be Hispanic or non-white, have more children, less education, and/or more likely to receive a greater number of different types of financial assistance. Applicant Characteristics Survey data from 1,006 participants were included in the analysis of RQ#2. Results indicate that 82% of participants completed Real Relationships, with those completing it more likely to indicate at baseline being unemployed, identifying as non-Hispanic White, having lower self-perceived health status or fewer children.

The analytic sample for the outcome analyses examining progress towards greater economic stability consisted of 609 adults; only participants involved in a relationship were included in the outcome analyses examining healthy relationship and marriage skills (n=551 adults). Only participants with a child under 21 years were included in the outcome analysis of parenting and co-parenting skills (n=383 adults). With only one exception, results indicated that the 2-Day Couples Retreat, the primary workshop format, was associated with lower outcomes when statistically significant differences related to workshop type were apparent.

## Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
A.	Introduction and study overview .....	1
B.	Description of the intended intervention .....	3
I.	IMPLEMENTATION STUDY .....	6
A.	Implementation research questions .....	6
B.	Study design .....	6
C.	Findings and analysis approach .....	19
III.	OUTCOMES STUDY .....	29
A.	Research questions .....	29
B.	Study design .....	29
C.	Findings and analysis approach .....	37
IV.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	41
V.	REFERENCES .....	43
VI.	APPENDICES .....	44
A.	Outcomes Study Data Cleaning and preparation .....	44
B.	Attrition analyses and tables .....	45
C.	Appendix Tables To Supplement Final Report .....	49
D.	Data collection instruments .....	84

## Tables

I.1.	Description of intended intervention components and target populations.....	4
I.2.	Staff training and development to support intervention components .....	5
II.1.	Characteristics of participants in implementation study.....	10
II.2.	Data used to address implementation research questions.....	13
II.3.	Measures used to address implementation RQ#1 .....	17
II.4.	Reasons Provided by Respondents for Not Participating in Scheduled <i>Real Relationships</i> workshop: years 1 & 2 (n=15 adults/individuals).....	21
III.1.	Sources of data used to address outcomes study research questions.....	31
III.2.	Outcomes study analytic sample .....	32
III.3.	Characteristics of participants in the outcomes study at baseline .....	33
III.4.	Outcome measures used to answer the outcomes study research questions .....	35
B.1.	Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: RQ#1, Study 3 .....	45
B.2.	Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, progress towards greater economic stability .....	46
B.3.	Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, healthy relationship and marriage skills .....	47
B.4.	Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, parenting and co-parenting skills .....	48
D.1.	Characteristics of participants and non-participants in implementation study: RQ#1, Study 3.....	49
D.2.	Potential barriers to participation in Real Relationships, as reflected in notes in an administrative database maintained by Children's Aid Society: RQ#1, Study 1 (n=291).....	55
D.3.	Characteristics of workshop completers and non-completers in implementation study: RQ#2 .....	56

D.4.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting workshop completion in implementation study: RQ#2 .....	62
D.5.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on nFORM exit survey.....	64
D.6.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey .....	66
D.7.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM entrance survey .....	68
D.8.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle my money and bills better" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey .....	70
D.9.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on nFORM exit survey .....	72
D.10.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM exit survey .....	74
D.11.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM entrance survey .....	76
D.12.	Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with partner/spouse better" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey .....	78

D.13. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on nFORM exit survey .....	80
D.14. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM exit survey .....	81
D.15. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM entrance survey .....	82
D.16. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey .....	83

# Descriptive Evaluation of Real Relationships in 9 Counties of Central Pennsylvania

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Introduction and study overview

Obstacles such as widespread poverty, unsatisfactory employment, poor family management skills, and lack of services in rural areas can make maintaining healthy marriages and relationships tremendously challenging. These conditions are prevalent in the nine rural, central Pennsylvania counties served by the Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County (CAS), making a Healthy Marriage program an important service for this region. In 2015, CAS received a 5-year grant from the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U. S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) to provide Healthy Marriage services. In addition to their Healthy Marriage program, CAS provides, throughout central Pennsylvania, professional services related to family support, adoption and foster care, childcare and early learning, and youth mentoring. CAS has provided services to local families since 1890.

The Healthy Marriage program offered by CAS through their Healthy Marriage grant is called Real Relationships. Real Relationships provides comprehensive marriage and relationship education and skills training to participants in Clearfield County (where CAS is located) and the eight surrounding counties in Pennsylvania. CAS contracted with By The Numbers to conduct the local evaluation. By The Numbers (BTN) is a Pennsylvania-based consulting firm owned and managed by Cathy Kassab, Ph.D. and David Abler, Ph.D. Together, they have over 50 years of combined experience in program evaluation, surveys, needs assessments, focus groups, and statistics.

Developers of one of the workshops used in Real Relationships, the Preventative Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP) indicate that finances are one of the primary sources of disagreement in a marriage (Stanley & Markman, 1997). Programs designed to support healthy marriages can help mitigate these problems by teaching couples how to deal with financially related hardships together. Moreover, maintaining a strong healthy marriage or relationship is a vital part of raising a family. However, economic stressors are prevalent in central Pennsylvania, as indicated below. In addition, the population is dispersed through space: Clearfield County is the third largest county in Pennsylvania in terms of square miles, however, the population density is small (71 people per square mile in 2010, based on the U.S. Census Bureau; QuickFacts).

Statistics demonstrate the economic need prevalent in the region prior to the start of the Real Relationships project. The American Community Survey from the US Census for 2009-2013 indicated that 34.3% of families with children under 5 were below the poverty level in Clearfield County, compared to 16.8% in Pennsylvania. Moreover, median family income in Clearfield County was \$51,031 compared to \$66,646 in Pennsylvania, and median owner-occupied home value was \$85,100 in Clearfield County compared to \$164,700 in Pennsylvania. Food Stamp participation in Clearfield County was 15.0% compared to 11.8% in Pennsylvania. The 2012-2013 Pennsylvania Early Childhood Education Profile published by the Pennsylvania Office of Child Development and Early Learning, Pennsylvania Department of Education indicates that 33.3% of Clearfield County children were living in economically high-risk families (below 100% of the Federal Poverty Level) as compared to 20.7% for the state; 74.6% were living in economically at-risk families (below 300% of the Federal Poverty Level) compared to 50% for the state; and, 50% of children were eligible for free/reduced lunch as compared to 43.2% for the state. Central Pennsylvania has suffered high unemployment rates and slow job growth for decades. For instance, the unemployment rate in March 2015 was 7.3% for Clearfield County but 5.5% for Pennsylvania.

Moreover, the Center for Children's Justice ranked Clearfield County as the sixth highest county in Pennsylvania (out of 67) for child abuse investigations and the eighth highest for substantiated cases per 1,000 children in 2013. Poor family management, a risk factor associated with problem behaviors, was chosen by the Clearfield County Collaboration Board as a risk factor to target in 2015 utilizing data obtained through evaluation of the 2013 PA Youth Survey (PAYS). Poor family management is described as parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe punishment for their children and failure to provide clear expectations and to monitor behavior. Children raised this way are at higher risk for problem behaviors. PAYS data shows Clearfield County students report 39% at risk.

Real Relationships seeks to strengthen families and improve family management skills by providing healthy marriage and relationship education and skills training to youth and adult participants. The local evaluation of Real Relationships focused solely on adults living in the community and examines two implementation research questions, and one outcome research question. The two implementation research questions examine (1) barriers to participation in the program and (2) differences between participants who started Real Relationships and those who completed it. The outcome research question examined differences by the workshop format through which Real Relationships was provided among participants completing the program on outcome measures related to (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills, and (c) parenting and co-parenting skills.

IRB approval was obtained on 4/6/2016 from Solutions IRB (IRB Registration #: IORG0007116 (FWA) #: FWA00021831). Approval was renewed yearly by Solutions IRB (3/22/2017, 3/29/2018, and 4/9/2019). At the request of By The Numbers, Solutions IRB closed the protocol on 4/11/2020, meaning that no more subjects could be enrolled in the local evaluation, subjects completed their protocol-related interventions, collection of private

identifiable information was completed, and analysis of private identifiable information was completed. All data that were analyzed after 4/11/2020 were deidentified.

The methodology for Study 1 (under the implementation research question, “What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?”) was approved by Solutions IRB on 4/9/2019.

The structure of the remainder of this report is as follows. First, the intervention, Real Relationships is described in detail. In section II, the methodology of the implementation research questions is then presented, followed by the findings for these studies. In section III, the study design and findings for the outcome research question is presented. Discussion and conclusions from the implementation and outcome studies are presented in Section IV. Appendices include on data clean and preparation, results from the attrition analyses, and data collection instruments developed by the local evaluator.

## B. Description of the intended intervention

Real Relationships offers comprehensive marriage and relationship education and skills training to residents of Clearfield County, where Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County (CAS) is located, in addition to eight adjacent counties. Additional services were available to help with participation barriers, parenting concerns, and economic and employment needs of participants. Specifically, these additional services were intensive case management offered to participants, Triple P - Positive Parenting Program, and Foundations in Personal Finance offered through supplemental classes to participants who completed a relationship education class. Triple P - Positive Parenting Program is a system of evidence-based education and support for parents and caregivers of children and adolescents developed by Prof. Matt Sanders and colleagues from The University of Queensland, Australia. Triple P incorporates five levels of intervention of increasing strength. CAS chose to implement the fourth level: Group Triple P, which consists of five 2-hour group sessions and three 20-minute individual telephone consultations for a group of parents of children aged 0-12 years. The course targets parents with concerns about their child's behavior who require intensive training in positive parenting or those who wish to learn a variety of parenting skills to apply to multiple contexts. Foundations in Personal Finance is a curriculum designed to fully equip facilitators with everything they need for a dynamic classroom experience. Four major units include: saving and budgeting; credit and debt; financial planning and insurance; and income, taxes and giving. There are 12 lesson areas, which are delivered via video by Dave Ramsey, the program developer, and his team. Participants follow along in the student text. More than 100 activities are included which focus on providing 21<sup>st</sup> century personal finance knowledge and skills in a student-centered, competency-based approach to learning.

The local descriptive evaluation was limited to adults living in the community. Specifically, the eligibility criteria for the local evaluation was being 18 years or older, and not incarcerated or institutionalized. The local evaluation included both persons involved in a relationship and individuals not involved in a relationship. Persons involved in a relationship participated in

workshop formats that were couples-based. Referring below to Table I.1, couples-based workshops included a 12-hour weekend workshop for married couples using the Within-Our Reach (WOR) curriculum, an 8-hour 1-day workshop for pre-marital couples using the Preventative Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP), and an 8-week workshop for married, committed, or engaged couples using the PREP curriculum.

Individuals not involved in a relationship participated in a 9-week workshop using the WOR curriculum. Individuals not involved in a relationship who participate in the 9-week WOR workshop learn about relationship skills that can help them in any type of relationship, be that personal, work, family, and so on.

**Table I.1. Description of intended intervention components and target populations**

Component	Curriculum and content	Dosage and schedule	Delivery	Target population
Relationship skills workshops	Within Our Reach (WOR) 8 Hours curriculum: improved healthy relationship and marriage skills, improved parenting and co-parenting skills, and progress towards greater economic stability	12-hour weekend workshops; held 9 times per year; the 12 hour workshop includes the 8 hours of WOR curriculum plus meals (dinner, breakfast and lunch)	Group lessons delivered by Children's Aid Society case managers and facilitators trained in Within Our Reach curriculum; curriculum is delivered at hotel/inn that has meeting rooms within the county being served	Low-income/at-risk married couples in rural central Pennsylvania
Relationship skills workshops	Preventative Relationship Enhancement program (PREP) 8.0 curriculum: improved healthy relationship and marriage skills, improved parenting and co-parenting skills, and progress towards greater economic stability	8-hour one-day workshops; held 9 times per year	Group lessons delivered by Children's Aid Society case managers and facilitators trained in PREP curriculum; at hotel/inn that has meeting rooms within the county being served	Low-income/at-risk pre-marital couples in rural central Pennsylvania
Relationship skills workshops	Within My Reach 8 Hours curriculum: improved healthy relationship and marriage skills, improved parenting and co-parenting skills, and progress towards greater economic stability	9-week continuous series of classes, 2 ½ hours of class each week, 4 times per year	Group lessons delivered at central location in the area by Children's Aid Society case managers and facilitators trained in Within Our Reach curriculum.	Low-income/at-risk individuals in rural central Pennsylvania
Relationship skills workshops	Preventative Relationship Enhancement Program (PREP) 8.0 curriculum: improved healthy relationship and marriage skills, improved parenting and co-parenting skills, and progress towards greater economic stability	8-week continuous series of classes, 2 2/1 hours of class each week, 4 times per year	Group lessons delivered at central location in the area by Children's Aid Society case managers and facilitators trained in Within Our Reach curriculum	Low-income/at-risk married, committed, or engaged couples in rural central Pennsylvania

While Real Relationship targets low-income/at-risk individuals, participants are not screened for these two factors. Residents who lived outside of the 9-county geographic area served by Real Relationships are still eligible to participate. However, they are required to travel to a site within the service area. All services are provided in English.

Service locations/sites are community settings in the 9-county geographic area. Adults are recruited from the community. Recruitment is done through Facebook posts and boosted posts, flyer distribution in the communities where classes, workshops and retreats are held, radio advertisements, newspaper ads, online calendar listings, participation in community fairs/festivals, presentations at social service agencies, contact with previous inquiries, and information to collaboration boards and agency contacts.

Each participant receives an incentive (gift card) every time s/he completes a survey. The incentive for completing the nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, entrance survey, and exit survey is a \$10 gift card, respectively. nFORM stands for Information, Family Outcomes, Reporting, and Management (nFORM) system, which Healthy Marriage grantees used to collect, store, and analyze performance measure data required by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF). The nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, entrance survey, and exit survey are part of the nFORM system.

Enrollment in Real relationships began July 5, 2016. The last day of data collection was 3/31/2020. The local evaluation addresses 3 different research questions. There is a different sample of adults for each research question. All analyses using data from nFORM were limited to community adults who indicated willingness to participate in the evaluation, as indicated in nFORM.

Table I.2 summarizes the training received by Real Relationship staff (i.e., facilitators). Facilitators received 4-days of initial training in the program. In addition, they received ½-day refresher training twice a year. The Real Relationship program manager conducted regular fidelity checks of facilitator's workshops.

**Table I.2. Staff training and development to support intervention components**

Component	Education and initial training of staff	Ongoing training of staff
Relationship skills workshops	Facilitators are male and female and hold at least a bachelor's degree and received four days of initial training. In addition, they complete IRB training.	Facilitators receive a half-day of semi-annual refresher training in the intervention's curricula from study staff.

As indicated previously, the local evaluation of Real Relationships focuses entirely on adult participants (18 years and older) living in the community. It addresses two implementation research questions and one research question for the outcome study. The findings from both implementation research questions provide important context to the outcome study, even though the criteria used to determine the relevant samples for the implementation and outcome studies differ somewhat. The research question, methodology, and findings for the outcome study are presented in Section III.

## I. IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

### A. Implementation research questions

The two implementation research questions are as follows:

**RQ#1)** What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?

**RQ#2)** How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it, as defined by responding to the nFORM exit survey?

RQ#1 addresses the context of implementation, and consists of 3 separate studies examining different aspects of barriers to participation. RQ#2 addresses one aspect related to dosage of the implementation of Real Relationships.

### B. Study design

RQ#1, Study 1 is an exploratory study examining potential issues that affected attendance among potential participants. The study relies on extant text from an administrative database used by CAS to track contact information and other administrative information about persons potentially interested in Real Relationships. The database is simply a systematic way to maintain a list of persons potentially interested in the program. All persons listed in the data file initiated contact with CAS regarding Real Relationship via telephone, email, or a message sent through CAS's Facebook page. Case managers would then respond to the request for information and ask about issues affecting attendance, as well as other questions related to the administration of the program. Because the data file was not maintained for evaluation/research purposes, the questions were not standardized across potential participants. When no information was provided for a person regarding issues affecting attendance, it was not possible to determine whether this was due to the person not being asked the question, or whether the person indicated no issues affected attendance. The nFORM identifier was not recorded for persons who enrolled in Real Relationships, and so it is not feasible to determine which potential participants in the file actually enrolled in the program. Responses to "issues that could affect attendance" were coded into types of barriers to participation. CAS began this database at the start of project (July 2016) in order to assist in the implementation of the project. The decision to use these data was made in 2018, and so there was a lack of rigor and consistency in how this information was collected.

Hence the results from Study 1 are considered exploratory. The goal is to provide CAS with information about potential barriers to participation. Results from Study 1 can suggest potential issues affecting attendance in the service area, and the frequency with which these issues are mentioned among potential participants who were asked about potential barriers and who indicated there was an issue that would affect attendance.

RQ#1, Study 2 is an exploratory study examining reasons why adults who did not attend a scheduled workshop did not attend. Specifically, Study 2 consisted of interviews over the telephone of adults who registered for a workshop but did not attend. This study was discontinued in early 2018 due to the small number of adults who did not attend their scheduled

workshop. Only one person in a couple was interviewed via telephone since the primary information being obtained was the reason the couple did not attend the scheduled session. However, only interviewing one person in the couple represents a limitation of this study; it is possible that the other person in the couple would have provided a different reason for not attending. All adults, except one, who were interviewed were part of a couple.

Results from Study 1 and Study 2, when viewed in combination can provide initial guidance to Children's Aid Society in terms of the types of barriers to workshop attendance faced by community adults in their service area. However, results from these two analyses are preliminary and they are not representative of the population as a whole. They could be used as part of the initial groundwork for designing a more systematic analysis of barriers to attendance.

RQ#1, Study 3 examines differences between participators in Real Relationships from potentially interested adults who did not participate. RQ#1, Study 3 is based on data from nFORM's Applicant Characteristics Survey. The Applicant Characteristics Survey is administered to clients who agree to participate in a Real Relationships program. Typically, the Applicant Characteristics Survey is administered within 4 weeks prior to the start of the workshop in which the client will participate.

In RQ#1, Study 3, characteristics of clients, based on responses to the Applicant Characteristics Survey, who attend Real Relationships (i.e., participators) were compared with those who did not attend (i.e., non-participators). Participators responded to the nFORM entrance survey at the start of the first session, and so adults who completed the entrance survey received at least some of the Real Relationships program. Consequently, whether an adult completed the entrance survey was used to define whether the adult participated in at least some of the program. This definition is used instead of session attendance since it is less prone to data entry error. CAS provides participants with an incentive (gift card) for completing the Applicant Characteristics Survey and the nFORM entrance survey.

RQ#2 addresses the question, "How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it?" The sample consists of participators, that is adults who responded to the nFORM entrance survey. In RQ#2, characteristics of clients, based on responses to the Applicant Characteristics Survey, who completed Real Relationships by responding to the nFORM exit survey (i.e., completors) were compared with those who participated in the program but did not complete it (i.e., non-completors).

## **1. Sample formation**

Consent for participation in Real Relationships and the evaluation is obtained through each stage of the enrollment and participation process. Verbal consent to participate in the program is requested of each potential participant prior to conducting the domestic violence screening. Once the potential participant is enrolled, the potential participant is asked to sign a consent form and releases, as appropriate. For enrollment in the study, verbal consent is obtained prior to completing the pre- and post-surveys.

RQ#1, Study 1: The data file containing records of all adults contacting CAS about Real Relationships contained 1,450 inquiries. It is possible that an individual could have contacted CAS multiple times; each contact would have been recorded in the database. Data collection by CAS started during the spring of 2016 (just prior to the implementation). The last day of data collection from this data source for the local evaluation was 10/31/2019.

RQ#1, Study 2: Only adults who were scheduled to attend a Real Relationships workshop but did not attend were included in the sample for study. RQ#1, Study 2 was conducted only during the first two years of the project. Because these non-participants were scheduled to attend a workshop, they had responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey and had an nFORM ID. The CAS program director forwarded the nFORM ID of non-participants to the local evaluator, who obtained contact information from nFORM. For couples who did not attend their scheduled workshop, the local evaluation team interviewed just one person from each couple over the telephone. Three attempts were made to contact non-participants.

In Year 1, there were 20 individuals in a relationship who did not attend their scheduled workshop. In Year 2, there were 20 individuals in a relationship and 1 individual not in a relationship who failed to attend a workshop by the time of the interview. Across the two years of the study, 14 adults in a relationship and the individual not in a relationship were interviewed over the telephone regarding the reason(s) they did not attend the Real Relationships workshop.

RQ#1, Study 3: The sample for this study is comprised of community adults who responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey by 10/31/2019. Adults who responded to the nFORM entrance survey by 4/1/2020 were classified as participators in the study. Non-participators were those who did not respond to the nFORM entrance survey by 4/1/2020. In order to help ensure that a non-participator was not misclassified, the 4/1/2020 date was chosen since it was 5 months after the last date Applicant Characteristics Survey data was collected for the local evaluation. As indicated in the prior section, the Applicant Characteristics Survey is typically administered within 4 weeks of the start of the workshop in which the client will participate, which is when the client is administered the nFORM entrance survey. This was done in order to ensure that data collected on the Applicant Characteristics Survey reflected the adult's statuses at the time they started the workshop. The Applicant Characteristics Survey was administered either in-person in a group setting, in-person individually, or over the telephone.

While participants had until 4/1/2020 to respond to the nFORM entrance survey, no one responded to it after 12/31/2019. In other words, all adults in the sample who responded to the nFORM entrance survey did so before 12/31/2019.

RQ#2: The sample for this study consists of all community adult participants who responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey by 10/31/2019 and responded to the nFORM entrance survey by 12/31/2019, that is they participated in a Real Relationships workshop by 12/31/2019. Adults who responded to the nFORM exit survey by 4/1/2020 were classified as completers (i.e., a valid date was entered in this field). Non-completers were those who did not respond to the nFORM exit survey by 4/1/2020. This definition of program completion is chosen since the majority (77%, as of 12/31/2019) were enrolled in a one-day or two-day retreat; an alternative

definition of program completion (i.e., percentage of classes completed) would not be appropriate for this population. Workshop type is included as a factor in the analysis for RQ#2 because whether the workshop is a one- or two-day program compared to a multi-week program may be related to the likelihood of completing Real Relationships. All of the multi-week workshops started in 2019 ended by 12/31/2019, and the exit survey is administered at the end of the last session for these workshop formats.

In order to help ensure that a non-completer was not misclassified, the 4/1/2020 date for the exit survey to be completed was chosen since it was at least 3 months after the end of the last workshop included in the sample. Three months corresponds to the period of time that CAS attempts to obtain exit survey data. CAS provides participants with an incentive (gift card) for completing the nFORM entrance and exit surveys. The nFORM workshop type and attendance forms are used to determine the type of workshop attended.

While it was not planned, the sample for RQ#2 is a subsample of that for RQ#1. This occurred because all adults in the sample for RQ#1 who participated in Real Relationships (i.e., responded to the nFORM entrance survey), did so by 12/31/2019.

Table II.1 lists relevant sample characteristics of adults included in RQ#1, Study 2; RQ#1, Study 3; and RQ#2. Data on characteristics of persons contacting CAS about Real Relationships (RQ#1, Study 1) were not collected. Again RQ#1 asks: "What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?" RQ#2 asks: "How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it, as defined by responding to the nFORM exit survey?" The data for RQ#1, Study 2 in Table II.1 is from all adults with nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey data on all of the variables included in the table (excluding months employed, other benefits associated with employment, and income); 32 adults out of the 41 in the population had complete Applicant Characteristics Survey data on these variables. In order to maintain the confidentiality of respondent's answers, data were not retained on which adults were interviewed. It is worth noting that 34% of the respondents represented in Table II.1 eventually participated in Real Relationships, although only 9% completed it.

The data analysis strategy for RQ#1, Study 3 and RQ #2 are the same. The former asks how participator and non-participators differ. The sample for RQ#2 is comprised of all adults who participated in Real Relationships (as defined in RQ#1, Study 3), and examines how adults who completed Real Relationships differ from those who did not complete it. Both questions rely on data measured by the Applicant Characteristics Survey to determine how participators and non-participators (RQ#1, Study 3), and completers and non-completers (RQ#2) differ.

A total of 1,357 adults agreed to be included in the evaluation and completed the Applicant Characteristics Survey by 10/31/2019. Over four-fifths (82%) of these adults had valid data for all of the variables listed in Table II.1 (except for the two employment-related variables and income). A subset of analyses was conducted for employed persons in order to examine the

relationship between length of employment and presence of benefits (proxies for employment stability and quality) and participation and completion status.

Whether a person is low-income is also a relevant measure for addressing RQ#1, Study 3 and RQ #2. However for RQ#1, Study 3, the number of adults who indicated an income of \$1,000 or less over the past 30 days seems high (46%). Moreover, there is ambiguity over how individuals within a couple would answer this question (i.e., would a person within a couple report only his/her own earnings or total joint earnings; if one of the individuals within a couple was not employed, would that person report earnings of their partner). In addition, there is a decrease in the sample size when income is included in the analysis. Given this ambiguity, questionable results, and reduction in the sample size, income is not included in the list of relevant characteristics in Table II.1.

**Table II.1. Characteristics of participants in implementation study**

Characteristic	Respondents to applicant characteristics survey		
	RQ#1, Study 2 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#1, Study 3 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#2
TTAge (mean; SD) <sup>b</sup>	4.2 (0.91) – 27 years	5.0 (1.39) – 35 years	5.1 (1.40) – 36 years
Female (%)	50%	52%	52%
<b>Race/ethnicity (%)</b>			
Hispanic	0%	2%	2%
Non-Hispanic White	84%	94%	95%
Non-Hispanic Black	16%	2%	2%
Non-Hispanic Asian	0%	0%	0%
Non-Hispanic Other	0%	3%	3%
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	94%	75%	75%
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more (mean; SD)	2.7 (1.02)	1.5 (1.34)	1.5 (1.33)
<b>Employment status (%)</b>			
Full-time	41%	44%	44%
Part-time or hours change weekly	16%	15%	15%
Temporary, occasional or seasonal	3%	2%	2%
Not currently employed	41%	39%	38%
Retired (%)	0%	10%	11%
<b>Highest degree earned (%)</b>			
No degree or diploma earned	28%	7%	6%
High school diploma or alternative (i.e., GED)	44%	41%	41%
Some college but no degree completion	16%	11%	11%
Vocational/technical certification	9%	12%	12%
Associate's degree	3%	12%	12%
Bachelor's degree	0%	11%	12%
Master's degree/advanced degree	0%	6%	6%
Have post-secondary education (%)	28%	52%	53%
Self-perceived health status: 1=excellent; 5=poor (mean: SD)	2.8 (1.07)	2.8 (1.04)	2.7 (1.04)

Characteristic	Respondents to applicant characteristics survey		
	RQ#1, Study 2 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#1, Study 3 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#2
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	78%	60%	59%
Number of different types of financial assistance received in the past month: 0, 1, 2, 3 or more (mean; SD)	1.6 (1.19)	1.1 (1.12)	1.1 (1.11)
<b>How or where participants heard about Real Relationships (%)</b>			
Word of mouth	31%	35%	34%
Newspaper ad, billboards, flyer	22%	20%	21%
Radio ad or TV spot	16%	10%	10%
Internet or social media	9%	22%	22%
Government agency	12%	4%	4%
Community organization	3%	6%	6%
Program staff or event	3%	8%	8%
Other	19%	16%	16%
<b>Reasons for enrolling in the program (%)</b>			
To learn about being a better parent	0%	4%	4%
To learn how to improve my personal relationships	78%	71%	71%
To find a job or better job	0%	0%	0%
My friends were coming	0%	2%	2%
My spouse/partner asked me to come	16%	16%	16%
My parole/probation officer told me to enroll in a program like this	0%	0%	0%
A court ordered me to enroll in a program like this	0%	1%	1%
Other	6%	7%	7%
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat	78%	49%	49%
1-Day Couples Retreat	6%	7%	8%
1-Day Engaged Couples	6%	21%	20%
Weekly Couples	6%	14%	15%
Weekly Individuals	3%	9%	9%
<b>Population</b>			
Adult couple	97%	91%	91%
Adult individual	3%	9%	9%
<b>Year responded to Applicant Characteristics Survey</b>			
Year 1 (by 9/30/16)	53%	10%	10%
Year 2 (by 9/30/17)	47%	29%	29%
Year 3 (by 9/30/18)	0%	29%	30%
Year 4 (by 9/30/19)	0%	26%	25%
Year 5 (10/1/19-10/31/20)	0%	6%	6%
Participated in Real Relationships (attended at least 1 session) (%)	34%	90%	100%

Characteristic	Respondents to applicant characteristics survey		
	RQ#1, Study 2 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#1, Study 3 <sup>a</sup>	RQ#2
Completed Real Relationships workshop (%)	9%	74%	82%
Sample Size	32	1,119	1,006
If employed: Number of months had current job (mean; SD)	15.2 (17.23)	63.1 (83.98)	66.1 (85.78)
<b>If employed: Have other benefits associated with job</b>			
Yes	42%	65%	66%
No	53%	33%	32%
Don't know	5%	2%	2%
Sample size (including number of months had current job)	18	654	596
Make \$1,000 or less during past 30 days (%)	32%	46%	45%
Sample size (including income)	31	1,039	934

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey

Notes: Some adults indicated multiple races, multiple ways of hearing about Real Relationships, and reasons for enrolling, and so totals for these variables exceed 100%. Adults who indicated that their highest degree was vocational/technical certification, some college but no degree completion, associate's degree or higher were classified as having some post-secondary education; those who had no degree or diploma, a high school diploma or its equivalent were classified as not having any post-secondary education. Adults who answered at least one of the 10 questions asking whether they received any of the types of financial assistance listed under Question B1 (i.e., TANF, SSI, SSDI) were included in the calculations for that variable; adults who indicated receiving 1 or more types of assistance were coded as having received assistance.

<sup>a</sup>Data on characteristics of persons included RQ#1, Study 1 were not collected.

<sup>b</sup>Values for age ranged from 1 to 8, with 1=under 18; 2=18-20; 3=21-24; 4=25-34; 5=35-44; 6=45-54; 7=55-64; 8=65 or older.

## 2. Data collection

Table II.2 lists the data source and the data collection schedule for the data used in all three studies for RQ#1 as well as for RQ#2, as described in detail under Study Design and Sample Formation (above). The implementation element and party responsible for collecting the data are also listed in the table.

The nFORM entrance survey was administered by CAS at the start of the first Real Relationships session (i.e., in-person in a group setting). CAS conducted all aspects of nFORM exit survey administration. For participants in weekly workshops, the nFORM exit survey was administered at the end of the last session. In order to maintain contact and reduce attrition on the nFORM exit survey, participants who attended a workshop that spanned less than 28 days (i.e., the 12-hour weekend workshop or the 8-hour one-day workshop) were scheduled to take the nFORM exit survey by the end of the last session. Participants were told before the end of the workshop of the incentive for answering the nFORM exit survey. Between the last session and the scheduled date for administering the nFORM exit survey, reminders were sent (telephone, email, postcard, and/or text, as appropriate) by CAS. If the participant was not able to schedule a date for the exit survey at the time of the last session, or if they were unable to attend their scheduled administration, reminders were sent and attempts made to schedule and administer the nFORM

exit survey through 3 months after the end of the last session. The nFORM exit survey was administered by CAS either in-person in a group setting, in-person individually, or over the telephone.

**Table II.2. Data used to address implementation research questions**

Implementation element	Research question	Data source	Timing/frequency of data collection	Party responsible for data collection
Context	RQ#1, Study 1: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	Secondary data from an administrative database used by CAS to track contact information and other administrative information about persons potentially interested in Real Relationships. All persons listed in the data file initiated contact with CAS regarding Real Relationship via telephone, email, or a message sent through CAS's Facebook page. Case managers would then respond to the request for information and ask about issues affecting attendance, as well as other questions related to the administration of the program. When no information was provided for a person regarding issues affecting attendance, it was not possible to determine whether this was due to the person not being asked the question, or whether the person indicated no issues affecting attendance.	When community adults contacts CAS	CAS
Context	RQ#1, Study 2: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	Interviews with community adults who were scheduled to attend a Real Relationships workshop but did not do so	Approximately 4 weeks after the scheduled workshop	Local evaluation staff

Implementation element	Research question	Data source	Timing/frequency of data collection	Party responsible for data collection
Context	RQ#1, Study 3: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey and entrance surveys; nFORM workshop type and attendance sheets	Applicant Characteristics Survey: up to 4 weeks before the scheduled workshop; nFORM entrance survey: start of 1 <sup>st</sup> session of workshop; nFORM workshop type and attendance: as workshop was scheduled and attended	CAS
Dosage	RQ#2: How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it, as defined by completing the nFORM exit survey?	nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, entrance and exit surveys; nFORM workshop type and attendance sheets	Applicant Characteristics Survey: up to 4 weeks before the scheduled workshop; nFORM entrance survey: start of 1 <sup>st</sup> session of workshop; nFORM exit survey: at least 24 days after completion of the entrance survey; nFORM workshop type and attendance: as workshop is scheduled and attended	CAS

### 3. Data preparation and measures

For RQ#1, Study 1, qualitative data were coded using a manifest coding scheme due to the visible surface content being a valid indicator of a barrier (e.g., people simply state “transportation issues,” or “need childcare”). Two members of the local evaluation team independently developed an inductive coding scheme that reflected the barriers mentioned by potential participants, and then compared results. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved to ensure interrater reliability. Coding was done manually in Excel. Specifically, an initial coding frame was developed from a subset of the data by each coder (i.e., from 100 responses). The coder then applied these codes to a different subset of data, and the coding schedule was modified as needed. All responses were coded again by the coder with the revised coding frame.

Once the data were coded, the number of times each code was listed for a response was determined, and the percentage of times each code was mentioned among those adults providing a comment related to a barrier was calculated. Potential participants sometimes indicated multiple barriers (i.e., codes in the coding frame). Data in the file are not listed by couple; rather it is individual data, and there is no variable indicating whether two people are part of a couple

(i.e., similar to the Couple ID in nFORM). Consequently, it is not possible to compare responses across persons within a couple.

For RQ#1, Study 2, only one person in a couple was interviewed via telephone since the primary information being obtained was the reason the couple did not attend the scheduled session. Respondents provided short direct answers to the questions. Responses were coded using manifest coding scheme due to the visible surface content being a valid indicator of a barrier (i.e., people simply stated “transportation issues,” or “need childcare”). The interviewer tabulated responses to the questions due to the small number of respondents interviewed. The number of couples and/or individuals listing a specific barrier are listed by year (Year 1 or Year 2) in the results section, and responses are also combined across the two years in order to help summarize the findings.

For RQ#1, Study 3, community adults who responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey but did not attend a workshop (non-participants) were compared in statistical analyses with those who attended at least one workshop (participants) on measures in the Applicant Characteristics Survey (refer to Table II.3). All adults who attended at least one workshop complete the nFORM entrance survey, and so whether an adult is defined as a participant or non-participant is determined by whether they respond to the nFORM entrance survey. Specifically, the presence of a valid date in the Entrance Survey Completion field (by 3/31/2020) is used to define a participant. Only persons who completed their Applicant Characteristics Survey by 10/31/2019 are included in the sample for this research question.

Because the sample is comprised of both adults in a couple, as well as adults not in a relationship, three different sets of analyses were conducted. Listwise deletion was used for all three sets of analyses. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, summary statistics) were calculated for all measures in all three sets of analyses and are presented in Table 1 in Appendix VIII. The overall sample was analyzed in the first set of analyses. These analyses ignored the dependency of the data for adults within couple. Because the outcome variable of interest (participant/non-participant) is binary, bivariate logistic regression analysis was conducted in order to test the statistical significance of the relationship between each predictor variables listed in Table II.3 and the outcome variable. In addition, independent t-tests were conducted for ordered predictor variables. In the second set of analyses (referred to as the couples analysis), multi-level analysis using Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling (HLM) 8.00 was conducted for adults in a couple, determined by the presence of a value in the CoupleID in nFORM, and for whom their partner was also included in the analysis. CoupleID linked the multi-level level-1 and level-2 models. The level-1 model was run as a bivariate Bernoulli model for most of the predictor variables. For two predictors – workshop type and year responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey – the predictor variable was fixed at level-2 rather than level-1. Adults with a Couple ID, but whose partner was excluded from the sample due to missing data were excluded from the multi-level analyses. Instead these adults were included in the third set of analyses. The third set of analyses, referred to as the individual analysis, included adults not in a relationship as well as adults who were part of a couple, but the other adult in the couple had

missing data. Bivariate logistic regression and independent t-tests were conducted for the third set of analyses (same as for the overall sample).

It is important to note that all analyses for RQ#1, Study 3 were bivariate, meaning the relationship between whether the adult was a participator or non-participator and each of the predictor variables (refer to Table II.3) did not control for any other variables. Because only bivariate analyses were conducted, collinearity among the predictors is not an issue in any of the analyses for RQ#1, Study 3. Moreover, while many of the predictor variables are significantly correlated the shared variance is small to no more than moderate. For instance, the two most tightly correlated variables only have a shared variance of 37% (among employed persons, whether they have other job-related benefits and employment status:  $r=0.607$ ;  $r^2=0.368$ ). Other tightly correlated variables include age and retirement status ( $r=0.567$ ;  $r^2=0.321$ ), age and months had a job among employed person ( $r=0.453$ ;  $r^2=0.205$ ); employment status and number of different types of financial assistance received in past month ( $r=0.410$ ;  $r^2=0.168$ ), and highest degree earned and whether the adult received financial assistance in the past month ( $r=-0.377$ ;  $r^2=0.142$ ). Except for intercorrelations that are necessarily related, such as not being employed with employment status or marital/engagement status with workshop format, intercorrelations are smaller than 0.38 (in absolute value), meaning shared variance is less than 14.4% ( $r^2=0.144$ ) between the remaining pairs of variables. Thus, a substantial percentage of the variance in each variable is not shared by a single variable, which means that each variable provides a somewhat different perspective to the characteristics of participators and non-participators.

Statistical significance was defined as being  $p<0.05$ , meaning the relationship is significantly different from zero at the .05 level using a two-tailed test. However,  $p$ -values are reported and  $p$ -values that are weaker are discussed, particularly those that are consistent with other analyses that have a statistically significant  $p$ -value.

The sample for RQ#2 corresponds with participators for RQ#1, Study 3 because results for RQ#1, Study 3 indicate that all adults in this sample responded to the nFORM entrance survey prior to 12/31/2019. For RQ#2, statistical analyses compared participators who completed Real Relationships with those who did not. Adults who responded to the nFORM exit survey by 4/1/2020 are referred to as completers, while participators who did not respond to the exit survey by this date are referred to as non-completers. These two groups were statistically compared on the same variables from the Applicant Characteristics Survey that were used for RQ #1, Study 3 (refer to Table II.3). Also the same analysis framework was used for RQ#2 as for RQ#1, Study 3.

**Table II.3. Measures used to address implementation RQ#1**

Implementation element	Research question	Measures
Context	RQ#1, Study 1: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number and frequency of each type of barrier cited by potential participants.</li> </ul>
Context	RQ#1, Study 2: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number and frequency of each type of barrier cited by potential participants.</li> </ul>

Implementation element	Research question	Measures
Context	RQ#1, Study 3: What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?	<p>This study addresses the question, how do the characteristics of those who participate in the program (participants) compare to those who expressed interest in participating but do not attend a Real Relationships workshop (referred to as non-participants). Measures are as follows.</p> <p>Number and percentage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– in each workshop format (from workshop series and session attendance nFORM files);</li> <li>– in each population type (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– completing the Applicant Characteristics Survey in Year 1, Year 2, etc.;</li> <li>– of male and female participants (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of non-Hispanic and white, and non-white or Hispanic participants (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of married/engaged and not married/engaged participants (recoded from Applicant Characteristics Survey)</li> <li>– of participants receiving some form of financial assistance (from Applicant Characteristics Survey)</li> <li>– in each category of highest degree, diploma or certificate earned, coded into level of greatest formal education, that being no degree or diploma earned, high school diploma or alternative, some college but no degree completion, vocational/technical certification, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree/advanced degree (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of participants with no degree or diploma earned (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of participants who attended post-secondary school (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– in each type of current employment status, coded into level of greatest employment, that being full-time; part-time or hours change weekly; temporary, occasional or seasonal employment or odd job; or not currently employed (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of retired (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– in each category for how hear about program (on Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of those who enrolled Real Relationships in order to learn how to improve personal relationships (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– of those who enrolled Real Relationships because spouse/partner asked them to (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– among employed persons only, whether have other benefits associated with job (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> </ul> <p>Average</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– age (from Applicant Characteristics Survey)</li> <li>– number of different types of assistance received: 0, 1, 2, 3 or more (from Applicant Characteristics Survey)</li> <li>– number of children have: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– self-perceived health status (from Applicant Characteristics Survey);</li> <li>– among employed participants only, months had job (defined as number of months between date on Applicant Characteristics Survey &amp; date start current job on Applicant Characteristics Survey).</li> </ul>
Dosage	RQ#2: How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it, as defined by completing the nFORM exit survey?	<p>This study addresses the question, how do the characteristics of those who complete Real Relationships (completers) compare to those who start the program but do not complete it (referred to as non-completers). Measures are the same as that used for RQ#1, Study 3 (above).</p>

### C. Findings and analysis approach

This section summarizes how data collected for RQ#1 (Studies 1, 2 and 3) and RQ#2 were analyzed, and the findings associated with each analysis. The analysis of administrative records (RQ#1, Study 1) indicated that the most common potential barrier to participation was contact/communication issues related potential participant's contact information changing. Interviews of a small sample of non-participants (RQ#1, Study 2) indicated that the primary reasons for not participating in a scheduled workshop was due to unexpected situations, such as sickness or death in the family, or an unexpected lack of transportation or childcare. Analysis of baseline data from the Applicant Characteristics Survey of participants and non-participants (RQ#1, Study 3) indicated that people who were less likely to participate in Real Relationships were more likely to be Hispanic or non-white, have more children, less education, and/or more likely to receive a greater number of different types of financial assistance. For those who were employed, non-participants were less likely to have employment-related benefits other than health insurance (such as sick leave or life insurance) and to be employed for a shorter period of time in the job they had at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey. Also, those who were scheduled for the 1-Day Engaged Couples workshop were less likely to participate. Only 10% of potential participants did not participate in Real Relationships. Results for RQ#2 indicate that participants who were more likely to complete Real Relationships were more likely to indicate being unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey, have lower self-perceived health status, have fewer children, or identify as non-Hispanic White. Also, those who participated in the 1-Day Couples Retreat were more likely to complete the program, as well as those who participated later during the 5-year program. Results indicated that age, or other factors that were associated with age, were associated with program completion. The majority (82%) of participants completed the workshop.

***RQ#1, Study 1. What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?***

Results suggest that potential barriers to participation included contact/communication barriers in terms of the program not being able to reach potential participants (due to changes in their contact information). Another frequently mentioned perceived barrier was having special needs, such as hearing loss or other health-related issues, needing a handicap accessible room, or learning or literacy issues. However, the program informed potential participants that they accommodate for special needs, and so having a special need(s) was not a barrier to participation. Less frequently mentioned issues included participant's work schedule or workload, change in partner status, transportation issues, childcare issues, and partner being resistant to participating in the program.

A total of 291 inquiries in the database containing 1,450 inquiries since the start of the program and 10/31/2019 listed a potential barrier to attend a Real Relationships program. As indicated previously, not all contacts may have been asked or answered the question about barriers to attending a program. In some cases, CAS staff were unable to reach the contact for various reasons and this was recorded in the database. The barrier in these cases was being unable to

contact the potential participant. In addition, it is possible that an individual is listed in the database multiple times if they contacted CAS multiple times. The analysis of these data is based solely on text entered in the potential barriers field in the database. It does not include responses from the program representative in terms of how a potential barrier mentioned by the contact could be addressed by the program and need not be a barrier. Also, the adult may have overcome the barrier they indicated on their own and attended Real Relationships. The frequency of each of the potential barriers identified is presented in Appendix Table 2.

The most frequently coded potential barriers dealt with contact/communication barriers in terms of the program not being able to reach potential participants (due to changes in their contact information). When this occurred in the database, staff were faced with issues contacting the potential participant with the contact information the program had been provided. These potential barriers included address, telephone issues, or email issues; 31% of the 291 records in which a barrier was identified reflected an issue with the adult's mailing address, telephone or email address. Nearly all of the mailing address, telephone or email address issues were due to difficulty with the telephone number provided (63%) or the address provided (38%). Examples of this communication barrier between Children's Aid Society and potential participants include telephone no longer working, address change, and telephone out of minutes.

Another frequently occurring potential barrier mentioned by contacts when first posed the question was having special needs; 30% of the 291 records reflected a potential barrier that was related to the special needs of the adult. The barrier in these cases is the participants' perception of how the program may or may not accommodate them. It is important to note that the program accommodates for special needs and does not turn away potential participants with disabilities, and that these data do not incorporate responses from CAS in terms of how a potential barrier mentioned by the contact could be addressed by the program and need not be a barrier. Examples of the types of special needs potential participants indicated included hearing loss, need for a handicap accessible room, literacy issues, reading or learning disability, social anxiety or other emotional issues, autism, PTSD, vision loss, and health issues such as arthritis or fibromyalgia.

About one-tenth of the 291 records with a coded potential barrier reflected impediments related to the potential participant's work schedule or workload (12%) or change in partner status (10%). However, changes in partner status are accommodated by CAS: adults who experienced a change in their partner status were offered a Real Relationships workshop format that was appropriate for their current relationship status, whether that be a person who was in a relationship and became single or was single but then entered a relationship. Also 9% indicated that transportation problems were a barrier. This included not having a vehicle, losing a driver's license, or limited resources to transportation.

Childcare issues and the partner being resistant to participating in Real Relationships were reflected in 5% of the 291 records, respectively. Other impediments to participating in Real Relationships included moving out of the area (4%), legal problems (2%), and emergencies such as a change in medical status or death in the family (1%). Also 1% of the 291 records reflected that the person or their partner was deceased once contact was made.

***RQ#1, Study 2. What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?***

*The primary reasons provided by respondents for nonparticipation were due to unexpected situations, such as sickness or death in the family, or an unexpected lack of transportation or childcare. A limitation of this study is the small size.*

During the July 1 – Dec. 31, 2016 period, CAS reported 16 individuals involved in a relationship as non-participants to By The Numbers. In addition, 4 individuals involved in a relationship attended the Friday night session of the Couples Retreat but missed the Saturday session. The evaluation team attempted to interview one adult from each relationship; no attempt was made to interview the second adult in a relationship. Out of the 20 individuals who did not participate or only participated during the first session of the 2-Day Couples Retreat, 7 were interviewed. Three attempts were made via telephone and text message (for those indicating it was okay to text them) to conduct an interview.

During the Jan. 1 – Sept. 30, 2017 period, CAS reported 20 individuals involved in a relationship and one individual not in a relationship (21 individuals) as non-participants to By The Numbers. By The Numbers was able to interview 7 adults involved in a relationship in addition to the one individual not in a relationship as to why they did not attend their scheduled session. The same data collection procedures used in Year 1 were used in Year 2. In total, across Years 1 and 2, CAS reported 40 individuals involved in a relationship and one individual not in a relationship as non-participants to By The Numbers (41 individuals, total). The evaluation team interviewed a total of 14 adults involved in a relationship and the one individual who was not in a relationship (n=15 adults).

All respondents indicated that something happened to prevent them from attending the retreat. Results are presented in the Table II.4. Five adults indicated that their absence was due to sickness or death in the family. Three adults indicated that they no longer had transportation to the retreat (i.e., car troubles, their ride could no longer take them). Another three adults indicated that their childcare plans fell through.

Other reasons for not attending the scheduled workshop was conflict with the non-participant's work schedule (2 adults), conflict with a prior commitment (1 adult); and partner did not want to attend (1 adult).

**Table II.4. Reasons Provided by Respondents for Not Participating in Scheduled Real Relationships workshop: years 1 & 2 (n=15 adults/individuals)**

Reasons for not attending scheduled session	7/1/16-12/31/16	1/1/17-9/30/17	Years 1 & 2 combined
Sickness/death in family	4	1	5
Transportation Issues	2	1	3
Child Care Issues	1	2	3
Conflict with Work Schedule	0	2	2
Conflict with a Prior Commitment	0	1	1
Partner did not want to attend	0	1	1

Respondents were asked whether Children's Aid Society could do something to make it easier for them to attend a *Real Relationships* program. Most respondents said "no." The remaining respondents suggested that Children's Aid Society could provide transportation or child care during the event to those who need it. Another suggestion was to schedule a workshop closer to a city in one of the surrounding counties served by CAS.

Respondents were asked whether there was anything else that they would like to add about attending a *Real Relationships* program. Several indicated that they were looking forward to the experience and were disappointed they did not participate. About one-quarter of the respondents indicated that they had already signed up to participate in an upcoming retreat or would like to sign up for another. Another respondent who left partway through the retreat indicated that they would have liked there to be more hand-on activities. One respondent indicated being confused about why they were asked several questions about their financial situation on the Applicant Characteristics Survey.

In summary, the primary reasons provided by respondents for non-participation was due to unexpected situations, such as sickness or death in the family, or an unexpected lack of transportation or childcare. Also, two respondents indicated conflict with their work schedule.

***RQ#1, Study 3. What are the barriers to Real Relationships class/workshops attendance among community adults expressing an interest in participating in the program?***

*Based on the analysis, only 10% of potential participants did not participate in Real Relationships. Results indicate that people who were less likely to participate in Real Relationships were more likely to be Hispanic or non-white, have more children, less education, and/or more likely to receive a greater number of different types of financial assistance. For those who were employed, non-participants were less likely to have employment-related benefits other than health insurance (such as sick leave or life insurance) and to be employed for a shorter period of time in the job they had at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey. Also, results were consistent in showing that those who were scheduled for the 1-Day Engaged Couples workshop were less likely to participate. Some results indicated that being registered for the 1-Day Couples Retreat and the Weekly Couples workshop was related to being more likely to participate. Being registered for the 2-Day Couples Retreat and the Weekly Individuals workshop was unrelated to workshop participation.*

As indicated in Table II.1, there were 1,119 adults with Applicant Characteristics Survey data for the variables listed; these represent the predictor variables used in the analyses. Overall, 90% of these adults participated in Real Relationships, as measured by whether they responded to the nFORM entrance survey. All of the variables listed in Table II.1, except income, were examined to see if there was a statistically significant relationship with participation status (coded 0=no; 1=yes). Appendix Table I.1 presents the frequency distribution of each of the variables of interest for participants and non-participants; the table also presents mean value for relevant variables, and appropriate test statistics. As indicated above, results are presented for three different samples: (1) the overall sample of 1,119 adults, (2) all couples in which data were available for both adults (n=894 adults representing 447 couples), and (3) adults in a couple in which the partner's data is missing from the sample and adults not part of a couple (n=225 adults). Also, analyses were conducted on the subset of adults who were employed. There were 654 adults

included in the overall sample for employed adults. For the couples analysis, there were 398 adults representing 199 couples. Because some adults in a couple were not employed (and hence, had missing data on the employment variables), the employed partner was shifted to the third set of analyses comprised of individuals in which there was no partner or the partner's data was excluded from the analysis ( $n=256$ ).

Overall, participants were significantly more likely to be older ( $p=0.024$ ), to be non-Hispanic White ( $p=0.003$ ), to have fewer children ( $p=0.003$ ), to have more education, and in particular to have at least a high school degree ( $p=0.002$  and  $p=0.022$ , respectively), to have received fewer types of financial assistance listed in the Applicant Characteristics Survey during the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey, and in particular not to have received any type of financial assistance ( $p=0.004$  and  $p=0.013$ , respectively). Also, the type of workshop format the person was scheduled to participate in was related to whether the adult actually participated: those enrolled in the 1-Day Couples Retreat and Weekly Couples workshop format were more likely to participate in Real Relationships ( $p=0.037$  and  $p<0.0013$ , respectively), while those enrolled in the 1-Day Engaged Couples Retreat were less likely to participate ( $p<0.001$ ). There was a tendency for participants to have a post-secondary education ( $p=0.061$ ). The relationship between participation status and whether the adult participated in the 2-Day Couples Retreat or Weekly Individuals workshop was not statistically significant. Participation status was also unrelated to gender, relationship status (married/engaged or not), employment status, whether the adult was retired, self-perceived health status, how or where the participant heard about Real Relationships, reasons for enrolling, whether the adult was part of a couple, and the year that the adult completed the Applicant Characteristics Survey.

Among the 654 adults who indicated being employed, those who participated in Real Relationships were employed in their current job significantly longer than those who did not participate ( $p=0.005$ ). They were also more likely to have benefits other than health insurance through their job, such as paid sick leave or life insurance ( $p=0.014$ ).

In order to control for the fact that some of the adult-level data for couples is not independent, separate analyses were conducted for (a) couples and (b) adults who were not part of a couple, or one of the adults in the couple was excluded from analyses due to missing data. Most of the 1,119 adults were part of a couple and data were complete for both adults (894 adults; 80% of the cases); these 894 adults represented 447 couples. Out of the remaining 225 adults, 99 (44%) attended a workshop as an individual. The remaining 126 adults (56%) were part of a couple, but one member of the couple did not have complete data and that adult was consequently excluded from these analyses. The frequency distribution for participants and non-participants for each of these sub-groups are also presented in Appendix Table 1. Multi-level analyses using the HLM 8.0 were used to examine the significance of the factors for the 447 couples with complete data for both adults (894 adults).

For the most part, results from the couples analysis were consistent with the overall analysis for many of the variables. Results from the couples analysis that were consistent with the overall analysis indicate that participants were more likely to be non-Hispanic White ( $p=0.024$ ), to have

fewer children ( $p=0.021$ ), to have more education ( $p=0.009$ ), and to have received fewer types of financial assistance during the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.036$ ), and to a weaker extent not to have received any type of financial assistance during the prior month ( $p=0.077$ ). They were also less likely to have participated in the 1-Day Retreat for Engaged Couples ( $p=0.035$ ), instead participating in either the 2-Day or 1-Day Couples Retreat or the Weekly Couples workshop. Also, among couples in which both adults were employed, those who were employed for a longer period of time in their current job and to have received employment-related benefits other than health insurance were significantly more likely to participate in Real Relationships ( $p<0.001$  and  $p=0.013$ , respectively). All but one of the remaining factors that were significant in the overall analysis were very weakly associated with participation in the couples analysis, i.e., greater age ( $p=0.105$ ), having a post-secondary education ( $p=0.129$ ), and participating in the 1-Day Retreat or Weekly Couples workshop ( $p=0.132$  and  $p=0.109$ , respectively). The only factor that was totally unrelated to participation in the couples analysis that was related to participation in the overall analysis was whether the adult had at least a high school degree ( $p=0.446$  in the couples analysis).

In contrast, the analysis of individuals (i.e., those not in a couple or the partner in a couple was excluded from the analysis due to missing data) indicated that those with at least a high school degree were more likely to participate in Real Relationships ( $p=0.003$ ). This result was apparent for both subgroups in the individuals analysis: those not part of a couple ( $p=0.091$ ;  $n=99$ ) and adults in a couple whose partner was excluded from the analysis due to missing data ( $p=0.011$ ;  $n=126$ ). One other factor was related to participation in the individuals analysis, that being hearing about Real Relationships through means other than the internet or social media ( $p=0.016$ ).

In summary, 90% of the adults in the sample participated in Real Relationships. The bulk of the sample for RQ#1, Study 3 was part of a couple, and included in the multi-level analyses. Participation among these people was clearly associated with being non-Hispanic and white, having fewer children, more education, receiving fewer types of financial assistance during the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey, and for those who were employed, longer employment in the job they had at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey and having work-related benefits other than health insurance. There was a weak association with being older. Couples who participated in Real Relationships were less likely to have participated in the 1-Day Retreat for Engaged Couples. The primary finding from the individuals analysis was that those with at least a high school degree or diploma were more likely to participate in Real Relationships.

The converse of these results is that people who were less likely to participate in Real Relationships were more likely to be Hispanic or non-white, have more children, less education, and/or more likely to receive a greater number of different types of financial assistance. For those who were employed, non-participants were less likely to have employment-related benefits other than health insurance (such as sick leave or life insurance) and to be employed for a shorter period of time in the job they had at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey. In

short, short non-participants appear to be more vulnerable and in greater economic need than those who participated in the program.

***RQ#2. How do community adults who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ from those who start the program but do not finish it, as defined by completing the nFORM exit survey?***

*Overall, 82% of participants completed Real Relationships. Results indicate that people who were more likely to complete Real Relationships were more likely to indicate being unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey, have lower self-perceived health status, have fewer children, or identify as non-Hispanic White. Also, those who participated in the 1-Day Couples Retreat were more likely to complete the program, as well as those who participated later during the 5-year program. On the other hand, there was a tendency for those who participated in the Weekly Couples workshops and those with fewer children to be less likely to complete the program. Results indicated that age, or other factors that were associated with age, were associated with program completion.*

As indicated in Table II.1, there were 1,006 adult participants with Applicant Characteristics Survey data for the variables listed; these represent the predictor variables used in the analyses. Overall, 82% of these adults completed Real Relationships, as measured by whether they responded to the nFORM exit survey. All of the variables listed in Table II.1, except income, were examined to see if there was a statistically significant relationship with completion status (coded 0=no; 1=yes). Data were analyzed in the manner as that for RQ#1, Study 3 (above). Appendix Table 3 presents the results for the three sets of analyses.

In the overall analysis, adults who completed Real Relationships were more likely to be older ( $p<0.001$ ), female ( $p=0.035$ ), non-Hispanic White ( $p=0.022$ ), to have fewer children ( $p=0.010$ ), less likely to be employed full-time and more likely to be unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.053$  and  $p=0.024$ , respectively), retired ( $p=0.014$ ), to have a lower self-perceived health status ( $p=0.001$ ), to have received fewer types of financial assistance in the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey or none at all ( $p=0.050$  and  $p=0.072$ , respectively), and to have participated in Real Relationships later during the 5-year project, that is, Year 3 and later ( $p<0.001$ ). Also, the type of workshop format the person participated in was related to whether the adult completed the program: those enrolled in the 1-Day Couples Retreat were more likely to complete Real Relationships ( $p=0.004$ ), while those enrolled in the Weekly Couples workshop were less likely to complete it ( $p=0.027$ ). The relationship between completion status and whether the adult participated in the 2-Day Couples Retreat, 1-Day Engaged Couples Retreat or Weekly Individuals workshop was not statistically significant. Completers were more likely to have heard of Real Relationships through program staff or an event ( $p=0.024$ ), and there was a tendency for completers to have heard about it through the internet or social media ( $p=0.061$ ). Completion status was unrelated to the other ways of hearing about the program and reasons for enrolling. In addition, completion status was unrelated to relationship status (married/engaged or not), educational level, whether the adult was part of a couple, and for those who were employed, the two employment variables.

As was done for RQ#1, Study 3, multi-level analyses using the HLM 8.0 were used to examine the significance of the factors for participants who were part of a couple and for whom data

from both adults were included in the analysis (i.e., couples analyses). Most of the 1,006 participants were part of a couple and data were complete for both adults (806 adults; 80% of the cases); these 806 adults represented 403 couples. A separate set of analyses was conducted for the remaining 200 adults who were not part of a couple, or one of the adults in the couple was excluded from analyses due to missing data (i.e., individuals analyses). Out of the remaining 200 adults, 91 (45.5%) attended a workshop as an individual. The remaining 109 adults (54.5%) were part of a couple, but one member of the couple did not have complete data and that adult was consequently excluded from these analyses.

For the most part, results from the couples analysis were consistent with the overall analysis for many of the variables, although there was a notable difference. Results from the couples analysis that were consistent with the overall analysis indicate that completers were more likely to be female ( $p=0.012$ ), to have fewer children ( $p=0.042$ ), less likely to be employed full-time and more likely to be unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.050$  and  $p=0.027$ , respectively), to have a lower self-perceived health status ( $p=0.006$ ), and to have participated in Real Relationships later during the 5-year project, that is, Year 3 and later ( $p<0.001$ ). Also, the type of workshop format the person participated in was related to whether the adult completed the program: those enrolled in the 1-Day Couples Retreat were more likely to complete Real Relationships ( $p=0.005$ ). There was a tendency for those enrolled in the Weekly Couples workshop to be less likely to complete it ( $p=0.067$ ), which is consistent with results from the overall analysis. There was a tendency for a number of other factors to be related to completion status in the couples analysis and which were clearly related in the overall analysis. These include the tendency for completers in the couples analysis to be more likely to be older ( $p=0.057$ ), non-Hispanic White ( $p=0.060$ ), retired ( $p=0.114$ ), and to have heard about the program through the internet or social media ( $p=0.090$ ).

In the individuals analysis, completing Real Relationships was related to being older ( $p<0.001$ ) and female ( $p=0.007$ ). There was a tendency for participants in the individual analyses to be more likely to complete Real Relationships if they were retired ( $p=0.062$ ), to have a lower self-perceived health status ( $p=0.065$ ), and to have participated in Real Relationships later during the 5-year project, that is, Year 3 and later ( $p=0.081$ ).

In the couples analysis, completion status was not related to whether the participant received any of the types of financial assistance listed on the Applicant Characteristics Survey or the number of different types of assistance received in the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.319$  and  $p=0.262$ , respectively). Moreover, results from the individuals analysis indicate that completion status was unrelated to whether financial assistance was received or the number of different types of assistance received in the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.327$  and  $0.444$ , respectively). These results are in contrast to findings from the overall analysis. Consequently, we must conclude that the receipt of financial assistance during the month prior to responding to the Applicant Characteristics Survey was unrelated to completion status.

In order to determine which factors were most clearly related to completion status, a multi-level model with multiple predictors was conducted for the couples data. Predictors that were significant or tended to be significant in the bivariate models were included in this model. Similarly, a multiple logistic regression was conducted for the adults in the individuals analysis using the predictors that were related in the bivariate models. Appendix Table 4 presents the results from these two analyses.

For the couples analysis, factors that remained statistically significant after controlling for all other variables in the model were race/ethnicity ( $p=0.046$ ), employment status at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.036$ ), self-perceived health status ( $0.019$ ), participation in the 1-Day Couples Retreat ( $0.033$ ), and year responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey ( $p=0.003$ ). Specifically, the following groups were significantly more likely to complete Real Relationships: non-Hispanic White participants, those who were unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey, those who rated their self-perceived health status as lower, and those who participated in the 1-Day Couples Retreat. Also, there was a tendency for those with fewer children ( $p=0.059$ ) to be more likely to complete the workshop. In addition, those who participated in the Weekly Couples workshop tended to be less likely to complete the workshop ( $p=0.084$ ). It is noteworthy that controlling on the above factors resulted in age and gender not being significantly related to completion status ( $p=0.283$  and  $0=0.187$ , respectively). The lack of findings for age is due to it being correlated with factors that are more strongly related to completion status, that being not being employed ( $r=0.13$ ;  $p<0.001$ ), number of children ( $-0.25$ ;  $p<0.001$ ), and self-perceived health status ( $r=0.10$ ;  $p=0.005$ ).

For adults in the individuals analysis, age was the primary factor related to completion status, controlling on all other variables in the model. Specifically, older adults were more likely to complete Real Relationships. There was a tendency for female participants to be more likely to complete the program ( $p=0.094$ ), as well as those who participated later during the program ( $p=0.111$ ). In the individuals analyses, age was strongly correlated with self-perceived health status ( $r=0.35$ ;  $p<0.001$ ) and being retired ( $r=0.65$ ;  $p<0.001$ ); these correlations explain the lack of a significant association between completion status and retirement and self-perceived health status. Age is also strongly correlated with being female ( $r=0.25$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). The variable called population, which indicates whether the individual was not in a relationship or part of a couple (but the partner did not have data in the sample for RQ#2), was also controlled due to the sample being comprised of both types of individuals; it did not approach statistical significance ( $p=0.704$ ).

In summary, those who were more likely to complete Real Relationships appear to be more likely to have fewer demands on their time, as indicated by having fewer children, more like to be unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey, and being older or other factors related to greater age (such as lower self-perceived health status). The idea that competing demands interfere with program completion is consistent with the finding that participants in the Weekly Couples workshop tended to be less likely to complete the program since maintaining a weekly commitment to participate is more likely to be difficult when a person has competing demands. Other factors related to program completion are identifying as

non-Hispanic White, participation in the 1-Day Couples Retreat, and participating later during the 5-year program.

### III. OUTCOMES STUDY

#### A. Research questions

This section describes the research questions, sample formation process, data collection procedures, outcome measures, and analytic approach for the outcomes study.

##### 1. Research questions

*How do outcomes, in terms of (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills, and (c) parenting and co-parenting skills for participants who completed their Real Relationships workshop differ by the format of the workshop (i.e., weekend retreat, multi-week retreat) at the time of the nFORM exit survey and the follow-up survey, which was administered no less than three months after the exit survey?*

Outcomes at the time of the nFORM exit survey are considered short-term outcomes, and those at the time of the follow-up survey are considered longer term outcomes. Comparing outcomes across these two surveys provide information regarding (a) the length of time it takes to detect a change in the short-term and longer term outcomes of interest for each workshop format and across all formats, and (b) how long the effect is observed for each workshop format and across all formats.

The specific outcomes associated with (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills, and (c) parenting and co-parenting skills are specified in Table III.4 in the “Outcome measures” section.

#### B. Study design

##### 1. Sample formation

Details regarding sample formation are provided under II. Implementation Study. The outcome study includes data from the local follow-up survey, a web-based survey via Survey Monkey. The first page of the survey is a web-based survey consent form, and respondents were asked to agree or not agree. Only respondents who agreed were included in analysis for the outcome study. Data from the local follow-up survey was used for measures of only (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills. The response rate on the local follow-up survey to measures of parenting and co-parenting skills was low (refer to Table III.2), and so data from the local follow-up survey for these outcome measures was not included in the analysis.

Each participant received an incentive (gift card) every time s/he completed a survey. The incentive for responding to the nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, entrance survey, and exit survey was a \$10 gift card, respectively. The incentive for responding to the local follow-up survey was a \$15 gift card.

Enrollment in Real relationships began July 5, 2016. In order to be included in the Outcome Study, a participant was required to respond to the nFORM exit survey by 10/31/2019. Local follow-up survey data collection ended on 4/1/2020.

## **2. Data collection**

As indicated in Table III.1, all data for the outcome study were taken from the Applicant Characteristics Survey, the nFORM entrance and exit surveys, and the local follow-up survey. The nFORM workshop type and attendance forms were used to determine the type of workshop attended. The timing and mode of data collection for each survey are also described in Table III.1. The local follow-up survey is based on the nFORM exit survey. It was administered at least 3 months after the nFORM exit survey was completed. The follow-up procedures are described below.

In order to reduce attrition on the local follow-up survey, adult participants in all (community) workshop formats were told by CAS about this survey during the *Real Relationships* program and the associated incentive for completing it. The local evaluation team conducted all aspects of the local follow-up survey administration (recruitment, data collection and analysis) once the participant had completed the nFORM exit survey.

For the follow-up survey, participants were sent multiple emails, texts (for those indicating it was okay to text), and postcard reminders, as needed. If participants provided multiple ways of being reached (i.e., email and/or text as well as mailing address), then participants were contacted through these multiple means. Specifically, if an email address was provided, then the participant was contacted via email first. If there is no response after a few days, then they were sent a text (for those who gave permission to be texted). Finally, they were sent a postcard reminder approximately 7-10 days after the original contact. Additional recruitment efforts were implemented in March 2017. If the participant did not respond after 30 days, they were sent another email (if email contact was provided), and a second text reminder a few days later if needed. A second postcard reminder was sent with a hand-written note of "If you have already done this survey – Thank You!" If needed, a third reminder postcard was sent 30 days after the second postcard with "Final Notification" handwritten at the bottom of the card. In some cases, the postcards were returned because the participant was no longer at the address provided and did not leave a forwarding address. A text message (if given permission to text) or email was sent, or a telephone call was made to these participants.

During the second quarter of Year 2, participants were provided the additional option of responding to the local follow-up survey by calling the local evaluation team and having it read to them over the telephone. The local evaluation team member input their responses for them.

**Table III.1. Sources of data used to address outcomes study research questions**

<b>Data source</b>	<b>Timing of data collection</b>	<b>Mode of data collection</b>	<b>Start and end date of data collection</b>
Intervention participants: Applicant Characteristics Survey	No more than 4 weeks prior to the start of the scheduled workshop	In-person or over the telephone	July 2016 through October 2019
Intervention participants: nFORM entrance survey	At the start of the 1 <sup>st</sup> Real Relationships workshop session	In-person	July 2016 through October 2019
Intervention participants: nFORM exit survey	28 or more days after completion of the entrance survey.  If the last session of the Real Relationships workshop is at least 28 or more days after the entrance survey, then administered at the end of the last session.	In-person or over the telephone	August 2016 through October 2019
Intervention participants: nFORM workshop type and attendance forms	Entered by CAS as workshop is scheduled and attended	Entered by CAS into nFORM	July 2016 through October 2019
Intervention participants: local follow-up survey	At least 3 months after completion of the exit survey	Online or over the telephone	November 2016 through March 2020

### 3. Analytic sample, outcomes, and descriptive statistics

Details regarding outcome study data cleaning and file preparation are presented in Appendix A. Table III.2 provides the number of cases in the analyses for each outcome. The number of cases differ for each outcome because of filters associated with each. All participants had the option to respond to the measures of progress towards economic stability (i.e., no filters applied to these questions). For these measures, 609 individuals had responses on the nFORM entrance survey, the nFORM exit survey and the local follow-up survey; this represents an 35% attrition rate based on the number enrolled in the program (n=931).

Only participants in a relationship had the option to respond to the primary outcome measures of improved healthy relationship and marriage skills; all of these participants were in a couples-based workshop format (i.e., 2-Day Couples Retreat, 1-Day Couples Retreat, 1-Day Engaged Couples, or Weekly Couples workshop). A total of 551 individuals had nFORM entrance survey, nFORM exit survey and the local follow-up survey data on the outcome measures of improved healthy relationship and marriage skills. This represents a 32% attrition rate, based on the number in a relationship when they enrolled in the program (n=812).

For the outcome measures of improved parenting and co-parenting skills, only participants with children under 21 had the option to respond to these questions. Only 98 individuals had complete survey data for these outcome measures on the nFORM entrance survey, nFORM exit survey and the local follow-up survey data. This represents an exceedingly high attrition rate of 85% out of the 658 participants enrolled in the program with children under 21. The attrition occurred throughout the course of the study, as evidenced by the attrition rate at the time of the exit survey being 58%, and it increasing to 85% for the local follow-up survey. It is unknown why respondents indicated that they had children under 21 years but did not respond to the specific

questions about them. Additional research would be needed in order to determine why parents did not respond to these questions.

**Table III.2. Outcomes study analytic sample**

Number	Number of individuals	Number of couples in couples analysis	Number of individuals in individuals analysis
Enrolled in the program	931	384	163
Completed a baseline survey	931	384	163
<b>Outcome for all participants: Progress towards greater economic stability</b>			
Completed post-program survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	770	310	150
Attrition rate (%)	17%		
Completed local follow-up survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	609	224	161
Attrition rate (%)	35%		
<b>Outcome for participants in couples programs only: Improved healthy relationship and marriage skills</b>			
Enrolled in the program	812	384	44
Completed a baseline survey	812	384	44
Completed post-program survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	693	309	75
Attrition rate (%)	15%		
Completed local follow-up survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	551	228	95
Attrition rate (%)	32%		
<b>Outcome for participants with child(ren) under 21 in couples programs only: Improved parenting and co-parenting skills</b>			
Enrolled in the program	658	298	62
Completed a baseline survey	658	298	62
Completed post-program survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	383	165	53
Attrition rate (%)	58%		
Completed local follow-up survey (accounts for item non-response and any other analysis restrictions)	98	30	38
Attrition rate (%)	85%		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, Survey, Attendance and Workshop data sheets; data from local follow-up survey

Notes: Each outcome question is comprised of a different subsample of participants; criteria for each outcome question is specified in the table. Presented are both the (a) number of couples included in the couples analysis and (b) number of individuals included in the individuals analyses comprised of adults in a couple for who the partner is missing data and individuals who are not part of a couple.

The last sample size row for each outcome question represents the final analytic sample for that outcome.

Two types of analyses were conducted for each set of outcome measures. For participants who are part of a couple, multi-level analyses using Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling (HLM) 8.00 was conducted for adults in a couple, determined by the presence of a value in the CoupleID in nFORM, and for whom their partner was also included in the analysis. CoupleID linked the multi-level level-1 and level-2 models. Adults with a Couple ID, but whose partner was excluded from the sample due to missing data were excluded from the multi-level analyses. Instead these adults were included in the second set of analyses, referred to as the individual analysis. In the individual analyses, adults who were part of a couple, but the other adult in the couple had missing data were included; when appropriate, adults not in a relationship were included as well in the individual analyses. Ordinary least squares and bivariate logistic regression were conducted for the second set of analyses.

The second column of figures presents the number of couples in the multi-level analyses (level 2); the number in level 1 is simply twice the number of couples. The number in the third set of figures in Table III.2 is the number of individuals in the individuals analyses.

Table III.3 presents the characteristics of the analytic sample for each outcome. The characteristics presented are potential control variables for each outcome.

**Table III.3. Characteristics of participants in the outcomes study at baseline**

Characteristic	All participants: progress towards greater economic stability	Participants in couples programs: improved healthy relationship & marriage skills	Participants with child(ren) under 21 & in couples programs: improved parenting & co-parenting skills
Age (mean; SD) <sup>a</sup>	5.0 (1.38) – 35 years	4.9 (1.33) – 33 years	4.6 (1.20) – 31 years
Female (%)	56%	54%	53%
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White (%)	95%	94%	95%
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	78%	86%	89%
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more (mean; SD)	1.4 (1.29)	1.5 (1.30)	1.3 (0.67)
<b>Employment status at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (%)</b>			
Full-time (=1)	44%	45%	55%
Part-time or hours change weekly (=2)	16%	18%	18%
Temporary, occasional or seasonal (=3)	3%	2%	2%
Not currently employed (=4)	37%	35%	25%
Retired	10%	8%	1%
Self-perceived health status: 1=Excellent; 5=Poor (mean; SD)	2.7 (1.03) – Good	2.7 (1.00) – Good	2.5 (0.99) – Good/Very Good
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	56%	54%	50%
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat	50%	55%	58%
1-Day Couples Retreat	9%	11%	7%

Characteristic	All participants: progress towards greater economic stability	Participants in couples programs: improved healthy relationship & marriage skills	Participants with child(ren) under 21 & in couples programs: improved parenting & co-parenting skills
1-Day Engaged Couples	21%	21%	22%
Weekly Couples	13%	13%	12%
Weekly Individuals	7%	Not included	Not included
Year responded to Applicant Characteristics Survey: 1 to 5 (mean; SD)	2.9 (0.92)	2.8 (0.92)	2.7 (0.89)
<b>Outcome Measures</b>			
Use a budget to plan spending on nFORM entrance survey (%)	54%	Not included	Not included
Use a budget to plan spending on nFORM exit survey (%)	64%	Not included	Not included
Use a budget to plan spending on local follow-up survey (%)	66%	Not included	Not included
Since attending the program, know how to handle money and bills better on nFORM exit survey: 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree) (mean; SD)	2.3 (0.75)	Not included	Not included
Since attending the program, know how to handle money and bills better on local follow-up survey: 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree) (mean; SD)	2.2 (0.72)	Not included	Not included
During the past month, worked with spouse/partner to find a resolution when had a serious disagreement on nFORM entrance survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)	Not included	3.4 (0.75)	Not included
During the past month, worked with spouse/partner to find a resolution when had a serious disagreement on nFORM exit survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)	Not included	3.5 (0.63)	Not included
During the past month, worked with spouse/partner to find a resolution when had a serious disagreement on local follow-up survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)	Not included	3.5 (0.67)	Not included
Since attending the program, know how to handle conflict with partner/spouse better on nFORM exit survey: 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree (mean; SD)	Not included	1.6 (0.56)	Not included
Since attending the program, know how to handle conflict with partner/spouse better on local follow-up survey: 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree (mean; SD)	Not included	1.7 (0.60)	Not included
How often spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do on nFORM entrance survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)	Not included	Not included	3.8 (0.40)

Characteristic	All participants: progress towards greater economic stability	Participants in couples programs: improved healthy relationship & marriage skills	Participants with child(ren) under 21 & in couples programs: improved parenting & co-parenting skills
How often spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do on nFORM exit survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)	Not included	Not included	3.7 (0.45)
How often spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do on local follow-up survey: 1=never; 4= often (mean; SD)			3.7 (0.53)
Since attending the program, feel more confident R has the skills necessary to be an effective parent on nFORM exit survey; 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree (mean; SD)	Not included	Not included	1.9 (0.66)
Since attending the program, feel more confident R has the skills necessary to be an effective parent on local follow-up survey; 1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree (mean; SD)			1.9 (0.61)
Sample size	609	551	98

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets; local follow-up survey

<sup>a</sup> Values for age ranged from 1 to 8, with 1=under 18; 2=18-20; 3=21-24; 4=25-34; 5=35-44; 6=45-54; 7=55-64; 8=65 or older.

Table III.4 presents the specific outcome measures used in the outcome study for each type of outcome (i.e., progress towards greater economic stability to which that all participants could respond, improved healthy relationship and marriage skills to which only participants in a relationship could respond, and improved parenting and co-parenting skills to which only those with children under 21 could respond).

**Table III.4. Outcome measures used to answer the outcomes study research questions**

Outcome name	Description of the outcome measure	Source of the measure	Timing of measure
<b>Outcome: Improved healthy relationship and marriage skills</b>			
Partner/Spouse Resolution of Conflict (EXITPartnerResolut)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=never; 2=hardly; 3=sometimes; 4=often) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "During the past month, how often did the following happen: When my partner/spouse and I had a serious disagreement, we worked on it together to find a resolution."	nFORM exit survey	At least 28 days after the entrance survey.

Outcome name	Description of the outcome measure	Source of the measure	Timing of measure
Partner/Spouse Resolution of Conflict (FUPartnerResolut)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=never; 2=hardly; 3=sometimes; 4=often) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "During the past month, how often did the following happen: When my partner/spouse and I had a serious disagreement, we worked on it together to find a resolution."	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with partner/spouse better (FUSinceProgrPartner)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=disagree; 4=strongly disagree) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better."	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)
<b>Outcome: Improved parenting and co-parenting skills</b>			
Time with child doing things child likes to do (EXITSpendTimeChild1)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=never; 2=hardly ever; 3=sometimes; 4=often) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "please tell us how often you've felt or acted this way in the past month: I spend time with [child 1] doing what he/she likes to do?"	nFORM exit survey	At least 28 days after the entrance survey.
Time with child doing things child likes to do (FUSpendTimeChild1)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=never; 2=hardly ever; 3=sometimes; 4=often) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "please tell us how often you've felt or acted this way in the past month: I spend time with [child 1] doing what he/she likes to do?"	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)
Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent (FUSinceProgrParenting)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=disagree; 4=strongly disagree) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent."	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)
<b>Outcome: Progress towards greater economic stability</b>			
Use a budget to plan spending (EXITBudget)	The outcome measure is a yes/no response taken directly from the question in the survey, "Currently, do you ... use a budget to plan your spending?" (n=0; yes=1)	nFORM exit survey	At least 28 days after the entrance survey.
Use a budget to plan spending (FUBudget)	The outcome measure is a yes/no response taken directly from the question in the survey, "Currently, do you ... use a budget to plan your spending?" (n=0; yes=1)	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle money and bills better (FUSinceProgBills)	The outcome measure is a 4-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=disagree; 4=strongly disagree) response taken directly from the question in the survey, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict my money and bills better."	Local follow-up survey	At least 4 months after entrance survey (criteria used: at least 3 months after the exit survey)

## C. Findings and analysis approach

This section summarizes how data were analyzed for the analyses associated with the outcome research question, limitations of these analyses, and the findings associated with each analysis.

With only one exception, results indicated that the 2-Day Couples Retreat, the primary workshop format, was associated with lower scores on the nFORM exit survey and local follow-up survey when statistically significant differences related to workshop type were apparent. However, the prevalence of differences between the samples analyzed for each outcome and those in the population not included in the analysis indicate that results should not be generalized to the population.

The outcome research question, again is:

- 1. How do outcomes, in terms of (a) progress towards greater economic stability, (b) healthy relationship and marriage skills, and (c) parenting and co-parenting skills for participants who complete their Real Relationships workshop differ by the format of the workshop (i.e., weekend retreat, multi-week retreat) at the time of the nFORM exit survey and the follow-up survey, which was administered no less than three months after the exit survey?**

For parenting and co-parenting analyses, there was a statistically significant difference between the analytic sample and those not in the analytic sample for only 3 of the 18 comparisons (17%); refer to Table B.4. However, there was an 85% attrition rate for the parenting and co-parenting analyses, resulting in a sample size of 60 individuals/30 couples for the couples analysis and 38 individuals for the individuals analysis. Clearly, the results from the analysis of this small sample should not be generalized to the population.

The same approach for analyzing the data for RQ#1, Study 3 and RQ#2 in the implementation study was used to examine the research question for the outcome study. For all analyses, first a base model for each outcome variable was estimated which examined the relationship between the outcome variable and workshop format, controlling for the baseline value of the outcome measure. Next, the final model that estimated the relationship between the outcome variable and workshop format, adjusting on relevant control variables is presented. In order to assess whether type of workshop was related to outcomes at the time of the nFORM exit survey and local follow-up survey, dummy variables for each workshop type were created; the 2-Day Couples Retreat was the omitted category in the multi-level and regression analyses. Consequently, all other workshop types were compared to the 2-Day Couples Retreat. This approach was used since at least 50% of the adults in the sample for each outcome measure participated in the 2-Day Couples Retreat, making it the primary workshop. Also, the same procedure for determining statistical significance in the implementation study was also used for the outcome study. Specifically, statistical significance was defined as being  $p < 0.05$ , meaning the relationship is significantly different from zero at the .05 level using a two-tailed test. However,  $p$ -values are reported and  $p$ -values that are weaker are discussed, particularly those that are consistent with other analyses that have a statistically significant  $p$ -value.

It is important to note that the attrition analyses presented in Appendix B indicate the presence of statistically significant differences on a substantial percentage of the variables examined ( $p < 0.05$ ). For the outcome analyses examining progress towards greater economic stability, there was a statistically significant difference for 8 of the 19 comparisons (42%) between adults in the analytic sample and those not in the analytic sample ( $p < 0.05$ ); refer to Table B.2. In the case of analyses examining healthy relationship and marriage skills, there was a statistically significant difference between those in the analytic sample and those not in the analytic sample for 12 of the 18 comparisons (67%); refer to Table B.3. These results mean that the analytic sample associated with each outcome was not representative of the population as a whole, and results cannot be generalized to the population.

Results from multi-level analyses and multiple logistic regressions examining differences across workshop formats on the use of a budget to plan spending are examined at the time of the nFORM exit survey, controlling for baseline on the entrance survey (Appendix Table 5), at the time of the local follow-up survey, controlling for scores on the exit survey (Appendix Table 6), and at the time of the local follow-up survey, controlling for scores on the entrance survey (Appendix Table 7). Participants in the 1-Day Couples Retreat, 1-Day Engaged Couples, Weekly Couples, and Weekly Individuals workshops did not differ significantly from those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat with respect to whether they used a budget to plan spending at the time of the nFORM exit survey, controlling on use at baseline ( $p > 0.40$ ). This finding was apparent for both samples, and in the base and final models (Appendix Table 8). However, at the time of the follow-up survey, participants in the 1-Day Engaged Couples workshop were significantly more likely to report using a budget to plan spending than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat – this was apparent when the baseline was the nFORM exit survey as well as the entrance survey (Appendix Tables 6 and 7).

Results from the multi-level analysis indicated that participants who received financial assistance were significantly more likely to use a budget to plan spending on the follow-up survey (Appendix Tables 6 and 7:  $p < 0.05$ ). Participants in the Weekly Couples workshop were significantly more likely than the other workshop participants to receive financial assistance (85% received financial assistance compared to 49% of other workshop participants;  $r = 0.233$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Prior to controlling for receipt of financial assistance, participants in the Weekly Couples workshop appeared to be more likely to use a budget at the time of the follow-up, compared to those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat controlling for use of a budget on the exit survey ( $p < 0.061$ ; Appendix Table 6) and controlling for use of a budget on the entrance survey ( $p = 0.037$ ; Appendix Table 7). However, after controlling for whether the adult received financial assistance in the past month the association between attending the Weekly Couples workshop and reporting using a budget to plan on the follow-up survey became statistically insignificant ( $p > 0.12$ ). This pattern of results suggests that the significant differences in use of a budget on the local follow-up survey between participants in the Weekly Couples workshop and participants in the 2-Day Couples Retreat in the model without controls (the base model in Appendix Tables 6 and 7) are likely explained by differences in characteristics of participants between the two workshops rather than to differences between the two workshops themselves.

Analyses were conducted which examined the relationship between which workshop adults participated in and the extent to which they agreed on the follow-up survey with the statement that they know how to handle money and bills better since attending the program, controlling for their agreement on the exit survey (Appendix Table 8). The clearest finding was for participants in the Weekly Individuals workshop – these participants were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p=0.023$ ).

The association between workshop format and the extent to which participants worked with their spouse/partner during the month prior to the survey to find resolutions to serious disagreements is presented in Appendix Tables 9-11. Results from the multi-level models indicated that participants in the 1-Day Couples Retreat reported doing this significantly more often than participants in the 2-Day Couples Retreat at the time of the nFORM exit survey, controlling for scores on the entrance survey ( $p=0.001$ ). There was a tendency for persons who were older to be more likely to agree with this statement among adults included in the individuals analysis ( $p=0.075$ ). Controlling on age in this sample resulted in the relationship between participation in the 1-Day Couples Retreat and the outcome becoming stronger ( $p=0.086$  after age is controlled). Consequently, in both the couples analysis and the individuals analysis, it appears as though participants in the 1-Day Couples Retreat more often sought a resolution to serious disagreements with their spouse at the time of the nFORM exit survey, compared to participants in the 2-Day Couples Retreat. However, by the time of the local follow-up survey, differences across workshop format were no longer apparent for this outcome ( $p>0.13$ ; refer to Appendix Tables 13 and 14).

Analyses were conducted which examined the relationship between which workshop adults participated in and the extent to which they agreed on the follow-up survey with the statement that they know how to handle conflict with their partner/spouse better since attending the program, controlling for their agreement on the exit survey (Appendix Table 12). Participants in the Weekly Couples workshop were significantly more likely to agree with this statement on the local follow-up survey than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p=0.023$ ), controlling for their agreement on the exit survey ( $p=0.036$ ).

Results from multi-level analyses and multiple logistic regressions examining differences across workshop formats on time spent during the past month with the youngest child doing what the child likes to do for participants with children under the age of 21 are examined at the time of the nFORM exit survey, controlling for baseline on the entrance survey (Appendix Table 13), at the time of the local follow-up survey, controlling for scores on the exit survey (Appendix Table 14), and at the time of the local follow-up survey, controlling for scores on the entrance survey (Appendix Table 15). Results from the couples analysis indicate that participants in the Weekly Couples workshop format indicated spending more time with their youngest child doing what the child likes to do at the time of the nFORM exit survey than participants in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p=0.001$ ). Controlling on whether the participant received financial assistance in the past month weakened the relationship, however there was still a tendency for participants in the Weekly Couples workshop to spend more time with their children than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p=0.078$ ).

Differences between the workshop formats in the outcome variable at the time of the local follow-up survey resulted in somewhat different findings. In the couples analysis, participants in the Weekly Couples workshop no longer differed significantly from those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat at the time of the follow-up survey ( $p>0.28$ ). Instead, participants in the 1-Day Engaged Couples workshop indicated spending more time with their youngest child doing what they like to do than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat at the time of the local follow-up survey ( $p<0.02$ ). Controlling on whether the participant received financial assistance in the past month seemed to strengthen the differences between these two workshop formats. In the case of the individuals analysis, participants in the Weekly Couples workshop indicated spending more time with their youngest child doing what the child liked to do on the local follow-up survey than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p<0.05$ ). These results were apparent for when response on the nFORM exit survey was controlled (Appendix Table 14) and when response on the nFORM entrance survey was controlled (Appendix Table 15). Due to the small number of cases in the individuals analysis, no additional control variables were included in the model.

Analyses were conducted which examined the relationship between which workshop adults participated in and the extent to which they agreed on the follow-up survey with the statement that they feel more confident that they have the skills necessary to be an effective parent since attending Real Relationships, controlling for their agreement on the exit survey (Appendix Table 16). In this model, participants in the 1-Day Couples Retreat were significantly more likely to agree with this statement than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat ( $p<0.05$ ). This relationship held even after controlling on whether the participant received financial assistance in the past month. It is worth noting that participants who received financial assistance in the past month tended to show greater agreement than those who did not receive assistance with the statement that they feel more confident that they have the skills necessary to be an effective parent since attending Real Relationships ( $p=0.054$ ).

## IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Despite results not being representative of the population, there are implications for implementation of the program in the future with a similar population, as well as avenues for future research. First, results suggest that a potential barrier to participation in Real Relationships is CAS staff not being able to reach potential participants after potential participants initially contact CAS due to changes in their contact information. One approach for dealing with that is to develop a standardized form for collecting this information when potential participants contact CAS about the program; the potential participant would be asked to provide multiple avenues to be contacted, such as landline telephone number, cell number, mailing address, email, and another person CAS could call if other avenues of contact fail. Timely follow-up with the potential participant and maintaining contact with the potential participant if it is not feasible to schedule them for a workshop soon after are important. Also, results from the Applicant Characteristics Survey indicate that participants who were less likely to participate in a Real Relationships workshop were more likely to have greater economic need, as indicated by receiving a greater number of different types of financial assistance and having less education. While the analytic sample used in this analysis was not representative of the population, these findings suggest that those with greater economic need may require more program supports in order to attend the program. The local evaluation did not speak to what types of program supports would be most effective. And so the agency may need to explore offering different types of support and collecting systematic data on what appears to be most effective for promoting attendance in the program.

There were several limitations to the local evaluation beyond the samples analyzed not being generalizable to the population. While the local evaluation was able to provide exploratory information regarding barriers to participation in the program, a more systematic analysis is needed in order to determine barriers to potential participants. Results from RQ#1, Study 3 indicated that only 10% of those who enrolled in Real Relationships did not attend at least one Real Relationships session. This finding indicates that once an adult is enrolled, they have an excellent chance of benefitting from at least partial program participation. However, this does not provide information about barriers or impediments inhibiting people from finding out about the program or enrolling in it. The analysis for RQ#1, Study 1 was intended to provide initial information about barriers or impediments to enrollment. However, the study was initiated partway through the project and relied on administrative data used by CAS. The approach used in RQ#1, Study 1 has merits and provided a glimpse into possible impediments to enrollment. However, a more systematic data collection effort is required in order for the approach to provide conclusive results. Another approach that could be used to capture information from those not contacting CAS about the program would be to interview or survey people attending program recruitment events. In addition, staff at agencies who refer potential clients to CAS could be interviewed or could perhaps arrange for their clients/customers to be interviewed or surveyed regarding their interest in the program and barriers to participation.

Results from RQ#2 indicated that 82% of the sample of adults who started Real Relationships completed it (n=1,006), as defined by responding to the nFORM exit survey that was administered at least 28 days after the nFORM entrance survey. Results suggest that those who were more likely to complete Real Relationships appeared to be more likely to have fewer demands on their time, as indicated by having fewer children, more likely to be unemployed at the time of the Applicant Characteristics Survey, and being older or other factors related to greater age. Although these results are not generalizable to the population, results are suggestive. Additional research is warranted in order to better understand the processes for promoting program completion and the need for additional program supports (i.e., child care, food, case management), especially among this subgroup. Incorporating interviews of participants who did not complete the program could provide a perspective on factors associated with dropping out of the program or not completing the exit survey; results from the interviews could provide a starting point for a systematic analysis of factors associated with program completion.

Results from RQ #3 indicate that, for the most part, participants in both the one-day and weekly workshops had significantly higher values on the outcome measures on the nFORM exit survey and local follow-up survey than those in the 2-Day Couples Retreat. It should be noted that differences were not significant in all analyses or for all one-day and weekly workshop formats. However, there was sufficient consistency across analyses to conclude that participants in the 2-Day Couples Retreat tended not to score as highly on the outcome measures as participants in the other couples-based workshop formats (when differences were apparent). These results beg the question of why this fairly consistent finding was apparent in the samples studied. Further research exploring this issue would be worthwhile since the 2-Day Couples Retreat is a popular format. An area of future research involves determining which factors are associated with change in the outcome measures; data on this could provide guidance on how to strengthen that format. The results for the outcome study also leads to the question, did participants in the different workshop formats engage in different approaches for reinforcing the material from the workshop after the workshop ended? Future research could compare the effectiveness of different approaches for reinforcing the material from the workshop after it ends.

## V. REFERENCES

Center for Children's Justice (2014), Bernville, PA. [www.C4CJ.org](http://www.C4CJ.org)

Children's Aid Society in Clearfield County (2015). Real Relationships: A Project of Children's Aid Society. Healthy Marriage Proposal to the Office of Family Assistance (OFA) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), U. S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS).

Pennsylvania Department of Education, Pennsylvania Office of Child Development and Early Learning. 2012-2013 Pennsylvania Early Childhood Education Profile.

Stanley S.M., Markman H.J. (1997) Marriage in the 90s: A nationwide random phone survey. Denver, CO: PREP, Inc.

U.S. Census Bureau: American Community Survey, 2009-2013. County-level Statistics.

<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/all?q=Clearfield%20County,%20Pennsylvania%20Income%20and%20Poverty>

U.S. Census Bureau: QuickFacts. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045219>

## VI. APPENDICES

### A. Outcomes Study Data Cleaning and preparation

SPSS was used to prepare, clean, and analyze the data. Data from nFORM were exported and read into SPSS. Data from the Workshop-Series sheet was merged into the Session Attendance sheet, and then aggregated to the Client ID level in order to determine the type of workshop the participant attended and attendance; these data were then merged into the Client Info sheet and the Survey Response Data sheet. All participants with an entrance survey participated in one of the four workshop formats since the entrance survey was administered at the start of the first workshop session. Participants were eligible to complete only one (1) workshop, and so attendance data were examined for few participants who are listed under multiple workshop formats in order to determine the actual workshop format in which they participated.

In addition, data in the Population field in the Workshop sheet was compared to that in the Attendance sheet. Cases where there was a discrepancy are examined in order to determine the correct value for Population. The data in Population was then compared to workshop format; the data for participants whose value for Population was inconsistent with workshop format were examined and corrected.

All adult participants who completed the nFORM exit survey were eligible to complete the local follow-up survey. Participants were sent a postcard with a unique identifier when they were eligible to respond to the follow-up survey. They are asked to enter the local evaluation identifier in the local follow-up survey on Survey Monkey. A separate file was maintained by the evaluation team that linked the nFORM ID with data from the local follow-up survey (i.e., the local evaluation ID and the unique ID provided by Survey Monkey). The follow-up survey data were exported from Survey Monkey weekly, and new respondents were identified and sent their incentive for responding to the survey; the unique ID provided by Survey Money was added to the file linking nFORM and Survey Monkey data. Merging the data from the local follow-up survey with data from nFORM is a one-to-one merge using the unique ID from Survey Monkey and the nFORM ID.

The analytic sample for each set of outcomes specified in the research question are individuals who (a) gave their consent to be part of the evaluation, (b) responded to the outcome and associated baseline questions on all three survey instruments, (c) provided data on relevant socio-demographic control variables, and (d) were administered the exit survey at least 28 days after the entrance survey. Control variables were from the Applicant Characteristics Survey and chosen from the pool of variables examined in the implementation study. Variables that were statistically related to workshop format in the overall sample. Highest level of education, months had a job, and whether the adult had employment-related benefits other than health insurance were excluded due to the higher number of missing data for these questions; however, these questions were significantly correlated with other control variables. Since the purpose of this analysis is to control on relevant factors, rather than to provide a descriptive analysis of participants, the decision was made to exclude them from the analysis.

## B. Attrition analyses and tables

**Table B.1. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: RQ#1, Study 3**

Baseline measure	RQ#1, Study 3: mean for the analytic sample (standard deviation)	Mean for individuals enrolled in the study but not in the analytic sample (standard deviation); n	Difference ( <i>p</i> -value of difference)
Female (%)	52%	64%; 235	0.12 (0.001)
Age (range: 1-8)	5.0 (1.39)	5.6 (2.08); 238	0.54 (<0.001)
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White (%)	94%	93%; 204	0.01 (0.457)
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	75%	58%; 231	0.16 (<0.001)
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more	1.5 (1.34)	1.3 (1.46); 132	0.2 (0.154)
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (%)	39%	58%; 218	0.19 (<0.001)
Retired (%)	10%	29%; 204	0.19 (<0.001)
Self-perceived health status: 1=excellent; 5=poor	2.8 (1.04)	2.8 (1.07); 227	0.1 (0.367)
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	60%	56%; 225	0.04 (0.292)
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat (%)	49%	29%; 238	0.20 (<0.001)
1-Day Couples Retreat (%)	7%	3%; 238	0.04 (0.038)
1-Day Engaged Couples (%)	21%	31%; 238	0.09 (0.002)
Weekly Couples (%)	14%	13%; 238	0.01 (0.658)
Weekly Individuals (%)	9%	24%; 238	0.16 (<0.001)
Sample size	1,119	n.a.	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

Notes: *p*-values are included in parentheses. The analytic sample includes adults included in RQ#1, Study 3

**Table B.2. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, progress towards greater economic stability**

Baseline measure	Progress towards greater economic stability: mean for the analytic sample (standard deviation)	Mean for individuals enrolled in the study but not in the analytic sample (standard deviation); n	Difference ( <i>p</i> -value of difference)
Female (%)	55%	53%; 745	0.03 (0.290)
Age (range: 1-8)	5.0 (1.38)	5.2 (1.69); 748	0.2 (0.058)
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White (%)	95%	93%; 714	0.02 (0.076)
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	78%	66%; 741	0.12 (<0.001)
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more	1.4 (1.29)	1.5 (1.41); 642	0.1 (0.225)
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (%)	37%	46%; 728	0.08 (0.003)
Retired (%)	10%	16%; 714	0.06 (0.001)
Self-perceived health status: 1=excellent; 5=poor	2.7 (1.03)	2.8 (1.06); 737	0.04 (0.457)
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	56%	62%; 735	0.06 (0.024)
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat (%)	50%	41%; 748	0.09 (0.001)
1-Day Couples Retreat (%)	9%	4%; 748	0.05 (<0.001)
1-Day Engaged Couples (%)	21%	24%; 748	0.03 (0.153)
Weekly Couples (%)	13%	15%; 748	0.02 (0.359)
Weekly Individuals (%)	7%	16%; 748	0.09 (<0.001)
Use of budget to plan spending, entrance survey (%)	54%	54%; 570	0.005 (0.863)
Use of budget to plan spending, exit survey (%)	64%	64%; 368	0.001 (0.963)
Use of budget to plan spending, local follow-up survey (%)	66%	64%; 121	0.02 (0.665)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle my money and bills better, exit survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	2.3 (0.75)	2.1 (0.71); 331	0.2 (0.002)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle my money and bills better, local follow-up survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	2.2 (0.72)	2.1 (0.66); 105	0.1 (0.427)
Sample size	609	n.a.	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

Notes: *p*-values are included in parentheses. The analytic sample includes adults in the outcome study, progress towards greater economic stability.

**Table B.3. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, healthy relationship and marriage skills**

Baseline measure	Healthy relationship & marriage skills: mean for the analytic sample (standard deviation)	Mean for individuals enrolled in the study but not in the analytic sample (standard deviation); n	Difference (p-value of difference)
Female (%)	54%	48%; 648	0.06 (0.031)
Age (range: 1-8)	4.9 (1.33)	5.0 (1.54); 650	0.1 (0.456)
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White (%)	94%	92%; 631	0.02 (0.208)
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	86%	75%; 648	0.11 (<0.001)
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more	1.5 (1.30)	1.6 (1.41); 587	0.2 (0.049)
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (%)	35%	40%; 636	0.05 (0.066)
Retired (%)	8%	13%; 628	0.05 (0.010)
Self-perceived health status: 1=excellent; 5=poor	2.7 (1.00)	2.8 (1.08); 642	0.1 (0.072)
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	54%	63%; 644	0.09 (0.002)
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat (%)	55%	48%; 650	0.08 (0.007)
1-Day Couples Retreat (%)	11%	4%; 650	0.07 (<0.001)
1-Day Engaged Couples (%)	21%	30%; 650	0.09 (0.001)
Weekly Couples (%)	13%	18%; 650	0.06 (0.008)
When my partner/spouse and I had a serious disagreement, we worked on it together to find a resolution during the past month, entrance survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.4 (0.75)	3.1 (0.84); 466	0.2 (<0.001)
When my partner/spouse and I had a serious disagreement, we worked on it together to find a resolution during the past month, exit survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.5 (0.63)	3.3 (0.73); 277	0.2 (<0.001)
When my partner/spouse and I had a serious disagreement, we worked on it together to find a resolution during the past month, local follow-up survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.5 (0.67)	3.4 (0.74); 72	0.1 (0.174)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better, exit survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	1.6 (0.56)	1.7 (0.64); 306	0.2 (<0.001)
Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better, local follow-up survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	1.7 (0.60)	1.8 (0.58); 85	0.1 (0.377)
Sample size	551	n.a.	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

Notes: p-values are included in parentheses. The analytic sample includes adults in the outcome study, healthy relationship and marriage skills. Adults not in the analytic sample were associated with a couples-based workshop, which is a criteria for the analytic sample.

**Table B.4. Summary statistics of key baseline measures and baseline differences for the analytic sample compared with enrollees who had missing data on key baseline measures or who did not complete follow-up data collection: Outcome study, parenting and co-parenting skills**

Baseline measure	Parenting & co-parenting skills: mean for the analytic sample (standard deviation)	Mean for individuals enrolled in the study but not in the analytic sample (standard deviation); n	Difference ( <i>p</i> -value of difference)
Female (%)	53%	49%; 560	-0.04 (0.451)
Age (range: 1-8)	4.6 (1.20)	4.6 (0.95); 560	-0.01 (0.944)
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White (%)	95%	95%; 555	0.00 (0.858)
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	89%	84%; 560	-0.05 (0.236)
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more	1.3 (0.67)	2.4 (1.01); 556	1.04 (<0.001)
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (%)	24%	34%; 556	0.10 (0.064)
Retired (%)	1%	2%; 554	0.01 (0.654)
Self-perceived health status: 1=excellent; 5=poor	2.5 (0.99)	2.7 (1.02); 558	0.19 (0.082)
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	50%	67%; 558	0.17 (0.001)
<b>Workshop type</b>			
2-Day Couples Retreat (%)	58%	58%; 560	0.00 (0.955)
1-Day Couples Retreat (%)	7%	10%; 560	0.02 (0.432)
1-Day Engaged Couples (%)	22%	16%; 560	-0.07 (0.100)
Weekly Couples (%)	12%	17%; 560	0.04 (0.260)
Time spent with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month, entrance survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.8 (0.41)	3.7 (0.51); 471	-0.11 (0.039)
Time spent with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month, exit survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.7 (0.45)	3.7 (0.48); 342	-0.03 (0.562)
Time spent with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month, local follow-up survey: 1=never; 4=often	3.7 (0.53)	3.6 (0.50); 16	-0.10 (0.487)
Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent, exit survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	1.9 (0.66)	1.8 (0.61); 417	-0.08 (0.223)
Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent, local follow-up survey: 1= strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree	1.8 (0.61)	1.9 (0.61); 283	0.06 (0.418)
Sample size	98	n.a.	n.a.

n.a. = not applicable.

Notes: *p*-values are included in parentheses. The analytic sample includes adults in the outcome study, parenting and co-parenting skills. Adults not in the analytic sample were associated with a couples-based workshop and had children under 21 years, which are two criteria for the analytic sample.

## C. Appendix Tables To Supplement Final Report

**Table D.1. Characteristics of participants and non-participants in implementation study: RQ#1, Study 3**

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Age (mean; SD): 1=under 18; 2=18-20; 3=21-24; 4=25-34; 5=35-44; 6=45-54; 7=55-64; 8=65 or older	5.1 (1.40) – 36 years	4.7 (1.31) – 31 years	4.9 (1.29) – 33 years	4.65 (1.12) – 31 years	5.6 (1.69) – 40 years	5.1 (1.82) – 36 years
Statistics	B=0.17 (SE=0.075); Wald=5.064; p=0.024; Odds=1.18; difference betw/ 2 means: t=2.62; df=1117; p=0.024		B=0.19 (SE=0.116); t=1.625; df=446; p=0.105; Odds=1.21		B=0.16 (SE=0.128); Wald=1.641; p=0.200; Odds=1.18; difference betw/ 2 means: t=1.288; df=223; p=0.199	
Female (%)	52%	51%	50%	51%	59%	52%
Statistics	B=0.02 (SE=0.199); Wald=0.013; p=0.910; Odds=1.02		B=-0.03 (SE=0.031); t=-0.871; df=446; p=0.384; Odds=0.97		B=0.28 (SE=0.425); Wald=0.446; p=0.504; Odds=1.33	
Race/ethnicity (%)						
Non-Hispanic White (=1)	95%	88%	95%	86%	95%	92%
Hispanic or Non-white (=0)	5%	12%	5%	14%	5%	8%
Statistics	B=0.93 (SE=0.319); Wald=8.586; p=0.003; Odds=2.54		B=0.97 (SE=0.429); t=2.265; df=446; p=0.024; Odds=2.64		B=0.50 (SE=0.805); Wald=0.389; p=0.533; Odds=1.65	
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	75%	74%	82%	81%	45%	52%
Statistics	B=0.02 (SE=0.227); Wald=0.005; p=0.942; Odds=1.02		B=0.09 (SE=0.361); t=0.261; df=446; p=0.795; Odds=1.10		B=-0.30 (SE=0.425); Wald=0.502; p=0.479; Odds=0.74;	
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 or more (mean; SD)	1.5 (1.33)	1.8 (1.41)	1.5 (1.32)	2.0 (1.34)	1.1 (1.32)	1.4 (1.55)
Statistics	B=-0.22 (SE=0.072); Wald=8.711; p=0.003; Odds=0.81; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-2.984; df=1117; p=0.003		B=-0.25 (SE=0.109); t=-2.317; df=446; p=0.021; Odds=0.78		B=-0.13 (SE=0.151); Wald=0.707; p=0.400; Odds=0.88; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-0.842; df=223; p=0.401	
Employment status at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey(%)						
Full-time (=1)	44%	37%	48%	40%	29%	28%
Part-time or hours change weekly (=2)	15%	15%	15%	16%	15%	12%
Temporary, occasional or seasonal (=3)	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	0%

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Not currently employed (=4)	38%	46%	34%	42%	54%	60%
Statistics	B=-0.12 (SE=0.072); Wald=2.730; p=0.098; Odds=0.89		B=-0.11 (SE=0.079); t=-1.409; df=446; p=0.160; Odds=0.89		B=-0.06 (SE=0.160); Wald=0.148; p=0.701; Odds=0.94	
Not currently employed (%)	38%	46%	34%	42%	54%	60%
Statistics	B=-0.33 (SE=0.200); Wald=2.751; p=0.097; Odds=0.72		B=-0.30 (SE=0.238); t=-1.272; df=446; p=0.204; Odds=0.74		B=-0.24 (SE=0.432); Wald=0.322; p=0.571; Odds=0.78	
Retired (%)	11%	7%	8%	3%	23%	20%
Statistics	B=0.45 (SE=0.381); Wald=1.372; p=0.241; Odds=1.56		B=0.79 (SE=0.704); t=1.120; df=446; p=0.263; Odds=2.20		B=0.18 (SE=0.527); Wald=0.114; p=0.736; Odds=1.20	
Highest degree earned (%)						
No degree or diploma earned	6%	12%	7%	9%	6%	24%
High school diploma or alternative (i.e., GED)	41%	44%	39%	47%	48%	36%
Some college but no degree completion	11%	15%	10%	16%	16%	12%
Vocational/technical certification	12%	11%	13%	10%	8%	12%
Associate's degree	12%	9%	12%	9%	10%	8%
Bachelor's degree	12%	7%	13%	8%	8%	4%
Master's degree/advanced degree	6%	2%	6%	1%	4%	4%
Statistics	B=0.20 (SE=0.064); Wald=9.479; p=0.002; Odds=1.22		B=0.18 (SE=0.070); t=2.613; df=446; p=0.009; Odds=1.20		B=0.16 (SE=0.150); Wald=1.211; p=0.271; Odds=1.18	
No degree or diploma earned (%)	6%	12%	7%	9%	6%	24%
Statistics	B=-0.72 (SE=0.313); Wald=5.240; p=0.022; Odds=0.49		B=-0.28 (SE=0.371); t=-0.762; df=446; p=0.446; Odds=0.75		B=-1.69 (SE=0.562); Wald=9.065; p=0.003; Odds=0.18	
Have post-secondary education (%)	53%	43%	54%	44%	47%	40%
Statistics	B=0.38 (SE=0.200); Wald=3.505; p=0.061; Odds=1.45		B=0.34 (SE=0.224); t=1.520; df=446; p=0.129; Odds=1.41		B=0.28 (SE=0.432); Wald=0.436; p=0.509; Odds=1.33	
Self-perceived health status: 1=Excellent; 5=Poor (mean; SD)	2.7 (1.04) – Good	2.8 (1.03) – Good	2.7 (1.02) – Good	2.8 (1.04) – Good	3.0 (1.10) – Good	3.0 (1.00) – Good

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Statistics	B=-0.10 (SE=0.095); Wald=1.132; p=0.287; Odds=0.90; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-1.064; df=1117; p=0.287		B=-0.10 (SE=0.106); t=-0.914; df=446; p=0.361; Odds=0.91		B=-0.05 (SE=0.196); Wald=0.058; p=0.810; Odds=0.95; difference betw/ prop.: t=-0.239; df=223; p=0.811	
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	59%	71%	57%	70%	65%	72%
Statistics	B=-0.54 (SE=0.217); Wald=6.222; p=0.013; Odds=0.58		B=-0.60 (SE=0.338); t=-1.774; df=446; p=0.077; Odds=0.55		B=-0.32 (SE=0.469); Wald=0.481; p=0.488; Odds=0.72	
Number of different types of financial assistance received in the past month: 0, 1, 2, 3 or more (mean; SD)	1.1 (1.11)	1.4 (1.15)	1.0 (1.08)	1.4 (1.13)	1.4 (1.20)	1.5 (1.26)
Statistics	B=-0.24 (SE=0.086); Wald=8.074; p=0.004; Odds=0.78; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-2.873; df=1117; p=0.004		B=-0.29 (SE=0.139); t=-2.101; df=446; p=0.036; Odds=0.75		B=-0.12 (SE=0.175); Wald=0.441; p=0.507; Odds=0.89; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-0.663; df=223; p=0.508	
How or where participants heard about Real Relationships (%)						
Word of mouth	34%	37%	34%	39%	34%	32%
Statistics	B=-0.12 (SE=0.206); Wald=0.320; p=0.571; Odds=0.89		B=-0.15 (SE=0.197); t=-0.753; df=446; p=0.452; Odds=0.86		B=0.11 (SE=0.454); Wald=0.062; p=0.804; Odds=1.12	
Newspaper ad, billboards, flyer	21%	17%	22%	14%	18%	28%
Statistics	B=0.27 (SE=0.263); Wald=1.024; p=0.312; Odds=1.30		B=0.49 (SE=0.312); t=1.579; df=446; p=0.115; Odds=1.64		B=-0.61 (SE=0.483); Wald=1.577; p=0.209; Odds=0.55	
Radio ad or TV spot	10%	10%	10%	11%	9%	4%
Statistics	B=0.03 (SE=0.334); Wald=0.011; p=0.918; Odds=1.03		B=-0.10 (SE=0.371); t=-0.267; df=446; p=0.789; Odds=0.91		B=0.86 (SE=1.050); Wald=0.678; p=0.410; Odds=2.37	
Internet or social media	22%	22%	25%	22%	8%	24%
Statistics	B=-0.03 (SE=0.239); Wald=0.018; p=0.892; Odds=0.97		B=0.16 (SE=0.266); t=0.615; df=446; p=0.539; Odds=1.18		B=-1.29 (SE=0.536); Wald=5.791; p=0.016; Odds=0.28	
Government agency	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	4%
Statistics	B=0.01 (SE=0.537); Wald=0.000; p=0.983; Odds=1.01		B=0.05 (SE=0.523); t=0.090; df=446; p=0.928; Odds=1.05		B=-0.14 (SE=1.091); Wald=0.016; p=0.899; Odds=0.87	
Community organization	6%	8%	5%	7%	8%	12%

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Statistics	B=-0.35 (SE=0.373); Wald=0.865; p=0.352; Odds=0.71		B=-0.24 (SE=0.439); t=-0.559; df=446; p=0.576; Odds=0.78		B=-0.45 (SE=0.668); Wald=0.453; p=0.501; Odds=0.64	
Program staff or event	8%	5%	7%	5%	10%	8%
Statistics	B=0.45 (SE=0.435); Wald=1.049; p=0.306; Odds=1.56		B=0.44 (SE=0.439); t=0.995; df=446; p=0.320; Odds=1.55		B=0.30 (SE=0.772); Wald=0.150; p=0.698; Odds=1.35	
Other	16%	17%	15%	14%	21%	28%
Statistics	B=-0.07 (SE=0.266); Wald=0.077; p=0.781; Odds=0.93		B=0.07 (SE=0.333); t=0.216; df=446; p=0.829; Odds=1.07		B=-0.41 (SE=0.479); Wald=0.737; p=0.391; Odds=0.66	
Reasons for enrolling in the program (%)						
To learn how to improve my personal relationships	71%	73%	70%	70%	72%	84%
Statistics	B=-0.14 (SE=0.224); Wald=0.379; p=0.538; Odds=0.87		B=0.001 (SE=0.201); t=0.003; df=446; p=0.997; Odds=1.00		B=-0.74 (SE=0.568); Wald=1.693; p=0.193; Odds=0.48	
My spouse/partner asked me to come	16%	16%	17%	18%	10%	8%
Statistics	B=-0.002 (SE=0.271); Wald=0.000; p=0.995; Odds=1.00		B=-0.05 (SE=0.199); t=-0.249; df=446; p=0.803; Odds=0.95		B=0.30 (SE=0.772); Wald=0.150; p=0.698; Odds=1.35	
Workshop type						
2-Day Couples Retreat	49%	50%	55%	57%	23%	24%
Statistics	B=-0.03 (SE=0.198); Wald=0.029; p=0.864; Odds=0.97		B=-0.07 (SE=0.342); t=-0.219; df=445; p=0.826; Odds=0.93		B=-0.06 (SE=0.498); Wald=0.013; p=0.911; Odds=0.95	
1-Day Couples Retreat	8%	2%	9%	2%	1%	0%
Statistics	B=1.51 (SE=0.723); Wald=4.369; p=0.037; Odds=4.54		B=1.47 (SE=0.975); t=1.509; df=445; p=0.132; Odds=4.36		B=19.13 (SE=28420.721); Wald=0.000; p=0.999; Odds=not reported	
1-Day Engaged Couples	20%	34%	20%	34%	20%	36%
Statistics	B=-0.75 (SE=0.213); Wald=12.499; p<0.001; Odds=0.47		B=-0.80 (SE=0.380); t=-2.114; df=445; p=0.035; Odds=0.45		B=-0.81 (SE=0.453); Wald=3.210; p=0.073; Odds=0.44	
Weekly Couples	15%	7%	16%	7%	11%	8%
Statistics	B=0.83 (SE=0.377); Wald=4.873; p=0.027; Odds=2.30		B=0.97 (SE=0.607); t=1.604; df=445; p=0.109; Odds=2.65		B=0.35 (SE=0.771); Wald=0.208; p=0.648; Odds=1.42	
Weekly Individuals	9%	7%	0%	0%	45%	32%

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Statistics	B=0.25 (SE=0.383); Wald=0.441; p=0.507; Odds=1.29		N/A		B=0.55 (SE=0.452); Wald=1.499; p=0.221; Odds=1.74	
Population						
Adult couple	91%	93%	100%	100%	54%	68%
Adult individual	9%	7%	0%	0%	46%	32%
Statistics	B=-0.27 (SE=0.383); Wald=0.484; p=0.486; Odds=0.77		N/A		B=-0.57 (SE=0.452); Wald=1.611; p=0.204; Odds=0.56	
Year responded to Applicant Characteristics Survey						
Year 1 (by 9/30/16)	10%	9%	10%	9%	10%	8%
Year 2 (by 9/30/17)	29%	27%	30%	27%	27%	28%
Year 3 (by 9/30/18)	30%	23%	30%	23%	31%	24%
Year 4 (by 9/30/19)	25%	32%	25%	30%	26%	40%
Year 5 (10/1/19-10/31/20)	6%	9%	6%	11%	6%	0%
Statistics	B=-0.14 (SE=0.092); Wald=2.355; p=0.125; Odds=0.87		B=-0.18 (SE=0.165); t=-1.061; df=445; p=0.289; Odds=0.84		B=-0.03 (SE=0.200); Wald=0.024; p=0.877; Odds=0.97	
Sample Size						
Number of Adults	1,006	113	806	88	200	25
Number of Couples	NA		447		NA	
If employed: Number of months had current job (mean; SD)	66.1 (85.78)	32.8 (54.47)	70.2 (81.95)	24.9 (26.44)	59.6 (91.19)	45.9 (81.25)
Statistics	B=0.01 (SE=0.003); Wald=7.804; p=0.005; Odds=1.01; difference betw/ 2 means: t=2.895; df=652; p=0.004		B=0.01 (SE=0.003); t=4.437; df=198; p<0.001; Odds=1.01		B=0.002 (SE=0.003); Wald=0.464; p=0.496; Odds=1.00; difference betw/ 2 means: t=0.684; df=254; p=0.495	
If employed: Have other benefits associated with job (%)	66%	50%	69%	44%	62%	59%
Statistics	B=0.68 (SE=0.277); Wald=6.100; p=0.014; Odds=1.98		B=0.88 (SE=0.353); t=2.504; df=198; p=0.013; Odds=2.42		B=0.14 (SE=0.454); Wald=0.093; p=0.760; Odds=1.15	
Sample size (including number of months had current job)						
Number of adults	596	58	362	36	234	22

Characteristic	Overall: participants	Overall: non- participants	Couples analysis: participants	Couples analysis: non- participants	Individuals: participants	Individuals: non- participants
Number of couples	NA		199		NA	

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: The outcome variable for RQ #1, Study 3 is whether the adult participated in at least the 1<sup>st</sup> session of Real Relationships, as indicated by responding to the nFORM entrance survey. The outcome variable for RQ#1, Study 3 is binary, coded 1=participated, 0=did not. All models are bivariate with the predictor variable listed in the row, and so each row in the table represents a different model.

For the Overall and Individuals analyses, logistic regression was used to compute the statistics since the outcome variable is binary. The Wald statistic reported for these models has a chi-square distribution, and the degrees of freedom is 1 for all models. The sample for the Individuals analyses are adults not part of a couple, and adults in a couple but one of the adults in the couple was excluded due to missing data (i.e., there was data for only one adult in the couple available for the analysis). When the predictor variable is ordered, results from an independent t-test is also presented. Results between the t-test and logistic regression are consistent for all models.

For the Couples Analysis, multi-level models using the HLM software were conducted for couples who had data available for both adults. Because the outcome variable is binary, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model. Most of the models contained a random (level-1) intercept and a fixed level-1 predictor (grand mean centered). For Workshop Type and Year Responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey model, the predictor variable was fixed at level-2 rather than level-1 (grand mean centered). Relationship status was modeled as a level-1 variable because the two adults in 6% of the couples provided different responses as to their relationship status. The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported for all multi-level models.

Couples who did not have relevant employment data for both adults had to be removed from the couples analyses for the two employment variables. The adult in the couple with relevant employment data was included in the individuals analyses instead.

**Table D.2. Potential barriers to participation in Real Relationships, as reflected in notes in an administrative database maintained by Children's Aid Society: RQ#1, Study 1 (n=291)**

Characteristic	Percent
Address, telephone or email issues	31%
Special needs	30%
Telephone issues	20%
Address issues	12%
Work schedule/workload	12%
Change in partner status	10%
Transportation problems	9%
Child care issues	5%
Partner resistant	5%
Moved out of area	4%
Legal problems	2%
Email issues	1%
Emergency	1%
Deceased	1%

**Table D.3. Characteristics of workshop completers and non-completers in implementation study: RQ#2**

Characteristic	Overall: completers	Overall: non-completers	Couples analysis: completers	Couples analysis: non-completers	Individuals: completers	Individuals: non-completers
Age (mean; SD): 1=under 18; 2=18-20; 3=21-24; 4=25-34; 5=35-44; 6=45-54; 7=55-64; 8=65 or older	5.15 (1.40) – 36 years	4.65 (1.33) – 31 years	5.0 (1.29) – 35 years	4.7 (1.28) – 31 years	5.8 (1.64) – 42 years	4.6 (1.50) – 30 years
Statistics	B=0.27 (SE=0.064); Wald=18.317; p<0.001; Odds=1.32; difference betw/ 2 means: t=4.368; df=1004; p<0.001		B=0.19 (SE=0.100); t=1.905; df=402; p=0.057; Odds=1.21		B=0.50 (SE=0.122); Wald=16.673 p<0.001; Odds=1.65; difference betw/ 2 means: t=4.519; df=198; p<0.001	
Female (%)	53%	45%	51%	46%	64%	40%
Statistics	B=0.35 (SE=0.164); Wald=4.467; p=0.035; Odds=1.42		B=0.26 (SE=0.102); t=2.517; df=402; p=0.012; Odds=1.29		B=0.96 (SE=0.355); Wald=7.264; p=0.007; Odds=2.61	
Race/ethnicity (%)						
Non-Hispanic White (=1)	96%	91%	95%	91%	96%	93%
Hispanic or Non-white (=0)	4%	9%	5%	9%	4%	7%
Statistics	B=0.71 (SE=0.311); Wald=5.218; p=0.022; Odds=2.04		B=0.67 (SE=0.356); t=1.887; df=402; p=0.060; Odds=1.96		B=0.51 (SE=0.713); Wald=0.504; p=0.478; Odds=1.66	
Relationship status: Married or engaged (%)	75%	74%	82%	82%	44%	48%
Statistics	B=0.02 (SE=0.187); Wald=0.013; p=0.908; Odds=1.02		B=0.01 (SE=0.327); t=0.028; df=402; p=0.978; Odds=1.01		B=-0.16 (SE=0.348); Wald=0.209; p=0.647; Odds=0.85	
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 or more (mean; SD)	1.4 (1.31)	1.7 (1.38)	1.5 (1.30)	1.8 (1.37)	1.1 (1.31)	1.3 (1.33)
Statistics	B=-0.16 (SE=0.061); Wald=6.722; p=0.010; Odds=0.86; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-2.610; df=1004; p=0.009		B=-0.20 (SE=0.099); t=-2.036; df=402; p=0.042; Odds=0.82		B=-0.12 (SE=0.128); Wald=0.841; p=0.359; Odds=0.89; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-0.917; df=198; p=0.360	
Employment status at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey(%)						
Full-time (=1)	43%	49%	47%	52%	27%	38%
Part-time or hours change weekly (=2)	15%	16%	15%	16%	15%	14%
Temporary, occasional or seasonal (=3)	2%	4%	2%	5%	2%	2%

Characteristic	Overall: completers	Overall: non-completers	Couples analysis: completers	Couples analysis: non-completers	Individuals: completers	Individuals: non-completers
Not currently employed (=4)	40%	31%	36%	26%	56%	45%
Statistics	B=0.12 (SE=0.061); Wald=3.728; p=0.053; Odds=1.12		B=0.14 (SE=0.071); t=1.963; df=402; p=0.050; Odds=1.15		B=0.18 (SE=0.128); Wald=1.997; p=0.158; Odds=1.20	
Not currently employed (%)	40%	31%	36%	26%	56%	45%
Statistics	B=0.40 (SE=0.176); Wald=5.119; p=0.024; Odds=1.49		B=0.50 (SE=0.227); t=2.218; df=402; p=0.027; Odds=1.65		B=0.45 (SE=0.349); Wald=1.630; p=0.202; Odds=1.56	
Retired (%)	12%	5%	8%	4%	26%	12%
Statistics	B=0.84 (SE=0.343); Wald=5.976; p=0.014; Odds=2.31		B=0.74 (SE=0.467); t=1.584; df=402; p=0.114; Odds=2.09		B=0.95 (SE=0.510); Wald=3.493; p=0.062; Odds=2.59	
Highest degree earned (%)						
No degree or diploma earned	7%	5%	7%	6%	6%	2%
High school diploma or alternative (i.e., GED)	40%	45%	39%	41%	44%	60%
Some college but no degree completion	11%	10%	10%	9%	17%	14%
Vocational/technical certification	11%	13%	12%	15%	9%	7%
Associate's degree	13%	9%	13%	8%	10%	12%
Bachelor's degree	13%	9%	13%	11%	9%	0%
Master's degree/advanced degree	5%	9%	6%	10%	4%	5%
Statistics	B=0.02 (SE=0.047); Wald=0.189; p=0.664; Odds=1.02		B=0.000 (SE=0.058); t=0.008; df=402; p=0.994; Odds=1.00		B=0.13 (SE=0.118); Wald=1.188; p=0.276; Odds=1.14	
No degree or diploma earned (%)	7%	5%	7%	6%	6%	2%
Statistics	B=0.34 (SE=0.369); Wald=0.874; p=0.350; Odds=1.41		B=0.26 (SE=0.391); t=0.673; df=402; p=0.501; Odds=1.30		B=1.02 (SE=1.064); Wald=0.918; p=0.338; Odds=2.77	
Have post-secondary education (%)	53%	50%	54%	53%	49%	38%
Statistics	B=0.14 (SE=0.164); Wald=0.784; p=0.376; Odds=1.16		B=0.09 (SE=0.182); t=0.480; df=402; p=0.631; Odds=1.09		B=0.46 (SE=0.355); Wald=1.677; p=0.195; Odds=1.58	
Self-perceived health status: 1=Excellent; 5=Poor (mean; SD)	2.8 (1.04) – Good	2.5 (1.05) – Very Good/Good	2.7 (1.02) – Good	2.45 (1.03) – Very Good/Good	3.0 (1.08) – Good	2.7 (1.10) – Good

Characteristic	Overall: completers	Overall: non-completers	Couples analysis: completers	Couples analysis: non-completers	Individuals: completers	Individuals: non-completers
Statistics	B=0.27 (SE=0.081); Wald=11.401; p=0.001; Odds=1.31; difference betw/ 2 means: t=3.413; df=1004; p=0.001		B=0.28 (SE=0.102); t=2.786; df=402; p=0.006; Odds=1.33		B=0.30 (SE=0.164); Wald=3.395; p=0.065; Odds=1.35; difference betw/ 2 means: t=1.866; df=198; p=0.064	
Received financial assistance in the past month (%)	57%	64%	56%	62%	63%	71%
Statistics	B=-0.30 (SE=0.170); Wald=3.229; p=0.072; Odds=0.74		B=-0.27 (SE=0.269); t=-0.999; df=402; p=0.319; Odds=0.76		B=-0.37 (SE=0.379); Wald=0.959; p=0.327; Odds=0.69	
Number of different types of financial assistance received in the past month: 0, 1, 2, 3 or more (mean; SD)	1.1 (1.10)	1.2 (1.14)	1.0 (1.07)	1.2 (1.12)	1.3 (1.20)	1.5 (1.19)
Statistics	B=-0.14 (SE=0.072); Wald=3.830; p=0.050; Odds=0.87; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-1.964; df=1004; p=0.050		B=-0.14 (SE=0.121); t=-1.123; df=402; p=0.262; Odds=0.87		B=-0.11 (SE=0.144); Wald=0.587; p=0.444; Odds=0.90; difference betw/ 2 means: t=-0.765; df=198; p=0.445	
How or where participants heard about Real Relationships (%)						
Word of mouth	34%	37%	34%	36%	33%	40%
Statistics	B=-0.14 (SE=0.170); Wald=0.703; p=0.402; Odds=0.87		B=-0.17 (SE=0.195); t=-0.887; df=402; p=0.376; Odds=0.84		B=-0.33 (SE=0.357); Wald=0.836; p=0.360; Odds=0.72	
Newspaper ad, billboards, flyer	20%	25%	21%	25%	16%	24%
Statistics	B=-0.26 (SE=0.192); Wald=1.862; p=0.172; Odds=0.77		B=-0.26 (SE=0.240); t=-1.067; df=402; p=0.286; Odds=0.77		B=-0.51 (SE=0.423); Wald=1.445; p=0.229; Odds=0.60	
Radio ad or TV spot	10%	11%	10%	11%	8%	14%
Statistics	B=-0.19 (SE=0.260); Wald=0.509; p=0.475; Odds=0.83		B=-0.05 (SE=0.326); t=-0.159; df=402; p=0.874 Odds=0.95		B=-0.71 (SE=0.534); Wald=1.756; p=0.185; Odds=0.49	
Internet or social media	23%	16%	26%	20%	9%	2%
Statistics	B=0.40 (SE=0.216); Wald=3.508; p=0.061; Odds=1.50		B=0.44 (SE=0.261); t=1.698; df=402; p=0.090; Odds=1.56		B=1.46 (SE=1.048); Wald=1.938; p=0.164; Odds=4.30	
Government agency	3%	4%	3%	5%	4%	2%
Statistics	B=-0.26 (SE=0.409); Wald=0.406; p=0.524; Odds=0.77		B=-0.31 (SE=0.552); t=-0.556; df=402; p=0.572; Odds=0.73		B=0.48 (SE=1.094); Wald=0.194; p=0.660; Odds=1.62	
Community organization	6%	7%	5%	6%	8%	7%

Characteristic	Overall: completers	Overall: non-completers	Couples analysis: completers	Couples analysis: non-completers	Individuals: completers	Individuals: non-completers
Statistics	B=-0.17 (SE=0.335); Wald=0.258; p=0.612; Odds=0.84		B=-0.22 (SE=0.392); t=-0.571; df=402; p=0.568; Odds=0.80		B=0.15 (SE=0.665); Wald=0.053; p=0.818; Odds=1.17	
Program staff or event	9%	4%	8%	4%	12%	5%
Statistics	B=0.91 (SE=0.404); Wald=5.067; p=0.024; Odds=2.48		B=0.68 (SE=0.481); t=1.410; df=402; p=0.159; Odds=1.97		B=1.01 (SE=0.765); Wald=1.729; p=0.188; Odds=2.73	
Other	16%	13%	15%	12%	22%	17%
Statistics	B=0.26 (SE=0.238); Wald=1.211; p=0.271; Odds=1.30		B=0.38 (SE=0.269); t=1.396; df=402; p=0.164; Odds=1.46		B=0.32 (SE=0.457); Wald=0.477; p=0.490; Odds=1.37	
Reasons for enrolling in the program (%)						
To learn how to improve my personal relationships	70%	72%	70%	72%	71%	74%
Statistics	B=-0.09 (SE=0.182); Wald=0.228; p=0.633; Odds=0.92		B=0.002 (SE=0.199); t=0.012; df=402; p=0.990; Odds=1.00		B=-0.15 (SE=0.392); Wald=0.139; p=0.709; Odds=0.86	
My spouse/partner asked me to come	16%	17%	17%	17%	9%	17%
Statistics	B=-0.09 (SE=0.219); Wald=0.179; p=0.672; Odds=0.91		B=-0.08 (SE=0.208); t=-0.400; df=402; p=0.689; Odds=0.92		B=-0.72 (SE=0.500); Wald=2.083; p=0.149; Odds=0.49	
Workshop type						
2-Day Couples Retreat	48%	51%	54%	59%	22%	26%
Statistics	B=-0.13 (SE=0.164); Wald=0.632; p=0.427; Odds=0.88		B=-0.19 (SE=0.280); t=-0.669; df=401; p=0.504; Odds=0.83		B=-0.22 (SE=0.400); Wald=0.305; p=0.581; Odds=0.80	
1-Day Couples Retreat	9%	0.5%	11%	1%	1%	0%
Statistics	B=2.90 (SE=1.010); Wald=8.267; p=0.004; Odds=18.25		B=2.69 (SE=0.947); t=2.840; df=401; p=0.005; Odds=14.72		B=19.89 (SE=28420.721); Wald=0.000; p=0.999; Odds=not reported	
1-Day Engaged Couples	20%	19%	20%	18%	19%	24%
Statistics	B=0.06 (SE=0.207); Wald=0.080; p=0.777; Odds=1.06		B=0.17 (SE=0.351); t=0.491; df=401; p=0.624; Odds=1.19		B=-0.29 (SE=0.415); Wald=0.480; p=0.488; Odds=0.75	
Weekly Couples	14%	20%	14%	23%	11%	12%
Statistics	B=-0.46 (SE=0.210); Wald=4.903; p=0.027; Odds=0.63		B=-0.64 (SE=0.351); t=-1.837; df=401; p=0.067; Odds=0.52		B=-0.11 (SE=0.541); Wald=0.044; p=0.833; Odds=0.89	
Weekly Individuals	9%	9%	0%	0%	47%	38%

Characteristic	Overall: completers	Overall: non-completers	Couples analysis: completers	Couples analysis: non-completers	Individuals: completers	Individuals: non-completers
Statistics	B=0.03 (SE=0.289); Wald=0.011; p=0.915; Odds=1.03		N/A		B=0.36 (SE=0.355); Wald=1.018; p=0.313; Odds=1.43	
Population						
Adult couple	91%	91%	100%	100%	53%	62%
Adult individual	9%	9%	0%	0%	47%	38%
Statistics	B=-0.04 (SE=0.288); Wald=0.025; p=0.875; Odds=0.96		N/A		B=-0.38 (SE=0.355); Wald=1.168; p=0.280; Odds=0.68	
Year responded to Applicant Characteristics Survey						
Year 1 (by 9/30/16)	6%	24%	6%	26%	7%	19%
Year 2 (by 9/30/17)	29%	31%	30%	31%	27%	29%
Year 3 (by 9/30/18)	32%	24%	31%	23%	32%	26%
Year 4 (by 9/30/19)	27%	17%	26%	16%	28%	19%
Year 5 (10/1/19-10/31/20)	6%	4%	6%	3%	6%	7%
Statistics	B=0.48 (SE=0.082); Wald=34.919; p<0.001; Odds=1.62	B=0.58 (SE=0.149); t=3.892; df=401; p<0.001; Odds=1.79		B=0.29 (SE=0.165); Wald=3.039; p=0.081; Odds=1.33		
Sample Size						
Number of adults	823	183	665	141	158	42
Number of couples	NA		403		NA	
If employed: Number of months had current job (mean; SD)	67.3 (88.87)	61.2 (71.84)	70.0 (85.44)	71.3 (65.64)	63.0 (94.11)	46.58 (78.34)
Statistics	B=0.001 (SE=0.001); Wald=0.475; p=0.491; Odds=1.00; difference betw/ 2 means: t=0.689; df=594; p=0.491		B=-0.000 (SE=0.001); t=-0.112; df=180; p=0.911; Odds=1.00		B=0.002 (SE=0.002); Wald=1.210; p=0.271; Odds=1.00; difference betw/ 2 means: t=1.114; df=232; p=0.266	
If employed: Have other benefits associated with job (%)	67%	62%	69%	68%	64%	54%
Statistics	B=0.222 (SE=0.214); Wald=1.068; p=0.301; Odds=1.25	B=0.06 (SE=0.239); t=0.261; df=180; p=0.794; Odds=1.06		B=0.43 (SE=0.328); Wald=1.728; p=0.189; Odds=1.54		
Sample size (including number of months had current job)						
Number of adults	479	117	293	69	186	48
Number of couples	NA		181		NA	

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: Only adults who participated in at least one Real Relationships session are included in the sample for RQ #2. That is, they responded to the nFORM entrance survey, and are considered "Participators" under RQ #1. The outcome variable for RQ #2 is whether the adult completed Real Relationships, as indicated by responding to both the nFORM entrance and exit surveys. The outcome variable for RQ #2 is binary, coded 1=completed, 0=started but did not complete the program. All models are bivariate with the predictor variable listed in the row, and so each row in the table represents a different model.

For the Overall and Individuals analyses, logistic regression was used to compute the statistics since the outcome variable is binary. The Wald statistic reported for these models has a chi-square distribution, and the degrees of freedom is 1 for all models. The sample for the Individuals analyses are adults not part of a couple, and adults in a couple but one of the adults in the couple was excluded due to missing data (i.e., there was data for only one adult in the couple available for the analysis). When the predictor variable is ordered, results from an independent t-test is also presented. Results between the t-test and logistic regression are consistent for all models.

For the Couples Analysis, multi-level models using the HLM software were conducted for couples who had data available for both adults. Because the outcome variable is binary, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model. Most of the models contained a random (level-1) intercept and a fixed level-1 predictor (grand mean centered). For Workshop Type and Year Responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey model, the predictor variable was fixed at level-2 rather than level-1 (grand mean centered). Relationship status was modeled as a level-1 variable because the two adults in 6% of the couples provided different responses as to their relationship status. The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported for all multi-level models.

Couples who did not have relevant employment data for both adults had to be removed from the couples analyses for the two employment variables. The adult in the couple with relevant employment data was included in the individuals analyses instead.

**Table D.4. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting workshop completion in implementation study: RQ#2**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=806 adults; 403 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=200 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (SE)	Wald (df=1)	p-value	Odds
Age	0.14 (0.126)	1.075 (395)	0.283	1.14	0.54 (0.169)	10.218	0.001	1.72
Female	0.16 (0.122)	1.322 (395)	0.187	1.17	0.68 (0.404)	2.811	0.094	1.97
Race/ethnicity: Non-Hispanic White	0.79 (0.396)	2.002 (395)	0.046	2.21	Not entered			
Number of Children: 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 or more	-0.21 (0.110)	-1.896 (395)	0.059	0.81	Not entered			
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey	0.53 (0.254)	2.099 (395)	0.036	1.71	Not entered			
Retired	-0.16 (0.545)	-0.300 (395)	0.764	0.85	-0.60 (0.694)	0.754	0.385	0.55
Self-perceived health status: 1=Excellent; 5=Poor (mean; SD)	0.25 (0.108)	2.351 (395)	0.019	1.29	0.01 (0.196)	0.001	0.980	1.01
How or where participants heard about Real Relationships: Internet or social media	0.27 (0.275)	0.984 (395)	0.326	1.31	Not entered			
Workshop type								
1-Day Couples Retreat	2.13 (0.996)	2.139 (399)	0.033	8.41	Not entered			
Weekly Couples	-0.67 (0.384)	-1.735 (399)	0.084	0.51	Not entered			
Year responded to Applicant Characteristics Survey	0.47 (0.159)	2.958 (399)	0.003	1.60	0.28 (0.174)	2.537	0.111	1.32
Population: Couple	Not entered				0.16 (0.411)	0.145	0.704	1.17
Intercept	2.14 (0.167)	12.794 (399)	<0.001	8.48	-2.606 (1.014)	6.603	0.010	0.07
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=2.851; Chi-sq=547.010; df=399; p<0.001				Model Chi-square=26.148; df=6; p<0.001			

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: Only adults who participated in at least one Real Relationships session are included in the sample for the couples and individuals analyses for RQ #2. That is, they responded to the nFORM entrance survey, and are considered "Participants" under RQ #1. The outcome variable for RQ #2 is whether the adult completed Real Relationships, as indicated by responding to both the nFORM entrance and exit surveys. The outcome variable for RQ #2 is binary, coded 1=completed, 0=started but did not complete the program. All predictor variables were entered simultaneously.

For the Couples Analysis, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model since the outcome variable is binary. All predictor variables except Workshop Type and Year Responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Workshop Type and Year Responded to the Applicant Characteristics Survey mode were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported.

**Table D.5. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (se)	Wald (df=1)	P-value	Odds
Base Model								
Intercept	0.75 (0.139)	5.359 (220)	<0.001	2.11	-0.27 (0.341)	0.628	0.428	0.76
Workshop type (2-day couples retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.29 (0.502)	0.580 (220)	0.562	1.34	0.57 (0.949)	0.366	0.545	1.78
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.25 (0.331)	-0.765 (220)	0.445	0.78	0.004 (0.578)	0.000	0.995	1.00
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.10 (0.364)	-0.279 (220)	0.780	0.90	-0.20 (0.602)	0.115	0.734	0.82
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				-0.61 (0.513)	1.418	0.234	0.54
Use of budget on NFORM entrance survey (0=no; 1=yes)	2.67 (0.252)	10.622 (223)	<0.001	14.51	2.45 (0.417)	34.358	<0.001	11.54
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.547; Chi-sq=246.658; df=220; p=0.105				Model chi-square=45.140; df=5; p<0.001			
Final Model								
Intercept	0.75 (0.140)	5.354 (220)	<0.001	2.11	-0.37 (0.403)	0.831	0.362	0.69
Workshop type (2-day couples retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.29 (0.503)	0.575 (220)	0.566	1.34	0.58 (0.950)	0.367	0.545	1.78
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.26 (0.327)	-0.804 (220)	0.422	0.77	-0.01 (0.578)	0.000	0.994	1.00
Weekly Couples (=0=no; 1=yes)	-0.16 (0.379)	-0.424 (220)	0.672	0.85	-0.23 (0.605)	0.148	0.700	0.79
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				-0.64 (0.520)	1.538	0.215	0.52

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (se)	Wald (df=1)	P-value	Odds
Use of budget on NFORM entrance survey (0=no; 1=yes)	2.67 (0.252)	10.611 (222)	<0.001	14.51	2.44 (0.418)	34.191	<0.001	11.49
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	0.15 (0.268)	0.547 (222)	0.585	1.16	0.18 (0.407)	0.207	0.649	1.20
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.553; Chi-sq=246.722; df=220; p=0.104				Model chi-square=45.347; df=6; p<0.001			

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets, and local follow-up survey

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model since the outcome variable is binary. Workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported.

**Table D.6. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (SE)	Wald (df=1)	p-value	Odds
Base Model								
Intercept	0.79 (0.127)	6.221 (220)	<0.001	2.21	-1.32 (0.451)	8.530	0.003	0.29
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.55 (0.385)	1.431 (220)	0.154	1.74	0.66 (1.031)	0.404	0.525	1.93
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.84 (0.335)	2.500 (220)	0.013	2.31	2.69 (0.872)	9.356	0.002	14.41
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.78 (0.414)	1.893 (220)	0.060	2.19	-0.45 (0.607)	0.545	0.460	0.64
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				0.46 (0.550)	0.705	0.401	1.59
Use of budget on NFORM exit survey (0=no; 1=yes)	1.98 (0.224)	8.839 (223)	<0.001	7.26	2.89 (0.464)	38.770	<0.001	17.96
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.657; Chi-sq=261.805; df=220; p=0.028				Model Chi-square=66.575; df=5; p<0.001			
Final Model								
Intercept	0.80 (0.128)	6.232 (220)	<0.001	2.22	-1.69 (0.525)	10.356	0.001	0.18
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.57 (0.382)	1.484 (220)	0.139	1.76	0.58 (0.985)	0.345	0.557	1.78
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.82 (0.334)	2.469 (220)	0.014	2.28	2.58 (0.872)	8.742	0.003	13.16
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.59 (0.411)	1.434 (220)	0.153	1.80	-0.57 (0.626)	0.842	0.359	0.56
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				0.34 (0.564)	0.355	0.551	1.40
Use of budget on NFORM exit survey (0=no; 1=yes)	1.99 (0.228)	8.724 (222)	<0.001	7.30	2.89 (0.471)	37.788	<0.001	18.07

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (SE)	Wald (df=1)	p-value	Odds
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	0.52 (0.258)	2.010 (222)	0.046	1.68	0.72 (0.462)	2.396	0.122	2.05
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.625; Chi-sq=258.422; df=220; p=0.038				Model Chi-square=68.995; df=6; p<0.001			

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model since the outcome variable is binary. Workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported.

**Table D.7. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple logistic regression for individuals analysis: predicting use of budget to plan spending (0=no;1=yes) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM entrance survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (SE)	Wald (df=1)	p-value	Odds
Base Model								
Intercept	0.84 (0.135)	6.206 (220)	<0.001	2.31	-0.33 (0.336)	0.938	0.333	0.72
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.68 (0.421)	1.603 (220)	0.110	1.96	0.76 (0.916)	0.688	0.407	2.14
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.77 (0.341)	2.250 (220)	0.025	2.15	2.10 (0.811)	6.697	0.010	8.16
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.80 (0.381)	2.104 (220)	0.037	2.23	-0.57 (0.555)	1.046	0.307	0.57
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				-0.04 (0.482)	0.007	0.932	0.96
Use of budget on NFORM entrance survey (0=no; 1=yes)	2.05 (0.241)	8.478 (223)	<0.001	7.74	1.94 (0.408)	22.528	<0.001	6.94
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.654; Chi-sq=261.608; df=220; p=0.028				Model Chi-square=42.412; df=5; p<0.001			
Final Model								
Intercept	0.84 (0.134)	6.296 (220)	<0.001	2.33	-0.72 (0.407)	3.083	0.079	0.49
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)								
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.68 (0.422)	1.617 (220)	0.107	1.98	0.78 (0.930)	0.704	0.401	2.18
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.75 (0.338)	2.211 (220)	0.028	2.11	2.10 (0.817)	6.618	0.010	8.18
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.58 (0.383)	1.527 (220)	0.128	1.79	-0.68 (0.563)	1.465	0.226	0.51
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)	NA				-0.17 (0.496)	0.122	0.727	0.84

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)				Individuals analysis: multiple logistic regression (n=161 adults)			
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	Odds	B (SE)	Wald (df=1)	p-value	Odds
Use of budget on NFORM entrance survey (0=no; 1=yes)	2.06 (0.241)	8.551 (222)	<0.001	7.85	1.95 (0.414)	22.128	<0.001	7.01
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	0.56 (0.260)	2.149 (222)	0.033	1.75	0.74 (0.412)	3.223	0.073	2.10
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.635; Chi-sq=257.042; df=220; p=0.044				Model Chi-square=45.679; df=6; p<0.001			

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, the level-1 model was run as a Bernoulli model since the outcome variable is binary. Workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). The unit-specific model with robust standard errors is reported.

**Table D.8. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle my money and bills better" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey**

	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=161 adults)		
Predictor variables	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	2.17 (0.033)	66.007 (220)	<0.001	1.46 (0.178)	8.206	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.01 (0.125)	-0.053 (220)	0.958	-0.43 (0.251)	-1.728	0.086
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.02 (0.084)	-0.261 (220)	0.794	-0.16 (0.154)	-1.027	0.306
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.17 (0.092)	-1.824 (220)	0.070	-0.07 (0.169)	-0.405	0.686
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)		NA		-0.33 (0.146)	-2.292	0.023
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I know how to handle my money and bills better on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	0.40 (0.050)	8.143 (223)	<0.001	0.36 (0.064)	5.523	<0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.104; Chi-sq=379.346; df=220; p<0.001			F=7.274; df=5,155; p<0.001		
Final Model						
Intercept	2.17 (0.032)	67.389 (220)	<0.001	1.62 (0.202)	8.033	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.02 (0.128)	-0.186 (220)	0.853	-0.44 (0.249)	-1.746	0.083
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.01 (0.080)	-0.130 (220)	0.897	-0.15 (0.153)	-0.992	0.323
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.08 (0.098)	-0.861 (220)	0.390	-0.04 (0.168)	-0.270	0.787
Weekly Individuals (0=no; 1=yes)		NA		-0.29 (0.147)	-1.985	0.049
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I know how to handle my money and bills better on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	0.38 (0.050)	7.727 (222)	<0.001	0.33 (0.065)	5.049	<0.001

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=448 adults; 224 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=161 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	-0.25 (0.066)	-3.856 (222)	<0.001	-0.19 (0.116)	-1.647	0.102
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.098; Chi-sq=372.981; df=220; p<0.001			F=6.581; df=6,154; p<0.001		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.9. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.54 (0.030)	119.242 (224)	<0.001	2.47 (0.274)	9.018	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.21 (0.066)	3.223 (224)	0.001	0.28 (0.197)	1.433	0.155
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.03 (0.070)	0.480 (224)	0.632	0.14 (0.155)	0.917	0.362
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.02 (0.118)	-0.215 (224)	0.830	0.21 (0.144)	1.492	0.139
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.34 (0.048)	7.040 (227)	<0.001	0.28 (0.079)	3.568	0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.085; Chi-sq=379.510; df=224; p<0.001			F=4.383; df=4,90; p=0.003		
Final Model						
Intercept	3.54 (0.030)	120.026 (224)	<0.001	2.07 (0.349)	5.946	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.20 (0.066)	3.033 (224)	0.003	0.34 (0.197)	1.737	0.086
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.03 (0.069)	0.411 (224)	0.682	0.23 (0.161)	1.422	0.159
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.01 (0.117)	-0.103 (224)	0.918	0.20 (0.143)	1.436	0.154
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.345 (0.048)	7.170 (226)	<0.001	0.29 (0.079)	3.660	<0.001
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (0=no;1=yes)	-0.06 (0.059)	-1.108 (226)	0.269	Not included		
Age at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (categories range from 1-8)	Not included			0.07 (0.039)	1.800	0.075

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.081; Chi-sq=370.860; df=224; p<0.001			F=4.242; df=5,89; p=0.002		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.10. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.55 (0.031)	113.881 (224)	<0.001	1.88 (0.438)	4.285	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.03 (0.086)	-0.309 (224)	0.758	-0.04 (0.252)	-0.143	0.886
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.10 (0.084)	1.221 (224)	0.223	-0.12 (0.196)	-0.607	0.545
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.11 (0.090)	1.197 (224)	0.232	-0.02 (0.185)	-0.126	0.900
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM exit survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.40 (0.058)	6.943 (227)	<0.001	0.44 (0.125)	3.500	0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.099; Chi-sq=396.377; df=224; p<0.001			F=3.140; df=4,90; p=0.018		
Final Model						
Intercept	3.55 (0.031)	113.856 (224)	<0.001	1.76 (0.485)	3.635	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.04 (0.087)	-0.517 (224)	0.606	-0.01 (0.257)	-0.037	0.970
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.09 (0.084)	1.121 (224)	0.264	-0.08 (0.208)	-0.395	0.694
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.13 (0.092)	1.420 (224)	0.157	-0.02 (0.186)	-0.131	0.896
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM exit survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.40 (0.057)	7.002 (226)	<0.001	0.43 (0.127)	3.349	0.001
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (0=no;1=yes)	-0.12 (0.066)	-1.820 (226)	0.070	Not included		
Age at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (categories range from 1-8)	Not included			0.03 (0.051)	0.537	0.592

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.101; Chi-sq=402.822; df=224; p<0.001			F=2.550; df=5,89; p=0.033		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.11. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM entrance survey**

	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
Predictor variables	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.55 (0.032)	112.482 (224)	<0.001	1.52 (0.309)	4.901	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	0.004 (0.090)	0.051 (224)	0.960	0.12 (0.222)	0.558	0.578
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.11 (0.080)	1.398 (224)	0.163	-0.20 (0.175)	-1.172	0.244
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.12 (0.101)	1.189 (224)	0.236	0.03 (0.163)	0.185	0.854
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.32 (0.048)	6.655 (227)	<0.001	0.56 (0.090)	6.239	<0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.103; Chi-sq=403.538; df=224; p<0.001			F=9.828; df=4,90; p<0.001		
Final Model						
Intercept	3.55 (0.031)	113.344 (224)	<0.001	1.16 (0.397)	2.921	0.004
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.02 (0.091)	-0.263 (224)	0.792	0.18 (0.224)	0.797	0.427
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.10 (0.080)	1.247 (224)	0.214	-0.13 (0.182)	-0.700	0.486
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.15 (0.101)	1.514 (224)	0.132	0.02 (0.162)	0.128	0.899
Extent worked with spouse/partner during the past month to find a resolution when have a serious disagreement on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.33 (0.047)	7.008 (226)	<0.001	0.56 (0.089)	6.312	<0.001
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (0=no;1=yes)	-0.16 (0.066)	-2.465 (226)	0.014	Not included		
Age at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (categories range from 1-8)	Not included			0.06 (0.045)	1.430	0.156

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.102; Chi-sq=403.561; df=224; p<0.001			F=8.363; df=5,89; p<0.001		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.12. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I know how to handle conflict with partner/spouse better" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=456 adults; 228 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=95 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	1.67 (0.028)	59.003 (224)	<0.001	0.75 (0.236)	3.169	0.002
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.07 (0.098)	-0.697 (224)	0.486	0.21 (0.231)	0.925	0.357
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.06 (0.072)	-0.817 (224)	0.415	-0.04 (0.183)	-0.217	0.828
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.18 (0.086)	-2.111 (224)	0.036	0.23 (0.173)	1.323	0.189
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	0.34 (0.055)	6.055 (227)	<0.001	0.62 (0.127)	4.889	<0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.092; Chi-sq=444.092; df=224; p<0.001			F=6.709; df=4,90; p<0.001		
Final Model						
Intercept	1.67 (0.028)	58.909 (224)	<0.001	0.72 (0.245)	2.961	0.004
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.06 (0.098)	-0.592 (224)	0.554	0.23 (0.234)	0.969	0.335
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.05 (0.072)	-0.751 (224)	0.453	-0.03 (0.184)	-0.187	0.852
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.19 (0.086)	-2.222 (224)	0.027	0.22 (0.176)	1.233	0.221
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	0.34 (0.055)	6.179 (226)	<0.001	0.62 (0.128)	4.861	<0.001
Not employed at time of Applicant Characteristics Survey (0=no;1=yes)	0.06 (0.051)	1.090 (226)	0.277	0.06 (0.136)	0.428	0.669
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.094; Chi-sq=448.147; df=224; p<0.001			F=5.355; df=5,89; p<0.001		

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.13. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=60 adults; 30 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=38 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.70 (0.054)	67.848 (26)	<0.001	2.36 (0.594)	3.983	<0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.14 (0.099)	-1.433 (26)	0.164	0.22 (0.245)	0.921	0.364
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.07 (0.164)	0.432 (26)	0.669	-0.26 (0.168)	-1.537	0.134
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.36 (0.098)	3.671 (26)	0.001	-0.06 (0.166)	-0.342	0.734
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.41 (0.166)	2.473 (29)	0.020	0.38 (0.153)	2.519	0.017
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.018; Chi-sq=30.782; df=26; p=0.236			F=2.960; df=4,33; p=0.034		
Final Model				Model with additional control variable not entered due to small sample size		
Intercept	3.70 (0.052)	70.615 (26)	<0.001			
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.16 (0.070)	-2.297 (26)	0.030			
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.03 (0.172)	0.162 (26)	0.873			
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.23 (0.126)	1.832 (26)	0.078			
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.38 (0.160)	2.348 (28)	0.026			
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	0.22 (0.129)	1.670 (28)	0.106			
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.016; Chi-sq=29.373; df=26; p=0.294					

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.14. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=60 adults; 30 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=38 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.77 (0.061)	61.631 (26)	<0.001	2.52 (0.885)	2.848	0.008
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.16 (0.356)	-0.436 (26)	0.667	0.43 (0.349)	1.238	0.225
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.24 (0.096)	2.548 (26)	0.017	0.06 (0.248)	0.255	0.800
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.08 (0.197)	-0.411 (26)	0.684	0.50 (0.237)	2.104	0.043
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM exit survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.35 (0.171)	2.057 (29)	0.049	0.26 (0.228)	1.150	0.258
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.041; Chi-sq=37.050; df=26; p=0.074			F=1.782; df=4,33; p=0.156		
Final Model						
Intercept	3.77 (0.059)	64.040 (26)	<0.001	Model with additional control variable not entered due to small sample size		
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.13 (0.286)	-0.456 (26)	0.652			
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.28 (0.098)	2.891 (26)	0.008			
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.02 (0.208)	0.100 (26)	0.921			
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM exit survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.40 (0.173)	2.338 (28)	0.027			
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	-0.21 (0.121)	-1.701 (28)	0.100			
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.036; Chi-sq=34.484; df=26; p=0.123					

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.15. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month (1=never;4=often) on local follow-up survey, controlling for the response on the nFORM entrance survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=60 adults; 30 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=38 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	3.77 (0.056)	67.401 (26)	<0.001	1.14 (0.756)	1.508	0.141
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.19 (0.268)	-0.705 (26)	0.487	0.58 (0.312)	1.870	0.070
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.21 (0.088)	2.407 (26)	0.023	0.11 (0.214)	0.506	0.616
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.06 (0.119)	0.514 (26)	0.612	0.53 (0.211)	2.517	0.017
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.55 (0.237)	2.326 (29)	0.027	0.62 (0.195)	3.192	0.003
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.022; Chi-sq=32.034; df=26; p=0.192			F=4.374; df=4,33; p=0.006		
Final Model						
Intercept	3.77 (0.054)	70.060 (26)	<0.001	Model with additional control variable not entered due to small sample size		
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.17 (0.209)	-0.835 (26)	0.411			
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.24 (0.092)	2.675 (26)	0.013			
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.16 (0.146)	1.085 (26)	0.288			
Frequency spent time with youngest child doing what he/she likes to do during the past month on NFORM entrance survey (1=never; 4=often)	0.58 (0.237)	2.443 (28)	0.021			
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	-0.16 (0.118)	-1.405 (28)	0.171			
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.017; Chi-sq=29.339; df=26; p=0.295					

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

**Table D.16. Multi-level analysis with multiple predictors for couples analysis, and multiple regression for individuals analysis: predicting agreement with statement, "Since attending Real Relationships, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent" (1=strongly agree;4=strongly disagree) on local follow-up survey, controlling for response on the nFORM exit survey**

Predictor variables	Couples analysis: multi-level model (n=60 adults; 30 couples)			Individuals analysis: multiple regression (n=38 adults)		
	B (SE)	t (df)	p-value	B (SE)	t (df=1)	p-value
Base Model						
Intercept	1.82 (0.073)	24.944 (26)	<0.001	0.99 (0.274)	3.628	0.001
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.64 (0.201)	-3.20 (26)	0.004	-0.23 (0.360)	-0.648	0.522
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.04 (0.160)	-0.231 (26)	0.819	-0.01 (0.243)	-0.054	0.957
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.39 (0.366)	-1.078 (26)	0.291	-0.32 (0.244)	-1.311	0.199
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I feel more confident that I have the skills necessary to be an effective parent on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	-0.00 (0.153)	-0.013 (29)	0.989	0.54 (0.123)	4.426	<0.001
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.093; Chi-sq=51.095; df=26; p=0.003			F=5.856; df=4,33; p=0.001		
Final Model				Model with additional control variable not entered due to small sample size		
Intercept	1.82 (0.069)	26.258 (26)	<0.001			
Workshop type (2-Day Couples Retreat is omitted category)						
1-Day Couples Retreat (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.62 (0.290)	-2.149 (26)	0.041			
1-Day Engaged Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	0.03 (0.146)	0.228 (26)	0.822			
Weekly Couples (0=no; 1=yes)	-0.23 (0.371)	-0.626 (26)	0.537			
Agreement with “Since attending the program, I know how to handle conflict with my partner/spouse better on NFORM exit survey (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree)	-0.04 (0.141)	-0.280 (28)	0.782			
Received financial assistance in the past month (0=no;1=yes)	-0.26 (0.131)	-2.015 (28)	0.054			
Statistics	Variance component for the intercept=0.081; Chi-sq=46.043; df=26; p=0.009					

Source: nFORM Applicant Characteristics Survey, nFORM Entrance Survey, nFORM Exit Survey, local follow-up survey, and nFORM Attendance and Workshop data sheets

Analysis Notes: For the Couples Analysis, workshop type variables were fixed at level-2 (grand mean centered). All other predictor variables were entered as fixed level-1 predictors (grand mean centered). Robust standard errors are reported.

#### D. Data collection instruments

Non-participants interview schedule (RQ#1, Study2) and the local follow-up survey are attached separately.