

# PARENTS AND CHILDREN TOGETHER: EFFECTS OF TWO HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAMS FOR LOW-INCOME COUPLES

## TECHNICAL SUPPLEMENT



**Parents and Children Together**

Parents and Children Together  
OPRE Report Number 2020-45

April 2020

**This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.**

**OPRE report number:**

2020-45

**Parents and Children  
Together: Effects of Two  
Healthy Marriage Programs  
for Low-income Couples**

**Technical Supplement**

**Contract number:**

HHSP23320095642WC

April 2020

**Mathematica reference number:**

06997.6M4

Reginald Covington

**Submitted to:**

Samantha Illangasekare, Project Officer  
Kathleen McCoy, Project Monitor  
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation  
Administration for Children and Families  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Quinn Moore

April Wu

Ankita Patnaik

Sarah Avellar

**Submitted by:**

Heather Zaveri, Project Director  
Mathematica Policy Research  
P.O. Box 2393  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393  
Telephone: (609) 799-3535

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested citation: Covington, Reginald, Quinn Moore, April Wu, Ankita Patnaik, and Sarah Avellar. (2020). *Parents and Children Together: Effects of Two Healthy Marriage Programs for Low-income Couples*. OPRE Report # 2020-45. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>.

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

[Sign up for the OPRE Newsletter](#)



Follow OPRE on  
Twitter [@OPRE\\_ACF](#)



Like OPRE on Facebook  
[facebook.com/OPRE.ACF](https://www.facebook.com/OPRE.ACF)



Follow OPRE on Instagram  
[@opre\\_acf](#)



**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

---

**CONTENTS**


---

I	RESEARCH DESIGN .....	1
	A. Overview of the research design .....	1
	B. Selection of HM grantees .....	2
	C. Sample eligibility and intake .....	3
	D. The study sample and data collection .....	4
	E. Approach to the impact analysis.....	7
II	ANALYTIC METHODS.....	9
	A. Multivariate estimation.....	9
	B. Treatment of missing data .....	11
	C. Analyzing outcomes not defined for the full sample .....	12
III	MEASURING AND ANALYZING COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS .....	19
	A. Development and testing of relationship quality measures.....	19
	B. Constructing couple-level outcomes .....	20
	C. Relationship status (key domain) .....	21
	D. Relationship quality (key domain).....	23
	E. Intimate partner violence (additional domain) .....	25
IV	MEASURING AND ANALYZING PARENTING .....	29
	A. Co-parenting relationship (key domain) .....	29
	B. Parenting skills (additional domain).....	30
V	MEASURING AND ANALYZING ECONOMIC STABILITY .....	33
	A. Labor market success (key domain) .....	33
	B. Perceived economic well-being (additional domain) .....	36
VI	MEASURING AND ANALYZING EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING.....	39
	A. Depressive symptoms (additional domain) .....	39
VII	SUBGROUP ANALYSIS .....	41
	A. Approach to conducting subgroup analysis.....	41
	B. Subgroups for the impact analysis .....	42
	C. Results of the subgroup analysis.....	44
VIII	PACT'S EFFECTS ON COUPLES WHO ATTENDED CORE WORKSHOPS .....	47

---

---

A. Methods for estimating effects for couples who attended core workshops..... 47

B. Developing the propensity score model ..... 50

C. Creation of comparison groups ..... 51

D. Estimation of Treatment-On-The-Treated impacts..... 53

E. Impacts of PACT on couples who attended core workshop sessions..... 54

REFERENCES..... 55

APPENDIX A: SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATED IMPACTS FOR THE FULL ANALYTIC SAMPLE

APPENDIX B: ESTIMATED IMPACTS FOR SUBGROUPS

APPENDIX C: PACT HM INTAKE FORMS

APPENDIX D: PACT HM BASELINE SURVEY

APPENDIX E: PACT HM 12-MONTH FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

---

**TABLES**


---

I.1.	Sample intake period and number of couples randomly assigned, by PACT HM program .....	4
I.2.	Baseline characteristics of couples enrolled in PACT .....	5
I.3.	PACT follow-up survey response rates, by research group and HM program (percentages) .....	7
I.4.	Healthy marriage domains .....	8
II.1.	Control variables used in regression models .....	10
II.2.	Conventions for describing the statistical significance of program impact estimates .....	11
II.3.	Baseline characteristics of couples with and without a focal child .....	13
II.4.	Results of assessments of risk of attrition bias for partial analysis samples .....	16
II.5.	Classification of study findings .....	17
II.6.	Sign and statistical significance of impacts on confirmatory outcomes, by estimation method .....	18
III.1.	Measures of relationship status .....	22
III.2.	Measures of relationship quality .....	25
III.3.	Measures of intimate partner violence .....	26
IV.1.	Measures of parenting .....	32
V.1.	Measures of labor market success .....	34
V.2.	Measures of perceived economic well-being .....	37
VI.1.	Measures of depressive symptoms .....	40
VII.1.	Subgroups examined in PACT HM impact analysis .....	44
VIII.1.	Baseline characteristics of randomly assigned couples in the ITT analysis sample .....	48
VIII.2.	Actual frequent attendance rates of program group couples, by likely attender status (%) .....	51
VIII.3.	Baseline characteristics of couples in the TOT sample, by matching method .....	52
VIII.4.	TOT impacts of frequently attending a PACT HM program, by matching method .....	54

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

---

## I RESEARCH DESIGN

---

This technical report supplements the Parents and Children Together (PACT) Healthy Marriage (HM) impact report (Moore et al. 2018) with additional details on the evaluation design and measures used for that analysis. The impact report described the effects of the two HM programs in PACT on couples' outcomes about one year after they enrolled in the study. This report includes details on those outcomes and analyses, additional results used to assess the robustness of the estimated impacts, and secondary findings. The data used for this analysis and accompanying documentation will be available through the Inter-University Consortium of Political and Social Research.<sup>1</sup>

This report is divided into seven chapters. In Chapter II, we provide details about the analytic methods, including the model specification and treatment of missing data. In Chapters III–V, we describe the outcome measures examined in the impact report and this supplement. All outcome measures pertain to four topic areas: couple relationship (Chapter III), parenting (Chapter IV), and economic stability and depressive symptoms (Chapter V). Chapter VI summarizes results for selected subgroups, and Chapter VII describes additional quasi-experimental analyses designed to expand understanding of the impacts of service receipt.

In the remainder of this chapter, we provide an overview of the research design for the PACT HM impact analysis. We also discuss selection of the HM programs in PACT, sample eligibility and intake, data sources and collection methods, and study enrollment and attrition.

### A. Overview of the research design

The PACT HM impact study is based on a rigorous random assignment design. The study team randomly assigned couples who enrolled in the study to either a program group that was offered admission to the program or a control group that had to wait one year before being eligible to receive program services. Members of the control group could participate in any other services available in the community. Table A.1 in Appendix A compares the services both groups of couples reported receiving between baseline and one-year follow-up.

By using a random assignment design, we developed two groups of couples who were, by design, similar in their average characteristics at the time they enrolled in the study. Because nothing else should have differed between the two groups except exposure to the program, comparing outcomes about one year after study enrollment provides an unbiased assessment of the program's impacts.

Accordingly, we estimated the effects of HM programs in PACT by comparing the outcomes of couples in the program group to those of the control group approximately one year after they enrolled in the study. The control group represents what would have happened to couples who applied to PACT HM if they had not been offered program services. Thus, these estimated effects represent the impact of offering services of HM programs in PACT to couples.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data from administrative records from the National Directory of New Hires will not be available, as access to these data requires special permissions from the Office of Child Support Enforcement.

The impact findings presented in the PACT HM impact report represent what are often referred to as intent-to-treat (ITT) estimates. The study team calculated these estimates by comparing outcomes for all couples assigned to the program group to outcomes for all couples in the control group, regardless of the level of participation of couples in the program group. ITT estimates incorporate the fact that some couples who enroll in an HM program do not participate in all available services. Therefore, these estimates answer the policy-relevant question: “What are the program effects on couples who are *offered* HM services?” These estimates take into account that policymakers typically cannot force people to participate in a program. However, these impacts may differ from those on couples in the program who actually received services, often referred to as treatment-on-the-treated (TOT) estimates. TOT and ITT estimates should be similar when most couples in the program group receive most of the intended services. In contrast, ITT estimates will be smaller than TOT estimates if the take-up of intended services is low, or if couples in the program group received only a small portion of available services. In addition, ITT estimates can differ from TOT estimates if couples who receive services have characteristics different from the average couple. In Chapter VII, we provide more information on the quasi-experimental estimates of impacts for couples in the program group who actually received HM program services.

## **B. Selection of HM grantees**

The criteria and process for selecting HM grantees for the PACT impact study were geared toward identifying grantees that were suitable for evaluation and provided good opportunities for detecting program impacts. The study team used three main criteria to select grantees for the study:

1. **Offer both couple relationship and job and career advancement services.** As a stipulation for receiving HM grants from the Office of Family Assistance (OFA), HM grantees were required to offer services to support and strengthen couples’ relationships. HM grantees were also encouraged to incorporate job and career advancement services into their programs. To be selected for the PACT evaluation, the planned services had to include both types of services.
2. **Ability to achieve adequate sample size.** Sample size is the primary determinant of statistical power—the probability that real impacts will be detected with confidence. To achieve adequate sample size for the pooled and subgroup analyses, it was key for HM grantees involved in PACT to have reasonable ways to expand recruitment to fill all program slots while still achieving a sufficiently large control group.
3. **Clear treatment-counterfactual distinction.** The chance of detecting effects on couples in the program group would decline if control group members received services similar to those offered in the HM program. Thus, couples in the control group could only receive services 12 months after random assignment. They could, however, participate in other services offered by the HM grantee or available elsewhere in the community. Therefore, the study team prioritized HM grantees providing services to the intervention group that were not available through the grantee’s other programs or in the community at large.

The study team reviewed all 2011 HM grant applications and selected two programs for the PACT HM study: (1) the El Paso Center for Children (EPCC) Children’s Healthy Opportunities

for Marriage Enrichment (HOME) program in El Paso, Texas; and (2) the Universal Behavioral Associates (UBA) Supporting Healthy Relationships program in the Bronx, New York. Both selected grantees planned to offer services to parenting couples, deliver a relationship education workshop of at least 18 hours, and provide job and career advancement services to a relatively large share of couples. The selected HM grantees were not intended to be a random or representative sample of all grantees in the 2011 grantee cohort. Rather, the study team sought to purposefully choose the HM grantees with the greatest capacity to support the study. The PACT HM implementation study provides more detail on the selected grantees (Zaveri et al. 2016).

### **C. Sample eligibility and intake**

The first step in the PACT intake procedures was to determine whether the couple was eligible for the PACT HM evaluation. To be eligible, a couple had to meet three criteria: (1) both members of the couple had to be 18 years of age or older, (2) one member of the couple had to be a male and the other female,<sup>2</sup> and (3) the couple had to be expecting a baby together (female member is pregnant) or at least one member of the couple had to live with a biological or adopted son or daughter.<sup>3</sup> For the third requirement, the child or children were not required to be the biological or adopted child of or live with both parents. Program staff determined couples' eligibility for the evaluation by referring to the PACT study eligibility checklist (Appendix D) or a similar form developed by the grantee.

After determining the couple's eligibility, program staff provided PACT-eligible couples with an orientation to the PACT HM study. As part of the orientation, program staff briefly explained the purpose of the study and informed eligible couples that they could not receive services without participating in the study. They further informed couples that there was an equal chance that they would be (1) accepted into the program immediately or (2) have to wait 12 months to receive services.

For female partners, intake workers also conducted a domestic violence screening. Program staff, who received training to identify signs of domestic violence, administered the protocol to the female partner while the couple was separated. The female partner answered questions about the nature of the couple's interactions and relationship dynamics, such as whether arguments ever turned physical or one partner ever exerted control over the other. Staff probed about the frequency or severity of violence, allowing them to differentiate between low-level mutual violence, such as an occasional fight, and more severe, unilateral violence, such as frequent aggression or control by one partner in multiple aspects of the relationship. On the basis of the female partner's responses, staff determined whether domestic violence was present in the relationship and whether the female partner needed a referral to a domestic violence partner organization for services. Generally, the HOME program allowed couples with lower-level mutual violence to participate in services, but not if there was evidence of severe unilateral violence against the female partner. The Supporting Healthy Relationships program did not

---

<sup>2</sup> Same-sex couples were eligible to participate in the program but were not included in the evaluation sample.

<sup>3</sup> HM grantees could serve clients who were eligible for their program but did not meet the eligibility criteria for the impact study. In general, these clients were excluded from the evaluation. As a result, the impact findings might not generalize to all couples served by the PACT HM grantees.

allow a couple to participate if the female partner disclosed severe unilateral domestic violence in the past year. Neither program screened males for domestic violence.

If the intake worker did not identify domestic violence concerns, he/she initiated the call to a trained Mathematica interviewer and gave the couple members a copy of the consent statement (Appendix D).<sup>4</sup> The Mathematica interviewer then asked for verbal consent to participate in the study, confirmed each partner's eligibility for PACT, and conducted the baseline interview.

Couples who were eligible for PACT, consented to the study, and completed the baseline survey were randomly assigned to the program or control group. Program staff conducted random assignment using PACT's web-based management information system (PACTIS). First, using the couple's names and dates of birth, program staff used PACTIS to check that the couple members had not been previously randomly assigned. If at least one member of the couple had been previously randomly assigned, they were ineligible for random assignment. Otherwise, program staff proceeded with random assignment using PACTIS. After PACTIS generated the couple's study group assignment, staff informed them of the result and provided both with \$10 gift cards in appreciation of their completing the baseline interview. Staff provided a list of support services available in the community to couples assigned to the control group. At both programs, staff assigned couples in the program group to workshops beginning no more than three weeks after enrollment in the study (Zaveri et al. 2016).

#### **D. The study sample and data collection**

The HM programs in PACT enrolled couples into the study sample from July 2013 through April 2015 (Table I.1). Before enrolling couples, both HM grantees spent several months piloting their recruitment and enrollment procedures, and other aspects of their programs. Altogether, the study team randomly assigned 1,595 couples, evenly split between the program and control groups. EPCC enrolled 573 couples in the HOME program and UBA enrolled 1,022 in Supporting Healthy Relationships.

**Table I.1. Sample intake period and number of couples randomly assigned, by PACT HM program**

Program	Sample intake period	Number of couples randomly assigned		
		Program group	Control group	Total
HOME	July 2013 to April 2015	286	287	573
Supporting Healthy Relationships	July 2013 to March 2015	511	511	1,022
<b>All programs</b>	<b>July 2013 to April 2015</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>798</b>	<b>1,595</b>

Source: PACT MIS data.

We examined several baseline characteristics of the couples assigned to the program and control groups to characterize the study sample and check for baseline equivalence of the research groups. As shown in Table I.2, random assignment created research groups with very

<sup>4</sup> To keep the female partners' reports of DV confidential, the male partner completed the baseline interview even when the female partner reported DV.

similar characteristics at baseline, with differences between groups generally small and not statistically significant.

**Table I.2. Baseline characteristics of couples enrolled in PACT**

Baseline characteristics	Program group	Control group
<b>Socioeconomic and demographic measures</b>		
Race and ethnicity		
Both partners Hispanic	79.2	76.1
Both partners black, non-Hispanic	10.2	10.8
Other	10.6	13.1
Both partners' primary language is English	35.9	38.0
Average age (in years)		
Women	33.4	33.5
Men	36.0	36.1
Average age difference		
Woman 4+ years older	10.0	10.6
Woman 1 to 3 years older	15.3	14.1
Same age	9.1	10.8
Man 1 to 3 years older	30.0	27.5
Man 4 to 9 years older	25.7	25.1
Man 10+ years older	9.8	12.0
Both partners have high school diploma or GED	55.3	55.4
Earnings in past 30 days (\$)		
Women	604.6	623.3
Men	1,516.2	1,513.8
Either partner reports financial hardship in the past 12 months	66.8	68.2
<b>Parenting characteristics</b>		
Number of residential biological and adopted children	2.2	2.2
Couple expecting a child	8.6	10.7
Average age of biological and adopted children (years)	6.7	6.9
Quality of co-parenting relationship (scale 1–10)	3.4	3.4
Either partner has child(ren) from other relationships	54.5	56.6
<b>Relationship characteristics</b>		
Couple lives together all or most of the time	88.9	87.2
Couple's relationship status		
Married	60.6	58.3
Romantically involved on a steady basis	21.2	22.2
Romantically involved on and off	12.7	13.8
Not in a relationship	5.5	5.6
Length of relationship		
Not in a relationship	5.5	5.6
Less than 2 years	17.2*	13.9
2 to less than 5 years	25.1	25.9
5 to less than 10 years	25.6	27.4
10+ years	26.5	27.1
Couple's relationship quality		
Support and affection (scale 1–4)	3.1	3.1
Positive conflict management (scale 1–4)	3.0	3.0
Avoidance of negative conflict management (scale 1–4)	2.5	2.5
Average of both partners' reported happiness (0–10)	7.5	7.4
Relationship commitment (scale 1–10)	9.1	9.1
<b>Well-being</b>		
At least one partner at risk for moderate or severe depression	36.4	34.8
<b>Sample size (couples)</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>798</b>

Source: PACT Healthy Marriage baseline survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Numbers are percentages unless otherwise noted. The two HM programs are weighted equally for these calculations. Chapter III describes the construction of the relationship quality measures.

\* Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

For each couple enrolled in the study, the study team aimed to collect information using three main data sources: (1) a telephone survey administered at baseline and 12 months after study enrollment, (2) administrative records from the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH), and (3) PACTIS. We describe these three data sources in more detail below.

### **1. Telephone survey design and administration**

The study team asked both members of each couple in the sample to complete two surveys: a 30-minute baseline survey before random assignment and a 45-minute follow-up survey about one year after random assignment. Both surveys followed a similar structure and were designed to capture detailed information on an array of topics, including the couple's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, relationship status and quality, co-parenting, economic stability, well-being, and motivation to participate in the HM program. The surveys drew on items found in well-established surveys used in other large-scale studies, such as the Building Strong Families, Fragile Families and Child Well-Being, and Work First New Jersey studies. When necessary, the study team modified questions drawn from these surveys to make them easier to understand or align more closely with the program's goals and target populations. The baseline and follow-up survey instruments are included in Appendix D.

Table I.3 presents follow-up response rates for the pooled sample, by gender. Almost all couples had at least one partner respond to the follow-up survey (94 percent). The response rate was 91 percent for women and 85 percent for men. Table I.3 shows that response rates were similar across the HM programs.

### **2. National Directory of New Hires**

We obtained detailed information on couples' recent employment history using administrative records collected for the National Directory of New Hires (NDNH), a database operated by the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE), developed to assist state child support agencies in locating parents and enforcing child support orders (ACF 2015). The database contains information on earnings from jobs covered by unemployment insurance and receipt of unemployment insurance benefits. Employment not covered by unemployment insurance—such as work by independent contractors or some temporary, part-time, under-the-table, or informal jobs—are not included in NDNH. We discuss the implications of this exclusion in Chapter V.

OCSE identified the NDNH records for PACT couples using names and Social Security numbers (SSNs). For some study participants, SSNs were incomplete, inaccurate, or did not match the given name in the NDNH records. Overall, OCSE identified NDNH records for 65 percent of female sample members and 67 percent of male sample members (Table I.3). The NDNH data available to the PACT HM study provide quarterly information for at least one year before and after sample enrollment. More data are available (for two or more years after enrollment) for couples who entered the sample earlier in the enrollment period.

### **3. PACTIS**

The PACT evaluation team developed PACTIS, a web-based management information system, to perform random assignment and track program participants. Grantee staff entered information about services provided to couples in the program group, including attendance at

group workshops and one-on-one meetings with facilitators, receipt of incentives and work supports, and referrals to other community service providers. Staff also entered information about the content and duration of each service.

In this report, we use PACTIS data to conduct an additional, exploratory analysis of the impact of HM programs in PACT on couples who received core services. We also explain how this approach differs from our main analysis and provide additional details in Chapter VII.

**Table I.3. PACT follow-up survey response rates, by research group and HM program (percentages)**

Program	Either partner		Women		Men	
	Program group	Control group	Program group	Control group	Program group	Control group
<b>Number of surveys completed</b>						
HOME	269	266	246	256	251	235
Supporting Healthy Relationships	487	481	473	465	436	431
<b>All programs</b>	756	747	737	721	687	666
<b>Percentage of surveys completed</b>						
HOME	94.1	92.7	92.3	89.2	87.8	81.9
Supporting Healthy Relationships	95.3	94.1	92.6	91.0	85.3	84.3
<b>All programs</b>	94.9	93.6	92.5	90.4	86.2	83.5
<b>Percentage with NDNH record</b>						
HOME	n.a	n.a	61.5	58.9	64.0	66.6
Supporting Healthy Relationships	n.a	n.a	66.1	69.0	66.1	70.6
<b>All programs</b>	n.a.	n.a.	65.5	65.4	64.1	69.2

Source: PACT follow-up survey and NDNH database.

n.a. = not applicable. To protect the confidentiality of PACT HM participants, we did not link couple members' NDNH records to those of their partners.

## E. Approach to the impact analysis

The HM grantees were charged with offering services to support and strengthen couples' relationships, and foster job and career advancement. These services may affect multiple aspects of couples' lives. For this reason, this analysis examined the effects of the HM programs in PACT on a range of outcomes. However, as the number of outcomes examined increases, so too does the risk of finding a statistically significant result that does not reflect a true program effect—that is, a spurious finding (Schochet 2009). Thus, our examination of the effectiveness of the HM programs in PACT focused on a relatively small set of outcomes we identified before the analysis began. They represent the primary outcomes that the HM programs in PACT aimed to affect most directly.

We grouped primary outcomes into four key domains: (1) relationship quality, (2) relationship status, (3) co-parenting skills, and (4) labor market success (Table I.4). *Key domains* are those that the grant aimed to affect most directly. The outcomes in these domains served as the main test of whether HM programs in PACT were effective.

We also examined the effects of HM programs in PACT on outcomes in several additional domains, such as parenting and intimate partner violence, supplementing the central analysis of PACT HM program effects on outcomes in the key domains listed above. When presenting findings in both the main report and this technical supplement, we indicate whether the domain is key or additional. In Chapter II, we discuss how we categorize and report on each outcome in the domains.

**Table I.4. Healthy marriage domains**

Domain	Classification of outcomes
<b>Couple relationship</b>	
Relationship quality	Key domain
Relationship status	Key domain
Intimate partner violence	Additional domain
<b>Parenting</b>	
Co-parenting skills	Key domain
Parenting skills	Additional domain
<b>Economic stability</b>	
Labor market success	Key domain
Perceived economic improvement	Additional domain
<b>Depressive symptoms</b>	
Depressive symptoms	Additional domain

## II ANALYTIC METHODS

As described in Chapter I, the evaluation of HM programs in PACT was based on a random assignment design in which couples were randomly assigned to either a program group offered services by a PACT HM program or a control group that could not receive these services for one year (but could access other services in the community). In this chapter, we discuss the methodological approaches used to derive the impact analysis results. We describe the multivariate estimation method (Section A), treatment of missing data (Section B), analysis of truncated samples (Section C), and adjustment for multiple comparisons (Section D).

### A. Multivariate estimation

To examine whether HM programs in PACT improved outcomes for the couples they served, we used weighted least-squares models and estimated impacts using data pooled across both programs. To calculate the average treatment effect for the overall sample, we weighted the two program sites equally, rather than weighting them in proportion to the size of their sample. Weighting sites equally is preferred to weighting each site according to the size of its sample because the relative sample sizes of the sites in the PACT evaluation are not representative of any broader populations. Thus, weighting each site according to the size of its sample would give a larger site more importance when computing a pooled estimate. In contrast, weighting sites equally generates a more policy-relevant parameter: the impact observed for an average program in the evaluation, recognizing that each site represents a somewhat different implementation of the program model.

The regression models estimated in the main analysis can be represented by the following equation:

$$(1) Y_i = \sum_{s=1}^2 \gamma_s S_i + \sum_{s=1}^2 \beta_s S_i * PACT_i + \sum_{s=1}^2 \delta_s S_i * X_i + \epsilon_i,$$

where  $Y_i$  is an outcome variable for the couple  $i$  (or father or mother  $i$ , if an outcome is measured at the partner level);  $S_i$  are indicators that equal 1 if the couple is in site  $s$  and 0 otherwise;  $PACT_i$  is an indicator that equals 1 if the couple is assigned to the program group;  $X_i$  is a vector of baseline characteristics of the couple, with no intercept;  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\delta$  are coefficient estimates; and  $\epsilon_i$  is a random disturbance term assumed to have a mean of 0, conditional on  $X$ ,  $S$ , and  $PACT$ . Each model also included a set of binary interaction variables indicating whether the couple had applied to a given PACT HM site and been assigned to the program group. The site-specific impact estimates are the regression coefficients associated with these site-research status interaction variables, represented by  $\beta$  in the equation above. The pooled impact estimate is the simple mean of the site-specific impact estimates.

The regression models included a large number of variables to control for characteristics measured in the baseline survey (Table II.1). These covariates included variables that reflect the couple's relationship stability and relationship status at the time of the baseline survey, co-parenting, demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and measures of each partner's well-being. Using covariates has two advantages: (1) it improves the precision of the impact estimates; and (2) it adjusts for small differences in the initial characteristics of the study groups that may have arisen by chance or through survey nonresponse.

The regression models included interactions between covariates and binary variables identifying each PACT HM site. Thus, the impact estimates were adjusted for observed site-level differences in baseline characteristics between the program and control groups that may have arisen by chance or due to survey nonresponse. In addition, this approach allows the influence of each explanatory variable to differ for each site.

**Table II.1. Control variables used in regression models**

Parenting and relationship characteristics
Number of residential biological and adopted children of either partner
Average age of residential biological and adopted children
Whether female member of the couple is pregnant
Quality of co-parenting relationship (scale 1–4)
Either member of the couple has children from other relationships
Couple lives together all or most of the time
Couple is married
Couple is romantically involved
Length of couple’s relationship
Support and affection (scale 1–4)
Positive conflict management (scale 1–4)
Avoidance of negative conflict management (scale 1–4)
Relationship happiness (scale 1–10)
Relationship commitment (scale 1–10)
Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics
Race and ethnicity
Average age of the partners
Age difference
Both partners’ primary language is English
Both partners have high school diploma or GED
Earnings in past 30 days for male and female partners separately
Either partner reports financial hardship in the past 12 months
Well-being
At least one partner at risk for moderate or severe depression

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

For each impact estimate, a two-tailed t-statistic was used to test the null hypothesis that there was no impact of HM programs in PACT on the outcome. In other words, the t-tests were used to determine whether there was no statistical evidence of an impact of these programs on the outcome. The associated *p*-value reflects the probability of obtaining the observed impact estimate when the null hypothesis of no effect is true. It is used to judge the likelihood that the impact estimate was statistically significant or arose simply by chance. Impact estimates with *p*-values less than 0.10 on two-tailed t-tests are denoted in the report by asterisks and referred to in the text as statistically significant (Table II.2).

**Table II.2. Conventions for describing the statistical significance of program impact estimates**

$p$ -value of impact estimate	Symbol used to denote $p$ -value	Impact estimate is considered statistically significant
$p < 0.01$	***	Yes
$0.01 \leq p < 0.05$	**	Yes
$0.05 \leq p < 0.10$	*	Yes
$p \geq 0.10$	None	No

Impact tables also report effect sizes. For continuous outcomes, the reported effect size is a standardized mean difference generated by dividing the impact estimate for an outcome measure by the standard deviation of that measure for the control group. Because the values are standardized, the effect sizes of different outcomes can be compared, even if they are measured in different units. For binary outcomes, the effect size measure is based on the log odds ratio, which has statistical and practical advantages over alternative effect size measures appropriate for binary variables (Fleiss 1994; Lipsey and Wilson 2001). The effect size measure used for binary variables was adjusted to be comparable to the standardized mean difference used for continuous outcomes.<sup>5</sup>

## B. Treatment of missing data

We estimated all regressions using weights to account for sample members who did not complete the follow-up survey or lacked administrative data. The nonresponse weights adjusted the data so the sample would be representative of all sample members, not just those who completed the survey. NDNH weights adjusted the data so the sample would be representative of all sample members, not just those who had an administrative record. For each type of weight, we developed three sets of weights to correspond to the three levels at which outcomes were measured: the couple, mother, and father levels. We calculated the weights by estimating the probability of nonresponse as a function of baseline characteristics using regression analysis. We adjusted the standard errors from the regression models to account for the variability associated with these weights.

We also used imputation in cases where data were missing due to item nonresponse. Survey respondents could refuse to answer a survey question if they did not know or did not feel comfortable providing the answer. Without imputation, the analysis sample would have been restricted to participants who responded to the relevant survey items. Moreover, restricting the sample in this way could affect its representativeness and potentially bias results.

To account for missing data due to item nonresponse, we imputed values using the multiple imputation by chained equation method (Ragunathan et al. 2001). This approach uses an iterative process to estimate regression models for each outcome measure with missing data. These models included a large number of baseline covariates, available survey responses from the sample member's PACT partner, and available nonmissing survey responses from the sample

<sup>5</sup> This calculation is based on the Cox index, an adjusted log odds ratio that assumes the binary outcome is based on an underlying normal distribution.

member. The set of covariates used in each of these models was tailored to include the covariates most relevant to the variable being imputed, including observed and imputed values. For example, the imputation of a father's report of whether the couple was romantically involved was based on a model that included a large set of baseline covariates, the mother's responses to items related to relationship status and quality (including romantic involvement), and the father's responses to related items. Couple-level outcome measures were imputed for couples when at least one partner responded to the survey.

Imputation was more complicated when the variable of interest was conditional on the value of other inputs. A relevant example of such a variable is average earnings. The earnings history grid included a number of variables, such as job start date, wage amount, hours worked, and job end date. If a job had any missing items, we imputed their values sequentially to generate an average earnings estimate for the period. We took steps to ensure that the imputed values were plausible so that our imputed values did not greatly influence the mean levels of outcomes. For example, we imputed earnings separately for each job, separately for women and men, and based on the sample members' nonmissing demographic and employment characteristics. Further, we required that imputed values for earnings were less than the 99th percentile of earnings among participants who reported earnings.

Using the imputation procedure just described, we generated five plausible replacement values for each missing value. We conducted all analysis on each of the five imputed data sets and then combined the results using a standard approach that accounts for the uncertainty associated with missing data imputations (Rubin 1987). Accounting for imputation uncertainty is a key advantage of the multiple imputation approach; common single imputation methods, such as mean-replacement imputation or hot decking, do not account for this uncertainty. As a result, standard errors from data based on single imputation methods may be understated, thus affecting inferences drawn from the data.

### **C. Analyzing outcomes not defined for the full sample**

Not all outcomes were defined for the full sample of couples. There were two types of situations in which this occurred. First, some outcomes were only defined for sample members having a child at the time of the baseline survey who was eligible to serve as a study focal child (more details on the selection of the focal child are provided in the next section). Second, some outcomes were not defined for the full sample because they were only available for sample members with certain post-random assignment relationship characteristics. We discuss these two situations in more detail below. We then describe the results of that attrition analysis.

#### **1. Analyzing outcomes defined only for couples with a focal child**

The follow-up survey included detailed questions about a focal child, who was selected for two reasons. First, the study team wanted to reduce burden on respondents, who would otherwise be asked to answer detailed questions about all of their children. Second, the team wanted to increase the likelihood that the parenting questions, which asked about such things as activities with the child, were appropriate based on the child's age and couple's level of involvement. For each couple, PACTIS randomly selected a focal child who met the following criteria at baseline: (1) younger than 21 (excluding in utero), and (2) lived with both members of the couple. About

78 percent of couples had at least one child who met the criteria.<sup>6</sup> On average, the selected focal child was about 8 years old at baseline.

Because having a focal child was based solely on sample members’ characteristics at baseline, analysis of outcomes defined only for those with focal children preserves the random assignment research design. These analyses were similar to that of subgroup impacts when subgroups are based solely on pre-random assignment characteristics (such as race or gender). Because the two research groups should have had very similar characteristics at baseline (similar to analyses based on the full sample), these impact estimates provided a rigorous, internally valid assessment of the effect of the program.

Although the impact estimates for outcomes defined only for couples with a focal child at baseline were internally valid, the results did not apply to the full sample. Because couples with a focal child versus those without one were different, the programs might have affected them differently. As a result, findings pertaining to these outcomes might not generalize to the full sample of couples in the study.

Table II.3 shows that couples with a focal child differed from couples without one. For example, male members of couples without a focal child earned less in the past 30 days (\$1,147 versus \$1,602). In addition, such couples were less likely to be married or in a steady romantic relationship and less likely to live together all or most of the time. Among couples with a focal child, both partners were more likely to be Hispanic.

**Table II.3. Baseline characteristics of couples with and without a focal child**

Baseline characteristics	Has a focal child	
	Yes	No
<b>Socioeconomic and demographic measures</b>		
Race and ethnicity		
Both partners Hispanic	79.9***	70.8
Both partners black, non-Hispanic	9.8	12.0
Other	10.3***	17.1
Both partners’ primary language is English	34.9*	41.4
Average age (in years)		
Women	33.3***	35.5
Men	35.9***	38.1
Average age difference		
Woman 4+ years older	10.3	10.7
Woman 1 to 3 years older	14.4	15.6
Same age	9.4	12.2
Man 1 to 3 years older	30.1**	23.3
Man 4 to 9 years older	25.6	24.8
Man 10+ years older	10.3	13.3
Both partners have high school diploma or GED	55.7	57.4
Earnings in past 30 days (\$)		

<sup>6</sup> About 22 percent of couples did not meet the criteria for having a focal child. Among randomly assigned couples, 14 percent did not live together all or most of the time. Because a focal child had to live with both partners, these couples did not have a child who met the criteria. About 8 percent of couples lived together but did not have a child who met the criteria (for example, a biological or adopted child did not live with them or did not meet the age criterion).

Baseline characteristics	Has a focal child	
	Yes	No
Women	627.7	623.3
Men	1,602.3***	1,146.9
Either partner reports financial hardship in the past 12 months	67.9	67.4
Parenting characteristics		
Number of residential biological and adopted children	2.4***	1.4
Couple expecting a child	6.3***	21.0
Average age of biological and adopted children (years)	6.8	6.8
Quality of co-parenting relationship (scale 1–4)	3.4	3.4
Either partner has child(ren) from other relationships	54.4*	60.8
Relationship characteristics		
Couple lives together all or most of the time <sup>a</sup>	95.2***	64.3
Couple's relationship status		
Married	62.8***	47.7
Romantically involved on a steady basis	20.9	23.5
Romantically involved on and off	11.0***	22.6
Not in a relationship	5.3	6.3
Length of relationship		
Not in a relationship	5.3	6.3
Less than 2 years	13.6***	22.6
2 to less than 5 years	25.0	26.5
5 to less than 10 years	28.0***	18.9
10+ years	28.1	25.7
Couple's relationship quality		
Support and affection (scale 1–4)	3.1	3.0
Positive conflict management (scale 1–4)	3.0	3.0
Avoidance of negative conflict management (scale 1–4)	2.5	2.5
Average of both partners' reported happiness (0–10)	7.5	7.4
Relationship commitment (scale 1–10)	9.1***	8.8
Well-being		
At least one partner at risk for moderate or severe depression	34.3*	40.9
Sample size	1,242	353

Source: PACT Healthy Marriage baseline survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: The two HM programs in PACT were weighted equally for these calculations. Chapter III describes the construction of the relationship quality measures.

<sup>a</sup>Some couples have a focal child but at least one partner reported living with that person's PACT partner none or some of the time.

\*Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

\*\*Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

\*\*\*Significantly different from zero at the .01 level, two-tailed test.

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

## 2. Analyzing outcomes defined for samples based on post-random assignment characteristics

Certain outcomes in the PACT HM evaluation are available only for a subset of couples because of characteristics determined after random assignment. This situation applies only to certain outcomes in the relationship quality domain. For example, some questions about relationship quality, such as the measure for support and affection, were asked only among couples who were in an intact relationship with each other at the time of the follow-up survey. If the program influenced the types of people for whom an outcome is defined, then the program and control group members for whom that outcome is defined may be different in important ways. This scenario would lead to biased estimates of the program's effectiveness in our analysis

of that outcome. For example, a program might have encouraged some couples to contact each other when they would not have done so in the absence of the program. If so, couples in the program group who had recent contact with their partners may have had a poorer initial relationship quality (measured at baseline), on average, than similar couples in the control group. Initial relationship quality would be related to quality at follow-up, thus influencing or biasing the estimated impact estimates. Researchers sometimes refer to this possibility as a truncation problem because the outcome is unavailable or undefined for some sample members (McConnell et al. 2008).

To assess the risk of bias in the estimates of PACT's effect on truncated outcomes, we followed the process used for the Building Strong Families study (Moore et al. 2012). We treated truncation as a type of sample attrition because, as with attrition, the measure is not available for the affected sample members. Specifically, we used a two-step procedure similar to that developed for the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) to assess the threat of attrition bias (U.S. Department of Education 2008).

As a first step, we compared overall and differential attrition in each analysis sample to WWC's attrition standard. The WWC has two thresholds for attrition—conservative and liberal—developed through validity testing on experimental data. The appropriate standard to use in a particular circumstance depends on whether outcomes are likely to be correlated with the propensity to be included in the analysis sample. The HM programs may have affected the likelihood of partners contacting each other; therefore, attrition could be correlated with the relationship quality and status outcome measures. For this reason, we used the conservative WWC attrition standard.<sup>7</sup> If this standard was met, we deemed there was a low risk of bias due to attrition.

If a sample failed to meet the attrition standard, the second step was testing the program and control group in each analytic sample for equivalence on observable characteristics that research has shown to correlate with the outcome of interest. For the analysis samples used to examine survey data to be considered sufficiently similar, we used a criterion that couples in the program and control groups must differ by less than 0.25 standard deviations on the following five baseline characteristics associated with relationship quality: indicator of whether couple is married, support and affection, relationship commitment, positive conflict management, and avoidance of negative conflict management.

Before conducting the impact analysis, we decided that analyses of outcomes that did not meet the attrition standard but did meet the equivalence standard would be deemed to produce impact estimates with only a moderate risk of bias based on WWC standards; these estimates would be included in the main report. Analytic samples that met neither the attrition nor the equivalence standard would be deemed to produce impact estimates with substantial risk of bias; they would therefore not be included in the main report, but rather in Appendix A.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Building Strong Families evaluation also used the conservative threshold.

### 3. Results of the attrition analysis

Table II.4 shows the attrition and equivalence results for couples/respondents included in the analysis of confirmatory outcomes. In total, we used seven samples to examine the impact of HM programs in PACT on confirmatory outcomes. For example, we used intact couples or couples in contact with each other to analyze the effect of HM programs on couple relationship quality. We also used separate male and female samples with NDNH administrative records to examine HM program impacts on economic stability. For six of seven samples, this analysis indicated that attrition was low. Attrition was high only for males who had an NDNH record. However, the program and control groups met the equivalence standards on earnings the year before enrolling in the study. Thus, the risk of attrition-related bias was low or moderate for all relevant samples for the analysis of the HM programs in PACT regarding effects on confirmatory outcomes. As a result, the results of our analyses of all confirmatory outcomes were included in the main report.

**Table II.4. Results of assessments of risk of attrition bias for partial analysis samples**

Sample description	Overall attrition (%)	Differential attrition (%)	High/low attrition	Equivalent?
At least one partner responded	6.0	1.4	Low	n.a.
Women	8.6	2.1	Low	n.a.
Men	15.2	2.7	Low	n.a.
Intact couples	17.7	2.7	Low	n.a.
Couples had contact before follow-up survey	9.1	0.6	Low	n.a.
Women who had NDNH record	35.0	0.9	Low	n.a.
Men who had NDNH record	33.4	5.1	High	Yes

n.a. = not applicable.

### D. Accounting for multiple comparisons

As discussed briefly in Chapter I, examining effects on numerous outcomes increases the chance of falsely identifying an impact as significant (Schochet 2009). To reduce this possibility, the PACT HM research design included three elements:

#### 1. Assessing program effectiveness: Identifying key domains and primary measures

We protected against spurious findings in part by identifying a compact set of outcomes closely aligned with the grant goals and focusing on areas in which the programs were likely to have an impact. First, we identified key and additional domains; that is, broad, conceptual areas of outcomes important to the study (see Chapter I). Second, within each domain, we classified measures as *primary* or *secondary outcomes* based on how well they captured the intended effects of the program. We describe these outcome measures in more detail in Chapters III through V. When describing each outcome measure, we report whether it was primary or secondary. We focused our confirmatory analysis on primary outcomes in key domains—those seen as most closely related to intended program effects. We selected the primary outcomes before starting the impact analysis to guard against mining the data for positive results (or the appearance of having done so). To supplement the confirmatory analysis, we also examined a

broader list of secondary outcomes. In a few cases, we added these outcomes after analysis began to help us explore findings based on our primary measures. These outcomes are described in more detail in Chapters III through VI.

## 2. Using a hierarchy of reporting

We also planned in advance how and where we would report our findings. Both the main and technical reports emphasize the findings from the confirmatory analyses but also describe results from other analyses. Following an approach used in the Building Strong Families evaluation (Wood et al. 2012), we reported the following (see Table II.5):

- Only primary measures in key domains in summary sections of the main report, such as the abstract and executive summary; they served as the central test of program effectiveness
- Primary measures in all domains in the main report
- Secondary measures only in this technical report
- Subgroup impacts that showed a pattern of statistically significant differences between the two relevant subgroups in the main report
- Subgroup impacts that did not show a pattern of statistically significant differences between the two relevant subgroups in the technical report

**Table II.5. Classification of study findings**

Classification of outcomes		Type of analysis	Location of findings
Key domain	Primary outcome	Confirmatory	Main report and summary sections (such as abstract and executive summary)
	Secondary outcome	Exploratory	Appendices
Additional domain	Primary outcome	Additional	Main report
	Secondary outcome	Exploratory	Appendices

## 3. Assessing robustness of findings within domains

We conducted robustness tests to determine whether statistically significant impacts were sensitive to our analysis decisions. The main impact findings are derived from a particular set of analytic decisions, ranging from the use of analytic weights to the treatment of missing data. We made these decisions in accordance with established research standards and the particular features of our design study. However, we also investigated the sensitivity of our results to alternative analytic decisions. Specifically, we estimated alternative impacts based on different treatment of analysis weights (using no weights), covariates (using no adjustment for baseline characteristics), and imputation procedures (using single imputation procedures).

The general pattern in these alternative estimates was consistent with the findings presented in the main report (Table II.6). Those findings show that HM programs in PACT improved multiple aspects of couples' relationships (Moore et al. 2018). They improved couples' relationship quality, including the level of commitment partners felt toward their relationship and the level of support and affection they felt toward each other. There is also some evidence that the programs helped couples avoid destructive conflict behaviors, although they did not improve

the use of constructive conflict behaviors or relationship happiness. The programs increased the likelihood that couples were married at the one-year follow-up by about 4 percentage points (63 percent for the program group versus 59 percent for the control group). They also improved couples' co-parenting relationships. The sensitivity tests confirm the main study findings that these programs had favorable impacts on couples' relationship quality and status. Across the four tests, we found favorable impacts on couples' level of support and affection, and their relationship commitment. We also found favorable impacts on the likelihood that couples were married at follow-up. The tests also provided additional evidence that the programs had positive impacts on the quality of couples' co-parenting relationships. There is weaker evidence of favorable impacts on couples' ability to avoid destructive conflict behaviors and women's reported earnings. The programs did not affect other outcomes.

**Table II.6. Sign and statistical significance of impacts on confirmatory outcomes, by estimation method**

Domain	Outcome	Main	No covariates	No outcome imputation	No weights	No adjustment
Relationship quality	Support and affection	++	++	+	++	+
	Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors	+	+	o	+	o
	Constructive conflict behaviors	o	o	o	o	o
	Relationship commitment	++	++	++	++	++
	Relationship happiness	o	+	o	o	o
Relationship status	Couple married to each other	++	++	+	++	++
	Couple married or romantically involved	o	o	o	o	o
Co-parenting	Quality of co-parenting relationship	++	++	+	++	+
Labor market success	Women's earnings, survey	+	o	+	o	o
	Women's earnings, administrative	o	o	n.a.	o	o
	Men's earnings, survey	o	o	o	o	o
	Men's earnings, administrative	o	o	n.a.	o	o

Source: Follow-up survey administered by Mathematica Policy Research and OCSE's NDNH database.

+++ / ++ / + Statistically significant positive impact at the .01 / .05 / .10 level.

--- / -- / - / 0 / - Statistically significant negative impact at the .01 / .05 / .10 level.

o No statistically significant impact.

n.a. = not applicable.

---

### III MEASURING AND ANALYZING COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS

---

The central aim of the HM programs in PACT was to improve the stability and quality of the relationships of participating couples. The core service of both programs was the marriage and relationship skills workshop, during which a male-female facilitator pair provided relationship skills education on topics such as communication skills, compromise, and problem solving (Zaveri and Baumgartner 2016). For the impact analysis, the study team used relationship quality and status as key outcome domains for the confirmatory analysis (that is, assessment of the programs' effects). We considered intimate partner violence to be an additional domain, even though the absence of violence is a key characteristic of a high quality, healthy relationship. This is because reducing intimate partner violence was not one of the PACT HM programs' central goals and this topic was not explicitly covered in the workshops. Further, both programs excluded couples if there was evidence of severe unilateral violence against the female partner. Tables A.2 and A.3 in Appendix A present impact findings related to these domains. In the rest of this chapter, we provide more detailed information on the measures.

#### A. Development and testing of relationship quality measures

Relationship quality is a multidimensional concept (Carrano et al. 2003; Fincham et al. 2007). Thus, we examined several measures, each representing a different aspect of relationship quality. In creating and selecting relationship quality measures, we sought to capture empirically distinct and conceptually important dimensions of relationship quality from the follow-up survey with as small a list of measures as possible. When designing the survey, we examined the relationship quality measures that researchers have included in other studies of relationship-strengthening programs, such as the Building Strong Families study (Wood et al. 2012). As necessary, we adapted these questions to be appropriate for a study sample comprising married and unmarried low-income couples. For some relationship dimensions, valid scales or measures were not available. In these cases, in consultation with experts and stakeholders in the relationship education field, we created and pretested new survey items or adapted questions from existing surveys and scales. When necessary, we adapted questions to be appropriate for the study sample and telephone survey administration.

Because many of the scale measures had been used in other studies, we conducted a factor analysis to confirm that a measure was appropriate for our study sample. Factor analysis is a statistical method that examines the correlations between a list of variables (or survey items) and demonstrates how the set of observed variables can be represented by a smaller number of underlying (and unobserved) factors. Because most of the items were subsets of existing measures that had been validated previously, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis to determine if the survey items loaded in the same way as in the research sample used in their development. In other words, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis to determine if the proposed scale measure was supported by the data. For each scale measure, we described the existing scale from which we drew to create the measure and provided details on how we changed the scale for this analysis.

As a second step, we assessed how well the group of items we identified in the first step focused on a single idea or construct, known as the scale's internal consistency. We measured the internal consistency of multi-item scales using Cronbach's alpha, a standard statistic for

assessing the strength of the correlations between the items included in a scale. It ranges from a minimum of zero to a maximum of one. A high Cronbach's alpha value means that all measures contributing to the scale are related and could measure the same underlying concept. We considered any scale measure with internal consistency of at least 0.60 to have acceptable reliability (Churchill and Peter 1984). In the remainder of this chapter and Chapters IV through V, we report Cronbach's alpha when describing scale measures.

## **B. Constructing couple-level outcomes**

We constructed the relationship quality and relationship status measures as couple-level outcomes that incorporated what both members of a couple said about the status of the relationship at the time of the follow-up survey. This practice is consistent with that used in the Building Strong Families evaluation (Moore et al. 2012). By using information on relationship status and quality gathered from both partners, we ensured that both partners' views of the relationship are reflected and avoided basing the success of HM programs in PACT on the perspectives of women (or men) only. Additionally, by focusing the primary analyses on couple-level (rather than individual-level) variables, the analyses included a smaller number of variables, thus reducing concerns about multiple comparisons. However, we also examined some relationship outcomes at the individual level in the secondary analysis, which can inform our interpretation of the impacts.

This approach to constructing relationship quality and status measures raised two issues: (1) what to do when two members of a couple gave conflicting responses; and (2) what to do when this information was available for only one of two members of a couple.

**What to do when partners disagreed?** When partners gave discrepant responses on relationship quality or status, our approach differed for measures of relationship quality and status.

We did not necessarily expect couples to agree on relationship quality, as the same relationship can be experienced by each partner in a different way. Partners may have disagreed on relationship quality because partners may have felt differently about the relationship (for example, one was satisfied and one was not) or because each partner behaved differently (for example, one partner was supportive or affectionate and the other less so). Further, research suggests that there may be gender differences in not only the level of satisfaction experienced by married men and women (Bernard 1972) but also the bases of their marital satisfaction (Rhyne 1981). Discrepant responses on relationship quality thus likely reflected different, but equally valid, relationship experiences. Accordingly, we constructed couple-level relationship quality measures as the average of the two partners' responses.

However, we generally expected couples to agree about their relationship status. This expectation is supported by the data. At follow-up, 94 percent agreed on whether they were married at follow-up, and 95 percent agreed on whether they were romantically involved.

The small percentage of couples who disagreed about their relationship status might have done so because the relationship status was ambiguous or the two members of the couple perceived the same situation differently. For example, one partner might have characterized their relationship as on-again/off-again, whereas the other member might have considered the

romantic relationship to be stable, or one partner could have reported they were married even if the marriage was not legally recognized. A second reason for inconsistent responses could be that the couple's relationship status changed between interviews. Partners were usually interviewed within a few weeks of each other.<sup>8</sup> However, in some instances, we conducted their interviews two or three months apart, or longer. The further apart the two interviews, the greater the likelihood their relationship status changed between interviews.

Given the ambiguity involved in interpreting discrepant relationship status responses, we used a simple rule in which we categorized a couple as married or romantically involved only if both members of the couple reported this status. When there was a discrepancy between the two statuses, the couple was assigned to the "no" category for that particular question (for example, "not romantically involved" or "not married").

**What to do when one member of the couple's response was missing?** We considered measures of relationship quality and status to be defined if *either* member of the couple responded to the survey, as in the Building Strong Families evaluation. Defining the variables in this way increased our response rates and sample sizes, and thus our power to detect impacts. It also had the advantage of using more available information and making our analysis sample as representative as possible of the population of couples included in the evaluation.

For cases in which one partner's response was missing, we imputed the outcomes using the multiple imputation approach described in Chapter II. These imputations were strengthened by the fact that partners' responses were correlated. As described above, partners generally agreed about their relationship status. Therefore, the relationship status reported by one partner was an excellent predictor of what the other partner would have said, greatly improving the precision of our imputations. For relationship quality, although partners may have had different perspectives about their relationships, their assessments of the relationship were correlated. For example, at baseline, the correlation between partners' reports of relationship happiness was 0.49. The imputations used the nonresponding partner's baseline perspective about their relationship, which also correlated with perspectives at follow-up. For example, among responding partners, we found the correlations between baseline and follow-up relationship happiness to be 0.49.

### **C. Relationship status (key domain)**

A key assessment of the success of HM programs in PACT involved examining whether they promoted stable relationships among participating couples. As shown in Table III.1, we examined two primary outcomes measuring relationship status: (1) whether the two partners were married to each other, and (2) whether they were romantically involved at the time of the follow-up survey. To supplement our confirmatory analysis, we also analyzed secondary outcomes, such as whether couples were living together and whether they reported either being married or engaged with a wedding date set.

---

<sup>8</sup> About 50 percent of partners were interviewed on the same day, 75 percent within 17 days of each other, and 90 percent within 68 days of each other.

## 1. Primary measures

**Couple is married.** In the follow-up survey, participants were asked to report on whether they and their PACT partners were married, divorced, separated, or never married to each other. We considered couples to be married if both partners reported they were married to each other.

**Couple is romantically involved.** To be considered romantically involved, both partners had to report any one of the following statuses: (1) married, (2) romantically involved on a steady basis, or (3) in an on-again and off-again relationship. As examples, we classified couples as romantically involved if both partners reported being in an on-again and off-again relationship or if one partner reported they were in an on-again and off-again relationship and the other partner reported they were married.

## 2. Secondary measures

To supplement our confirmatory analysis of PACT HM program impacts on the couple's relationship status, we analyzed several secondary measures.

**Couple lives together all or most of the time.** In the follow-up survey, participants were asked whether they currently were living with their partner in the same household all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time. We constructed a binary indicator of whether both members of the couple reported living with the other partner all or most of the time. If at least one member of the couple reported that they lived with their partner some or none of the time, we coded the couple as not living together.

**Couple lives together all of the time.** We constructed a binary indicator of whether both members of the couple reported living with the other partner all of the time. If at least one member of the couple reported that they lived with their partner most, some, or none of the time, we coded the couple as not living together all of the time.

**Couple is married or engaged with a wedding date.** If respondents reported that they were not married to their partner but were in a romantic relationship (either on a steady basis or on-again and off-again), the follow-up survey asked them if they were engaged to be married to their partner. If the respondent answered yes, the survey asked the respondent when they were planning to get married. On the basis of their responses, we constructed a binary indicator of whether both members of the couple reported either being married to each other or engaged with a wedding date set.

**Table III.1. Measures of relationship status**

Outcome	Measure	Priority level
Married	Whether both partners report they are married to each other	Primary
Married or romantically involved	Whether both partners report they are married to each other, in a steady romantic relationship, or in an on-and-off again relationship with each other	Primary
Living together all or most of the time	Whether both partners report living with the other partner "all" or "most" of the time	Secondary
Couple living together all of the time	Whether both partners report living with the other partner "all" of the time	Secondary

Outcome	Measure	Priority level
Married or engaged with a wedding date set	Whether both partners report they are married or engaged with a wedding date set	Secondary

**D. Relationship quality (key domain)**

We examined program impacts on five primary relationship quality measures: (1) support and affection, (2) avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors, (3) constructive conflict behaviors, (4) relationship commitment, and (5) relationship happiness. To supplement our confirmatory analysis, we analyzed secondary measures, such as the couple’s perceptions of changes in the relationship and fidelity. We provide a detailed description of each measure below and in Table III.2. As an additional secondary analysis, we also analyzed individual-level measures of all outcomes (primary and secondary) separately for males and females.

**1. Primary measures**

**Support and affection.** The follow-up survey asked respondents about the degree to which they agreed with 13 statements regarding their relationship. The survey items were developed for the Building Strong Families study (Moore et al. 2012). The statements reflected positive relationship traits such as support, intimacy, friendship, commitment, and trust. For example, respondents were asked their level of agreement with the following statements: “[PARTNER] listens to me when I need someone to talk to,” “I trust [PARTNER] completely,” and “[PARTNER] encourages or helps me to do things that are important to me.” For each statement, the survey provided four response options: “strongly disagree”, “disagree”, “agree” and “strongly agree.” We assigned each response option a number from one to four, with higher numbers indicating greater agreement with the statement. We created a partner-level measure of support and affection by averaging each individual’s responses to all 13 statements. For the couple-level outcome measure, we took the average value of the two partner-level measures. The couple-level scale (based on each partners’ responses to 13 items) showed a high level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.95.

**Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors.** The follow-up survey asked respondents about the frequency with which they and their partners engaged in 10 negative conflict behaviors. The statements were drawn from the Gottman Sound Relationship House Questionnaires (Gottman 1999). They reflected criticism or contempt the partners demonstrate toward each other; their tendency to escalate or withdraw from arguments, or engage in personal attacks; and other harmful behaviors associated with conflict. For example, respondents were asked their level of agreement with the following statements: “Little arguments turn into ugly fights with accusations, criticisms, name calling, or bringing up past hurts,” “When we argue, one of us is going to say something we will regret,” and “When we argue, one of us withdraws and refuses to talk about it anymore.” For each statement, the respondent was provided with four response options: “never,” “almost never,” “sometimes,” or “often.” We assigned each response option a number from one to four, with higher numbers indicating more limited use of negative conflict behaviors. We created a partner-level measure by averaging each individual’s responses to all 10 statements. For the couple-level outcome measure, we took the average of the partner-

level responses. The scale showed an acceptable level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.93.

**Constructive conflict behaviors.** The follow-up survey asked respondents seven questions about the frequency with which they used constructive conflict behaviors with their partner. For example, respondents were asked about their level of agreement with the following statements: "During arguments, we are good at taking breaks when we need them," and "Even when arguing we can keep a sense of humor." We drew these statements from the Gottman Sound Relationship House Questionnaires (Gottman 1999). For each statement, the respondent was provided with four response options: "never," "almost never," "sometimes," or "often." We assigned each response option a number from one to four, with higher numbers indicating greater use of constructive behaviors. We created a partner-level measure by averaging each individual's responses across these statements. For the couple-level outcome measure, we took the average of the partner-level responses. The scale showed an acceptable level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83.

**Relationship commitment.** The follow-up survey asked each respondent the following question: "On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all committed and 10 is completely committed, how committed are you to your [marriage/relationship] with [PARTNER]?" This survey item was developed for the PACT study. For the couple-level outcome measure, we averaged the responses provided by each partner.

**Relationship happiness.** The follow-up survey asked each respondent the following question: "On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all happy and 10 is completely happy, how happy would you say your relationship with [PARTNER] is?" The statements were modified from the Building Strong Families study (Moore et al. 2012). For the couple-level outcome measure, we averaged the responses provided by each partner.

## 2. Secondary measures

**Perceptions of changes in the relationship.** The follow-up survey asked each respondent whether they agreed with five statements about improvements in the quality of their relationship in the past year. For example, respondents were asked about their level of agreement with the following statements: "I feel closer to [PARTNER] than I did a year ago," and "[PARTNER] and I have less trouble working out disagreements than we did a year ago." These questions were developed for PACT. For each statement, the respondent was provided four response options: "strongly disagree," "disagree," "agree," or "strongly agree." We assigned each response option a number from one to four, with higher numbers indicating greater agreement that their relationship had improved. We created partner-level measures by averaging the respondents' responses to these five statements. For the couple-level measure, we took the average of the partner-level measures. The measure had an acceptable level of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.89.

**Fidelity.** On the follow-up survey, respondents were asked whether they had cheated on their partner since the time of random assignment. They were also asked whether they believed their partner had cheated on them during this time. For this latter question, the survey provided four response options: "definitely yes", "probably yes", "probably no" and "definitely no." The questions were drawn from the Building Strong Families 15-month Survey. We created a binary

indicator of whether neither partner indicated that they themselves had been unfaithful nor had they reported that their partner had “definitely” been unfaithful.

**Partner-specific measures.** We constructed the primary measures in the relationship quality domain at the couple level (as described above). As part of the secondary analysis, we also examined men’s and women’s responses separately (Table III.2). Except for the fidelity measure, we created the female-specific measures based on the responses of the female partner and the male-specific measures based on the responses of the male partner. For the individual-level measure of fidelity, we constructed the measure based on reports from both partners about the individual in question. The individual-level measures of support and affection for men and women showed high internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alphas of 0.95 for males and 0.95 for females. The individual-level measures of constructive conflict behaviors showed an acceptable level of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alphas of 0.81 for males and 0.85 for females), as did the individual-level measures of avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors (0.93 for males and 0.93 for females).

**Table III.2. Measures of relationship quality**

Outcomes	Measure	Priority level
Support and affection	Average across partners of individual responses to 13 survey questions; variable ranges from 1 to 4, with higher values indicating greater perceived support and affection in the couple relationship	Primary
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors	Average across partners of individual responses to 10 survey questions; variable ranges from 1 to 4, with higher values indicating lower frequency of destructive conflict behaviors	Primary
Constructive conflict behaviors	Average across partners of individual responses to seven survey questions; variable ranges from 1 to 4, with higher values indicating greater frequency of positive conflict behaviors	Primary
Relationship commitment	Average across partners of reported commitment; variable ranges from 1 to 10, with higher values indicating greater average reported commitment	Primary
Relationship happiness	Average across partners of reported happiness with the relationship; variable ranges from 1 to 10, with higher values indicating greater average happiness in the relationship	Primary
Perceived changes in relationship	Average across partners of individual responses to five survey questions; variable ranges from 1 to 4, with higher values indicating greater agreement among the partners that their relationship has improved over the past year	Secondary
Fidelity	Whether both partners have been sexually faithful (neither partner reports having cheated on their partner or that the other partner “definitely” has cheated on them) since the date of random assignment	Secondary
Partner-specific measures	Individual-level measures of support and affection, avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors, constructive conflict behaviors, relationship commitment, relationship happiness, perceived changes in relationship, and fidelity, analyzed separately for males and females	Secondary

### **E. Intimate partner violence (additional domain)**

We examined whether HM programs in PACT reduced the incidence of intimate partner violence (IPV) among participating couples (as reported by the woman in each couple). We

considered this domain additional because domestic services were not a core service of these programs. As described in Chapter I, both programs excluded couples if there was evidence of severe unilateral violence against the female partner. Among those who enrolled in PACT, both programs referred couples to their DV partner if they suspected that DV was an issue in the couple’s relationship. For these reasons, we considered IPV an additional domain. Below, we describe the primary and secondary measures in this domain. (See Table III.3.)

### 1. Primary measure

**Any severe physical assault.** The follow-up survey asked female respondents a series of questions about the prevalence of violence in their relationships with their PACT HM program partner. We drew the questions from the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus et al. 1996)—specifically, they mirrored the seven types of assault from the physical assault subscale of the CTS2 categorized by the scale developers as “severe” rather than “minor.” For example, respondents were asked if over the past year their partner committed violence against them by using a knife or gun, punching or hitting with something that could hurt, or burning or scalding on purpose. We created a binary indicator of whether the female partner reported experiencing at least one of the seven types of severe physical assault by her program partner in the past year.

### 2. Secondary measures

**Any physical assault.** In addition to the “severe” assault measures discussed above, the follow-up survey asked respondents about five other types of physical assault that the CTS2 scale developers categorized as “minor.” For example, partners were asked if their PACT HM partner threw something that could hurt them, or pushed or shoved, or slapped them. We constructed a binary indicator of whether the female partner reported experiencing any severe physical assault or at least one of the five types of minor physical assault by her PACT HM partner in the past year.

**Multiple severe physical assaults.** We constructed a binary indicator of whether the female partner reported that she had experienced more than one type of severe physical assault in the previous year.

**Any sexual coercion.** The follow-up survey asked female respondents whether during the previous year their PACT HM partner had used force or threats to make them have sex or do sexual things they did not want to do. We constructed a binary indicator of whether the female respondent reported “yes” to this question.

**Any severe physical assault or sexual coercion.** We constructed a binary indicator of whether the female respondent reported that she experienced any of the seven severe physical assault behaviors or reported experiencing sexual coercion.

**Table III.3. Measures of intimate partner violence**

Outcomes	Measure	Priority level
Any severe physical assault	Binary variable indicating whether female partner reported experiencing any of 7 types of severe physical assault by the partner in the past year	Primary
Any physical assault	Binary variable indicating whether female partner reported experiencing any of 12 types of physical assault by the partner in the past year	Secondary

---

Outcomes	Measure	Priority level
Multiple severe physical assaults	Binary variable indicating whether female partner reported experiencing more than one of the 7 types of severe physical assault by the partner in the past year	Secondary
Any sexual coercion	Binary variable indicating whether female partner reported experiencing any sexual coercion by the partner (partner used “force or threats to make you have sex or do sexual things you didn’t want to do”) in the past year	Secondary
Any severe physical assault or sexual coercion	Binary variable indicating whether female partner reported experiencing any of 7 types of severe physical assault or sexual coercion by the partner in the past year	Secondary

---

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

---

## IV MEASURING AND ANALYZING PARENTING

---

The HM programs in PACT offered couples tools intended to foster healthy relationships, including communication skills, conflict management, and co-parenting strategies (Zaveri and Baumgartner 2016). This content could improve not only the couples' romantic relationship but also their co-parenting skills—that is, how couples coordinate on parenting a child, support each other, and manage conflict regarding child rearing. For this reason, we examined program impacts on the co-parenting relationship and classified co-parenting as a key domain.

Research has shown that a father's relationship quality with his partner is positively associated with the quality of his relationships with the children—a pattern generally not observed for mothers (Almeida et al. 1999; Kouros et al. 2014). Thus, improvements in couples' relationship quality might have beneficial spillover effects on a father's parenting. For this reason, we examined impacts on father involvement. We considered father involvement an additional domain because it is less central to the goals of HM programs in PACT.

Table A.4 in Appendix A presents impact findings related to these domains. In the rest of this chapter, we provide more detailed information on the measures.

### A. Co-parenting relationship (key domain)

By enhancing couples' relationship and communication skills, and increasing the likelihood that they are in committed romantic relationships, HM programs in PACT might also enhance the quality of the co-parenting relationship. Enhancement of these skills could persist even if couples are no longer romantically involved if they continue to apply them in their relationship as parents. To examine the impact of these programs on co-parenting, we measured the quality of the co-parenting relationship using a single summary measure of 10 items drawn from the Parenting Alliance Inventory (PAI), a well-established 20-item scale of the quality of the co-parenting relationship created by Abidin and Brunner (1995). The 10 items on the follow-up survey represented a subset of items from the full PAI originally selected in consultation with Dr. Abidin for use in the Building Strong Families evaluation. These items indicated whether respondents thought that they and their PACT partner communicated well in their co-parenting roles and were a good co-parenting team. Using a four-point scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree), sample members were asked to state their level of agreement with each statement.

For this analysis, we created the quality of co-parenting relationship scale measure by averaging both partners' responses to the 10 items to create a couple-level outcome. The couple-level measure has a high level of internal consistency; the Cronbach's alpha was 0.94. This measure was defined for all couples who completed the follow-up—regardless of whether they were in a romantic relationship at the follow-up or had a focal child. If only one member of the couple responded to the survey, the value for the missing survey response was imputed using the methods described in Chapter II. We also created this measure separately for men and women to be analyzed as secondary outcomes: Cronbach's alphas for mothers and fathers were 0.95 and 0.93, respectively.

## B. Parenting skills (additional domain)

Research has shown that marital or relationship quality and parenting quality are positively linked (Krishnakumar and Buehler 2000). Therefore, HM programs in PACT could affect parenting because it targets relationship quality.

The quality of a co-parenting relationship might influence the parenting skills of men and women differently. Research has shown that a father's relationship quality with his partner is positively associated with his relationship with his children (Almeida et al. 1999). In contrast, studies have shown that mothers tend to invest more in the relationship with their children when experiencing relationship conflict with their partner or spouse (Kouros et al. 2014). On the basis of these research findings, we hypothesized that improvements in couples' relationship quality might have beneficial spillover effects on a father's parenting skills but uncertain effects on women's parenting. If mothers do indeed respond to relationship conflict by investing more in their relationship with their children, then services aiming to improve relationship quality might also unintentionally have a negative effect on women's parenting practices. Because of this uncertainty, we classified fathers' outcomes in this domain as primary and mothers' outcomes as secondary.<sup>9</sup>

### 1. Primary measures

**Fathers' engagement in parenting activities.** The follow-up survey asked all fathers to report how often in the past month they had engaged in certain caregiving or play activities with the focal child. The activities depended on the age of the focal child. For example, if the focal child was 5 years or younger, the survey asked the respondent about how often he or she fed, read books to, told stories to, or played with the focal child. For older focal children, the survey asked respondents about activities such as helping the child with homework and talking with the child about things in which he/she is especially interested. Most questions were drawn from or modified from surveys related to the Supporting Healthy Marriage evaluation (Lowenstein et al. 2014). Responses were recorded on a four-point scale ranging from "very often" to "never." We assigned each response category a number ranging from 1 to 4, with higher values for greater engagement in the activity. The final measure represents the average value of the father's responses across caregiving activities. The scale had an acceptable level of internal consistency across each age group for focal children.<sup>10</sup> Specifically, the measure's alpha coefficients for responses pertaining to focal children by age were 0.68 (ages 0–5), 0.82 (ages 6–15), and 0.81 (ages 16–21).

**Fathers' nurturing behaviors.** The follow-up survey included a series of questions to assess fathers' engagement in nurturing behaviors with the focal child. Depending on the age of the child, fathers were asked how often they engaged in (1) showing patience with the child when he/she is upset, (2) praising the child when he/she behaves well or meets a goal, (3) talking to the child about how things are going at work or school, (4) and encouraging the child to talk

---

<sup>9</sup> For this reason, the main impact report refers to this domain as "father involvement" rather than "parenting skills."

<sup>10</sup> Although the items that comprised the scale varied across the age of the focal child, the conceptual meaning and basic principles behind the scale would be the same. Moreover, this approach has been used in other studies that examine father engagement across different child ages (for example, Eggebeen and Knoester 2001).

about his/her feelings. The survey asked fathers of focal children ages 0 to 5 about the first two behaviors, whereas the questions for fathers of focal children ages 6 to 21 addressed all four behaviors. The questions were drawn from the Parenting Practices Questionnaire (Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995). For each question, the response options were “never,” “once in a while,” “somewhat often,” and “very often.”

We calculated a score for each father by taking the average value of a father’s responses across all statements. The resulting scale ranged from 0 to 3, with higher values indicating greater use of nurturing behavior with the focal child. For children ages 6 to 21, the scale had high internal consistency (alpha coefficient = 0.75). For focal children younger than age 6, the proposed scale consisted of only two points, so a test of internal consistency was not possible. However, we found that the items correlated modestly (correlation coefficient = 0.30).

## 2. Secondary measures

**Mothers’ engagement in parenting activities.** We constructed this measure similarly to the measure of fathers’ engagement (described above), with one exception: we did not include mothers in this analysis if their focal child’s age was 5 or younger. Most of these mothers reported engaging with their children very often—that is, there was little variation in the data. We therefore constructed the measure only for mothers whose focal child was ages 6 to 21. We found the measure to be internally consistent: Cronbach’s alpha was 0.78 (focal child ages 6–15) and 0.78 (focal child ages 16–21).

**Mothers’ nurturing behaviors.** This measure was constructed in a similar way to the measure of fathers’ nurturing behaviors (described above), with one exception: we did not include mothers in this analysis if their focal child’s age was 5 or younger. Most of these mothers reported engaging in these behaviors very often, with little variation in the data. For couples whose focal child’s age was 6 or greater, we found the scale to be internally consistent (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.75).

**Disciplinary approach.** HM programs in PACT may influence participants’ disciplinary approach. By emphasizing the importance of resolving conflicts using nonviolent methods, the programs may have influenced parents to adopt a more nonviolent disciplinary approach and reduce their use of harsh discipline. A nonviolent disciplinary approach is characterized as having clear expectations and consequences for the child, yet allowing for flexibility and collaborative problem solving with the child when dealing with behavioral challenges. Prior studies have shown that couples experiencing less conflict are less likely to use more punitive forms of discipline, such as spanking or yelling at child (Almeida et al. 1999; Buehler and Gerard 2002). We examined PACT HM programs’ impacts on nonviolent and verbal discipline.

- **Nonviolent discipline.** For this measure, we drew a question from the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale (PC-CTS; Straus 1979), a widely used 22-item scale. The follow-up survey asked respondents how often they took away the [FOCAL CHILD]’s activities or belongings as a consequence of doing something wrong. Response options were recorded on a four-point scale, ranging from “very often” to “never.” We assigned each response a numeric value response, ranging from 0 (never) to 3 (very often). We examined this outcome separately for men and women.

- Verbal discipline.** We drew one question from the PC-CTS scale to measure respondents' frequency of verbally disciplining the focal child in ways that could be considered harsh, such as shouting or screaming. This question was asked of respondents whose focal child was ages 3 to 21. For this question, the response options were "never," "once in a while," "somewhat often," and "very often." We assigned each category a number ranging from 0 to 3, with higher numbers for greater frequency of verbal discipline with the focal child. We examined this outcome separately for men and women. (See Table IV.1.)

**Table IV.1. Measures of parenting**

Outcome	Measure	Priority level
<b>Co-parenting relationship (key domain)</b>		
Quality of co-parenting relationship	Scale of 10 items drawn from Parenting Alliance Inventory (Abidin and Brunner 1995); created by averaging mothers' and fathers' responses to all 10 items	Primary
<b>Parenting skills (additional domain)</b>		
Fathers' engagement in parenting activities	Scale of nine items related to parenting activities with the focal child, such as reading books or telling stories and playing during the past month	Primary
Fathers' nurturing behaviors	Average of how frequently father used nurturing behaviors with the focal child, such as showing patience when the child is upset or encouraging the child to talk about his/her feelings	Primary
Mothers' engagement in parenting activities	Scale of nine items related to parenting activities with the focal child, such as reading books or telling stories and playing during the past month	Secondary
Mothers' nurturing behaviors	Average of how frequently mother used nurturing behaviors with the focal child, such as showing patience when the child is upset or encouraging the child to talk about his/her feelings	Secondary
Nonviolent discipline of focal child <sup>a</sup>	Average of how frequently the partner used age-appropriate, nonviolent disciplinary tactics (taking away privileges or explaining why something was wrong, for example) when the focal child (ages 3–21) did something wrong	Secondary
Verbal discipline of focal child <sup>a</sup>	How frequently the partner shouts, yells, or screams at the focal child (ages 3–21): 0 = never, 1 = once in a while, 2 = somewhat often, 3 = very often	Secondary

<sup>a</sup>We examined this outcome measure for mothers and fathers separately.

## V MEASURING AND ANALYZING ECONOMIC STABILITY

---

The PACT HM grantees supplemented relationship education services by offering services related to job and career advancement and financial management. These low-intensity economic stability services included a brief stand-alone job and career advancement workshop in both sites, as well as supplemental economic stability material integrated into core relationship skills workshops in the Supporting Healthy Relationships program (Zaveri and Baumgartner 2016). We classified labor market success as a key domain. As part of our additional analysis, we also examined program impacts on perceptions of economic improvement.

Table A.5 in Appendix A presents impact findings related to these domains. In the rest of this chapter, we provide more detailed information on the measures.

### A. Labor market success (key domain)

Participants in the programs had substantial labor market challenges. In 45 percent of couples, at least one partner did not have a high school diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (GED). Moreover, in about half of the couples, only one partner worked for pay; in 13 percent, neither partner worked. In response to the labor market needs of the target population, both programs offered job and career advancement services to couples. Therefore, labor market outcomes are an important part of the assessment of PACT HM's effectiveness in achieving its goals.

#### 1. Data sources for labor market success measures

To assess the impact of HM programs in PACT on participant's labor market success, we created measures using two data sources: (1) information reported by sample members on the follow-up survey and (2) administrative records collected from the NDNH database operated by OCSE. We examined earnings using both NDNH and survey data because each data source has both strengths and limitations.

The earnings data from NDNH and the survey data should be considered complementary. NDNH data are available for a longer reference period (up to two years) for some couples in the PACT HM sample. In addition, the data are accessible even if sample members did not complete the follow-up survey. As a result, impact estimates for outcomes constructed using NDNH are less likely to be affected by nonresponse bias. However, the NDNH data were not accessible to the PACT team if the couple member did not provide a correct SSN; OCSE was unable to match sample members successfully for about one-third of the sample (Table II.4). In addition, NDNH data do not capture informal employment or any jobs not covered by unemployment insurance (UI). In contrast, the follow-up survey asked couple members about formal employment as well as the temporary, part-time, under-the-table, and informal employment common among low-wage workers but typically not covered by UI benefits. However, survey reports of earnings might be more likely to be subject to reporting error.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Income underreporting in survey data is well documented and particularly common for low-income populations (Moore et al. 2000; Cody and Tuttle 2002; Meyer et al. 2009; Bound et al. 1994). However, employers may also underreport earnings to evade paying taxes and often do so (Abraham et al. 2013).

## 2. Primary measures

We examined two primary measures of labor market success (Table V.1), examining these outcomes separately for males and females.

**Earnings from administrative and survey data as primary outcome measures.** We examined earnings using both administrative records (NDNH data) and survey data. By examining earnings from both data sources, we reduced the risk of missing an impact the programs may have had on earnings either in formal or informal jobs. This approach—focusing on earnings and using both administrative and survey data—has been widely used in prior studies of the impacts of employment and training programs on low-income individuals. Earlier studies that used this approach include those examining Parents’ Fair Share, Job Corps, the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA), Workforce Investment Act (WIA), and Child Support Noncustodial Parent Employment Demonstration (CSPED) (see Barnow and Smith 2015 for a comprehensive review of many of these earlier studies).

We examined two earnings outcomes as the primary measures of program effectiveness in the labor market success domain:

- **Average monthly earnings during the year after random assignment: administrative data.** This outcome measure was based on administrative records of employee wages in the NDNH data. We defined the one-year follow-up period as the first four complete calendar quarters following random assignment.<sup>12</sup> We created the measure by summing quarterly earnings data across the year and then dividing by 12. We assigned a value of zero for respondents who were matched to NDNH data but did not have reported earnings during the one-year follow-up. As described previously, we excluded respondents who were not matched to NDNH data from this analysis. We constructed the earnings for males and females separately.
- **Average monthly earnings during the three months before the follow-up survey: survey data.** The follow-up survey included information on job stop and start dates and pay rates for formal jobs, as well as earnings from informal jobs. We combined this information to construct average monthly earnings in all reported jobs for the three months before the follow-up survey interview.

**Table V.1. Measures of labor market success**

Outcomes	Measures	Priority level
Monthly earnings: administrative records	Average monthly earnings created by summing quarterly earnings data across the four quarters following random assignment and then dividing by 12	Primary

<sup>12</sup> We did not include the calendar quarter during which enrollment occurred as part of the follow-up period. If we had done so, the follow-up period would typically include the time before program enrollment, when no services were provided to the program group. For example, a sample member who enrolled in November 2013 (Quarter 4) would not have received services during the first month of the quarter. Our approach defined the follow-up period for this respondent as Quarters 1 through 4 of 2014. This approach aligns with those of other recent evaluations using NDNH data (McConnell et al. 2016).

Outcomes	Measures	Priority level
Monthly earnings: survey report	Average monthly earnings from all jobs during the three months before the follow-up survey	Primary
Employment status: survey report	Ever employed during the three months before the follow-up survey	Secondary
Employment status: administrative records	Ever employed any time during the first year after random assignment	Secondary
Employment stability: administrative records	Number of quarters of longest employment spell during the year after random assignment	Secondary
Monthly earnings across two years: administrative records	Average monthly earnings for two years after random assignment (for sample members with at least two years of administrative data)	Secondary
Employment with fringe benefits: survey reports	Whether any employment during the three months before the follow-up survey provided fringe benefits	Secondary
Type of employment: survey reports	Whether ever or currently employed in a regular full-time or part-time job during the three months before the follow-up survey	Secondary

Note: For all measures, we created separate versions for women and men.

### 3. Secondary measures

To supplement our confirmatory analysis, we examined PACT’s impacts on a longer list of additional measures of labor market success. These additional analyses provided more details on the specific aspects of labor market success that PACT may have affected. The secondary outcomes also allow us to assess the robustness of the results regarding the specific definitions chosen for the primary outcomes.

The list of secondary outcome measures within the labor market success domain fall into four categories: (1) employment status; (2) employment stability; (3) earnings; and (4) job quality. Some of these measures supplement the primary analysis by examining a reference period different from that used with the primary measure.

**Employment status.** We constructed two secondary measures for employment status using survey and administrative data. Using survey data, we constructed a binary (yes/no) indicator of whether the respondent reported that he or she was ever employed in a formal or informal job during the three months before the follow-up survey. Using administrative data, we examined employment status during the year after random assignment for all sample members.

**Number of consecutive quarters employed in the first year.** We measured economic stability as the duration of the longest continuous employment spell during the first year after random assignment, measured using administrative data. We calculated this duration as the number of consecutive quarters (ranging from zero to four) in which the respondent had earnings reported in the NDNH data. For example, if a respondent worked only during Quarters 3 and 4 after random assignment, we assigned the value of two. If the respondent worked only during Quarters 2 and 4 after random assignment, we assigned this measure the value of one because the two quarters were not consecutive.

**Monthly earnings across two years.** To examine the programs' effect on earnings covering a wider range of time, we used a different reference period than that used with the primary measure, which pertained to earnings in the first year after random assignment—a period we could examine for all sample members. In the secondary analysis, we measured earnings over a two-year follow-up period. Specifically, we examined average earnings for two years after random assignment, using NDNH data. This measure was available to sample members who enrolled in the study in the second quarter of 2014 or earlier (about 60 percent of the sample).

**Fringe benefit.** For each formal job a respondent reported, the follow-up survey included a question on whether the job provided health insurance or membership in a health maintenance organization (HMO) or preferred provider organization (PPO) plan, or paid leave for holidays, vacation, or illness. We constructed a binary indicator of whether respondents were employed in a job offering any of these benefits during the three months before the follow-up survey.

**Type of employment.** For each paid job a partner reported having had in the past three months or currently, the follow-up survey included a question on what best described his or her work at that job. Response options included regular full-time or part-time employee, temporary help agency employee, self-employed, day laborer, or something else. The survey asked respondents who selected “something else” to describe their work. We constructed a binary indicator of whether the respondent ever worked or was currently working as a regular full-time or part-time employee during the three months before the follow-up survey.

## **B. Perceived economic well-being (additional domain)**

Perceived economic improvement captures each partner's subjective assessment of changes in their financial and employment situations. These subjective assessments augmented our understanding of direct measures of economic stability, such as earnings and employment stability. Because the purpose of this analysis is to better understand results related to direct measures of economic stability, we considered perceived economic well-being as an additional domain. Table V.2 provides a brief description of the outcomes in this domain. Impact estimates related to these outcomes are presented in Appendix A, Table A.6.

### **1. Primary measures**

**Better off financially now.** The HM programs in PACT may have affected perceived financial well-being in ways other than increasing current income. For example, programs' services could have provided couple members with access to training or social networks that could improve their perceived financial outlook (Helliwell 2006). The 12-month follow-up survey asked respondents “Are you better off financially now than you were a year ago?” This question was developed for PACT. To examine this outcome, we constructed a binary indicator of whether the respondent felt better off financially at the time of the survey than a year earlier, according to his or her response on the follow-up survey. We analyzed this outcome separately for men and women.

**Know how to handle bills better now.** PACT services covered financial management skills and financial literacy. Thus, PACT might have affected partners' ability to handle financial issues. The 12-month follow-up survey asked respondents “Do you know how to handle your money and bills better than you did a year ago?” This question was developed for PACT. We

constructed a binary indicator of whether the partner knew how to handle his or her money and bills better at the time of the follow-up survey compared to a year earlier. We analyzed this outcome separately for men and women.

## 2. Secondary measures

To provide context for the primary findings on job satisfaction, we examined two additional secondary measures:

**Whether satisfied with current job or taking steps to improve employment.** We also examined two components of job satisfaction: whether satisfied with current job or taking steps to improve employment. For this secondary measure, we created a binary indicator that equals one if couple members reported any of the three conditions: (1) he/she was employed in a job or jobs with which she/he was very satisfied, (2) she/he was taking steps or planning to take steps to find a better job if not very satisfied with the current job, or (3) she/he was taking steps or planning to take steps to find a job if he/she was unemployed.

**Whether has an updated resume.** Research has shown that certain job-search behaviors are significantly and positively related to not only the probability and speed of re-employment (Kanfer et al. 2001) but also employment quality (Saks et al. 2000). One common measure of job search behavior is whether one has prepared (or recently updated) a resume, which captures how “preparatory” dimension of job search (Kanfer et al. 2001). For fathers who were not very satisfied with their current job, we constructed a binary indicator of whether they had an updated resume.

**Table V.2. Measures of perceived economic well-being**

Outcomes	Measures	Priority level
Better off financially now	Whether feel better off financially now than a year ago	Primary
Know how to handle bills better now	Whether knows how to handle money and bills better now than a year ago	Primary
Whether satisfied with current job or taking steps to improve employment	Whether employed in a job or jobs with which the sample member is very satisfied, taking steps to find a better job (if employed but not very satisfied), or taking steps or planning to take steps to find a job (if unemployed)	Secondary
Has an updated resume	Whether has updated resume, among those not very satisfied with their job or jobs	Secondary

Note: For all measures, we created separate versions for women and men.

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

## VI MEASURING AND ANALYZING EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING

---

Both HM programs in PACT covered a group of topics related to emotional well-being, such as stress and coping, problem solving, and goal planning (Zaveri and Baumgartner 2016). Support from staff and peers during individual and group sessions may improve depressive symptoms, and fathers' well-being may have been indirectly affected through the program's effects on fathers' outcomes such as earnings and father involvement. For these reasons, we examined effects on depressive symptoms as part of our additional analysis of the effects of HM programs in PACT.

### A. Depressive symptoms (additional domain)

Although not a stipulation of HM grant funding, both HM programs in PACT covered a group of topics related to emotional well-being, such as stress and coping, problem solving, and goal planning (Zaveri and Baumgartner 2016). Relationship skills, such as being supportive of one another, communicating, and anger management, may also benefit individuals' emotional health. Further, support from staff and peers during individual and group sessions may improve depressive symptoms. For these reasons, we examined effects on depressive symptoms as part of our additional analysis. Table V.3 provides a brief description of the outcomes in this domain. Table A.6 in Appendix A includes impact estimates related to these outcomes.

#### 1. Primary outcomes

**Depressive symptoms.** The follow-up survey asked respondents eight questions about the frequency of their experiencing depressive symptoms in the past two weeks. The questions were drawn from the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-8) depression scale, which has been shown to be a valid diagnostic and severity measure of depressive symptoms in research (Kroenke et al. 2009). For each question, the survey provided four possible responses: (1) not at all, (2) several days, (3) more than half the days, and (4) nearly every day. We summed the numeric value of each partner's responses across the eight questions. The summary scale ranges from 0 to 24, with higher values reflecting more frequent depressive symptoms experienced by the respondent. The summary measure has an adequate level of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha was 0.88 for males and 0.89 for females).

#### 2. Secondary outcomes

**At risk of high or moderate depression.** We constructed a binary indicator of whether the respondent scored 10 or higher on the summary scale of frequency of depressive symptoms in the past two weeks. Past research has used such a score as the cutoff for moderate to severe depression (Kroenke et al. 2001; Kroenke et al. 2009).<sup>13</sup> Including both measures allowed us to examine impacts on both the frequency of depressive symptoms and risk of moderate to severe depression.

---

<sup>13</sup> The initial validation study of PHQ measures found that most patients (88 percent) with major depression had scores of 10 or greater. Thus, a score of 10 has been recommended as the cutoff score for diagnosing this condition (Kroenke et al. 2001).

**Table VI.1. Measures of depressive symptoms**

Outcomes	Measures	Priority level
Depressive symptoms	Frequency with which a respondent experienced depressive symptoms, created by summing a respondent's responses to eight questions from the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-8) depression scale	Primary
At risk of high or moderate depression	Whether the respondent was at risk for moderate to severe depression (score of 10 or higher) using the PHQ-8 depression scale	Secondary

Note: For all measures, we created separate versions for women and men.

---

## VII SUBGROUP ANALYSIS

---

To provide a comprehensive assessment of the HM programs in PACT, we examined whether the programs were more effective for certain subgroups of couples. As described in Chapter II, we designed the study with the goal of estimating impacts for the full sample of the couples enrolled in the study. However, program effects may have been moderated by who was served, where, and how (for example, Durlak and DuPre 2008; Pawson et al. 2005). To account for this possibility, we estimated program impacts separately for key subgroups.

In the remainder of this chapter, we describe the approach to conducting subgroup analysis, the process for evaluating the effectiveness of HM programs in PACT for these subgroups, and the results of the subgroup analysis. In Appendix B, we provide a full set of subgroup findings.

### A. Approach to conducting subgroup analysis

Subgroup analysis provides an opportunity to explore possible variations in the effectiveness of HM programs in PACT but also poses a risk of finding significant results by chance. An increase in the number of statistical tests increases the risk of a “false positive”—a statistically significant finding that does not reflect a true effect. To reduce this risk, we used three strategies:

1. **Limit the number of outcomes examined.** In the subgroup analysis, we examined impacts only on outcomes most central to the programs—primary measures within key domains. For the confirmatory analyses, there were 10 primary outcomes in the four key domains (relationship quality, relationship status, co-parenting skills, and labor market success). Across all the domains (key and additional), there were 41 outcomes (primary and secondary).
2. **Limit the number of subgroups examined.** Before beginning the impact analysis, we carefully selected a relatively short list of subgroups for which there was a reasonable expectation of variation in impacts. In addition, we sought subgroups with practical importance for program operations. Table VI.1 shows the complete list of subgroups.
3. **Feature only subgroup findings with strong patterns of impacts.** Although limiting the number of outcomes and subgroups reduced the number of comparisons, we were still concerned about the risk of finding statistically significant results by chance. Therefore, we reported subgroup results in the main report only if there was a strong pattern of impact differences across subgroup categories. For this purpose, we defined a strong pattern as a statistically significant difference between the two subgroup categories in at least two out of the four domains after adjusting for multiple comparisons using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. In an exception to this rule, before beginning the analysis, the team designated initial marital status as a priority subgroup that should be discussed in the main impact report regardless of the pattern of findings. An important contribution of the PACT HM evaluation is that it examines the effectiveness of offering HM services to a mix of married and unmarried low-income couples raising children. Prior research suggests that healthy marriage and relationship education (HMRE) programs might be more effective for married couples than unmarried couples (Hawkins and Erickson 2015). Therefore, it is important to examine if impacts differed based on whether couples were married at baseline.

## B. Subgroups for the impact analysis

For the PACT analysis, we focused on two types of subgroups. The first type was based on the couples' characteristics, which can be useful for targeting programs towards certain populations. The second type was at the site level and may provide guidance for future program development.

### 1. Subgroups based on sample characteristics

To explore whether program impacts varied by couples' characteristics, we defined subgroups related to four areas: (1) couple relationship, (2) demographics, (3) parenting, and (4) well-being.

#### a. Couple relationship

The couple's relationship was at the center of both programs. However, couples entered the program in different situations, and program effects might have varied based on relationship characteristics. We created subgroups based on two relationship characteristics:

- **Marital status (priority subgroup).** We examined subgroups based on marital status: (1) both partners reported they were married at the time of the PACT baseline versus (2) at least one partner reported they were not married at the time of the PACT baseline. At program entry, most couples were married (59 percent), but a sizable proportion were unmarried (41 percent).
- **Relationship quality by marital status.** We examined four subgroups based on initial relationship quality and marital status: (1) married couples with high relationship quality; (2) married couples with poor relationship quality; (3) unmarried couples with high relationship quality; and (4) unmarried couples with poor relationship quality.

#### b. Demographics

The programs might have affected couples differently depending on their demographic characteristics. We examined the results for subgroups based on two demographic characteristics:

- **Primary language.** We examined subgroups based on whether at least one partner reported his/her primary language was Spanish or any language other than English. Qualitative research emphasizes the importance of offering HMRE program services in Spanish (Perez et al. 2013). Including a Spanish-speaking facilitator helps programs connect with their participants. This finding may be important because more than three-quarters of the couples enrolled in the PACT HM study are Hispanic, and less than 40 percent of couples reported English as the primary language of both partners (see Table VI.1).
- **Both partners have high school education.** Educational attainment is linked with marriage and divorce (Raley et al. 2015) as well as socioeconomic well-being. Additionally, the couples in PACT in which both partners have a high school diploma may be better able to take advantage of the programs—for example, because they have fewer barriers or competing needs. We examined results for subgroups in which both partners had at least a

high school diploma or GED versus those in which at least one partner did not have a high school diploma or GED.

### c. Parenting

Couples in the PACT HM study may have experienced the program differently depending on whether they have children from other relationships. Thus, we examined the results for subgroups based on parenting characteristics.

- **Multipartner fertility.** In the PACT HM baseline sample, 56 percent of couples reported that at least one partner had a child from a previous relationship. Couples with multipartner fertility may benefit more from the programs than those who only have children with their current partner. The programs may be particularly helpful because multipartner fertility can be stressful and is associated with negative outcomes for adults and children, such as parental depression (Turney and Carlson 2011) and lower father involvement (Tach et al. 2010). With the focus on communication and strengthening couples' relationships, programs may be able to reduce this stressor for families. Therefore, we examined impacts for two subgroups: one in which neither partner had a child from a previous relationship, compared with another in which at least one partner had a child from a previous relationship.

### d. Well-being

HM programs may be most beneficial for couples experiencing behavioral health issues. We examined whether couples at risk of depression at baseline benefitted more or less from PACT.

- **Depression risk.** There is some evidence that couples in which at least one partner is at risk for high or moderate depression may benefit more from HMRE programs (Raley et al. 2015). Among PACT HM couples, approximately 36 percent had at least one partner classified as at risk for moderate or severe depression at baseline. We examined subgroups of couples in which at least one partner was at risk of moderate or severe depression versus those in which neither partner was at risk.

## 2. Subgroups based on site

In addition to the pooled analysis across both sites, we also estimated impacts by site. EPCC and UBA offered programs with similar packages of services, but with some notable differences. For example, UBA's relationship skills workshop consisted of more hours than that offered by EPCC. The Supporting Healthy Relationships program ranged from 24 to 27 hours; the HOME Program offered an 18-hour workshop. In addition, job and career advancement services were more integrated and provided more regularly in Supporting Healthy Relationships than the HOME program. Supporting Healthy Relationships included job and career advancement topics in its relationship skills workshop, and offered a stand-alone workshop on obtaining employment and soft skills development. The HOME Program provided two workshops to promote economic and financial well-being: (1) a two-hour job readiness workshop held approximately every other month on resume preparation, interview and communication skills, and appropriate work attire; and (2) an occasional workshop on financial literacy. The subgroup analysis can provide evidence that program impacts may differ but cannot explain what drives any potential differences.

**Table VII.1. Subgroups examined in PACT HM impact analysis**

Subgroup	Subgroup definition and proportion of sample
<b>Couple relationship</b>	
Marital status	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Married. Both partners report they are married (59 percent)</li> <li>2. Unmarried. At least one partner reports they are not married (41 percent)</li> </ol>
Relationship quality by marital status	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Married couples with poor relationship quality. Below the median of quality for married couples (29 percent)</li> <li>2. Married couples with high relationship quality. At or above the median for married couples (30 percent)</li> <li>3. Unmarried couples with poor relationship quality. Below the median of quality for unmarried couples (20 percent)</li> <li>4. Unmarried couples with high relationship quality (at or above the median for unmarried couples) (21 percent)</li> </ol>
<b>Demographic and socioeconomic</b>	
Primary language	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. English. At least one partner reports being born outside of the U.S. (37 percent)</li> <li>2. Spanish. At least one partner speaks Spanish as her/his primary language (62 percent)</li> </ol>
Education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Both partners have a high school diploma or GED (44 percent)</li> <li>2. At least one partner does not have a high school diploma or GED (56 percent)</li> </ol>
<b>Parenting</b>	
Multipartner fertility	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one partner has a child from a previous relationship (56 percent)</li> <li>2. Neither partner has a child from a previous relationship (44 percent)</li> </ol>
<b>Well-being</b>	
Depression risk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one partner is at risk for moderate or severe depression. Based on the Patient Health Questionnaire; each response was coded (not at all = 0; several days = 1; more than half the days = 2; nearly every day = 3) and summed. Scores of 10 or higher indicate moderate to severe depression. (36 percent)</li> <li>2. Neither partner is at risk for moderate or severe depression. Score on Patient Health Questionnaire was less than 10 for both partners (64 percent)</li> </ol>
<b>Site characteristics</b>	
Site-specific	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supporting Healthy Relationships (64 percent)</li> <li>2. Healthy Opportunities for Marriage Enrichment Program (36 percent)</li> </ol>

### C. Results of the subgroup analysis

As shown in Appendix B, no strong patterns of subgroup impacts emerged among the subgroups we examined. After adjusting for multiple comparisons, we did not find strong evidence that program impacts varied by couple-specific or site characteristics. There were no statistically significant differences in impacts at the subgroup level on any outcome when applying the multiple comparison adjustment.

As reported in the main report, we found no statistically significant differences between impacts for the HOME program and Supporting Healthy Relationships for any confirmatory outcomes (Moore et al. 2018). Moreover, the magnitude of impacts was similar between the two HM programs in PACT for most outcomes (Tables B.8 and B.9).

The largest differences between program impacts are those related to men's earnings. For the HOME program, we found small, negative impacts on men's earnings in survey reports and

administrative records (Table B.8); neither of these impacts were statistically significant. For Supporting Healthy Relationships, we found moderately sized positive impacts on men's earnings in survey reports and administrative records (Table B.9); the impact on survey-reported earnings were statistically significant and the impact on earnings in administrative records was statistically significant at the .10 level. The positive impacts on men's earnings for Supporting Healthy Relationships are consistent with the fact that this program offered a more robust set of employment services than the HOME program. However, as noted, the difference in the impacts between programs was not statistically significant for any outcome, meaning that all differences in impacts between programs are consistent with what one might find due to chance. Although this exploratory analysis suggests that the programs affected men's earnings similarly, the study would require a larger sample size to more definitely address this research question.

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

## VIII PACT'S EFFECTS ON COUPLES WHO ATTENDED CORE WORKSHOPS

---

The impacts presented in the PACT HM main report (Moore et al. 2018) were estimated by comparing outcomes of couples in the program group to those in the control group—regardless of whether or how frequently the couples in the former actually participated in program services. Such intent-to-treat (ITT) impact estimates are widely used, in part because the estimates address a policy-relevant research question: what is the effect of offering a program in the real world, where some individuals will not participate in program services?

However, stakeholders also are often interested in the effects of a program on those who actually received services. This impact estimate is referred to as the effect of treatment on the treated (TOT). Voluntary social programs, particularly those serving low-income individuals, commonly have low participation rates (McCurdy and Daro 2001; Garvey et al. 2006). Overall participation rates were high for the HM programs in PACT. More than 90 percent of couples in the program group received some program services. However, about one-third of couples assigned to the program group attended fewer than half of the core workshops (Zaveri et al. 2016). Limited participation in the programs may have depressed the ITT effects, even if the treatment affected those couples who received a larger number of services. To explore this possibility, we used a quasi-experimental framework to estimate the TOT. In other words, we used techniques that did not rely solely on the study's random assignment design.

This analysis focused on whether participating in core workshops affected key outcomes. These workshops were the largest component of the HM programs in PACT. They were also the primary method for delivering marriage and relationship skills education—the content required by the HM grant. For this analysis, we measured participation as whether both partners attended at least half of the core workshop sessions. To limit the risk of detecting statistically significant results by chance, we present results for the confirmatory outcomes only. In Section A, we describe the analytical methods used to estimate TOT impacts. In Section B, we describe our procedures for developing the TOT models. In Section C, we describe how we created the comparison groups for the TOT analysis. In section D, we describe our approach to estimating TOT impacts. In Section E, we present our TOT impact estimates.

### **A. Methods for estimating effects for couples who attended core workshops**

The central difficulty in estimating PACT impacts on core workshop participants is identifying an appropriate comparison group. For an unbiased comparison, we needed to identify the couples in the control group who would have participated in at least half of the core workshops if they had been assigned to the program group. If certain types of couples were more likely to participate, then comparing the participants to the full control group could lead to biased estimates. However, the descriptive analysis provides evidence that couples who participated in at least half of the core workshops were similar to the average couple in the control group (Table VII.1).

There was only one observable difference between the couples who participated in the workshop sessions and those assigned to the control group (Table VII.1). At baseline, couples who frequently attended core workshop sessions were more likely to report that the male partner was 1 to 3 years older than the female partner than were couples in the control group; this

difference was statistically significant at the 10 percent level. For other baseline characteristics, differences between the groups were small and not statistically significant.

**Table VIII.1. Baseline characteristics of randomly assigned couples in the ITT analysis sample**

Baseline characteristics	Program group couples who attended 50% of workshops	Control group couples
<b>Socioeconomic and demographic measures</b>		
Race/ethnicity		
Both partners Hispanic	79.0	76.2
Both partners black, non-Hispanic	10.1	10.7
All other couples	10.9	13.0
Both partners' primary language is English	33.7	37.9
Average age (in years)		
Female partner's age	34.3	33.5
Male partner's age	37.0	36.2
Average age difference		
Woman 4+ years older	9.9	11.2
Woman 1 to 3 years older	14.9	14.3
Same age	8.4	10.7
Man 1 to 3 years older	32.2*	27.1
Man 4 to 9 years older	24.2	24.9
Man 10+ years older	10.4	11.8
Both partners have diploma or GED	56.5	54.6
Earnings:		
Female partner's earnings in the past 30 days	606.1	637.3
Male partner's earnings in the past 30 days	1,501.8	1,496.8
Either partner reports financial hardship in the past 12 months	65.6	68.3
<b>Parenting characteristics</b>		
Number of residential biological and adopted children	2.3	2.2
Couple expecting a child	8.0	10.5
Average age of biological and adopted residential children (years)	6.9	6.9
Co-parenting quality scale	3.4	3.4
Either partner has child(ren) from other relationships	54.9	56.3
<b>Relationship characteristics</b>		
Couple lives together all or most of the time	89.0	87.0
Couple's relationship status		
Married	62.7	58.8
Romantically involved on a steady basis	20.1	22.1
Romantically involved on and off	11.2	13.9
Not in a relationship	6.0	5.3
Length of relationship		
Not in a relationship	6.0	5.3
Less than 2 years	14.4	13.9
2 to less than 5 years	22.9	25.5
5 to less than 10 years	25.9	27.9
10+ years	30.8	27.3
<b>Well-being</b>		
Either partner at risk for moderate or severe depression	36.1	34.7
<b>Sample size</b>	512	745

Source: PACT baseline survey.

Note: The two HM programs were weighted equally for these calculations. Attendance at 50% of workshop sessions considers the hours of workshop sessions offered to that particular couple and thus varies by HM grantee.

\* Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

## 1. Methods used in this analysis

For the TOT analysis, we first calculated a propensity score—the predicted probability of attending core workshops based on couples’ characteristics at the time they enrolled in the PACT HM study. As mentioned earlier, we measured attendance as a binary indicator of whether the couple attended at least 50 percent of core workshop sessions. We used this binary indicator as the dependent variable in the propensity score model (PSM), which included only couples in the treatment group. Using the regression coefficients from this model, we assigned each couple a propensity score for *frequent attendance*. The team then used the propensity score to create two matched samples, using quasi-experimental methods: traditional matching and likely attenders.

In the traditional matching method, PACT couples who attended workshops were matched to couples in the control group with similar propensity scores. This method resulted in two research groups that were similar in their observed baseline characteristics. The two groups could still differ, however, on unmeasured characteristics, such as their level of motivation to improve their relationships.

The “likely attender” method approach used propensity scores to identify and compare couples in both research groups who would have been most likely to frequently attend core workshops if offered the chance to do so. These estimates were not necessarily based on couples who actually attended workshops, but rather on those whose baseline characteristics suggested they were likely to attend. This approach avoided the problems described in the previous paragraph and preserved the study’s experimental framework because the predicted propensity score was based entirely on initial characteristics and not the couples’ attendance decisions. We thus can be more confident that likely attenders in the treatment and control groups were similar on both measured and unmeasured characteristics.

Despite preserving the experimental framework, we refer to the likely attender method as a quasi-experimental approach. The reason is that these results provided an accurate estimate of the impacts of HM programs in PACT for those couples who appeared *likely to frequently attend* core workshops, but not necessarily those who *actually frequently attended* them.

Although these traditional and likely attender approaches differ, both rely on the propensity models to be highly predictive of participation. When using the traditional matching approach, models with greater predictive power provide more confidence that the program group attendees were truly comparable to the control group couples to whom they were matched. In the likely attender approach, if the propensity model is not highly predictive, a substantial proportion of couples identified as likely attenders may not have been actual attenders. In this case, the estimated TOT impacts will be attenuated. Therefore, the credibility of the TOT estimates depends on how well the probability of participation can be estimated.

If the predictive power of the PSM is high, then the two TOT approaches will yield similar results that likely reflect the effects of the HM programs in PACT on those who frequently attended core workshops. Conversely, if the PSM has little predictive power, these approaches tend to yield different results, neither of which is likely to represent the program’s effects for attenders (Schochet and Burghardt 2007). Therefore, an examination of the degree to which

results from these two methods are similar can suggest how much confidence can be placed in the estimates.<sup>14</sup>

## **B. Developing the propensity score model**

To estimate couples' propensity scores, we followed the approach used in the Building Strong Families study (Moore et al. 2012). Using a logistic regression model, we developed models that predicted the likelihood of meeting the attendance threshold based on couples' pre-random assignment characteristics. In the remainder of this section, we provide a brief description of our approach to creating propensity. Moore et al. 2012 provides a more detailed description of this approach.

### **1. Data used in the propensity score estimation**

We used data from PACTIS and the baseline survey to build a model that would estimate each couple's predicted probability of frequently attending core workshops. PACTIS contained data on workshop attendance used to identify couples who attended at least half of the core workshop sessions offered. We used data collected from the baseline survey to predict couples' likelihood of meeting the threshold of core workshop attendance. The baseline survey offered a wide array of variables that might be related to couples' attendance and the outcomes of interest—essential to constructing a highly predictive PSM.

### **2. Building the propensity score model**

To build the PSM, we first identified a wide range of possible predictors of participation in program core workshops. We began by including all variables used as baseline controls in our ITT impact models. We also included a subset of measures with strong theoretical connections with couples' attendance levels, such as whether a couple anticipated transportation problems interfering with their attendance.

After selecting this initial set of predictor variables, we chose additional strong predictors from the remaining pool of variables. First, for each site, we estimated a logistic regression model, with frequent attendance as the dependent variable and the initial set of predictor variables as independent variables. We then added the candidate variable with the strongest correlation with the residual to the next run of the logistic regression. This process continued until we selected three variables in a row that had  $p$ -values above 0.25. At that point, we removed those final three measures and considered the components of the PSM predictors for that site as final.

---

<sup>14</sup> For the TOT analysis, we decided not to use the Bloom adjustment, another common approach. This adjustment involves inflating the ITT estimates by the inverse of the proportion of program group members who actually received treatment (Bloom 1984). Our adjustment assumes that all impacts observed for the program group were generated by those who actually received PACT HM services, and that the impacts of the program on couples who never received services are zero. Although the Bloom adjustment is a rigorous way to examine impacts for couples who received any services, it is not well suited for this analysis because it cannot be used to estimate the effects of different types or amounts of services.

### 3. Estimation of the propensity score

To estimate the propensity score for frequent attendance of core workshop sessions, we used a logistic regression model:

$$(1) \Pr(\text{Participation}) = \Lambda(X_i \beta_s)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the cumulative distribution function for the logistic distribution,  $X_i$  represents a set of pre-random assignment characteristics for program group couple  $i$ , and  $\beta$  is a vector of regression coefficients for each characteristic in the sites.

We used results from that model to calculate each couple’s probability of frequently attending core workshop sessions. We ran the model using only program group couples to generate the regression coefficients. We used those coefficients, in combination with each couple’s individual characteristics, to predict the likelihood of participation (or propensity scores) for both program and control group members. Because the regression coefficients varied by program, the influence of any particular variable in determining a couple’s propensity score could vary depending on the program in which the couple was enrolled.

#### C. Creation of comparison groups

Our traditional matching and likely attender approaches used the same propensity scores. The central difference between the approaches is the way we used those scores to construct research groups. For the traditional matching approach, each couple in the program group who attended at least half of the core workshop sessions was matched to the control group couple from the same site with the most similar propensity score. For the likely attender method, we created subgroups of couples with high propensity scores within both the program and control groups. This approach created groups on the basis of pre-random assignment characteristics to avoid bias introduced by unobservable traits that influenced actual attendance. We selected “cutoff values” for identifying likely attenders, such that the number of program group couples above the cutoff was the same as the number of couples who actually met the attendance threshold. We allowed the cutoff to differ across sites, so the numbers of likely and actual attenders in the program group were identical within each site.

The results showed that the model did have substantial predictive power. As shown in Table VII.2, the rates of frequent attendance among those identified as likely attenders were much higher than those for all couples. Overall, 68 percent of couples assigned to the program group attended at least half of the core workshop sessions. Among couples identified as likely to frequently attend core workshop sessions, the frequent attendance rate was nearly 80 percent.

**Table VIII.2. Actual frequent attendance rates of program group couples, by likely attender status (%)**

Attendance threshold	All program group couples	Program group couples included in likely attenders analysis	Program group couples excluded from likely attenders analysis
Attended at least 50% of core workshops	67.8	79.0	44.2

If the PSMs and construction of treatment and comparison groups worked properly, the research groups should have been well matched (Table VII.3). Among couples in the traditional matching method sample, we did not find any statistically significant differences between the study groups across a wide range of baseline characteristics. The sample of likely attenders showed two statistically significant differences. In this sample, men in the program group were less likely to report being 10 or more years older than their female partners, and couples were more likely to report not being in a relationship when compared with couples in the control group. For both the traditional matching and likely attender methods, we included covariates in the regression models that generated TOT estimates to adjust for observed differences between the study groups.

**Table VIII.3. Baseline characteristics of couples in the TOT sample, by matching method**

Baseline characteristics	Traditional matching method	Likely attender method		
	Program group	Control group	Program group	Control group
<b>Socioeconomic and demographic measures</b>				
Race/ethnicity				
Both partners Hispanic	79.0	76.8	80.2	76.5
Both partners black, non-Hispanic	10.1	10.7	10.5	11.1
Other	10.9	12.5	9.3	12.4
Both partners' primary language is English	33.7	35.7	31.0	35.6
Average age (in years)				
Women	34.3	34.7	35.5	35.6
Men	37.0	37.0	38.4	38.4
Average age difference				
Woman 4+ years older	9.9	11.5	9.7	11.2
Woman 1 to 3 years older	14.9	13.1	14.9	14.0
Same age	8.4	10.6	8.6	8.5
Man 1 to 3 years older	32.2	29.3	34.0	29.7
Man 4 to 9 years older	24.2	23.7	22.9	22.3
Man 10+ years older	10.4	11.8	9.9**	14.3
Both partners have high school diploma or GED	56.5	56.7	59.2	58.3
Earnings in past 30 days (\$)				
Women	606.1	567.1	623.0	607.9
Men	1,501.8	1,433.5	1,524.6	1,509.9
Either partner reports financial hardship in the past 12 months	65.6	65.1	65.7	65.2
<b>Parenting characteristics</b>				
Number of residential biological and adopted children	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3
Couple expecting a child	8.0	11.4	6.9	9.6
Average age of biological and adopted residential children (years)	6.9	7.4	7.5	7.8
Quality of co-parenting relationship (scale 1–4)	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4
Either partner has child(ren) from other relationships	54.9	55.9	56.2	60.1

Baseline characteristics	Traditional matching method	Likely attendee method		
	Program group	Control group	Program group	Control group
<b>Relationship characteristics</b>				
Couple lives together all or most of the time	89.0	86.5	89.3	85.9
Couple's relationship status				
Married	62.7	58.5	65.6	61.4
Romantically involved on a steady basis	20.1	22.2	18.1**	23.5
Romantically involved on and off	11.2	13.3	9.9	11.3
Not in a relationship	6.0	6.0	6.4*	3.8
Length of relationship				
Not in a relationship	6.0	6.0	6.4*	3.8
Less than 2 years	14.4	12.1	11.0	9.6
2 to less than 5 years	22.9	21.2	20.1	19.7
5 to less than 10 years	25.9	29.0	27.0	31.0
10+ years	30.8	31.7	35.5	35.8
Support and affection (scale 1–4)	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (scale 1–4)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (scale 1–4)	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4
Average of both partners' reported happiness (0–10)	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.5
Average of both partners' reported commitment score (1–10)	9.0	9.0	9.1	9.1
<b>Well-being</b>				
Either partner at risk for moderate or severe depression	36.1	33.9	35.9	34.5
<b>Sample size</b>	512	653	535	520

Source: PACT baseline survey and PACTIS.

Note: The two HM programs are weighted equally for these calculations.

\* Significantly different from zero at the .10 level, two-tailed test.

\*\*Significantly different from zero at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

## D. Estimation of Treatment-On-The-Treated impacts

We calculated the TOT impact estimates using methods similar to those used for the ITT estimates (see Chapter II of this report). Consistent with the ITT estimates, we used weighted least squares regression models. Other aspects of the analysis—including the calculation of pooled impacts by weighting HM programs in PACT equally and the choice of covariates to control for characteristics measured in the baseline survey—were the same as those used in estimating ITT impacts.

The weight we assigned to couples in the control group depended on the matching method, however. For the traditional matching method, we assigned program group couples their usual analysis weights based on survey nonresponse. In contrast, we assigned control group couples the analysis weight of the program group couple to whom they were matched. If we matched a control group couple to more than one couple in the program group, we assigned that couple the sum of the weights of their matched program group couples. For the likely attendee method, we

used analysis weights based on the couple’s probability of survey nonresponse, as in the ITT analysis.

### E. Impacts of PACT on couples who attended core workshop sessions

For the TOT impacts, we generally found that the pattern of results resembled the findings from the ITT analysis—no matter the method used to create the treatment and comparison groups. Attending any core workshop session had a positive impact on couples’ level of support and affection toward each other and their relationship commitment (Table VII.4). Across both matching methods, couples in the program group were more likely to report being married and higher quality co-parenting relationships—though the differences were not statistically significant.

**Table VIII.4. TOT impacts of frequently attending a PACT HM program, by matching method**

Outcome	Using traditional matching method				Using likely attenders method			
	Program group	Control group	TOT impact	Effect size	Program group	Control group	TOT impact	Effect size
<b>Relationship quality</b>								
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.1*	0.119	3.4	3.3	0.0*	0.104
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.8	2.7	0.1	0.088	2.8	2.7	0.1*	0.094
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.1	0.114	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.060
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.4	9.3	0.2*	0.148	9.5	9.3	0.2***	0.149
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	8.0	7.8	0.1	0.071	8.0	7.9	0.1	0.059
<b>Relationship status and co-parenting skills</b>								
Married	63.7	60.2	3.5	0.090	66.3	64.3	2.0	0.054
Married or romantically involved	89.4	88.5	0.9	0.059	90.9	90.1	0.8	0.059
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.095	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.064
<b>Labor market success</b>								
Men’s average monthly earnings (survey reports)	2,061.6	1,939.7	121.9	0.070	2,054.2	2,040.8	13.4	0.008
Women’s average monthly earnings (survey reports)	893.3	848.3	45.0	0.038	913.4	867.6	45.8	0.034
<b>Sample size</b>								
<b>All couples</b>	512	653			535	520		
<b>All fathers</b>	474	588			495	468		
<b>All mothers</b>	510	632			532	504		

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

---

## REFERENCES

---

- Abidin, R.R., and J.F. Brunner. "Development of a Parenting Alliance Inventory." *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1995, pp. 31–40.
- Abraham, Katharine G., John Haltiwanger, Kristin Sandusky, and James R. Spletzer. "Exploring Differences in Employment Between Household and Establishment Data." *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2013, pp. 129–172.
- Almeida, David M., Elaine Wethington, and Amy L. Chandler. "Daily Transmission of Tensions Between Marital Dyads and Parent-Child Dyads." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 61, no. 1, 1999, pp. 49–61.
- Barnow, B.S., and J. Smith. "Employment and Training Programs." No. w21659. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2015.
- Bernard, J. *The Future of Marriage*. New York: World, 1972.
- Bloom, Howard S. "Accounting for No-Shows in Experimental Evaluation Designs." *Evaluation Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1984, pp. 225–246.
- Bound, J., C. Brown, G.J. Duncan, and W.L. Rodgers. "Evidence on the Validity of Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Labor Market Data." *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol. 12, no. 3, 1994, pp. 345–368.
- Buehler, Cheryl, and Jean M. Gerard. "Marital Conflict, Ineffective Parenting, and Children's and Adolescents' Maladjustment." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 64, no. 1, 2002, pp. 78–92.
- Carrano, J., K. Cleveland, J. Bronte-Tinkew, and K.A. Moore. "Conceptualizing and Measuring 'Healthy Marriages' for Empirical Research and Evaluation Studies: A Compendium of Measures—Part One." Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. Washington, DC: Child Trends, 2003.
- Churchill, Gilbert A., Jr., and J. Paul Peter. "Research Design Effects on the Reliability of Rating Scales: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 21, no. 4, 1984, pp. 360–375.
- Cody, S., and C. Tuttle. "The Impact of Income Underreporting in CPS and SIPP on Microsimulation Models and Participating Rates." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, July 24, 2002.
- Devaney, Barbara, and Robin Dion. "15-Month Impacts of Oklahoma's Family Expectations Program." Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, 2010.

- Durlak, J.A., and E.P. DuPre. "Implementation Matters: A Review of Research on the Influence of Implementation on Program Outcomes and the Factors Affecting Implementation." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 41, nos. 3–4, 2008, pp. 327–350.
- Edin, K., and M. Kefalas. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood Before Marriage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005.
- EGgebeen, David J., and Chris Knoester. "Does Fatherhood Matter for Men?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 63, no. 2, 2001, pp. 381–393.
- Fincham, Frank D., Scott M. Stanley, and Steven R.H. Beach. "Transformative Processes in Marriage: An Analysis of Emerging Trends." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 69, no. 2, 2007, pp. 275–292.
- Fleiss, J.L. "Measures of Effect Size for Categorical Data." In *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, edited by H. Cooper and L.V. Hedges (pp. 245–260). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994.
- Garvey, Christine, Wrenetha Julion, Louis Fogg, Amanda Kratovil, and Deborah Gross. "Measuring Participation in a Prevention Trial with Parents of Young Children." *Research in Nursing & Health*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2006, pp. 212–222.
- Gottman, John Mordechai. *The Marriage Clinic: A Scientifically-Based Marital Therapy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999.
- Gubits, Daniel, Amy E. Lowenstein, Jorgen Harris, and JoAnn Hseuh. "Do the Effects of a Relationship Education Program Vary for Different Types of Couples? Exploratory Subgroup Analysis in the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation." OPRE Report No. 2014-22. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014.
- Hawkins, Alan J., and Sage E. Erickson. "Is Couple and Relationship Education Effective for Lower Income Participants? A Meta-Analytic Study." *Journal of Family Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 1, 2015, pp. 59–68.
- Helliwell, John F. "Well-Being, Social Capital and Public Policy: What's New?" *The Economic Journal*, vol. 116, no. 510, 2006, pp. 34–45.
- Hseuh, JoAnn, Desiree Principe Alderson, Erika Lundquist, Charles Michalopoulos, Daniel Gubits, David Fein, and Virginia Knox. "The Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation: Early Impacts on Low-Income Families." OPRE Report 2012-11. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012.
- Hseuh, JoAnn, and Virginia Knox. "A Family-Strengthening Program for Low-Income Families: Final Impacts from the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation." OPRE Report 2014-09A. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014.

- Kanfer, R., C.R. Wanberg, and T.M. Kantrowitz. "Job Search and Employment: A Personality–Motivational Analysis and Meta-Analytic Review." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 86, no. 5, 2001, pp. 837–855.
- Kouros, Chrystyna D., Lauren M. Papp, Marcie C. Goeke-Morey, and E. Mark Cummings. "Spillover Between Marital Quality and Parent-Child Relationship Quality: Parental Depressive Symptoms as Moderators." *Journal of Family Psychology*, vol. 28, no. 3, 2014, pp. 315–325.
- Krishnakumar, Ambika, and Cheryl Buehler. "Interparental Conflict and Parenting Behaviors: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Family Relations*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2000, pp. 25–44.
- Kroenke, K., T.W. Strine, R.L. Spitzer, J.B. Williams, J.T. Berry, and A.H. Mokdad. "The PHQ-8 as a Measure of Current Depression in the General Population." *Journal of Affective Disorders*, vol. 114, nos. 1–3, 2009, pp. 163–173.
- Kroenke, K., R.L. Spitzer, and J.B. Williams. "The PHQ-9: Validity of a Brief Depression Severity Measure." *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 9, 2001, pp. 606–613.
- Lipsey, M.W., and D.B. Wilson. *Practical Meta-Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Lowenstein, Amy E., Noemi Altman, Patricia M. Chou, Kristen Faucetta, Adam Greeney, Daniel Gubits, Jorgen Harris, JoAnn Hsueh, Erika Lundquist, Charles Michalopoulos, and Vinh Q. Nguyen. "A Family-Strengthening Program for Low-Income Families: Final Impacts from the Supporting Healthy Marriage Evaluation, Technical Supplement." OPRE Report 2014-09B. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014.
- McConnell, S., E.A. Stuart, and B. Devaney. "The Truncation-by-Death Problem: What to Do in an Experimental Evaluation When the Outcome Is Not Always Defined." *Evaluation Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2008, pp. 157–186.
- McCurdy, Karen, and Deborah Daro. "Parent Involvement in Family Support Programs: An Integrated Theory." *Family Relations*, vol. 50, no. 2, 2001, pp. 113–121.
- Meyer, B.D., W.K. Mok, and J.X. Sullivan. "The Under-Reporting of Transfers in Household Surveys: Its Nature and Consequences." No. w15181. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2009.
- Moore, J.C., L.L. Stinson, and E.J. Welniak. "Income Measurement Error in Surveys: A Review." *Journal of Official Statistics*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2000.
- Moore, Q., R.G. Wood, A. Clarkwest, A. Killewald, and S. Monahan. "The Building Strong Families Project: The Long-Term Effects of Building Strong Families: A Relationship Skills Education Program for Unmarried Parents. Technical Supplement." Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012.

- Moore, Quinn, Sarah Avellar, Ankita Patnaik, Reginald Covington, and April Wu. "Parents and Children Together: Effects of Two Healthy Marriage Programs for Low-Income Couples." OPRE Report No. 2018-58. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018.
- Pawson, R., T. Greenhalgh, G. Harvey, and K. Walshe. "Realist Review—A New Method of Systematic Review Designed for Complex Policy Interventions." *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, vol. 10, no. 1 (suppl.), 2005, pp. 21–34.
- Perez, Carlos, Matthew D. Brown, Jason B. Whiting, and Steven M. Harris. "Experiences of Latino Couples in Relationship Education: A Critical Analysis." *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, vol. 21, no. 4, 2013, pp. 377–385.
- Raghunathan, T.E., J.M. Lepkowski, J. Van Hoewyk, and P. Solenberger. "A Multivariate Technique for Multiply Imputing Missing Values Using a Sequence of Regression Models." *Survey Methodology*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2001, pp. 85–96.
- Raley, R. Kelly, Megan M. Sweeney, and Danielle Wondra. "The Growing Racial and Ethnic Divide in U.S. Marriage Patterns." *The Future of Children*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2015, pp. 89–109.
- Rhyme, D. "Bases of Marital Satisfaction Among Men and Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 43, no. 4, 1981, pp. 941–955.
- Robinson, C. C., B. Mandleco, S.F. Olsen, and C.H. Hart. "Authoritative, Authoritarian, and Permissive Parenting Practices: Development of a New Measure." *Psychological Reports*, vol. 77, no. 3, pt. 1, 1995, pp. 819–830.
- Rubin, D.B. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1987.
- Saks, Alan M., and Blake E. Ashforth. "Change in Job Search Behaviors and Employment Outcomes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 56, no. 2, 2000, pp. 277–287.
- Schochet, P.Z. "An Approach for Addressing the Multiple Testing Problem in Social Policy Impact Evaluations." *Evaluation Review*, vol. 33, no. 6, 2009, pp. 539–567.
- Schochet, Peter Z., and John Burghardt. "Using Propensity Scoring to Estimate Program-Related Subgroup Impacts in Experimental Program Evaluations." *Evaluation Review*, vol. 31, no. 2, 2007, pp. 95–120.
- Straus, Murray A. "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 41, no. 1, 1979, pp. 75–88.
- Straus, M. A., S.L. Hamby, S. Boney-McCoy, and D.B. Sugarman. "The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data." *Journal of Family Issues*, vol. 17, no. 3, 1996, pp. 283–316.

- Tach, Laura, Ronald Mincy, and Kathryn Edin. "Parenting as a 'Package Deal': Relationships, Fertility, and Nonresident Father Involvement Among Unmarried Parents." *Demography*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2010, pp. 181–204.
- Turney, Kristin, and Marcia J. Carlson. "Multipartnered Fertility and Depression Among Fragile Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 73, no. 3, 2011, pp. 570–587.
- U.S. Department of Education. "WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook." Washington, DC: Institute for Education Sciences, December 2008. Available at [https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/wwc\\_procedures\\_v2\\_standards\\_handbook.pdf](https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/referenceresources/wwc_procedures_v2_standards_handbook.pdf). Accessed August 18, 2018.
- Wood, Robert G., Quinn Moore, Andrew Clarkwest, and Alexandra Killewald. "The Long-Term Effects of Building Strong Families: A Program for Unmarried Parents." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 76, no. 2, 2014, pp. 446–463.
- Wood, Robert G., Quinn Moore, Andrew Clarkwest, Alexandra Killewald, and Shannon Monahan. "The Building Strong Families Project: The Long-Term Effects of Building Strong Families: A Relationship Skills Education Program for Unmarried Parents." Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, 2012.
- Wood, Robert G., Sheena McConnell, Quinn Moore, Andrew Clarkwest, and JoAnn Hseuh. "Strengthening Unmarried Parents' Relationships: The Early Impacts of Building Strong Families." Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2010.
- Zaveri, H., and R. Dion. "Embedding Job and Career Advancement Services in Healthy Marriage Programs: Lessons from Two Programs in PACT." OPRE Report No. 2015-47. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2015.
- Zaveri, Heather, and S. Baumgartner. "Parents and Children Together: Design and Implementation of Two Healthy Marriage Programs." OPRE Report No. 2016-63. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2016.

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**APPENDIX A:**

**SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATED IMPACTS FOR THE FULL ANALYTIC SAMPLE**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**Table A.1. Impacts on service receipt since random assignment: both sites combined**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Healthy relationship education</b>					
Group sessions:					
Ever attended	53.1	19.4	33.7***	< 0.001	1.059
Average hours attended	12.7	5.3	7.4***	< 0.001	0.591
Individual support:					
Ever received	22.2	19.5	2.7	0.153	0.085
Average hours received	2.8	3.0	-0.1	0.784	-0.016
<b>Other services received by mothers</b>					
Parenting classes:					
Ever attended	32.2	24.6	7.6***	0.001	0.228
Average hours attended	6.1	4.5	1.6*	0.059	0.106
Ever participated in:					
Education program or ESL classes	23.4	26.6	-3.1	0.168	-0.101
Job training	17.6	17.2	0.5	0.826	0.020
Job search assistance	21.2	20.8	0.5	0.839	0.017
Any of these	42.5	45.3	-2.8	0.309	-0.068
Ever receive counseling on:					
Anger management	9.0	5.9	3.1**	0.028	0.276
Help with a mental health, alcohol, or substance abuse problem	6.6	5.7	0.9	0.532	0.091
<b>Other services received by fathers</b>					
Parenting classes:					
Ever attended	25.8	13.2	12.6***	0 < 0.001	0.499
Average hours attended	3.4	2.2	1.2**	0.033	0.114
Ever participated in:					
Education program or ESL classes	12.5	11.9	0.6	0.737	0.035
Job training	14.4	13.0	1.4	0.474	0.074
Job search assistance	22.8	19.4	3.4	0.157	0.122
Any of these	34.2	33.4	0.9	0.748	0.024
Ever receive counseling on:					
Anger management	9.8	5.3	4.5***	0.004	0.401
Help with a mental health, alcohol, or substance abuse problem	5.9	6.3	-0.5	0.739	-0.050
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>Couples</b>	664	640			
<b>Mothers</b>	737	721			
<b>Fathers</b>	687	666			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Table refers to services received from random assignment to the time of the 12-month follow-up survey. Information on healthy relationship education based on the average of the mother's and father's responses. Information on other services received by mothers based on mothers' reports. Information on other services received by fathers based on fathers' reports. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 1,291 to 1,458, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

ESL = English as a Second Language.

**Table A.2. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship quality: both sites combined (percentages unless stated otherwise)**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Relationship quality (key domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.0**	0.029	0.104
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.7	2.7	0.1*	0.088	0.070
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.317	0.048
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.4	9.2	0.1**	0.018	0.118
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	7.9	7.8	0.1	0.121	0.069
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Perceptions of change in the relationship (range: 1–4)	3.5	3.4	0.1***	< 0.001	0.234
Father’s perception of change in the relationship (range: 1–4)	3.6	3.5	0.1***	< 0.001	0.194
Mother’s perception of change in the relationship (range: 1–4)	3.5	3.3	0.2***	< 0.001	0.197
Father’s support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.254	0.059
Mother’s support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.2	0.1**	0.034	0.104
Father’s constructive conflict behavior scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.289	0.055
Mother’s constructive conflict behavior scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.0	0.593	0.027
Father’s destructive conflict behavior scale (range: 1–4)	2.7	2.7	-0.0	0.904	-0.006
Mother’s destructive conflict behavior scale (range: 1–4)	2.8	2.7	0.1**	0.025	0.101
Both partners were sexually faithful	82.4	81.2	1.2	0.571	0.048
Male partner was sexually faithful	87.3	86.4	0.8	0.655	0.044
Female partner was sexually faithful	92.3	91.4	0.9	0.597	0.070
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>All couples</b>	755	745			
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	672	649			
<b>Couple in contact with each other</b>	728	723			
<b>Fathers</b>	673	654			
<b>Mothers</b>	718	704			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Details on the construction of these measures are in Chapter III. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 1,257 to 1,500, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**Table A.3. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and intimate partner violence: both sites combined (percentages unless stated otherwise)**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Relationship status (key domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Couple married to each other	62.8	58.7	4.2**	0.013	0.106
Couple married or romantically involved	89.9	87.5	2.4	0.180	0.148
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Couple living together all or most of the time	78.6	74.1	4.5**	0.033	0.152
Couple living together all the time	62.1	56.9	5.2**	0.045	0.132
Couple married or engaged with a wedding date	64.0	60.5	3.5**	0.043	0.090
<b>Intimate partner violence (additional domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Any severe physical assault	5.3	8.4	-3.1**	0.029	-0.303
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Any physical assault	12.7	15.7	-3.0	0.119	-0.149
Multiple severe physical assaults	2.5	4.7	-2.2**	0.049	-0.386
Any sexual coercion	1.1	1.1	-0.0	0.968	-0.013
Any severe physical assault or sexual coercion	5.4	9.2	-3.9***	0.009	-0.354
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>Couples</b>	755	745			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Details on the construction of these measures are in Chapter III. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 1,455 to 1,500, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**Table A.4. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on co-parenting and parenting skills: both sites combined (percentages unless stated otherwise)**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Co-parenting skills (key domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.4	0.0**	0.028	0.104
<b>Parenting skills (additional domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Father's engagement in parenting activities (range: 0–3)	2.3	2.3	0.1	0.108	0.095
Father's nurturing behavior (range: 0–3)	2.5	2.4	0.1	0.116	0.092
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Father's use of authoritative discipline (range: 0–3)	1.5	1.5	-0.0	0.460	-0.051
Mother's use of authoritative discipline (range: 0–3)	1.7	1.6	0.1	0.231	0.082
Father's use of verbal discipline (range: 0–3)	0.9	0.9	0.0	0.558	0.040
Mother's use of verbal discipline (range: 0–3)	1.1	1.1	-0.0	0.521	-0.042
Mother's engagement in parenting activities (range: 0–3)	2.5	2.5	-0.0	0.861	-0.015
Mother's nurturing behavior (range: 0–3)	2.6	2.6	-0.0	0.437	-0.067
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>Couples</b>	755	745			
<b>Fathers with a focal child</b>	559	506			
<b>Mothers with a focal child</b>	482	444			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Details on the construction of these measures are in Chapter IV. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 637 to 1,500, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**Table A.5. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on labor market success: both sites combined (percentages unless stated otherwise)**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Father's earnings (\$)	2,057.8	1,984.7	73.2	0.385	0.043
Mother's earnings (\$)	934.8	835.5	99.2*	0.083	0.075
Father's earnings (administrative data)	1,786.4	1,726.4	60.1	0.584	0.032
Mother's earnings (administrative data)	777.6	762.0	15.5	0.828	0.012
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Father employed any time in the past three months	91.1	88.1	3.0*	0.089	0.195
Mother employed any time in the past three months	59.3	55.5	3.7	0.139	0.092
Father employed any time during the first year after random assignment (administrative data)	76.8	76.0	0.7	0.785	0.025
Mother employed any time during the first year after random assignment (administrative data)	56.9	58.7	-1.8	0.573	-0.044
Father's number of quarters of longest employment spell during year after random assignment (administrative data)	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.915	0.006
Mother's number of quarters of longest employment spell during year after random assignment (administrative data)	1.7	1.8	-0.0	0.837	-0.012
Father's average monthly earnings for two years after random assignment (administrative data)	1,752.1	1,745.9	6.1	0.965	0.003
Mother's average monthly earnings for two years after random assignment (administrative data)	718.4	708.7	9.7	0.914	0.008
Fathers: any employment in the past three months provides fringe benefits	51.8	50.0	1.8	0.516	0.043
Mothers: any employment in the past three months provides fringe benefits	29.9	28.4	1.5	0.508	0.045
Father employed in a regular full-time or part-time job in the past three months	68.9	64.2	4.7*	0.070	0.129
Mother employed in a regular full-time or part-time job in the past three months	45.9	41.9	4.0	0.109	0.099
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>All fathers</b>	687	666			
<b>All mothers</b>	737	721			
<b>Fathers with administrative data</b>	521	552			
<b>Mothers with administrative data</b>	510	522			
<b>Fathers with two years of administrative data</b>	304	325			
<b>Mothers with two years of administrative data</b>	296	304			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Details on the construction of these measures are in Chapter V. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 600 to 1,458, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**Table A.6. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on perceived economic improvement and depressive symptoms: both sites combined (percentages unless stated otherwise)**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	p-value	Effect size
<b>Perceived economic improvement (additional domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Father feels better off financially than a year ago	70.9	71.3	-0.4	0.887	-0.011
Mother feels better off financially than a year ago	67.8	64.4	3.5	0.186	0.093
Father reports he knows how to handle money and bills better now than a year ago	88.0	88.5	-0.6	0.762	-0.033
Mother reports she knows how to handle money and bills better now than a year ago	87.8	84.3	3.5*	0.074	0.177
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Father either satisfied with current job or taking steps to improve employment	90.9	87.0	3.9**	0.031	0.241
Mother either satisfied with current job or taking steps to improve employment	75.4	75.9	-0.6	0.808	-0.018
Father has an updated resume	51.6	55.2	-3.6	0.339	-0.087
Mother has an updated resume	45.6	48.9	-3.3	0.266	-0.079
<b>Depressive symptoms (additional domain)</b>					
<b>Primary outcomes</b>					
Father's frequency of depressive symptoms (range: 0–24)	3.4	3.9	-0.4	0.114	-0.083
Mother's frequency of depressive symptoms (range: 0–24)	3.9	4.7	-0.8***	0.005	-0.143
<b>Secondary outcomes</b>					
Father at risk for moderate or severe depression	9.9	13.5	-3.5*	0.058	-0.207
Mother at risk for moderate or severe depression	12.1	16.9	-4.8**	0.015	-0.238
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>All fathers</b>	687	666			
<b>All mothers</b>	737	721			
<b>Father not satisfied with current employment</b>	424	448			
<b>Mother not satisfied with current employment</b>	579	578			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Details on the construction of these measures are in Chapter V. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 872 to 1,458, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**APPENDIX B:  
ESTIMATED IMPACTS FOR SUBGROUPS**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**Table B.1. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status, relationship quality, and co-parenting skills, by couple's marital status**

Outcome	Couples married at baseline			Couples unmarried at baseline		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	94.4	90.5	3.8**	15.4	15.4	-0.1
Couple married or romantically involved	94.9	93.3	1.6	82.9	80.2	2.6
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.1***	3.3	3.3	0.0
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.8	2.8	0.1*	2.6	2.6	-0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.2	0.1*	3.1	3.1	0.0
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.5	9.4	0.1	9.3	9.1	0.2*
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	8.2	8.0	0.2	7.5	7.5	0.0
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.5	3.4	0.1**	3.4	3.3	0.0
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father's earning (survey)	2,159.9	2,155.8	4.1	1,934.9	1,801.6	133.4
Mother's earnings (survey)	977.4	933.8	43.6	866.5	707.5	159.0
Father's earnings (administrative)	2,016.9	2,019.7	-2.8	1,414.2	1,348.6	65.7
Mother's earnings (administrative)	803.4	772.6	30.8	738.2	749.2	-11.1
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All couples</b>	436	407		319	338	
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	412	380		260	269	
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	428	401		300	322	
<b>Fathers</b>	409	371		278	295	
<b>Mothers</b>	428	392		309	329	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information on subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details on the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 529 to 843, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.2. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by married couple's initial relationship quality**

Outcome	Relationship quality below median for married couples			Relationship quality at or above median for married couples		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	92.1	85.5	6.6**	96.8	95.7	1.1
Couple married or romantically involved	93.5	88.6	4.9 †	97.0	97.9	-0.9
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.1***
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.5	2.4	0.1	3.2	3.1	0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.1	3.0	0.1	3.4	3.4	0.0
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.7	9.7	0.1
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	7.5	7.2	0.2	8.9	8.8	0.1
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.3	0.0	3.6	3.6	0.1**
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father's earning (survey)	2,386.4	2,095.7	290.7†††	1,889.1	2,318.3	-429.2***
Mother's earnings (survey)	1,287.4	1,080.7	206.7	713.9	768.3	-54.4
Father's earnings (administrative)	2,097.0	1,916.9	180.1	2,022.5	2,087.5	-65.0
Mother's earnings (administrative)	982.0	907.8	74.3	649.7	698.1	-48.4
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All married couples</b>	218	219		218	189	
<b>Married couples in an intact relationship</b>	201	196		211	185	
<b>Married couples in contact with each other</b>	212	214		216	188	
<b>Fathers</b>	204	192		205	180	
<b>Mothers</b>	214	206		214	187	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 385 to 437, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.3. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by unmarried couple's initial relationship quality**

Outcome	Relationship quality below median for unmarried couples			Relationship quality at or above median for unmarried couples		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	17.6	3.7	13.9**†	18.4	19.1	-0.6
Couple married or romantically involved	76.0	73.0	3.0	90.3	85.0	5.3
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.0	0.1	3.5	3.5	0.0
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.3	2.3	-0.1	2.9	2.8	0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.9	2.8	0.1	3.2	3.2	-0.0
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.1	8.7	0.4	9.5	9.3	0.2
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	6.8	6.7	0.1	8.3	8.0	0.3
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.2	0.1	3.5	3.5	0.1
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father's earning (survey)	2,223.7	1,926.5	297.2	1,778.7	1,636.7	142.0
Mother's earnings (survey)	1,008.7	925.1	83.6	782.6	544.9	237.7**
Father's earnings (administrative)	1,458.9	1,530.0	-71.1	1,431.5	1,153.2	278.3
Mother's earnings (administrative)	929.1	971.1	-41.9	613.0	573.2	39.8
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All unmarried couples</b>	156	148		163	190	
<b>Unmarried couples in an intact relationship</b>	113	105		147	164	
<b>Unmarried couples in contact with each other</b>	141	138		159	184	
<b>Unmarried fathers</b>	133	128		145	167	
<b>Unmarried mothers</b>	152	140		157	189	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 218 to 353, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.4. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by couple’s primary language**

Outcome	At least one partner speaks Spanish as their primary language			All other couples		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	73.2	67.9	5.3***†	47.8	49.9	-2.1
Couple married or romantically involved	93.4	88.4	4.9***††	82.8	88.3	-5.5
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.1**	3.4	3.3	0.0
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.9	2.8	0.1**	2.5	2.6	-0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.1	0.1***††	3.1	3.1	-0.1
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.4	9.2	0.2**	9.4	9.3	0.1
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	8.1	7.9	0.2*	7.4	7.5	-0.1
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.4	0.1***	3.4	3.4	-0.0
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father’s earning (survey)	2,161.7	2,020.9	140.9	2,077.4	2,187.1	-109.7
Mother’s earnings (survey)	799.6	647.9	151.7**	1,288.0	1,307.1	-19.0
Father’s earnings (administrative)	2,000.7	1,872.0	128.6	1,672.5	1,607.0	65.5
Mother’s earnings (administrative)	684.5	625.1	59.4	1,032.9	1,182.6	-149.7
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All couples</b>	456	429		299	316	
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	425	381		247	268	
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	443	420		285	303	
<b>Fathers</b>	414	385		273	281	
<b>Mothers</b>	444	415		293	306	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 515 to 885, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.5. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by couple's education**

Outcome	Both partners have a high school diploma or GED			At least one partner had neither a high school diploma nor a GED		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	65.1	63.2	1.9	60.5	53.7	6.7***
Couple married or romantically involved	89.7	87.8	1.9	90.7	87.1	3.5
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.0	3.4	3.3	0.1*
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.7	2.7	0.1	2.8	2.7	0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.2	0.0	3.2	3.1	0.1
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.4	9.3	0.2*	9.4	9.2	0.2*
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	7.8	7.7	0.1	8.0	7.8	0.2
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.5	3.4	0.0	3.4	3.3	0.1*
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father's earning (survey)	2,399.3	2,292.4	106.9	1,612.3	1,638.6	-26.3
Mother's earnings (survey)	1,207.8	1,126.5	81.3	604.4	475.1	129.3*
Father's earnings (administrative)	2,053.9	2,070.6	-16.7	1,363.4	1,306.3	57.1
Mother's earnings (administrative)	1,007.7	997.4	10.3	474.6	428.1	46.5
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All couples</b>	411	413		348	335	
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	368	361		307	291	
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	401	405		330	321	
<b>Fathers</b>	372	371		319	297	
<b>Mothers</b>	400	398		341	326	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 598 to 824, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

GED = General Equivalency Diploma.

**Table B.6. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by couple's multipartner fertility**

Outcome	At least one partner has a child from a previous relationship			Neither partner has a child from a previous relationship		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	55.2	52.8	2.4	71.0	66.9	4.1*
Couple married or romantically involved	86.1	87.4	-1.3	92.8	88.8	3.9*
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.3	0.0	3.4	3.4	0.1**
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.6	2.6	0.1	2.9	2.8	0.1
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.1	3.1	-0.0	3.2	3.2	0.0
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.3	9.1	0.2	9.5	9.4	0.1
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	7.6	7.5	0.0	8.2	8.0	0.2*
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.3	0.0	3.5	3.4	0.1**
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father's earning (survey)	1,935.6	1,872.8	62.8	2,245.3	2,136.3	108.9
Mother's earnings (survey)	1,013.4	937.1	76.2	870.9	724.0	146.9*
Father's earnings (administrative)	1,548.9	1,554.1	-5.2	2,172.8	1,938.3	234.5
Mother's earnings (administrative)	835.3	878.7	-43.4	721.3	648.2	73.1
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All couples</b>	433	436		322	310	
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	373	377		299	273	
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	414	421		314	303	
<b>Fathers</b>	389	384		298	283	
<b>Mothers</b>	423	424		314	298	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 572 to 869, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.7. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success, by couple’s depression risk**

Outcome	At least one partner is at risk for moderate or severe depression			Neither partner is at risk for moderate or severe depression		
	Program group	Control group	Impact	Program group	Control group	Impact
<b>Relationship status</b>						
Couple married to each other	57.9	51.4	6.6**	65.7	62.6	3.1
Couple married or romantically involved	88.3	80.7	7.6**†	91.0	91.2	-0.2
<b>Relationship quality</b>						
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.2	-0.0 †	3.5	3.4	0.1***
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.5	2.4	0.1	2.9	2.9	0.0
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	0.0
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.2	9.1	0.2	9.5	9.3	0.1*
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	7.4	7.1	0.4*	8.2	8.1	0.0
<b>Co-parenting</b>						
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.3	0.0	3.5	3.4	0.1**
<b>Labor market success</b>						
Father’s earning (survey)	1,970.0	1,876.6	93.4	2,104.6	2,072.6	32.0
Mother’s earnings (survey)	1,011.7	874.8	136.9	902.9	845.7	57.2
Father’s earnings (administrative)	1,691.2	1,522.6	168.6	1,816.8	1,890.7	-74.0
Mother’s earnings (administrative)	828.3	788.6	39.6	755.6	769.3	-13.8
<b>Sample size</b>						
<b>All couples</b>	284	269		471	476	
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	243	218		429	431	
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	272	256		456	467	
<b>Fathers</b>	256	233		431	433	
<b>Mothers</b>	277	256		460	465	

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 461 to 947, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

†††/††/† Statistically significant differences among the subgroup impact estimates at the .01/.05/.10 level.

**Table B.8. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success: HOME Program**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	Standard deviation	Sample size
<b>Relationship status</b>					
Couple married to each other	74.4	69.6	4.8*	2.81	535
Couple married or romantically involved	93.1	90.1	3.0	2.55	535
<b>Relationship quality</b>					
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.4	0.1	0.04	494
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.9	2.8	0.1	0.05	530
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.04	530
Relationship commitment (range: 1–10)	9.5	9.4	0.1*	0.08	494
Relationship happiness (range: 1–10)	8.3	8.2	0.1	0.14	535
<b>Co-parenting</b>					
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.5	3.4	0.0	0.03	535
<b>Labor market success</b>					
Father's earning (survey)	2,037.0	2,105.5	-68.5	130.18	486
Mother's earnings (survey)	806.1	732.1	74.0	65.70	520
Father's earnings (administrative)	1,821.0	1,959.5	-138.5	169.19	374
Mother's earnings (administrative)	696.2	775.1	-78.8	125.52	341
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>All couples</b>	269	266			
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	252	242			
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	266	264			
<b>Fathers</b>	251	235			
<b>Mothers</b>	264	256			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 486 to 535, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**Table B.9. Impacts of HM programs in PACT on relationship status and quality, co-parenting skills, and labor market success: Supporting Healthy Relationships**

Outcome	Program group	Control group	Estimated impact	Standard deviation	Sample size
<b>Relationship status</b>					
Couple married to each other	51.2	47.7	3.5*	1.90	965
Couple married or romantically involved	86.7	84.8	1.9	2.19	965
<b>Relationship quality</b>					
Support and affection scale (range: 1–4)	3.3	3.3	0.0	0.03	827
Avoidance of destructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	2.6	2.6	0.0	0.04	921
Constructive conflict behaviors scale (range: 1–4)	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.03	921
Relationship commitment (range: 1– 10)	9.3	9.1	0.2*	0.09	831
Relationship happiness (range: 1– 10)	7.5	7.3	0.2*	0.12	965
<b>Co-parenting</b>					
Quality of co-parenting relationship (range: 1–4)	3.4	3.3	0.1***	0.03	965
<b>Labor market success</b>					
Father’s earning (survey)	2,078.6	1,863.8	214.8**	104.03	867
Mother’s earnings (survey)	1,063.4	939.0	124.4*	75.52	938
Father’s earnings (administrative)	1,751.9	1,493.2	258.7*	137.36	699
Mother’s earnings (administrative)	858.9	749.0	109.9	85.75	691
<b>Sample size</b>					
<b>All couples</b>	486	479			
<b>Couples in an intact relationship</b>	420	407			
<b>Couples in contact with each other</b>	462	459			
<b>Fathers</b>	436	431			
<b>Mothers</b>	473	465			

Source: PACT 12-month follow-up survey conducted by Mathematica Policy Research.

Note: Chapter VI provides more information about subgroup definitions. Chapters III and V provide details about the construction of these measures. Sample sizes vary by outcome based on survey skip patterns and range from 827 to 965, depending on the measure.

\*\*\*/\*\*/\* Impact estimates are statistically significant at the .01/.05/.10, two-tailed test.

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**APPENDIX C:**

**PACT HM INTAKE FORMS**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

## PACT Eligibility Checklist

### INSTRUCTIONS:

- Use this checklist to help determine if a couple is eligible **before** you give the orientation to the study.
- If the answer to **ANY** question is “No,” this couple is **NOT ELIGIBLE** for the study and should **NOT** complete the baseline survey **OR** be submitted for random assignment.
- If the answer to **ALL** of the questions is “Yes,” this couple is **ELIGIBLE** for the study. Conduct the study orientation. If the couple agrees to the terms of the study then initiate the call to Mathematica for the study consent and Baseline Interview.
- Please remember that **ONLY** study-eligible clients who complete the baseline survey will receive the \$10 gift card. Couple members who are ineligible for the study or who are eligible but do not complete the baseline survey will **NOT** receive the \$10 gift card.
- If the members of the couple come in separately screen each couple member for individual eligibility and proceed with intake. **NOTE:** Full eligibility for the study cannot be completed until both members of the couple complete the intake process.

**1. IS THE APPLICANT PART OF A COUPLE (AS DEFINED BY THE COUPLE) IN WHICH BOTH COUPLE MEMBERS ARE APPLYING TO THE PROGRAM?**

Yes [ELIGIBLE]

No [NOT ELIGIBLE]

**2. ARE BOTH MEMBERS OF THE COUPLE ELIGIBLE FOR THE PROGRAM?**

Yes [ELIGIBLE]

No [NOT ELIGIBLE]

**3. ARE BOTH MEMBERS OF THE COUPLE 18 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER?**

Yes [ELIGIBLE]

No [NOT ELIGIBLE]

**4. IS ONE MEMBER OF THE COUPLE FEMALE AND THE OTHER MALE?**

Yes [ELIGIBLE]

No [NOT ELIGIBLE]

**5. THE COUPLE IS EXPECTING A BABY TOGETHER (SHE IS PREGNANT) OR AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF THE COUPLE IS THE MOTHER OR FATHER OF A BIOLOGICAL OR ADOPTED CHILD WHO LIVES WITH HIM/HER?**

*The child or children do not need to be children in common and the child/children may be living with only one parent.*

Yes [ELIGIBLE]

No [NOT ELIGIBLE]

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**[Healthy Marriage program name]**  
**PARENTS AND CHILDREN TOGETHER (PACT) STUDY OF**  
**HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAMS**

**UNIVERSITY BEHAVIORAL ASSOCIATES ([HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM]) IS PART OF A NATIONAL STUDY**

[Healthy Marriage program] is part of the Parents and Children Together (PACT) study, a national study being conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The study is being done to learn more about which services help couples build better relationships and be better parents, as well as improve their economic stability. The Department of Health and Human Services asked researchers from an organization called Mathematica to assist with the study. We invite you to be a part of the study.

**WHAT IS THE STUDY ABOUT?**

The study is being done to learn how well programs like [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] work. This program aims to help couples build better relationships, have healthy interactions with their children, and get and keep good jobs. This study will determine whether the program achieves those aims, and will help us learn whether there are ways these kinds of programs can be improved.

The [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] is for couples. If you participate in the program you and your partner can attend a series of group workshops where you can learn how to communicate better as a couple and work together as a couple to solve problems and have a healthy relationship. You can also get help with employment problems you might be facing.

If you want to be in the program, you and your partner have to agree to be a part of the PACT study. If you and your partner decide you do not want to be a part of the study, you will not be able to participate in the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM]. You will be given information about other services that you can receive in the community. You will be free to participate in any of these other services provided by other organizations to get help with your relationship or employment issues.

If you decide to be in the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] and the study, and you are eligible for the study, we will ask you to answer some questions today on the telephone with the researchers in New Jersey. They will ask you questions about yourself, your partner, and your child or children. This will take about 30 minutes. A staff member from the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] will give you a phone and a private space to use to answer the questions. You will receive \$10 in appreciation of your time.

In about 12 months, the researchers will contact you again by phone and ask you about topics such as your relationships with your partner, your interactions with your child or children, your relationship with other family members, your employment, and services you receive. At that time, you may also be asked to participate in focus groups and in-person interviews. We will provide more information about these activities later and your participation is voluntary.

The decision to participate in the survey in 12 months, the interviews, and the check lists is voluntary and will have no effect on your participation in the program, and you can decide in 12 months whether to participate in the survey and interviews.

If you agree to be part of the study, it means you are giving permission for the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] to share information with the researchers about the services you receive from the program. The research team may also contact federal and state agencies for information about your employment and earnings, and child support agreements. We will ask you for your social security number. We want to assure you that it will be kept private and will only be used for research purposes. It may be used in requests to federal and state agencies for more information about your employment and earnings and child support agreements and may be used to locate you more easily for the interview in a year's time.

#### **HOW WILL PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS BE CHOSEN?**

This study will look at two groups of couples: those who receive [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] services, and those who receive referrals to other existing services in the community. The study will compare outcomes for the two groups. A computer will randomly select which group you will be in. One of the groups will receive the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] services at no cost to them. The other group will be able to receive referrals to other organizations for services, but not the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] services.

The computer works like a flip of a coin—assignment to a group is completely random. This procedure makes sure that assignments to the groups are fair. Everyone who agrees to join the study has the same chance of being placed into either group. The chance of being able to receive services is not influenced by what you say to program staff or your answers to the questions on the telephone. A staff member [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] will let you know which group you are assigned to after you and your partner complete today's interview.

If you are not randomly assigned to participate in the [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM], you will be provided with information about other services available to you in the community, and you will be able to talk to a staff person about those other services.

At any time, after you have been randomly assigned, you can call Mathematica's help line to say that you no longer want the program to share information about you with the Mathematica researchers, and that will have no effect on the services available to you.

### **WILL YOUR PRIVACY BE PROTECTED?**

Everything you tell the researchers will be used for research purposes only, unless we are required by law to release it for some other purpose. The Department of Health and Human Services may allow other researchers to use the information that you provide, and researchers may use your name and contact information to get in touch with you in the future for research purposes. Nobody will ever publish your name in connection with the information you provide. Instead, information about you will be combined with information about other people in the study, so researchers can describe the overall program effects and participants' experiences.

### **WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY?**

Your participation in the study could help in providing services in the future to other couples like you. You may feel uncomfortable answering some questions in interviews. You can refuse to answer those questions if you wish, and it will not change your participation in the program. Although researchers will take many steps to protect all study information, there is a small risk that non-researchers could see it, including information about your employment and earnings, and child support agreements. In addition, representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services and New England Institutional Review Board (IRB) may inspect and have access to confidential information as they ensure your rights as a study participant are protected.

To help us protect your privacy, we have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institutes of Health. With this Certificate, the researchers cannot be forced to disclose information that may identify you, even by a court subpoena, in any federal, state, or local civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceedings. The researchers will use the Certificate to resist any demands for information that would identify you, with one exception. The Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent the researchers from disclosing information that would identify you as a participant in the research project if you tell the interviewers anything that suggests you are very likely to harm yourself, that you are planning to hurt another person or child, or that someone is likely to harm you.

You should understand that a Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent you or a member of your family from voluntarily releasing information about yourself or your involvement in this research. If an insurer, employer, or other person obtains your written consent to receive research information, then the researchers may not use the Certificate to withhold that information.

### **WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY?**

You may or may not benefit from participating in this study.

### **IS YOUR PARTICIPATION VOLUNTARY?**

We hope you will want to be in the study but your participation is strictly voluntary. However, if you do not want to be in the study, you cannot be entered into the computer system to see if you can receive services from [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM]. If you agree to be in the study and later decide you do not want to answer some or all study questions or have information from the program shared with researchers, you may decline at any time. By agreeing now to be in the study, even if later you tell us you want to withdraw from the study, you are authorizing researchers to use information that was collected about you before you withdrew.

## Consent to Participate in Parents and Children Together

*I have read the information on the previous pages.*

- *I have been informed about the services offered by [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM], and I want to participate in those services.*
- *I agree to answer a set of questions now. I can choose to participate in later study activities when the researchers contact me in 12 months. I understand that I may be asked some questions about personal things, but I will not have to answer any questions that make me feel uncomfortable. I can change my mind about participating at a later time, and this will not affect my participation in the program.*
- *I give permission for the study team to collect information on [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] services I receive. I give permission for [HEALTHY MARRIAGE PROGRAM] staff to release information to the study team about me and my participation in the program.*
- *I give permission for the researchers to access information about me from federal, state and local agencies about my employment and earnings, and child support arrangements and payments.*
  - *I understand that all information will be protected. However, I do understand that if a person on the study team observes child abuse, it must be reported.*
  - *I can call Sheena McConnell, Principal Investigator for the PACT study, at 202-484-4518 or Shawn Marsh, Survey Director for the PACT study, at 609-936-2781 or toll-free at 1-800-668-7686 at Mathematica Policy Research to get an answer about any questions I may have.*
- *If I have questions about my rights as a research volunteer, or feel that I have been harmed in any way by participating in the study, I can call the New England Institutional Review Board, at 1-800-232-9570.*

**APPENDIX D:**

**PACT HM BASELINE SURVEY**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

Contract Number:  
HHSP23320095642WC/HHSP23337034T

Mathematica Reference Number:

Submitted to:  
Administration for Children and Families  
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW  
Washington, DC, 20447  
Project Officer: Nancye Campbell

Submitted by:  
Mathematica Policy Research  
P.O. Box 2393  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393  
Telephone: (609) 799-3535  
Facsimile: (609) 799-0005  
Project Director: Sheena McConnell

**Parents and Children  
Together – Healthy  
Marriage Baseline**

July 18, 2013

Ayesha DeMond  
Adam Dunn  
Camilla Fernandez  
Jane Fortson  
Cleo Jacobs Johnson  
Alexandra Killewald  
Shawn Marsh  
Sheena McConnell  
Rob Wood

**MATHEMATICA**  
**Policy Research**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

OMB No.: 0970-0403

Expiration Date: 07/31/2016

# **Parents and Children Together Evaluation**

## **Healthy Marriage Baseline Survey**

Items D11a-e: Adapted and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, FL 33549, from the Parenting Alliance Measure by Richard R. Abidin, EdD and Timothy R Konold, PhD, Copyright 1999 by PAR, Inc. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission from PAR, Inc.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0970-0403. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.

## CONTENTS

Section	Page
i. INTRODUCTION .....	iv
A. CONTACT INFORMATION 1.....	1
B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS .....	6
C. RELATIONSHIP STATUS.....	9
D. PARENTING.....	17
E. RELATIONSHIP QUALITY .....	21
F. ECONOMIC STABILITY .....	26
G. BACKGROUND AND WELL BEING .....	31
H. MOTIVATION TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAM.....	35
I. CONTACT INFORMATION 2.....	37

## i. INTRODUCTION

INTERVIEWER SELECT STAFF NAME AND PROGRAM NAME FROM DROP DOWN MENU.

PROGRAMMER:  
PRELOAD STAFF NAMES AND PROGRAM NAMES.

ALL

**INTRO1 .** INTERVIEWER: WAS THIS CALL RECEIVED ON THE INTERVIEWER LINE OR THE SUPERVISOR LINE?

NOTE: YOU SHOULD NOT SELECT SUPERVISOR LINE UNLESS YOU WERE GIVEN PERMISSION TO DO SO BY YOUR SUPERVISOR.

1-877-305-0245 (INTERVIEWER LINE) ..... 1  
1-855-398-3303 (SUPERVISOR LINE).....0

ALL

**INTRO1A.** Hello, could you please tell me the name of the program you are calling from?

HOME-EL PASO ..... 1  
JEWISH FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S SERVICE (JFCS) ..... 2  
UNIVERSITY BEHAVIORAL ASSOCIATES (UBA) ..... 3

ALL

**INTRO2.** Can you please tell me your name?

**PROGRAMMER: PROVIDE DROP-DOWN LIST OF STAFF NAMES**

CONTINUE ..... 1  
NAME NOT IN LIST ..... 99

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **INTERVIEWER: ENTER STAFF MEMBER'S NAME (STRING 50)**

SOFT CHECK: IF INTRO2=99: INTERVIEWER: STOP! A SUPERVISOR MUST APPROVE THIS STAFF PERSON'S NAME BEFORE YOU CAN PROCEED.  
SUPERVISOR: ENTER PASSWORD TO UNLOCK INTERVIEW.

INTRO1=0

**INTRO2a.** Why is the client required to attend the program?

COURT ORDER ..... 1  
WILDCARD (SPECIFY)..... 99

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **INTERVIEWER: ENTER OTHER REASON (STRING 50)**

ALL

**INTRO3. Thank you for that information. Can you please hand the phone to the client?**

CONTINUE..... 1

PROGRAMMER: IF INTRO1=0, GO TO 7, ELSE GO TO 1.

INTRO1=1

**i1. Hello, my name is [INTERVIEWER NAME], and I work for Mathematica Policy Research. I understand that you are interested in [PROGRAM NAME] and the Parents and Children Together study. Is that correct?**

YES ..... 1 GO TO i2

NO ..... 0 GO TO i1a

i1=00

**i1a. Please tell me why you are not interested in participating.**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

i1=00

**i1b. Your participation is important because it will help us learn about services for couples like you in the future. All information we collect will be kept strictly private, and if you are eligible for the study, you will receive \$10 for completing the survey today. Will you reconsider and agree to participate in the PACT study?**

YES, I WILL PARTICIPATE ..... 1 GO TO i2

NO, I WILL NOT PARTICIPATE ..... 0 GO TO i6b

i1=1 OR i1b=1

i2. Great. Thanks for taking the time to talk to me today. I would like to tell you a little bit more about the study, which is called PACT for short. Please stop me at any time if you have a question.

The [PROGRAM NAME] is part of the Parents and Children Together (PACT) study, a national study being conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The study is being done to learn more about which services help couples build a better relationship and be better parents as well as improve their economic stability. The Department of Health and Human Services asked researchers from an organization called Mathematica to assist with the study. We invite you to be a part of the study.

The study is being done to learn how well programs like [PROGRAM NAME] work. This program aims to help couples build better relationships, have healthy interactions with their children, and get and keep good jobs. The study will determine whether the program achieves those aims, and will help us learn whether there are ways these kinds of programs can be improved.

The [PROGRAM NAME] program is for couples. If you participate in the program you and your partner can attend a series of group workshops where you can learn how to communicate better as a couple and work together as a couple to solve problems and have a healthy relationship. You can also get help with employment problems you might be facing.

If you want to be in the program, you and your partner have to agree to be a part of the PACT study. If you and your partner decide that you do not want to be a part of the study, you will not be able to participate in the [PROGRAM NAME] program. You will be given information about other services that you can receive in the community. You will be free to participate in any of these other services provided by other organizations to get help with your relationship or employment issues.

If you decide to be in the [PROGRAM NAME] program and the study and you are eligible for the study, I will ask you to complete a short survey on the telephone with me today. I will ask you questions about yourself, your partner and your child or children. This will take about 30 minutes. You will receive \$10 once you complete the survey in appreciation of your time.

Do you have any questions about what I've said so far?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i3

i2=1

i2a. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

ALL

i3. In about 12 months, the researchers will contact you again by phone and ask you about topics such as your relationships with your partner, your interactions with your child or children, your relationship with other family members, your employment, and services you receive.

At that time, you may also be asked to participate in focus groups and in-person interviews. We will provide more information about these activities later, and your participation is voluntary.

The decision to participate in the survey in 12 months, the interviews, and the check lists are voluntary and will have no effect on your participation in the program. We will provide more information about these activities later, and you can decide in 12 months whether to participate in the survey and interviews.

If you agree to be part of the study, it means you are giving permission for the [PROGRAM NAME] program to share information with the researchers about the services you receive from the program. The research team may also contact federal and state agencies for information about your employment and earnings, and child support agreements. We will ask you for your social security number. We want to assure you that it will be kept private and will only be used for research purposes. It may also be used in requests to federal and state agencies for more information about your employment and earnings and child support agreements and may be used to locate you more easily for the interview in a year's time.

Do you have any questions at this time?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i4

i3=1

i3a. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

ALL

- i4. This study will look at two groups of couples: those who receive the [PROGRAM NAME]'s program services, and those who receive referrals to other existing services in the community. The study will compare outcomes for the two groups. A computer will randomly select which group you will be in. One of the groups will receive [PROGRAM NAME] program services at no cost to them. The other group will be able to receive referrals to other organizations for services, but not the [PROGRAM NAME] program services.

The computer works like a flip of a coin; assignment to a group is completely random. This procedure makes sure that assignments to the groups are fair. Everyone who agrees to join the study has the same chance of being placed into either group. The chance of being able to receive services is not influenced by what you say to program staff or your answers to the questions on the telephone. A staff member from [PROGRAM NAME] will let you know which group you are assigned to after you and your partner complete today's interview.

If you are not randomly assigned to participate in [PROGRAM NAME] program, you will be provided with information about other services available to you in the community, and you will be able to talk to a staff person about those other services.

Do you have any questions now?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i5

i4=1

- i4a. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

ALL

- i5. At any time, after you have been randomly assigned, you can call Mathematica's help line to say that you no longer want the program to share information about you with the Mathematica researchers, and that will have no effect on the services available to you.

Everything you tell the researchers will be used for research purposes only, unless we are required by law to release it for some other purpose. The Department of Health and Human Services may allow other researchers to use the information that you provide, and researchers may use your name and contact information to get in touch with you in the future for research purposes. Nobody will ever publish your name in connection with the information you provide. Instead, information about you will be combined with information about other people in the study, so researchers can describe the overall program effects and participants' experiences.

Your participation in the study could help in providing services in the future to other couples like you.

You may feel uncomfortable answering some questions in interviews. You can refuse to answer those questions if you wish, and it will not change your participation in the program. Although researchers will take many steps to protect all study information, there is a small risk that non-researchers could see it, including information about your employment and earnings, and child support agreements.

In addition, representatives from the Department of Health and Human Services and the New England Institutional Review Board (IRB) may inspect and have access to confidential information as they ensure your rights as a study participant are protected.

Do you have any questions now?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i5b

i5=01

i5a. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

ALL

i5b. To help us protect your privacy, we have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institutes of Health. With this Certificate, the researchers cannot be forced to disclose information that may identify you, even by a court subpoena, in any federal, state, local, civil, criminal, legislative, administrative, or other proceedings. The researchers will use the Certificate to resist any demands for information that would identify you, with one exception. The Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent the researchers from disclosing information that would identify you as a participant in the research project if you tell me anything that suggests you are very likely to harm yourself, that you are planning to hurt another person or child, or that someone is likely to harm you.

You should understand that a Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent you, or a member of your family, from voluntarily releasing information about yourself or your involvement in this research. If an insurer, employer or other person obtains your written consent to receive research information, then the researchers may not use the Certificate to withhold that information.

Do you have any questions now?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i5d

i5B=01

i5c. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

i1=01

15d. We hope you will want to be in the study but your participation is strictly voluntary. However, if you do not want to be in the study, you cannot be entered into the computer system to see if you can receive services from [PROGRAM NAME]. If you agree to be in the study and later decide you do not want to answer some or all study questions or have information from the program shared with researchers, you may decline at any time. By agreeing now to be in the study, even if later you tell us you want to withdraw from the study, you are authorizing researchers to use information that was collected about you before you withdrew.

Do you have any questions now?

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO i6

i5d=1

i5e. What is your question?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

ALL

**i6. Do you agree to be in the PACT study?**

YES ..... 1 GO TO A1

NO ..... 0

i1=0 OR IF i6=0

**i6a. Please tell me why you are not interested in participating in the PACT study.**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)

i1=0 OR IF i6=0

**i6b. Your participation is important because it will help us learn about services for couples like you in the future. All information we collect will be kept strictly private, and you will receive a \$10 gift card once you complete the survey today. Will you reconsider and agree to participate in the PACT study?**

YES, I WILL PARTICIPATE ..... 1 GO TO i2

NO, I WILL NOT PARTICIPATE ..... 0

i1b = 0

**i6c. If you do not want to be part of the study, you will not be able to participate in [PROGRAM NAME] and you will be given information about other services that you can receive in the community. Will you reconsider and agree to participate in the PACT study?**

YES, I WILL PARTICIPATE ..... 1 GO TO i2

NO, I WILL NOT PARTICIPATE ..... 0

i6c = 0

**i6d. Thank you very much for your time. Can you please hand the phone back to the staff person at [PROGRAM NAME]?**

INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT WILL NOT BE PART OF THE PACT STUDY AND WILL NOT BE IN THE PROGRAM BUT WILL RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT OTHER SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY.

INTRO1=0

i7. Hello, my name is [INTERVIEWER NAME], and I work for Mathematica Policy Research. Thanks for taking the time to talk to me today. I would like to tell you a little bit more about the [PROGRAM NAME] program.

The [PROGRAM NAME] program is participating in a study being conducted by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and Mathematica is assisting with the study. The study is called Parents and Children Together, or PACT, for short. Because you are required to receive services from [PROGRAM NAME], we are not asking you to participate in the PACT study. However, [PROGRAM NAME] will need to record some information about you in the PACT database in order to track your participation in their program. Everything you tell the researchers will be used for research purposes only, unless we are required by law to release it for some other purpose.

Do you have any questions?

YES ..... 1  
NO ..... 0 GO TO i7b

i7=01

i7a. What is your question?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)  
INTERVIEWER: PRESS Alt-F1 TO ACCESS FAQ

i7=00

i7b. Do you agree to allow [PROGRAM NAME] to record your information in the PACT database?  
YES ..... 1 GO TO A1  
NO ..... 0

i7b=00

FILL STAFF MEMBER NAME FROM INTRO2 ANSWER

i7c. Thank you very much for your time. Can you please hand the phone back to [STAFF MEMBER NAME]?  
INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT DID NOT AGREE TO HAVE THEIR INFORMATION RECORDED IN THE PACT DATABASE. DO NOT GIVE RESPONDENT A GIFT CARD.

## A. CONTACT INFORMATION

Thank you. I would like to start by asking you some questions about yourself.

ALL

**A1. What is your full name? Please spell that for me.**

INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM LAST NAME GIVEN IS THEIR FULL LEGAL NAME (i.e. ARE THERE TWO LAST NAMES OR HYPHENATED LAST NAME).

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
FIRST NAME

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
MIDDLE INITIAL/NAME

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
LAST NAME

SOFT CHECK: CONFIRM SPELLING OF NAME WITH RESPONDENT: [FILL NAME GIVEN].  
IF NECESSARY, GO BACK TO A1 TO CORRECT SPELLING.

ALL

FILL FULL NAME FROM A1

**A1a. I want to make sure that we call you by the correct name. Do you go by another name besides [FIRST NAME]?**

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO A2

A1a=01

**A1b. Please spell that name for me.**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NAME

ALL

**A2. What is your date of birth?**

|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|\_|\_|  
(01-12) (01-31) (1900-2013)  
MONTH DAY YEAR

SOFT CHECK: IF OUT OF RANGE < 18 YEARS OLD; I recorded (fill A2 ANSWER). Is that correct?  
PROGRAMMER: IF R CONFIRMS THEY ARE <18 YEARS OLD, GO TO END2.

ALL

**A3. What is your Social Security Number?**

|\_|\_|\_|-|\_|\_|-|\_|\_|\_|\_|  
(000-999) (00-99) (0000-9999)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**A3a. INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION:**

RWTW ASK OR VERIFY: **Are you male or female?**

MALE..... 1  
FEMALE ..... 2

ALL

**A4. What is your address?**

**PROBE: Is there an apartment number?**

STREET 1

STREET 2

APT. #

CITY

STATE

ZIP

ALL

**A5. What is your home telephone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

NO LANDLINE AT HOME, ONLY CELL PHONE ..... 0

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**A6. Do you have a cell phone?**

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO A9

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO A9

REFUSED ..... r GO TO A9

A6=1

**A6a. What is your cell phone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

SKIP IF INTRO1=0

**A7. I am going to ask you about the kind of cell phone service plan you have with your cell phone provider.**

Youthbuild

CODE ONE PER ROW

YES	NO	DK	REF
-----	----	----	-----

a. Do you have a contract? ..... 1 0 d r

b. Do you have a 'pay as you go' plan? ..... 1 0 d r

c. Do you have unlimited calling? ..... 1 0 d r

d. Do you have unlimited texting? ..... 1 0 d r

e. OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 1 0 d r

\_\_\_\_\_ (100)

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): SPECIFY OTHER TYPE OF PLAN

SKIP IF INTRO1=0 A7d=0

**A8. Is it okay for us to text you at this number?**

PACT developed

YES .....1

NO .....0

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

ALL

**A9. What is the full name of the person that will participate in [PROGRAM NAME] with you? Please spell that name for me.**

INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM LAST NAME GIVEN IS THE FULL LEGAL NAME (i.e. ARE THERE TWO LAST NAMES OR HYPHENATED LAST NAME).

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
FIRST NAME

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
MIDDLE INITIAL/NAME

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
LAST NAME

SOFT CHECK: CONFIRM SPELLING OF NAME WITH RESPONDENT: [FILL NAME GIVEN].  
IF NECESSARY, GO BACK TO A9 TO CORRECT SPELLING.

ALL

**A9a. Is [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] male or female?**

RWTW MALE..... 1  
FEMALE ..... 2

HARD CHECK: IF [A3a=1 AND A9a=1] OR [A3a=2 AND A9a=2] GO TO END3

ALL

INSERT FIRST NAME FROM A9 FIRST NAME AS [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]

**A10. I want to make sure that we use (his/her) correct name. Does [PARTNER/SPOUSE FIRST NAME] go by another name?**

YES ..... 1  
NO ..... 0 GO TO A11  
DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO A11  
REFUSED ..... r GO TO A11

PROGRAMMER: IF INTRO1=0 AND A10=0,  
DK, OR R, GO TO END4

A10=1

**A10a. Please spell that name for me.**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NAME

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

PROGRAMMER: IF INTRO1=0 AND A10a=  
NAME GIVEN, DK or R, GO TO END4

ALL

**A11. Do you have a biological or adopted child that lives with you?**

- YES ..... 1 GO TO B1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

A11=0, DK, R

IF A9a=1 FILL "HIM" IF A9a=2 FILL "HER"  
FILL [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] FROM A9 OR A10a

**A11a. Does [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have a biological or adopted child that lives with (him/her)?**

- YES ..... 1 GO TO B1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

A11=0, DK, R AND A11a=0, DK, R

FILL [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] FROM A9 OR A10a

**A11b. Are you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] expecting a child together?**

- YES ..... 1 GO TO B1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO B1
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO B1
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO B1

## B. DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about your background.

ALL

**B1. Are you Hispanic, Latino, or of Spanish origin?**

OMB

INSTRUCTION: IF RESPONDENT ONLY SAYS "YES", PROBE: **Are you Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or of other Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?**

**CODE ALL THAT**

**APPLY**

- NO, NOT OF HISPANIC, LATINO OR SPANISH ORIGIN ..... 0
- YES, MEXICAN, MEXICAN AMERICAN, CHICANO ..... 1
- YES, PUERTO RICAN ..... 2
- YES, CUBAN ..... 3
- YES, ANOTHER HISPANIC, LATINO OR SPANISH ORIGIN ..... 4
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**B2. What is your race?**

OMB

**CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

- AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKA NATIVE ..... 1
- ASIAN ..... 2
- BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN ..... 3
- NATIVE HAWAIIAN OR OTHER PACIFIC ISLANDER ..... 4
- WHITE ..... 5
- OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **SPECIFY OTHER RACE**

ALL

**B3. What country were you born in?**

BSF

**CODE ONE ONLY**

- UNITED STATES ..... 1 GO TO B5
- PUERTO RICO ..... 2
- CANADA ..... 3
- MEXICO ..... 4
- CUBA ..... 5
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC..... 6
- EL SALVADOR ..... 7
- HAITI ..... 8
- JAMAICA..... 9
- GUATEMALA ..... 10
- NICARAGUA..... 11
- OTHER COUNTRY (SPECIFY)..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO B5
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO B5

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **SPECIFY OTHER COUNTRY**

B3 NE 1, D OR R

**B4. When did you first come to live in the United States?**

BSF

INSTRUCTION: FIRST CODE IF ANSWER IS 'SPECIFIC YEAR' OR 'NUMBER OF YEARS AGO'. YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ENTER SPECIFIC YEAR OR NUMBER OF YEARS ON THE NEXT SCREEN.

- SPECIFY YEAR ..... 1
- SPECIFY NUMBER OF YEARS AGO..... 2

|\_|\_|\_|\_| YEAR  
(1900 - 2013)

OR

|\_|\_|.|\_| NUMBER OF YEARS AGO  
(0-99.9)

- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**B5. What is the highest level of education you have completed?**

INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT SAYS "HIGH SCHOOL," PROBE: **Did you receive a diploma or GED?**

COBRA tailored for PACT

**CODE ONE ONLY**

- DID NOT COMPLETE HIGH SCHOOL OR GED ..... 1
- HIGH SCHOOL: DIPLOMA..... 2
- HIGH SCHOOL: GENERAL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OR GED..... 3
- SOME COLLEGE/SOME POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL COURSES ..... 4
- 2-YEAR OR 3-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE (ASSOCIATE'S DEGREE)..... 5
- VOCATIONAL SCHOOL DIPLOMA ..... 6
- 4-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE (BACHELOR'S DEGREE) ..... 7
- SOME GRADUATE WORK/NO GRADUATE DEGREE ..... 8
- GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE (e.g., MA, MBA, Ph.D., JD, MD) ..... 9
- NEVER ATTENDED SCHOOL ..... 10 GO TO B6
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

B3 NE 1 AND B5 NE 10

**B5a. Did you complete this education in the United States?**

PACT developed

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**B6. What is your primary language?**

BSF

- ENGLISH..... 1
- SPANISH..... 2
- OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

## C. RELATIONSHIP STATUS

The next questions are about you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME].

ALL

### C1. Are you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]...

BSF 15 month  
follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- Married**, ..... 1  
**Divorced**, ..... 2  
**Separated, or** ..... 3  
**Have you never been married to each other?** ..... 4 GO TO C5  
**DON'T KNOW** ..... d GO TO C5  
**REFUSED** ..... r GO TO C5

C1 = 1, 2 OR 3

### C2. When did you get married to [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?

BSF 15 month  
follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR.

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/YYYY

|\_|\_| / |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|      DATE OF MARRIAGE  
(01-12) (1900-2014)  
MONTH      YEAR

- DON'T KNOW** ..... d GO TO C5  
**REFUSED** ..... r GO TO C5

C1= 3 AND C2 NOT=DK, RF

### C3. And when did you separate from [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?

BSF 15 month  
follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR.

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/YYYY

GO TO C5

|\_|\_| / |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|      DATE OF SEPARATION  
(01-12) (1900-2014)  
MONTH      YEAR

- DON'T KNOW** ..... d GO TO C5  
**REFUSED** ..... r GO TO C5

C1=2 AND C2 NOT=DK, RF AND C3 NOT= DK, RF

**C4. When did the divorce become final?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR.

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/YYYY

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ DATE OF END OF MARRIAGE GO TO C5  
(01-12) (1900-2014)  
MONTH YEAR

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C5

REFUSED ..... r GO TO C5

C1 ≠ 1

**C5. Which of the following statements best describes your current relationship with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

**We are romantically involved on a steady basis.** ..... 1 GO TO C6

**We are involved in an on-again and off-again relationship.** ..... 2 GO TO C6

**We are not in a romantic relationship.** ..... 3 GO TO C10

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C6

REFUSED ..... r GO TO C6

C1 ≠ 1 AND C5 ≠ 3

**C6. How long have you been romantically involved with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?**

BSF baseline

INSTRUCTION: FIRST CODE IF ANSWER IS 'SPECIFY TOTAL NUMBER' OR 'SPECIFY DATE' YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ENTER NUMBER OF UNITS OR SPECIFIC DATE ON THE NEXT SCREEN.

SPECIFY TOTAL NUMBER (UNITS) ..... 1

SPECIFY DATE ..... 2

\_\_\_\_.\_\_\_\_ # OF UNITS

MONTHS ..... 1

YEARS ..... 2

WEEKS (IF LESS THAN ONE WEEK, ENTER 1 WEEK) ..... 3

OR

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ SPECIFIC DATE  
(01-12) (1900-2014)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

[C1 =4, DK OR R] AND [C5= 1 OR 2]

**C7. Are you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] engaged to be married?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO C10
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C10
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO C10

C7=1

**C7a. Have you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] made a specific plan together to get married?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO C10
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C10
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO C10

C7A = 1

**C8. When are you planning to get married?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR.  
 PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/YYYY

_ _	/	_ _ _ _	DATE PLANNING TO MARRY
(01-12)		(2012-2100)	
MONTH		YEAR	

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF NO DATE IS GIVEN, DO NOT PROBE

- NO DATE HAS BEEN SET ..... 13 GO TO C10
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C10
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO C10

C1 = 2, 4, DK OR R AND C5 NE 3 AND C7 NE 0, DK OR RF AND C7A NE 0, DK OR RF AND C8 NE 13, DK OR RF

**C9. What do you think the chances are you will marry [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] in the future? Would you say . . .**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- No chance, ..... 0
- A little chance, ..... 1
- A 50-50 chance, ..... 2
- A pretty good chance, or ..... 3
- An almost certain chance? ..... 4
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**C10. Do you currently live with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] in the same household ...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- All of the time, ..... 1 GO TO C12
- Most of the time, ..... 2
- Some of the time, or ..... 3
- None of the time? ..... 4
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

IF C10 ≠ 1

**C11. How often do you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] see or talk to each other? Is it...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- Every day or almost every day, ..... 1
- A few times a week, ..... 2
- A few times a month, ..... 3
- About once a month, ..... 4
- Only a few times in the past year, or ..... 5
- Hardly ever or never? ..... 6
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL
IF C1 = 1 OR 3 FILL "TO SOMEONE ELSE BESIDES [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]"
IF C1=2 FILL "TO SOMEONE ELSE"

**C12. Have you ever been married [[to someone else] besides [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]]?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO C14
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C14
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO C14

C12 = 1
IF C1=1 OR 3 AND IF C12=1, FILL: "Including your current marriage,"

**C13. [Including your current marriage,] in total, how many times have you been married?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

- # OF MARRIAGES (1-99)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

SOFT CHECK: [IF C1=1,2 OR 3 AND C12=1 AND C13 < 2] OR [IF C1=1,2 OR 3 AND C12=0 AND C13 < 1]  
**You mentioned in a previous question that you were married [INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: THE NUMBER OF MARRIAGES IN THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE MORE THAN 1], can you confirm how many times you have been married including your current marriage? [INTERVIEWER: IF C13=0 OR 1AFTER SOFT CHECK, PLEASE CHANGE ANSWER IN C1.**

A11=1 OR A11a=1
-----------------

**Now I have some questions about your children.**

**C14. Are you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] expecting a baby together now?**

PACT developed

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO C15
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C15
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO C15

A11b=1 OR C14=1

**C14a. When is your baby with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] due?**

PACT developed

|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|\_|\_| DUE DATE

(01-12) (01-31) (2013-2015)  
MONTH DAY YEAR

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: ALLOW REFUSAL FOR MM/DD/YYYY

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF DAY UNKNOWN RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR.

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

SOFT CHECK: IF DATE GIVEN FOR BABY DUE IS ON OR BEFORE DATE OF INTERVIEW [DATE BABY DUE < DATE OF INTERVIEW] ASK: **I want to make sure I have the date the baby is due recorded correctly, you told me the baby is due [Fill date from C14a] is that correct?** INTERVIEWER CORRECT DATE GIVEN IF NECESSARY IN C14a.

A11b=1 OR C14=1

**C14b. Right before the pregnancy, did you want to have a baby with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]? Would you say...**

NSFG EG-12a

**Definitely yes,** ..... 1

**Probably yes,** ..... 2

**Probably no, or** ..... 3

**Definitely no?** ..... 4 GO TO C15

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

[A11b=1 OR C14=1] AND C14b=1,2,3 D OR R

**C14c. Would you say this pregnancy came sooner than you wanted, at about the right time, or later than you wanted?**

NSFG EG-17

SOONER..... 1

RIGHT TIME..... 2

LATER..... 3

DIDN'T CARE ..... 4

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**C15. How many biological children do you have with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]? Please don't include any children that have not yet been born or children that you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] had with other partners.**

Modified from  
BSF baseline

\_\_\_\_ CHILDREN  
(0-99)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

IF A3a = 1 FILL "WOMEN", IF A3a = 2, FILL "MEN"

**C16. How many biological children do you have with other (men/women) besides [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]? Please include all of your children with other (men/women), even if they are not currently living with you. Please do not include children who have not been born yet.**

BSF baseline

\_\_\_\_ # OF CHILDREN WITH OTHER PARTNER(S)  
(0-99)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

IF A3a = 1 FILL "MEN", IF A3a = 2, FILL "WOMEN"

IF A3a = 1, FILL "HER", IF A3a = 2, FILL "HIS"

**C17. How many biological children does [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have with other (men/women)? Please include all of (his/her) children with other partners, even if they are not currently living with you. Please do not include children who have not been born yet.**

BSF baseline  
modified

\_\_\_\_ # OF CHILDREN WITH OTHER PARTNER(S)  
(0-99)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**C18. Do you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have any adopted children?**

BSF baseline  
modified

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0 GO TO C19

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO C19

REFUSED ..... r GO TO C19

C18 = 1

**C18a. How many adopted children do you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have?**

**PROBE: Please do not include any children you previously told us about.**

BSF baseline modified

|\_|\_| # OF CHILDREN  
(0-99)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

**SOFT CHECK: IF C18a=0 AND C18=1 ASK RESPONDENT: How many adopted children do you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have? IF ANSWER REMAINS 0, RECODE C18.**

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION:  
IF C15+C16+C17+C18a=0 GO TO E1  
IF C15 + C16 + C17 +C18a ≥ 1 GO TO C19

IF C15 + C16+ C17+ C18a=0 GO TO E1

IF C18=0 FILL NUMBER IF [C15 + C16 + C17 ≥ 1]  
IF C18=1 FILL NUMBER IF [C15 + C16 + C17+ C18a ≥ 1]

**C19. How many of these [FILL NUMBER] children that you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have, live with you?**

IF C15+C16 +C17 + C18a=1 ASK **Does this child that your or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have, live with you?"**

|\_|\_| # OF CHILDREN WHO LIVE WITH RESPONDENT  
(0-99)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION:  
IF C19=0 GO TO D11, ELSE GO TO D1

## D. PARENTING

PROGRAMMER:

WE WILL ROSTER FOR UP TO 10 CHILDREN.

THIS INCLUDES ALL CHILDREN OF RESPONDENT INCLUDING  
BIOLOGICAL, ADOPTED AND STEP CHILDREN LIVING IN THE  
RESPONDENTS' HOUSEHOLD

**Now, we want to talk about the children in your home. In this section, we want to focus on your or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME's] biological children or adopted children who live with you all or most of the time. Please do not include any current pregnancies.**

	CHILD 1	CHILD 2	CHILD 3
<p>Total Children in C19 &gt; 0</p> <p><b>D1.</b> [FOR CHILD 1 (IF C19 &gt; 1), FILL: <b>Starting with the youngest child in your home FOR CHILD 2-10 FILL: Now thinking of the next youngest child in your home,] please spell this child's first and last name for me. ....</b></p> <p>[ALL] Remember that in this section we would like to focus on your and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] biological or adopted children</p> <p>INSTRUCTION; IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT GIVE FULL NAME PROBE FOR A NAME OR INITIALS</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>FIRST NAME</p> <p>_____</p> <p>LAST NAME</p> <p>DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D1 =1, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>FIRST NAME</p> <p>_____</p> <p>LAST NAME</p> <p>DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D1 =1, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>FIRST NAME</p> <p>_____</p> <p>LAST NAME</p> <p>DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D1 =1, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</p>
<p>D1 NOT= Deceased</p> <p><b>D2.</b> [CHILD 1 FILL: I want to make sure that we use [CHILD FIRST NAME]'s correct first name.] Do you call [CHILD FIRST NAME] by a different name?.....</p>	<p>YES..... 1</p> <p>NO..... 0 GO TO D4</p> <p>DECEASED ..... 2 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D2 =2, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss</p> <p>DON'T KNOW.. d GO TO D4</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r GO TO D4</p>	<p>YES..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 0 GO TO D4</p> <p>DECEASED ..... 2 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D2 =2, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss</p> <p>DON'T KNOW.. d GO TO D4</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r GO TO D4</p>	<p>YES..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 0 GO TO D4</p> <p>DECEASED ..... 2 GO TO D10</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: IF D2 =2, THEN SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss</p> <p>DON'T KNOW.. d GO TO D4</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r GO TO D4</p>

BSF

	CHILD 1	CHILD 2	CHILD 3
D2=1 <b>D3. Please spell that name for me.</b> ..... <input type="text" value="BSF"/>	NOTE: IF NICKNAME, USE AS FILL FOR [CHILD FIRST NAME] IN REMAINDER OF SURVEY _____ NICKNAME  DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D3 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>	NOTE: IF NICKNAME, USE AS FILL FOR [CHILD FIRST NAME] IN REMAINDER OF SURVEY _____ NICKNAME  DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D3 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>	NOTE: IF NICKNAME, USE AS FILL FOR [CHILD FIRST NAME] IN REMAINDER OF SURVEY _____ NICKNAME  DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D3 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>
D1 NOT=1, D2 NOT=2 AND D3 NOT=1 FILL [CHILD FIRST NAME] FROM D1 OR D3 CODE SEX. IF NECESSARY ASK: <b>D4. Is [CHILD FIRST NAME] a boy or girl?</b> .....	BOY .....1 GIRL.....2 DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r DECEASED ....3 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D4 =3, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>	BOY .....1 GIRL.....2 DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r DECEASED ....3 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D4 =3, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>	BOY .....1 GIRL .....2 DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r DECEASED ....3 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D4 =3, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b>
D1 NOT=1, D2 NOT=2, D3 NOT=1 AND D4 NOT=3 <b>D5. What is [CHILD FIRST NAME]'s date of birth?</b> .....	PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/DD/YYYY  _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _  (0-12) (01-31) (1900-2014) MONTH DAY YEAR DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D5 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW..d REFUSED.....r	PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/DD/YYYY  _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _  (0-12) (01-31) (1900-2014) MONTH DAY YEAR DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D5 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW..d REFUSED.....r	PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/DD/YYYY  _ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _  (0-12) (01-31) (1900-2014) MONTH DAY YEAR DECEASED ....1 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D5 =1, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW..d REFUSED.....r
D5 =D OR R <b>D6. How old is [CHILD FIRST NAME]? Is that weeks, months or years? ...</b> <input type="text" value="PACT developed"/>	_ _  (0-99) WEEKS .....1 MONTHS .....2 YEARS.....3 DECEASED ....4 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D6=4, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r	_ _  (0-99) WEEKS .....1 MONTHS .....2 YEARS.....3 DECEASED ....4 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D6=4, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r	_ _  (0-99) WEEKS .....1 MONTHS .....2 YEARS.....3 DECEASED ....4 GO TO D10 INTERVIEWER: IF D6=4, THEN SAY: <b>I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.</b> DON'T KNOW.....d REFUSED.....r

	CHILD 1	CHILD 2	CHILD 3
<p>ALL</p> <p>IF RESPONDENT SAYS CHILD DOES NOT LIVE IN HOUSEHOLD, CODE AS 4.</p> <p><b>D7. Does [CHILD FIRST NAME] live with you...</b></p> <p>.....</p> <p>FFCWS tailored for PACT</p>	<p><b>All of the time,</b>..... 1</p> <p><b>Most of the time, or</b> ..... 2</p> <p><b>Some of the time?</b> ..... 3</p> <p>NONE OF THE TIME ..... 4</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r</p> <p>IF D7, CHILD 1 = 1 OR 2 THEN GO TO D8, OR IF D7, CHILD 1 = 3 OR 4. GO TO D10.</p>	<p><b>All of the time,</b>..... 1</p> <p><b>Most of the time, or</b>..... 2</p> <p><b>Some of the time?</b>..... 3</p> <p>NONE OF THE TIME..... 4</p> <p>DON'T KNOW..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p> <p>IF D7, CHILD 2 = 1 OR 2 THEN GO TO D8, OR IF D7, CHILD 2 = 3 OR 4, GO TO D10.</p>	<p><b>All of the time,</b>..... 1</p> <p><b>Most of the time, or</b>..... 2</p> <p><b>Some of the time?</b>..... 3</p> <p>NONE OF THE TIME..... 4</p> <p>DON'T KNOW..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p> <p>IF D7, CHILD 3 = 1 OR 2 THEN GO TO D8, OR IF D7, CHILD 3 = 3 OR 4. GO TO D10.</p>
<p>D7, CHILD 1-10 = 1 OR 2 ASK D8, OTHERWISE GO TO D10.</p> <p><b>D8. What is [CHILD FIRST NAME]'s relationship</b></p> <p>.....</p> <p>RTW tailored for PACT</p> <p>IF RESPONDENT SAYS STEPCCHILD CODE AS 3</p> <p>INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF RESPONDENT SAYS SON/DAUGHTER PROBE FOR RESPONSE CATEGORIES</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p>
<p>D7, CHILD 1-10 = 1 OR 2 ASK D9,</p> <p><b>D9. What is [CHILD FIRST NAME's] relationship to [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?</b></p> <p>.....</p> <p>IF RESPONDENT SAYS STEPCCHILD CODE AS 3</p> <p>INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF RESPONDENT SAYS SON/DAUGHTER PROBE FOR RESPONSE CATEGORIES</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p>	<p>BIOLOGICAL CHILD ..... 1</p> <p>ADOPTED CHILD ..... 2</p> <p>PARTNER'S CHILD ..... 3</p> <p>NOT RELATED ..... 4</p> <p>OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99</p> <p>_____ (STRING 50)</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p>
<p>ALL</p> <p><b>D10. Do any other biological or adopted children of you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] live in your home?</b></p> <p>.....</p> <p>PACT developed</p>	<p>YES ..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 0</p> <p>DON'T KNOW ..... d</p> <p>REFUSED ..... r</p> <p>IF C19=1 AND D10, CHILD 1=0 GO TO D11 IF C19 ≥2 AND D10, CHILD 1=1 GO TO D1, CHILD 2 IF C19 &gt;1 AND D10, CHILD 1=0, d OR r SOFT CHECK: <b>YOU TOLD US YOU HAD [FILL NUMBER FROM C19] CHILDREN LIVING WITH YOU. IS THAT CORRECT?</b> IF D1, CHILD 1=1 AND D10,</p>	<p>YES..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 0</p> <p>DON'T KNOW..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p> <p>IF C19=2 AND D10, CHILD 1=0 GO TO D11 IF C19 ≥3 AND D10, CHILD 1=1 GO TO D1, CHILD 3 IF C19 &gt;1 AND D10, CHILD 2=0, d OR r SOFT CHECK: <b>YOU TOLD US YOU HAD [FILL NUMBER FROM C19] CHILDREN LIVING WITH YOU. IS THAT CORRECT?</b> IF [D1, CHILD1=1 AND D1, CHILD 2=1] AND [D10, CHILD 1=0 AND D10, CHILD 2=0] GO TO E1.</p>	<p>YES ..... 1</p> <p>NO ..... 0</p> <p>DON'T KNOW..... d</p> <p>REFUSED..... r</p> <p>IF C19=3 AND D10, CHILD 1=0 GO TO D11 IF C19≥4 AND D10, CHILD 1=1 GO TO D1, CHILD 4 IF C19 &gt;1 AND D10, CHILD 3=0, d OR r SOFT CHECK: <b>YOU TOLD US YOU HAD [FILL NUMBER FROM C19] CHILDREN LIVING WITH YOU. IS THAT CORRECT?</b> IF [D1, CHILD 1=1,D1, CHILD 2=1 AND D1, CHILD 3=1] AND [D10, CHILD 1=0, D10, CHILD 2=0 AND D10, CHILD 3=0 GO TO E1.</p>

FILL CHILD IF C15+C16+C17+C18A=1  
 FILL CHILDREN IF C15+C16+C17+C18A > 1

**D11. Now, I would like to talk about you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] as parents.**

PAM

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: FILL IF [C15=1 AND C16+C17 ≥ 1] [This includes children you have in common, as well as children you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have with other partners.]

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: FILL IF [C15=0 AND C16+C17 ≥ 1] [This includes children you or [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] have with other partners.]

For each statement, please answer if you strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, or strongly disagree.

[STATEMENT a to e] Do you strongly agree, mildly agree, mildly disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #1 (blue card) for the answer choices.

		CODE ONE PER ROW					
		STRONGLY AGREE	MILDLY AGREE	MILDLY DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
a.	PAM 18 .....	1	2	3	4	d	R
b.	PAM 11 .....	1	2	3	4	d	R
c.	PAM 3 .....	1	2	3	4	d	R
d.	PAM 14 .....	1	2	3	4	d	R
e.	PAM 7 .....	1	2	3	4	d	R

ALL

**D12. Next, I would like to have your thoughts on a few statements about families. Tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements . . .**

INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #2 (yellow card) for the answer choices.

		CODE ONE PER ROW					
		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
BSF 15 month follow-up	a. Single parents can bring up children just as well as couples can. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R
FF	b. When there are children in the family, parents should stay together even if they don't get along. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R
	c. It is better for a couple to be married than to just live together. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R
SHM	d. Mothers are more important than fathers in raising children. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R
	e. It is better for children if their parents are married. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R
FF MOD FOR PACT	f. A father should provide financial support to his child, even if the mother is living with another man. ....	1	2	3	4	d	R

## E. RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

ALL

**E1.** Now I would like to ask about how you feel in the relationship with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all happy and 10 is completely happy, taking all things together, how happy are you with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?

BSF 15 month follow-up modified for PACT

You can choose any number from 0 to 10.

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| DESCRIPTION  
(0-10)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

IF C1 = 1, FILL "MARRIAGE", IF C1 NE1 = FILL "RELATIONSHIP"

**E1a.** On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all committed and 10 is completely committed, how committed are you to your (marriage/relationship) with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]?

Adapted from Scott Stanley

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| DESCRIPTION  
(0-10)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

IF C1 = 1, FILL "MARRIAGE", IF C1 NE1 = FILL "RELATIONSHIP"

**E1b.** On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not at all committed and 10 is completely committed, how committed would you say [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] is to your (relationship/marriage)?

Adapted from Scott Stanley

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| DESCRIPTION  
(0-10)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

SKIP IF C5=3

IF C1 = 1, FILL "MARRIAGE", IF C1 NE1 = FILL "RELATIONSHIP"

**E2.** In the last three months, have you ever thought your (marriage/relationship) was in trouble?

SHM

YES ..... 1

NO ..... 0

NOT IN A RELATIONSHIP ..... 99

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

I'm going to ask you some questions about [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME].

E3. Tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements.  
 [STATEMENT a-h] Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?

INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #2 (yellow card) for the answer choices.

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE PER ROW

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
a. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] is honest and truthful with me. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
b. I can trust [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] completely. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
c. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] can be counted on to help me. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
d. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] knows and understands me. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
e. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] listens to me when I need someone to talk to. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
f. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] respects me. .	1	2	3	4	d	r
SKIP IF C5=3						
g. [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] shows love and affection.....	1	2	3	4	d	r
h. I feel appreciated by [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME]. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r

ALL

**E4.** Now, I am going to read you some statements about things you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] may experience when you are together. Tell me if this often happens, sometimes happens, hardly ever happens, or never happens.

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

[STATEMENT a - j] Does this happen often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?

INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #3 (green card) for the answer choices.

CODE ONE PER ROW

OFTEN	SOMETIMES	HARDL Y EVER	NEVE R	DK	REF
-------	-----------	-----------------	-----------	----	-----

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

a. **We are good at solving our differences.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

b. **[PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] is rude and mean to me when we disagree.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

SHM

c. **[PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] is good at calming me when I get upset.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

d. **Little arguments turn into ugly fights with accusations, criticisms, name calling or bringing up past hurts.**..... 1 2 3 4 d r

e. **We are pretty good listeners, even when we have different positions on things.**..... 1 2 3 4 d r

f. **[PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] blames me for things that go wrong.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

g. **Even when arguing we can keep a sense of humor.**..... 1 2 3 4 d r

h. **When we argue, I feel personally attacked by [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME].** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

BSF

i. **When we discuss something, [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] acts as if I am totally wrong.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

j. **I feel respected even when we disagree.** ..... 1 2 3 4 d r

ALL

**E5. In the last three months how often [STATEMENT a-d]...Was it often, sometimes, hardly ever, or never?**  
**INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #3 (green card) for the answer choices.**

		CODE ONE PER ROW					
		OFTEN	SOMETIMES	HARDLY EVER	NEVER	DK	REF
SHM revised for PACT	a. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] made you feel stupid? .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
SHM revised for PACT	b. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] tried to keep you from seeing or talking with your friends or family? .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
SHM revised for PACT	c. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] kept money from you, made you ask for money, or taken your money without asking? .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
SHM revised for PACT	d. Have you felt afraid that [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] would hurt you? .....	1	2	3	4	d	r

ALL

**E6. In the past year, how many times has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] pushed, shoved, hit, slapped or grabbed you?**

SHM modified for PACT

**Would you say...**

CODE ONE ONLY

- Never, .....0
- Once, .....1
- Twice, .....2
- Three to five times, .....3
- More than five times? .....4
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

ALL

**E7. Sometimes couples are not always faithful to each other. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] cheated on you with someone else in the past 12 months? Would you say...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

BSF 36 month follow-up tailored for PACT

IF NOT IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP (C5=3): **Sometimes couples are not always faithful to each other. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] ever cheated on you with someone else? Would you say...**

CODE ONE ONLY

- Definitely yes, ..... 1
- Probably yes, ..... 2
- Probably no, or ..... 3
- Definitely no? ..... 4
- WAS NEVER IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP ..... 99
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**E8. In the past 12 months, have you cheated on [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] with someone else?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

BSF 36 month follow-up tailored for PACT

IF NOT IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP (C5=3): **Have you ever cheated on [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] with someone else?**

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- WAS NEVER IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP ..... 99
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

## F. ECONOMIC STABILITY

The next questions are about work you have done for pay.

ALL

**F1. In the past 30 days, have you worked for pay? Please include any regular paid jobs, odd jobs, temporary jobs, work in your own business, "under the table" work, "informal" work, or any other types of work you have done.**

WFNJ tailored for PACT

YES ..... 1 GO TO F3  
 NO ..... 0  
 DON'T KNOW ..... d  
 REFUSED ..... r

F1 NE 1

**F2. In what month and year did you last work for pay? Please include any regular paid jobs, odd jobs, temporary jobs, work in your own business, "under the table" work, "informal" work, or any other types of work you have done.**

WFNJ tailored for PACT

/   
 MONTH YEAR GO TO F6  
 (1-12) (1900-2014)  
 NEVER WORKED FOR PAY ..... 0 GO TO F6  
 DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO F6  
 REFUSED ..... r GO TO F6

F1=1

**F3. In the past 30 days, how much money did you make? Please include tips, bonuses, commissions, and regular overtime pay, and count all money you received before taxes and deductions. If you held more than one job, include your total earnings from all of your work during the 30 days.**

WFNJ tailored for PACT

\$  ,  AMOUNT GO  
 TO F6  
 (0-999,999)  
 DON'T KNOW ..... d  
 REFUSED ..... r

SOFT CHECK: IF ANSWER = 0; INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM ANSWER WITH RESPONDENT. IF THEY DID RECEIVE PAY, PLEASE CHANGE THE ANSWER IN F3.

SOFT CHECK: IF ANSWER = IS \$5,000 OR ABOVE; INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM ANSWER WITH RESPONDENT THIS IS THE AMOUNT THEY MADE IN THE PAST 30 DAYS. IF NOT, PLEASE CHANGE THE ANSWER IN F3.

F3 = D OR R

**F4. I just need to know a range. Can you tell me if it was . . .**

BSF 15  
month  
follow up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: YOU CAN STOP READING WHEN RESPONDENT PROVIDES RANGE.

CODE ONE ONLY

- Less than \$500, ..... 1 GO TO F6
- Between \$500 and \$750, ..... 2 GO TO F6
- Between \$750 and \$1,000, ..... 3 GO TO F6
- Between \$1,000 and \$1,250, ..... 4 GO TO F6
- Between \$1,250 and \$1,500, ..... 5 GO TO F6
- Between \$1,500 and \$1,750, ..... 6 GO TO F6
- Between \$1,750 and \$2,000, ..... 7 GO TO F6
- Between \$2,000 and \$2,500, ..... 8 GO TO F6
- Between \$2,500 and \$3,000, ..... 9 GO TO F6
- Between \$3,000 and \$3,500, ..... 10 GO TO F6
- Between \$3,500 and \$4,000, ..... 11 GO TO F6
- Between \$4,000 and \$4,500, ..... 12 GO TO F6
- Between \$4,500 and \$5,000, ..... 13 GO TO F6
- Between \$5,000 and \$5,500, ..... 14 GO TO F6
- Between \$5,500 and \$6,000 or ..... 15 GO TO F6
- \$6,000 or more? ..... 16 GO TO F6
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

F4=D OR R

**F4a. How many weeks this past month did you work?**

WFNJ

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF LESS THAN 1 WEEK, CODE AS 1.

\_\_\_\_ WEEKS

(1-4)

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO F6

REFUSED ..... r GO TO F6

F4a = ANSWER

**F4b. How many hours do you usually work in a week? Your best estimate is fine.**

RWTW tailored for PACT

\_\_\_\_ . \_\_\_\_ HOURS PER WEEK

(1-98.9)

99 OR MORE HOURS PER WEEK ..... 99

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO F6

REFUSED ..... r GO TO F6

F4b =ANSWER

**F4c. What is your current hourly rate of pay, before taxes and deductions?**

RWTW tailored for PACT

\$ | | | | . | | | PER HOUR  
(1-999.99)

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO F6

REFUSED .....r GO TO F6

AMOUNT = 4a ANSWER X 4b ANSWER X 4c ANSWER

**F4d. Based on what you've told me, last month you made about [AMOUNT]. Is that correct?**

RWTW

YES ..... 1

NO .....0 GO TO F4a

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO F4a

REFUSED .....r GO TO F4a

SOFT CHECK: IF F4d=0, d or r Say: **Ok, let's go over this again...** INTERVIEWER: GO TO F4a

PROGRAMMER:  
IF F4D= NO, DON'T KNOW OR REFUSED TWICE, GO TO F5.

IF ANSWER AT F4d

**F5. In addition to your pay, do you get tips, bonuses, or commissions?**

RWTW tailored for PACT

YES ..... 1

NO .....0 GO TO F6

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO F6

REFUSED .....r GO TO F6

F5=1

**F5a. In the past 30 days, how much did you receive in tips, bonuses, or commissions?**

RWTW tailored for PACT

\$ | | | | , | | | | AMOUNT ..... GO TO F6  
(0-999,999)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

SOFT CHECK: IF ANSWER = 0; INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM ANSWER WITH RESPONDENT. IF THEY DID NOT RECEIVE TIPS, BONUSSES, OR COMMISSIONS, GO BACK TO F5 AND CHANGE TO NO.

F5a = D OR R

**F5b. I just need to know a range. Can you tell me if it was . . .**

BSF 15  
month  
follow up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: YOU CAN STOP READING WHEN RESPONDENT PROVIDES RANGE.

CODE ONE ONLY

- Less than \$500, ..... 1
- Between \$500 and \$750, ..... 2
- Between \$750 and \$1,000, ..... 3
- Between \$1,000 and \$1,250, ..... 4
- Between \$1,250 and \$1,500, ..... 5
- Between \$1,500 and \$1,750, ..... 6
- Between \$1,750 and \$2,000, ..... 7
- Between \$2,000 and \$2,500, ..... 8
- Between \$2,500 and \$3,000, ..... 9
- Between \$3,000 and \$3,500, ..... 10
- Between \$3,500 and \$4,000, ..... 11
- Between \$4,000 and \$4,500, ..... 12
- Between \$4,500 and \$5,000, ..... 13
- Between \$5,000 and \$5,500, or ..... 14
- Between \$5,500 and \$6,000? ..... 15
- \$6,000 or more? ..... 16
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**F6. The next questions are about where you live.**

WFNJ

**Do you currently own your home, rent it, pay some amount toward rent, live rent free with a friend or relative, or do you have some other arrangement?**

CODE ONE ONLY

- OWN OR HAVE MORTGAGE ..... 1
- RENT ..... 2
- PAY SOME OF THE RENT ..... 3
- LIVE RENT FREE (SOMEONE ELSE RENTS/OWNS HOUSE) ..... 4
- LIVE IN SHELTER ..... 5
- LIVE ON STREETS ..... 6
- LIVE IN ABANDONED BUILDING/CAR ..... 7
- OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 250)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **What is the other arrangement?**

ALL

F7. Now, I have some questions about difficulties you may have experienced in the past 12 months. Please tell me if there has been a time during the past 12 months when . . .

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE PER ROW

YES	NO	DK	REF
-----	----	----	-----

	a. You could not pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage that you were supposed to pay? .....	1	0	d	r
--	---	---	---	---	---

	b. You had service turned off by the water, gas or electric company, or the oil company would not deliver oil because you could not afford to pay the bill? .....	1	0	d	r
--	---	---	---	---	---

	c. You were evicted from your home or apartment because you could not pay the rent or mortgage? .....	1	0	d	r
--	---	---	---	---	---

Gallup

	d. You did not have enough money to buy food that you or your family needed? .....	1	0	d	r
--	--	---	---	---	---

ALL

TEXAS SITE FILL [TEXAS WORKS] FOR [LOCAL NAME OF TANF]  
NY AND FL SITES NO FILL [LOCAL NAME OF TANF]

F8. Now, I'm going to ask you about some benefits you or members of your household may have received.

In the past 30 days, please tell me whether you, [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME], or the children who live with you received cash welfare which is also known as TANF, [or [LOCAL NAME OF TANF]]?

PROBE: Did you, [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME], or the children who live with you receive income from this source in past 30 days?

BSF 15 month follow-up

YES .....1  
 NO .....0  
 DON'T KNOW .....d  
 REFUSED .....r

ALL

F9. In the 30 days, please tell me whether you, [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME], or the children who live with you received food stamps, also known as Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP benefits.

PROBE: Did you, [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME], or the children who live with you receive income from this source in 30 days?

BSF 15 month follow-up

YES .....1  
 NO .....0  
 DON'T KNOW .....d  
 REFUSED .....r

## G. BACKGROUND AND WELL BEING

The next questions are about your relationship with your biological parents.

ALL

**G1. When you were growing up—that is before you turned 18—did you live most of the time with . . .**

**PROBE:** In which of these living situations did you spend most of your time before you turned 18?

BSF 15  
month  
follow up

CODE ONE ONLY

- Both your biological mother and your biological father, .....** 1
- Your biological mother only, .....** 2 GO TO G3
- Your biological father only, or .....** 3 GO TO G3
- Neither of your biological parents? .....** 4 GO TO G3
- DON'T KNOW .....** d GO TO G3
- REFUSED .....** r GO TO G3

G1=1

**G2. Did you always live with both of your biological parents until you turned 18?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow up  
modified  
for PACT

- YES .....** 1
- NO .....** 0
- DON'T KNOW .....** d
- REFUSED .....** r

ALL

**G3. Were your biological parents ever married to each other?**

BSF 15 MONTH FOLLOW UP

- YES .....** 1
- NO .....** 0
- DON'T KNOW .....** d
- REFUSED .....** r

These next questions are about how you are doing.

ALL

**G4. Over the last two weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?**

PHQ-8 PROGRAMMER: FILL a-h

Would you say that the problem happened not at all, several days, more than half the days, or nearly every day in the last two weeks?

INTERVIEWER: Respondent can refer to Card #4 (pink card) for the answer choices.

CODE ONE RESPONSE PER ROW

	NOT AT ALL	SEVERAL DAYS	MORE THAN HALF THE DAYS	NEARLY EVERY DAY	DK	REF
a. Little interest or pleasure in doing things.....	0	1	2	3	d	r
b. Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless. ....	0	1	2	3	d	r
c. Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much. ....	0	1	2	3	d	r
d. Feeling tired or having little energy.....	0	1	2	3	d	r
e. Poor appetite or overeating.....	0	1	2	3	d	r
f. Feeling bad about yourself—or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down....	0	1	2	3	d	r
g. Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television.....	0	1	2	3	d	r
h. Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite—being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual. ....	0	1	2	3	d	r

I would like to ask you a few questions about your experience with the criminal justice system.

ALL

**G5. Have you ever been arrested?**

- BSF YES ..... 1  
NO ..... 0 GO TO G9  
DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO G9  
REFUSED ..... r GO TO G9

G5 = 1

**G6. How many times in your life have you been arrested?**

- SVORI INTERVIEWER: CODE 0 IF NEVER ARRESTED  
|\_|\_|\_| TIMES  
(1-200)  
NEVER ARRESTED ..... 0 GO TO G9  
DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO G9  
REFUSED ..... r GO TO G9

G6 GE 1

**G7. Have you ever been convicted of a crime?**

- PACT DEVELOPED  
YES ..... 1  
NO ..... 0 GO TO G9  
DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO G9  
REFUSED ..... r GO TO G9

G7 = 1

**G8. Are you currently on parole or probation?**

- SVORI  
YES ..... 1  
NO ..... 0  
DON'T KNOW ..... d  
REFUSED ..... r

Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME'S] experience with the criminal justice system.

ALL

**G9. Has [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] ever been convicted of a crime?**

- |                          |     |                  |   |          |
|--------------------------|-----|------------------|---|----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | BSF | YES .....        | 1 |          |
|                          |     | NO .....         | 0 | GO TO H1 |
|                          |     | DON'T KNOW ..... | d | GO TO H1 |
|                          |     | REFUSED .....    | r | GO TO H1 |

G9=1

FILL "he" IF A3a=2, FILL "she" IF A3a=1

**G10. Is [he/she] currently on parole or probation?**

- |                          |       |                  |   |  |
|--------------------------|-------|------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SVORI | YES .....        | 1 |  |
|                          |       | NO .....         | 0 |  |
|                          |       | DON'T KNOW ..... | d |  |
|                          |       | REFUSED .....    | r |  |

## H. MOTIVATION TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAM

Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about your interest in [PROGRAM NAME].

ALL
$C15 + C16 + C17 + C18A = 1$ SAY "CHILD", $C15 + C16 + C17 + C18A > 1$ , SAY "CHILDREN".

**H1. People apply to relationship programs for different reasons. I'm going to read you three reasons why people might apply to these programs. Please tell me which of these reasons was most important to you when you decided to apply to [PROGRAM NAME].**

**PROGRAMMER: FILL a-c**

**Which of these reasons was most important to you when you decided to apply to [PROGRAM NAME]?**

CODE ANSWER AS '1' (MOST IMPORTANT)

PACT developed

CODE ONE ONLY

NUMBER	DK	REF
--------	----	-----

a. <b>Improving your relationship with your [child/children].</b> .....	_  (1)	d	r
b. <b>Improving your job situation.</b> .....	_  (1)	d	r
c. <b>Improving your relationship with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME].</b> .....	_  (1)	d	r

ALL
$C15 + C16 + C17 + C18A = 1$ SAY "CHILD", $C15 + C16 + C17 + C18A > 1$ , SAY "CHILDREN".

**H1a. Now, of the two remaining reasons, [PROGRAMMER: FILL REMAINING CHOICES] which of these two was most important to you in your decision to apply to the program?**

CODE ANSWER AS '2' (2ND MOST IMPORTANT)

INTERVIEWER: CODE REMAINING OPTION AS '3'.

PACT developed

CODE ONE PER ROW

NUMBER	DK	REF
--------	----	-----

a. <b>Improving your relationship with your [child/children].</b> .....	_  (2-3)	d	r
b. <b>Improving your job situation.</b> .....	_  (2-3)	d	r
c. <b>Improving your relationship with [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME].</b> .....	_  (2-3)	d	r

ALL

**H2. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not important and 10 is very important, how important is it for you to make time to participate in [PROGRAM NAME]? You can pick any number from 0 to 10.**

PACT developed

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| DESCRIPTION  
(0-10)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**H3. On a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is not important and 10 is very important, how important do you think it is for [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] to make time to participate in [PROGRAM NAME]? You can pick any number from 0 to 10.**

PACT developed

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| IMPORTANCE  
(0-10)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

## I. CONTACT INFORMATION 2

We are almost finished. I just have a few more questions that will help us contact you in about a year. We will only use this information, including your social networking accounts, if we cannot reach you with the information you provided us.

ALL

I1. What is your email address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
DON'T HAVE ONE.....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

ALL

I2. Do you have any of the following social networking accounts?

Youthbuild

Do you have a Facebook account?

YES .....1  
NO .....0 GO TO I3  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I3  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I3

I2=1

I2a. What name do you use on Facebook?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

ALL

I3. Do you have a MySpace account?

YES .....1  
NO .....0 GO TO I4  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I4  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I4

I3=1

I3a. What name do you use on MySpace?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

ALL

**I4. Do you have a Twitter account?**

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO I5
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO I5
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO I5

I4=1

**I4a. What name do you use on Twitter?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**I5. Do you have a social networking account other than Facebook, MySpace, or Twitter?**

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO I6a
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO I6a
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO I6a

I5=1

**I5a. What social networking provider do you use?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

16a. We would like to contact you in about a year to see how you are doing. In case we have trouble reaching you, we would like to have the names of three people who would most likely know where you are or who you keep in close contact with, such as a grandmother or grandfather, other relative, or friend. We will not contact these people for any other reason. Please do not include people who live with you now or the person you came to the program with.

The information you provide, including the social networking accounts of your contacts, will only be used if we cannot contact you using the information you provided us.

What is the full name of the first person we should contact?

\_\_\_\_\_  
FIRST NAME (STRING 50)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MIDDLE INITIAL/NAME (STRING 50)

\_\_\_\_\_  
LAST NAME (STRING 50)

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO  
END1.....

REFUSED .....r GO TO  
END1.....

I6A NE D OR R

16b. What is his/her address?

PROBE: Is there an apartment number?

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 1

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 2

\_\_\_\_\_  
APT. #

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY

\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

I6a NE D OR R

**I6c. What is his/her relationship to you?**

**CODE ONE ONLY**

- MOTHER..... 1
- FATHER..... 2
- SISTER/BROTHER..... 3
- GRANDMOTHER/GRANDFATHER..... 4
- FRIEND..... 5
- OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **ENTER OTHER RELATIONSHIP TYPE**

I6a NE D OR R

**I6d. What is [his/her] home telephone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

- NO LANDLINE, ONLY CELL PHONE..... 0
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I6a NE D OR R

**I6e. Does [he/she] have a cell phone?**

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 0 GO TO I6g
- DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO I6g
- REFUSED..... r GO TO I6g

I6e=1

**I6f. Can I have that number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I6a NE D OR R

**I6g. What is [his/her] work telephone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

NO WORK NUMBER.....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I6a NE D OR R

**I6h. What is [his/her] email address?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DOESN'T HAVE ONE.....0 GO TO I6j  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I6j  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I6j

I6h NE 0, D, OR R

**I6i. Does [he/she] have another email address?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I6a NE D OR R

**I6j. Which of the following is the primary social network used by this person?**

**CODE ONE ONLY**

**Facebook**,.....1  
**Twitter**,.....2  
**MySpace**,.....3  
**a personal blog, or**.....4  
**some other social network? (SPECIFY)**.....99

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)

NONE.....0 GO TO I7a  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I7a  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I7a

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **What other social network do they use?**

I6j = 1, 2, 3, 4, OR 99

IF I6j=4, FILL "WEB ADDRESS" AND "FOR THAT PERSONAL BLOG" ELSE FILL "NAME" AND "IN THAT SOCIAL NETWORK"

**16k. What (name/web address) does this person use (in that social network/for that personal blog)?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NAME  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

**SECOND CONTACT**

I6A NE D OR R

**17a. What is the full name of the second person we should contact?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
FIRST NAME  
\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
MIDDLE INITIAL/NAME  
\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
LAST NAME  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO END1  
REFUSED .....r GO TO END1

I7a NE D OR R

**17b. What is [his/her] address? PROBE: Is there an apartment number?**

STREET 1  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 2  
\_\_\_\_\_  
APT. #  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I7a NE D OR R

I7c. What is [his/her] relationship to you?

CODE ONE ONLY

- MOTHER..... 1
- FATHER..... 2
- SISTER/BROTHER..... 3
- GRANDMOTHER/GRANDFATHER..... 4
- FRIEND..... 5
- OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): ENTER OTHER RELATIONSHIP TYPE

I7a NE D OR R

I7d. What is [his/her] home telephone number?

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

- NO LANDLINE, ONLY CELL PHONE..... 0
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I7a NE D OR R

I7e. Does [he/she] have a cell phone?

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 0 GO TO I7g
- DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO I7g
- REFUSED..... r GO TO I7g

I7e=1

I7f. Can I have that number?

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I7a NE D OR R

I7g. What is [his/her] work telephone number?

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_| - \_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| - \_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

NO WORK NUMBER.....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I7a NE D OR R

I7h. What is [his/her] email address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DOESN'T HAVE ONE.....0 GO TO I7j  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I7j  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I7j

I7h NE 0, D, OR R

I7i. Does [he/she] have another email address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I7a NE D OR R

I7j. Which of the following is the primary social network used by this person?

CODE ONE ONLY

Facebook,..... 1  
Twitter,..... 2  
MySpace,..... 3  
a personal blog, or..... 4  
some other social network? (SPECIFY)..... 99

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NONE.....0 GO TO I8a  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I8a  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I8a

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): What other social network do they use?

I7j=1, 2, 3, 4 OR 99  
IF I7j=4, FILL "WEB ADDRESS" AND "FOR THAT PERSONAL BLOG" ELSE FILL "NAME" AND "IN THAT SOCIAL NETWORK"

**I7k. What (name/web address) does this person use (in that social network/for that personal blog)?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NAME  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

**THIRD CONTACT**

I7a NE D OR R

**I8a. What is the full name of the third person we should contact?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
FIRST NAME  
\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
MIDDLE INITIAL/NAME  
\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
LAST NAME  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO END1  
REFUSED .....r GO TO END1

I8a NE D OR R

**I8b. What is [his/her] address?**

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 1  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 2  
\_\_\_\_\_  
APT. #  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I8a NE D OR R

**I8c. What is [his/her] relationship to you?**

**CODE ONE ONLY**

- MOTHER..... 1
- FATHER..... 2
- SISTER/BROTHER..... 3
- GRANDMOTHER/GRANDFATHER..... 4
- FRIEND..... 5
- OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99
- OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99
- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **ENTER OTHER RELATIONSHIP TYPE**

I8a NE D OR R

**I8d. What is [his/her] home telephone number?**

- |\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)
- NO LANDLINE, ONLY CELL PHONE..... 0
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I8a NE D OR R

**I8e. Does [he/she] have a cell phone?**

- YES..... 1
- NO..... 0 GO TO I8g
- DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO I8g
- REFUSED..... r GO TO I8g

I8e=1

**I8f. Can I have that number?**

- |\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)
- DON'T KNOW..... d
- REFUSED..... r

I8a NE D OR R

18g. What is [his/her] work telephone number?

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_| - \_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| - \_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

NO WORK NUMBER.....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I8a NE D OR R

18h. What is [his/her] email address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DOESN'T HAVE ONE.....0 GO TO I8j  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I8j  
REFUSED .....r GO TO I8j

I8h NE 0, D, OR R

18i. Does [he/she] have another email address?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
EMAIL ADDRESS

DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I8a NE D OR R

18j. Which of the following is the primary social network used by this person?

CODE ONE ONLY

Facebook,.....1  
Twitter,.....2  
MySpace,.....3  
a personal blog, or.....4  
some other social network? (SPECIFY).....99

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)

NONE.....0 GO TO END1  
DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO END1  
REFUSED .....r GO TO END1

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): What other social network do they use?

I8j=1, 2, 3, 4, OR 99

IF I8j=4, FILL "WEB ADDRESS" AND "FOR THAT PERSONAL BLOG" ELSE FILL "NAME" AND "IN THAT SOCIAL NETWORK"

**I8k. What (name/web address) does this person use (in that social network/for that personal blog)?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
NAME  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

END OF CALL

**END1. Those are all of the questions I have. You will receive a \$10 gift card as a token of our appreciation. We will be in touch with you again in about a year to see how you are doing. As I mentioned earlier, a computer will randomly assign you and [PARTNER/SPOUSE NAME] to one of two study groups once [he/she] completes the interview. Now I need to speak with the staff person at ^Screening.aProgName, so please do not hang up. Please hand the phone back to the staff person. Thank you.**

INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT HAS COMPLETED THE INTERVIEW.

A2 < 18 YEARS OLD AND INTRO1=1

**END2. Thank you very much for your time. Those are all of the questions I have. Now I need to speak with the staff person at ^Screening.aProgName, so please do not hang up. Can you please hand the phone back to the staff person?**

INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT IS NOT ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PACT STUDY BECAUSE THE RESPONDENT IS UNDER 18 YEARS OF AGE. IF PARTNER HAS NOT YET COMPLETED BASELINE, INFORM PROGRAM STAFF TO TELL PARTNER NOT TO CALL IN TO COMPLETE. PROVIDE PROGRAM STAFF WITH MPRID. DO NOT GIVE RESPONDENT A GIFT CARD.

[A3A=1 AND A9A=1] OR [A3A=2 AND A9A=2]

**END3. Thank you very much for your time. Those are all of the questions I have. Now I need to speak with the staff person at ^Screening.aProgName, so please do not hang up. Can you please hand the phone back to the staff person?**

INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT AND THEIR PARTNER ARE NOT ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PACT STUDY. RESPONDENT AND THEIR PARTNER ARE ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE PROGRAM SERVICES FROM THE SITE. IF PARTNER HAS NOT YET COMPLETED BASELINE, INFORM PROGRAM STAFF TO TELL PARTNER NOT TO CALL IN TO COMPLETE. PROVIDE PROGRAM STAFF WITH MPRID. DO NOT GIVE RESPONDENT A GIFT CARD.

(INTRO1=0 AND A10=0, DK OR R) OR (INTRO1=0 AND A10a=DK OR R)

**END4. Those are all of the questions I have. Now I need to speak with the staff person at [PROGRAM NAME], so please do not hang up. Can you please hand the phone back to the staff person? Thank you.**

INTERVIEWER: INFORM PROGRAM STAFF THAT RESPONDENT HAS COMPLETED THE INTERVIEW AND HE OR SHE CAN ENTER THEIR INFORMATION INTO PACTIS. PROVIDE PROGRAM STAFF WITH MPRID. DO NOT GIVE RESPONDENT A GIFT CARD.

# **MATHEMATICA** **Policy Research**

[www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com)

Improving public well-being by conducting high quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC  
Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**APPENDIX E:**

**PACT HM 12-MONTH FOLLOW-UP SURVEY**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**Parents and Children Together –  
Healthy Marriage – Follow-up Survey**

January 8, 2014

Ayesha DeMond  
Rebecca DiGiuseppe  
Robin Dion  
Sheena McConnell  
Cleo Jacobs Johnson  
Shawn Marsh  
Amanda Skaff  
Rachel Sutton-Heisey



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research

Contract Number:  
HHSP23320095642WC/HHSP23337034T

Mathematica Reference Number:  
06997.26Y

Submitted to:  
Administration for Children and Families  
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW  
Washington, DC, 20447  
Project Officer: Nancye Campbell

Submitted by:  
Mathematica Policy Research  
P.O. Box 2393  
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393  
Telephone: (609) 799-3535  
Facsimile: (609) 799-0005  
Project Director: Sheena McConnell

**Parents and Children Together –  
Healthy Marriage – Follow-up  
Survey**

January 8, 2014

Ayesha DeMond  
Rebecca DiGiuseppe  
Robin Dion  
Cleo Jacobs Johnson  
Shawn Marsh  
Sheena McConnell  
Amanda Skaff  
Rachel Sutton-Heisey

**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research



**PACT**

**Healthy Marriage**

**Follow-up Survey**

**January 8, 2014**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0970-0403. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection.

Items C1a-j: "Adapted and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, Florida 33549, from the Parenting Alliance Measure by Richard Abidin, EdD and Timothy R. Konold, PhD, Copyright 1999 by PAR, Inc. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission by PAR, Inc.

Items C4 a and c: "Reproduced with permission of authors and publisher from: C.C. Robinson, B. Mandleco, S.F. Olsen, and C.H. Hart. Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 1995, 77, 819-830. © Psychological Reports 1995."

Items C5a, c, d, e, and f; and Items H1a-l, j, k, m: "Material from the CTS copyright © 2003 by Western Psychological Services. Authorized research translation reprinted by S. Marsh, Mathematica Policy Research, for specific, limited research use under license of the publisher, WPS, 625 Alaska Avenue, Torrance, California, 90503, U.S.A. ([rights@wpspublish.com](mailto:rights@wpspublish.com)). No additional reproduction, in whole or in part, by any medium or for any purpose, may be made without the prior written authorization of WPS. All rights reserved."

---

## CONTENTS

Section	Page
i. INTRODUCTION .....	iii
A. CONTACT INFORMATION 1.....	1
B. FAMILY STRUCTURE.....	2
C. PARENTING.....	8
D. RELATIONSHIP QUALITY .....	13
E. ECONOMIC STABILITY .....	20
F. MENTAL HEALTH .....	26
G. SERVICE RECEIPT.....	27
H. INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE .....	32
I. CONTACT INFORMATION 2.....	33

PROGRAMMER BOX IN0.  
IF DIAL OUT, GO TO IN1;  
IF FIELD CALL IN, GO TO IN2;  
IF RESPONDENT CALL IN, GO TO IN3.

CALL OUT

**IN1. May I please speak with [SAMPLE MEMBER]? My name is [NAME] and I'm calling from Mathematica Policy Research, a research company in Princeton, New Jersey.**

SPEAKING TO [NAME] .....	1	GO TO IN13
[NAME] COMES TO PHONE.....	2	GO TO IN13
PERSON ASKS WHAT CALL IS ABOUT.....	3	GO TO IN4
[NAME] IS NOT AVAILABLE .....	4	GO TO IN6
[NAME] IS INCARCERATED .....	5	GO TO IN8
[NAME] HAS MOVED/HAS A DIFFERENT NUMBER .....	6	GO TO IN9
NEVER HEARD OF [NAME] / WRONG NUMBER.....	7	THANKS; STATUS 1530
[NAME] IS DECEASED .....	8	GO TO IN12
[NAME] DOES NOT SPEAK ENGLISH .....	9	THANKS, STATUS 1401
HUNG UP.....	10	STATUS 1240
REFUSED .....	r	STATUS 1220

FIELD CALL IN

**IN2. May I have your first name?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
FIRST NAME

IN2 = ANSWERED (FIELD CALL IN)

**IN2a. And your last name?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 30)  
LAST NAME

IN2a = ANSWERED (FIELD CALL IN)

**IN2b. May I have your field interviewer ID number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|\_|  
(0000 - 99999)

IN2b = ANSWERED (FIELD CALL IN)

**IN2c. CODE PURPOSE OF FIELD CALL IN**

- CALLED TO COMPLETE INTERVIEW ..... 1 GO TO IN13
- CALLED TO SAY [NAME] IS DECEASED ..... 2 GO TO IN12
- CALLED TO SAY [NAME] IS INCARCERATED..... 3 GO TO IN8

RESPONDENT CALL IN

**IN3. Thank you for calling. My name is [FILL INTERVIEWER NAME] from Mathematica Policy Research. May I have your name?**

- SPEAKING TO RESPONDENT ([NAME])..... 1 GO TO IN13
- SOMEONE ELSE CALLED TO COMPLETE INTERVIEW ..... 2 GO TO IN5
- CALLED TO ASK WHY WE CALLED..... 3 GO TO IN4
- CALLED TO SET APPOINTMENT ..... 4 GO TO IN6
- CALLED TO REFUSE..... 5 STATUS 1240
- CALLED TO SAY [NAME] MOVED/HAS A DIFFERENT NUMBER ..... 6 GO TO IN9
- CALLED TO SAY [NAME] IS DECEASED ..... 7 GO TO IN12
- CALLED TO SAY [NAME] IS INCARCERATED..... 8 GO TO IN8
- CALLED TO SAY NEVER HEARD OF [NAME] / WRONG NUMBER ..... 9 THANKS; STATUS 1530
- HUNG UP..... 10 STATUS 1240

IN1 = 3 OR IN3 = 3 (WHAT IS CALL ABOUT)

FILL \$40 IF PayExperiment = 1 AND (Today – SampleLoadDate LE 30 days); ELSE \$25

FILL we last spoke to (him / her) ... IF SM completed 12-month survey: ELSE he/she consented...

**IN4. I would like to speak with [NAME] about a research study [he/she] joined about a year ago when [he/she] consented to join the study. I want to ask [NAME] some questions about how [he / she] has been doing since [we last spoke with [him / her]]. [NAME] will be paid \$25 for [his/her] time.**

**May I please speak with [NAME]?**

- SPEAKING TO [NAME] ..... 1 GO TO IN13
- [NAME] COMES TO PHONE.....2 GO TO IN13
- [NAME] IS NOT AVAILABLE .....3 GO TO IN6
- [NAME] IS INCARCERATED .....4 GO TO IN8
- [NAME] HAS MOVED/HAS A DIFFERENT NUMBER .....5 GO TO IN9
- NEVER HEARD OF [NAME] / WRONG NUMBER.....6 STATUS 1530
- [NAME] IS DECEASED.....7 GO TO IN12
- [NAME] DOES NOT SPEAK ENGLISH .....8 STATUS 1401
- HUNG UP.....9 STATUS 1240
- .....STATUS 1220

PROGRAMMER SKIP BOX IN4 =6 OR IN4=8  
 INTERVIEWER: **THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO SPEAK WITH ME. GOODBYE.**  
 IF IN4=6 STATUS CASE 1530  
 IF IN4=8 STATUS CASE 1401

IN3 = 2 (SOMEONE ELSE CALLED IN TO COMPLETE INTERVIEW)

**IN5. I'm sorry, but I need to speak to [NAME]. May I please speak with [NAME]?**

- [NAME] COMES TO PHONE..... 1 GO TO IN13
- [NAME] IS NOT AVAILABLE .....2 GO TO IN6
- [NAME] IS INCARCERATED .....3 GO TO IN8
- [NAME] HAS MOVED/HAS A DIFFERENT NUMBER .....4 GO TO IN9
- NEVER HEARD OF [NAME] / WRONG NUMBER.....5 STATUS 1530
- [NAME] IS DECEASED.....6 GO TO IN12
- [NAME] DOES NOT SPEAK ENGLISH .....7 STATUS 1401
- HUNG UP.....8 STATUS 1240
- .....STATUS 1220

PROGRAMMER SKIP BOX IN5 =5 OR IN5=7  
INTERVIEWER: **THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO SPEAK WITH ME. GOODBYE.**  
IF IN5=5 STATUS CASE 1530  
IF IN5=7 STATUS CASE 1401

IN1 = 4 OR IN3 = 4 OR IN4 = 3 OR IN5 = 2 (NOT AVAILABLE; SET APPOINTMENT)

**IN6. When would be a good time to call back?**

[NAME] COMES TO PHONE.....1 GO TO IN13  
SET APPOINTMENT .....2 GO TO IN7

IN6 = 2 (SET APPOINTMENT)

**IN7. When would be a good time to reach [SAMPLE MEMBER]?**

INSTRUCTION:RECORD DATE AND TIME FOR CALL BACK.  
INSTRUCTION:MAKE AN APPOINTMENT USING THE PARALLEL BLOCK.  
INSTRUCTION:USE THE 'APPOINTMENT' TAB OR PRESS <CTRL-S> TO INVOKE THE APPOINTMENT MAKING DIALOG.

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)

IN1 = 5 OR IN2c = 3 OR IN3 = 8 OR IN4 = 4 OR IN5 = 3 (INCARCERATED)

**IN8. What is the name of the place where [NAME] is being held?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 200)

NAME OF PRISON  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r GO TO BOX IN8d.1

IN8 = ANSWERED, d

**IN8a. In what city or town is that located?**

NAME OF CITY/TOWN  
.....  
REFUSED .....r

IN8 = ANSWERED, d

**IN8b. In what state is that located?**

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
NAME OF STATE  
REFUSED .....r

IN8 = ANSWERED, d

**IN8c. When is [NAME] expected to be released?**

**PROBE:** I just need a month and year. Your best estimate is fine.

INTERVIEWER: ENTER MONTH ON NEXT SCREEN OR CODE DON'T KNOW

PROGRAMMER: COLLECT DATE WITH SEPARATE FIELDS

ENTER DATE ON NEXT SCREEN ..... 1

SERVING A LIFE SENTENCE ..... 2 GO TO IN8d

**IN8c\_month & IN8c\_year**

**When is [NAME] expected to be released?**

**PROBE:** I just need a month and year. Your best estimate is fine.

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
(1-12) (2012- 2099)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

IN8 = ANSWERED, d

**IN8d. And do you know [NAME]'s inmate number?**

INTERVIEWER: ENTER NUMBER OR CODE DON'T KNOW

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)

INMATE NUMBER

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

PROGRAMMER SKIP BOX IN8d.1  
GO TO THANKS AND END INTERVIEW.  
STATUS CASE 1541 (PRISON).

IN1 = 6 OR IN3 = 6 OR IN4 = 5 OR IN5 = 4 (MOVED; HAS DIFFERENT PHONE)

**IN9. Do you or does anyone there know how we can reach [NAME]?**

YES ..... 1 GO TO IN10

NO ..... 0 STATUS 1530

PROGRAMMER SKIP BOX IN9=0  
INTERVIEWER: **THANK YOU FOR TAKING TIME TO SPEAK WITH ME. GOODBYE.**  
IF IN5=5 STATUS CASE 1530

IN9 = 1

**IN10. May I please have [his/her] telephone number?**

INTERVIEWER: ENTER NUMBER ON NEXT SCREEN OR CODE DON'T KNOW

ENTER NUMBER ..... 1

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO IN11

REFUSED ..... r GO TO IN11

IN10 = 1

**IN10\_phone. Please give me the phone number, area code first.**

|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|

**SOFT CHECK: IF IN10\_phone IS NOT 10 NUM DIGITS; THE PHONE NUMBER SHOULD BE 10 NUMERIC DIGITS, NO SPACES, DASHES, PARENTHESES OR OTHER PUNCTUATION. THE FIELD SHOULD ALSO NOT BE EMPTY.**

SOFT CHECK: USE STANDARD PHONE NUMBER CHECKS.

IN9 = 1 or IN10=DK OR R

**IN11. May I have [his/her] address?**

INTERVIEWER: ENTER ADDRESS ON NEXT SCREEN OR CODE DON'T KNOW

ENTER ADDRESS..... 1

DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO IN19

REFUSED ..... r GO TO IN19

**IN11\_address. What is [NAME]'s address?**

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 1

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 2

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREET 3

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY

\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP

PROGRAMMER SKIP BOX IN11.1  
GO TO THANKS AND END.  
IF IN10 = 1 (NEW NUMBER), STATUS CASE 1899;

IN1 = 8 OR IN2c = 2 OR IN3 = 7 OR IN4 = 7 OR IN5 = 6 (RESPONDENT IS DECEASED)

I was calling about... IF IN1 = 8 (CALL OUT)

**IN12. I am very sorry to hear that. [I was calling about a research study on behalf of the US Department of Health and Human Services] When did [NAME] pass away?**

**Thank you. Please accept my condolences. Goodbye.**

PROGRAMMER: COLLECT DATE WITH SEPARATE FIELDS

ENTER DATE ON NEXT SCREEN ..... 1

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

**IN12\_month & IN12\_day & IN12\_year**

**Thank you. Please accept my condolences. Goodbye.**

|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|\_|\_|

(1-12) (1 - 31) (2012- 2099)

DON'T KNOW ..... d

REFUSED ..... r

STATUS CASE 1440 (DECEASED) AND END.

[IN1=1 OR 2] OR IN2C=1 OR [IN4=1 OR 2] OR IN5=1 OR IN6=1

Fill [PACT PARTNER] from [BASELINE A9 or A9a]

**IN13.** [Hello, my name is [NAME] and I'm calling from Mathematica Policy Research, a research company in Princeton, New Jersey.] I'm calling you about the PACT study you joined when you applied to the [GRANTEE PROGRAM] about a year ago with [PACT PARTNER]. You may have received a letter recently to let you know that we would be calling you for a follow-up interview for our study. I'd like to interview you today.

The interview will take about 45 minutes and you will receive \$25 for completing the interview. Your participation in the survey is voluntary. You do not have to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

To help us protect your privacy, we have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality from the National Institutes of Health. With this Certificate, the researchers cannot be forced to disclose information that may identify you, even by a court subpoena, in any federal, state, local, civil, criminal, legislative, administrative, or other proceedings. The researchers will use the Certificate to resist any demands for information that would identify you, with one exception. The Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent the researchers from disclosing information that would identify you as a participant in the research project if you tell the interviewers anything that suggests you are very likely to harm yourself, that you are planning to hurt another person or child, or that someone is likely to harm you. You should understand that a Certificate of Confidentiality does not prevent you, or a member of your family, from voluntarily releasing information about yourself or your involvement in this research. You may or may not benefit from participating in this study.

Because we want to get your opinion, it is important that you answer the questions without help from anyone else. Of course, you can share what you said with others after we have completed the interview.

This interview may be recorded so my supervisor can monitor the interview and make sure that the questions are asked correctly. These recordings will be destroyed when the study is completed.

Is now a good time to start?

YES ..... 1 GO TO IN15

NO ..... 0

IN13=0

**IN14.** When would be a good time to do the interview?

INSTRUCTION: RECORD DATE AND TIME FOR CALL BACK.

INSTRUCTION: MAKE AN APPOINTMENT USING THE PARALLEL BLOCK.

INSTRUCTION: USE THE 'APPOINTMENT' TAB OR PRESS <CTRL-S> TO INVOKE THE APPOINTMENT MAKING DIALOG.

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)

IN13=1

**IN15. I just need to verify that I am speaking with the correct person. What is your date of birth?**

|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|/|\_|\_|\_|\_|  
MONTH DAY YEAR  
(1-12) (1-31) (1900-1996)

PROGRAMMER NOTE: IF AT LEAST 2 DATA ELEMENTS MATCH GO TO A1a

DON'T KNOW.....d GO TO IN16

REFUSED.....r GO TO IN16

BIRTHDAY INCORRECT= LESS THAN 2 DATA ELEMENTS MATCH MM/DD/YYYY GO TO IN16

PROGRAMMER: NOTE AT LEAST TWO PIECES OF BIRTHDAY INFORMATION MUST MATCH FOR VERIFICATION (FOR EXAMPLE, MONTH AND YEAR)

IN15=BIRTHDATE INCORRECT, d OR r

**IN16. And what are the last 4-digits of your Social Security Number?**

|\_|\_|\_| LAST FOUR IF MATCH GO TO A1a  
(0000-9999)

DON'T KNOW.....d GO TO IN17

REFUSED.....r GO TO IN17

SSN INCORRECT .....FF GO TO IN17

IN16= d, r OR FF

**IN17. Can you tell me the name of the street that you lived on when you first enrolled in the program on [RA DATE]?**

\_\_\_\_\_(STRING 20)  
INSTRUCTION: RECORD ADDRESS GIVEN BY RESPONDENT

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO IN18

REFUSED .....r GO TO IN18

RESP. ADDRESS INCORRECT .....0 GO TO IN18

IN17= d, r OR 0

**IN18. I'm sorry. I need to check my records before I can interview you. Is this the best time to reach you in the future?**

YES ..... 1

NO, CALL BACK INFO ..... 0

\_\_\_\_\_(STRING 20)  
INSTRUCTION: RECORD DATE AND TIME FOR CALL BACK.

IN 11=D OR R OR IN18=ANSWER

**IN19. Thank you for taking time to speak with me. Goodbye.**

INSTRUCTION: STATUS THIS CASE 1380 FOR SUPERVISOR REVIEW.

IF IN11=D OR R STATUS CASE 1530.

## A. CONTACT INFORMATION

Great. Thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. Before we get started I would like to make sure we have your name recorded correctly.

ALL

**A1a. Can you verify your first name?**

BSF 36  
Month  
Follow-up

**PROBE:** Can you spell that for me please?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
FIRST NAME

ALL

**A1b. And your middle name please?**

BSF 36  
Month  
Follow-up

**PROBE:** Can you spell that for me please?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
MIDDLE NAME

ALL

**A1c. And your last name please?**

BSF 36  
Month  
Follow-up

**PROBE:** Can you spell that for me please?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
LAST NAME

ALL

FILL [RESP FIRST NAME] FROM A1a.

**A2. Are you usually called [RESP FIRST NAME] or do you go by another name?**

BSF 15  
Month  
Follow-up

**INSTRUCTION:** IF SAME JUST HIT ENTER.

**PROBE:** Can you spell that for me please?

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)  
FIRST NAME

## B. FAMILY STRUCTURE

The next questions are about you and [PACT PARTNER].

ALL

**B1. Are you and [PACT PARTNER]...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- married, .....1 GO TO B5
- divorced, .....2
- separated, or .....3
- have you never been married to each other? .....4
- MARRIAGE ANNULLED .....5
- WIDOWED/PARTNER DIED .....6 GO TO B7
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

**SOFT CHECK: IF BASELINE C1=1, 2 OR 3 (married, divorced, or separated) AND FOLLOW UP B1=4 ASK: You previously told us you were [FILL BASELINE C1 ANSWER] and now you are reporting you have never been married. Are you and [PACT PARTNER], married, divorced, separated or have you never been married to each other?**

**IF B1=6 SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

B1 NE 1 AND B1 NE 6

**B2. Which of the following statements best describes your current relationship with [PACT PARTNER]?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- We are romantically involved on a steady basis.** .....1 GO TO B3
- We are involved in an on-again and off-again relationship.** .....2 GO TO B3
- We are not in a romantic relationship.** .....3 GO TO B2a
- PARTNER DIED .....4 GO TO B7
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO B3
- REFUSED .....r GO TO B3

**IF B2=4 SAY: I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

B2=3
IF B1=2 OR 3 FILL "MARRIAGE" IF B1=4 OR B2=3 FILL "ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP"

**B2a. When did your [romantic relationship/marriage] with [PACT PARTNER] end?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

<table border="0"> <tr> <td> _ _ </td> <td>/</td> <td> _ _ _ _ </td> <td>DATE RELATIONSHIP ENDED</td> <td>GO TO B2b</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(01-12)</td> <td></td> <td>(2012-2100)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MONTH</td> <td></td> <td>YEAR</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	_ _	/	_ _ _ _	DATE RELATIONSHIP ENDED	GO TO B2b	(01-12)		(2012-2100)			MONTH		YEAR		
_ _	/	_ _ _ _	DATE RELATIONSHIP ENDED	GO TO B2b											
(01-12)		(2012-2100)													
MONTH		YEAR													

- PARTNER DIED.....0 GO TO B7
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO B2b
- REFUSED .....r GO TO B2b

B2A NE 0
----------

**B2b. I am going to read you a list of reasons that people give for why their relationships ended. For each reason, tell me if this is why your relationship with [PACT PARTNER] ended.**

BSF 15-month follow-up

Was it because...[STATEMENT a-j]

	CODE ONE PER ROW			
	YES	NO	DK	REF
a. the two of you were not communicating well or were arguing too much? .....	1	0	d	r
b. you lacked support from family members? .....	1	0	d	r
c. you and [PACT PARTNER] were living too far apart? .....	1	0	d	r
d. one of you cheated or was unfaithful? .....	1	0	d	r
e. one of you could not keep a job or contribute enough financially to the family? .....	1	0	d	r
f. you or [PACT PARTNER] were abusive or violent? .....	1	0	d	r
g. one of you used drugs or alcohol? .....	1	0	d	r
h. one of you went to jail or prison? .....	1	0	d	r
i. one of you was not a good parent or role model? .....	1	0	d	r
j. were there any other reasons why your romantic relationship ended? .....	1	0	d	r
IF YES. what were those other reasons? (SPECIFY) .....				

B2=3

**B2c. Do you think it is a good thing for you that you and [PACT PARTNER] broke up?**

PACT  
Developed

- YES .....1 GO TO B5
- NO.....0 GO TO B5
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO B5
- REFUSED .....r GO TO B5

B1 = 2,4,5, d OR r AND B2= 1, 2,DK, R

**B3. Are you and [PACT PARTNER] engaged to be married?**

BSF 15 month  
follow-up

- YES .....1 GO TO B4
- NO.....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

B3=0, d, r  
IF B3=0 FILL "ALTHOUGH YOU ARE NOT ENGAGED"

**B3a. [Although you are not engaged], have you and [PACT PARTNER] made a specific plan together to get married?**

Adapted  
from Scott  
Stanley

- YES .....1 GO TO B4
- NO.....0 GO TO B5
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO B5
- REFUSED .....r GO TO B5

B3=1 OR B3a=1

**B4. When are you planning to get married?**

BSF 15 month  
follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: RECORD ONLY MONTH AND YEAR. IF NO MONTH GIVEN, MARK AS MISSING.

PROGRAMMER NOTE: ALLOW REFUSAL IN MM/YYYY

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ DATE PLANNING TO MARRY  
(01-12) (2014-2100)  
MONTH YEAR

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF NO DATE IS GIVEN, DO NOT PROBE

- NO DATE HAS BEEN SET.....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

B1 NE 6 AND B2 NE 4

**B5. Do you currently live with [PACT PARTNER] in the same household ...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- all of the time,** .....1 GO TO B7
- most of the time,** .....2
- some of the time, or** .....3
- none of the time?** .....4
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

B5 NE 1

**B6. How often do you and [PACT PARTNER] see or talk to each other? Is it...**

BSF 15 month follow-up

CODE ONE ONLY

- every day or almost every day,** .....1
- a few times a week,** .....2
- a few times a month,** .....3
- about once a month,** .....4
- only a few times in the past year, or** .....5
- hardly ever or never?** .....6
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

PROGRAMMER NOTE:  
( IF EXPECTING A BABY) GO TO B7 (NOT EXPECTING A BABY) GO TO C1.

IF NOT EXPECTING GO TO C1

**B7.** Our records indicate that about a year ago you told us that you and [PACT PARTNER] were expecting a baby.

BSF 36 month follow-up

**Did you have that baby?**

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF RESPONDENT REPORTS MULTIPLE BIRTHS, ENTER "YES." AND ENTER THE NUMBER OF BABIES AT B7a.

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: IF RESPONDENT REPORTS DATE OF BIRTH, ANSWER "YES" AND ENTER DATE OF BIRTH AT B7b.

IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS NO WITHOUT EXPLANATION, PROBE: **I'm sorry...what happened?**

IF B7=2 or B7=4 OR B7=6 SAY: **I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

CODE ONE ONLY

- |                         |   |           |
|-------------------------|---|-----------|
| YES.....                | 1 | GO TO B7a |
| YES, BUT BABY DIED..... | 2 | GO TO C1  |
| NO.....                 | 3 | GO TO C1  |
| NO, MISCARRIAGE.....    | 4 | GO TO C1  |
| NO, ABORTION.....       | 5 | GO TO C1  |
| NO, BABY DIED.....      | 6 | GO TO C1  |
| NO, DENY PREGNANCY..... | 7 | GO TO C1  |
| DON'T KNOW.....         | d | GO TO C1  |
| REFUSED.....            | r | GO TO C1  |

B7=1

**B7a.** ENTER WITHOUT ASKING IF KNOWN: OTHERWISE PROBE: **How many babies did you have?**

BSF 15 month follow-up

INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: ENTER THE NUMBER OF BABIES BORN

IF B7a=0 SAY: **I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

NUMBER OF BABIES BORN GO TO B7b  
 (1-99)

BABY DIED.....0 GO TO C1

B7a ≥1
B7a =1 fill “was the baby” B 7a ≥ 2 OR MORE fill “were these babies”

**B7b. What date [was the baby/were these babies] born?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

IF B7b=0 SAY: I’m very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.

\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ CHILD DATE OF BIRTH  
(01-12) (01-31) (2013-2015)  
MONTH DAY YEAR

BABY DIED .....0 GO TO C1

B7a =1
B7a ≥ 2 OR MORE: SAY “Thinking of the baby born first on that date...”

INTERVIEWER: CODE SEX. IF NECESSARY ASK:

**B7c. [Thinking of the baby born first on that date,] Is this baby a boy or a girl?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

BOY .....1

GIRL.....2

DON’T KNOW .....d GO TO C1

REFUSED .....r GO TO C1

B7c = 1 or 2
FILL “him” IF B7c=1, “her” IF B7c=2

**B7d. So I can refer to [him/her] later in the survey; what do you usually call [him/her]?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 20)

FIRST NAME

INSTRUCTION; IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT GIVE FIRST NAME PROBE FOR A NAME OR INITIALS

DON’T KNOW .....d GO TO C1

REFUSED .....r GO TO C1

## C. PARENTING

SKIP IF B1=6 OR B2=4 (PARTNER DECEASED)

Now, I would like to talk about you and [PACT PARTNER] as parents.

PAM The following statements are about [PACT PARTNER]'s and your involvement in the care of your children.

**C1.** For each statement, please answer if overall you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. In your answers, you should include children you have in common, as well as other children you live with.

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**[STATEMENT a-j]** Overall, do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with this statement?

CODE ONE PER ROW

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
a. <b>PAM 13</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
b. <b>PAM 4</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
c. <b>PAM 18</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
d. <b>PAM 14</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
e. <b>PAM 11</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
f. <b>PAM 10</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
g. <b>PAM 3</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
h. <b>PAM 5</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
i. <b>PAM 6</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r
j. <b>PAM 7</b> .....	1	2	3	4	d	r

Items C1a-j: "Adapted and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, Florida 33549, from the Parenting Alliance Measure by Richard Abidin, EdD and Timothy R. Konold, PhD, Copyright 1999 by PAR, Inc. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission by PAR, Inc.

IF FOCAL CHILD EMPTY GO TO D1

IF # OF CHILDREN AT BASELINE ≥ 2 FILL **The computer has selected one of your children for me to ask additional questions about. Now, I would like to ask you some questions about the time you spend with [FOCAL CHILD].**

IF # OF CHILDREN AT BASELINE =1 FILL **Now, I would like to ask you some questions about the time you spend with [FOCAL CHILD].**

**C2. Does [FOCAL CHILD] live with you all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time?**

PACT Developed

CODE ONE ONLY

- all of the time,** .....1
- most of the time,**.....2
- some of the time, or** .....3
- none of the time?**.....4
- DECEASED.....5 GO TO D1
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

INTERVIEWER: IF C2=5, THEN SAY: **I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

C2 NE 5

**C2a. Does [FOCAL CHILD] live with [PACT PARTNER] all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time?**

PACT Developed

CODE ONE ONLY

- all of the time,** .....1
- most of the time,**.....2
- some of the time, or** .....3
- none of the time?**.....4
- DECEASED.....5 GO TO D1
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

INTERVIEWER: IF C2a=5, THEN SAY: **I'm very sorry to hear that. Our condolences for your loss.**

FOCAL CHILD AGE 0-5 ASK C3a, C3b, C3c  
 FOCAL CHILD IS 6-15 ASK C3d-C3i  
 IF FOCAL CHILD IS 16-21 ASK C3d, C3e, C3f, C3h, C3i

---

FOR C3b IF BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HIM", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "HER"  
 FOR C3e IF BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HIS", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "HER"  
 FOR C3g, h, and i IF BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HE", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "SHE"

**C3. How often in the past month have you...[STATEMENT A-I].**

**Would you say never, once in a while, somewhat often, or very often.**

CODE ONE PER ROW

		NEVER	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMEWHAT OFTEN	VERY OFTEN	DK	REF
SHM	a. read books or told stories to [FOCAL CHILD]? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM	b. fed [FOCAL CHILD] or given [him/her] something to eat? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM	c. played with [FOCAL CHILD] inside or outdoors? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
EHS	d. had a meal with [FOCAL CHILD]? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM	e. talked with [FOCAL CHILD] about [his/her] friends? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM Adapted	f. spent time with [FOCAL CHILD] doing things [he/she] likes to do? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Panel Study of Income Dynamics	g. worked on homework together? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
	h. talked with [FOCAL CHILD] about things [he/she] is especially interested in? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM	i. took [FOCAL CHILD] places [he/she] needed to go? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r

IF FOCAL CHILD IS 0-6 ASK C4c AND C4d  
 IF FOCAL CHILD IS 6-21 ASK C4a, b, c, and d

FOR C4a IF BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HIS", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "HER"  
 FOR C3c and C3d IF BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HE", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "SHE"

**C4. How often do you [STATEMENT a-d]? Would you say never, once in a while, somewhat often, or very often.**

		CODE ONE PER ROW					
		NEVER	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMEWHAT OFTEN	VERY OFTEN	DK	REF
Modified from PPQ	a. PPQ .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
PACT developed	b. talk to [FOCAL CHILD] about how things are going at school or work? .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
SHM	c. PPQ .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Modified from PPQ	d. show patience with [FOCAL CHILD] when [he/she] is upset?	0	1	2	3	d	r

Items C4 a and c: "Reproduced with permission of authors and publisher from: C.C. Robinson, B. Mandleco, S.F. Olsen, and C.H. Hart. Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 1995, 77, 819-830. © Psychological Reports 1995."

IF FOCAL CHILD AGE 0-2 GO TO D1
IF FOCAL CHILD IS 3-15 ASK C5a-f
IF FOCAL CHILD IS 16-21 ASK C5a, d, and e
FOR C5c BASELINE D4=1 FILL "HE", IF BASELINE D4=2 FILL "SHE"

**C5. Thinking about the times when [FOCAL CHILD] has done something wrong, how often do you...[STATEMENT A-F]? Would you say never, once in a while, somewhat often, or very often.**

		CODE ONE PER ROW					
		NEVER	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMEWHAT OFTEN	VERY OFTEN	DK	REF
Modified from CTSPC	<b>a. CTSPC 17</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
	<b>b. explain why something was wrong?</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Modified from CTSPC	<b>c. CTSPC 1</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Modified from CTSPC	<b>d. CTSPC 6</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Modified from CTSPC	<b>e. CTSPC 21</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r
Modified from CTSPC	<b>f. CTSPC 8</b> .....	0	1	2	3	d	r

Items C5a, c, d, e, and f: "Material from the CTS copyright © 2003 by Western Psychological Services. Authorized research translation reprinted by S. Marsh, Mathematica Policy Research, for specific, limited research use under license of the publisher, WPS, 625 Alaska Avenue, Torrance, California, 90503, U.S.A. ([rights@wpspublish.com](mailto:rights@wpspublish.com)). No additional reproduction, in whole or in part, by any medium or for any purpose, may be made without the prior written authorization of WPS. All rights reserved."

## D. RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

Now, I would like to ask about your relationship with [PACT PARTNER].

B1 NE 6

BSF 15 month follow-up modified for PACT

**D1.** Taking all things together, on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all happy and 10 is completely happy, how happy would you say your relationship with [PACT PARTNER] is?

|\_|\_|\_|  
(1-10)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

B1=1 OR B2= 1 OR 2

B1 = 1, FILL "marriage", B2=1 OR 2 FILL "relationship"

**D1a.** On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all committed and 10 is completely committed, how committed are you to your [marriage/relationship] with [PACT PARTNER]?

Adapted from Scott Stanley

|\_|\_|\_|  
(1-10)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

B1=1 OR B2= 1 OR 2

B1 = 1, FILL "marriage", B2=1 OR 2 FILL "relationship"

**D1b.** On a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all committed and 10 is completely committed, how committed would you say [PACT PARTNER] is to your [marriage/relationship]?

Adapted from Scott Stanley

|\_|\_|\_|  
(1-10)

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

IF B1=1 OR B2=1 OR 2 (IF MARRIED, ROMANTICALLY INVOLVED, OR IN AN ON-AGAIN, OFF-AGAIN RELATIONSHIP)

**D2. Tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements about your current relationship with [PACT PARTNER].**  
**[STATEMENT a-f]**

BSF 15 month follow-up

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?**

CODE ONE PER ROW

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
BSF 15 month follow-up	a. <b>[PACT PARTNER] shows love and affection. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 36 month follow-up	b. <b>[PACT PARTNER] and I often talk about things that happen to each of us during the day. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 36 month follow-up	c. <b>[PACT PARTNER] and I enjoy doing even ordinary, day-to-day things together. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 36 month follow-up	d. <b>I want my relationship with [PACT PARTNER] to stay strong no matter what rough times we may have. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 36 month follow-up	e. <b>[PACT PARTNER] encourages or helps me to do things that are important to me. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 36 month follow-up	f. <b>I am satisfied with my sexual relationship with [PACT PARTNER]. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r

B1 NE 6 (PARTNER IS ALIVE) AND B6 NE 6 (HAS SOME CONTACT WITH PARTNER)

**D3. Tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements about your current relationship with [PACT PARTNER].**

BSF 15 month follow-up

**[STATEMENT A-G]**

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree?**

CODE ONE PER ROW

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGRE E	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
BSF 15 month follow-up	a. <b>[PACT PARTNER] is honest and truthful with me. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	b. <b>I trust [PACT PARTNER] completely.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	c. <b>[PACT PARTNER] can be counted on to help me.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	d. <b>[PACT PARTNER] knows and understands me.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	e. <b>[PACT PARTNER] listens to me when I need someone to talk to...</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	f. <b>[PACT PARTNER] respects me....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	g. <b>I feel appreciated by [PACT PARTNER]. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r

B1 NE 6 (PARTNER IS ALIVE) AND B6 NE 6 (HAS SOME CONTACT WITH PARTNER)

**D4.** I am going to read you some statements about things you may experience when you are with [PACT PARTNER]. Please tell me if this happens with you and [PACT PARTNER]. Tell me if this often happens, sometimes happens, almost never happens, or never happens.

BSF 15 month follow-up

**[STATEMENT a -h]**

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**Does this happen often, sometimes, almost never, or never?**

CODE ONE PER ROW

		OFTEN	SOMETIMES	ALMOST NEVER	NEVER	DK	REF
BSF 15 month follow-up	a. <b>We are good at solving our differences. .</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
SHM	b. <b>[PACT PARTNER] is rude and mean to me when we disagree.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	c. <b>[PACT PARTNER] is good at calming me when I get upset.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	d. <b>Little arguments turn into ugly fights with accusations, criticisms, name calling, or bringing up past hurts. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	e. <b>We are pretty good listeners, even when we have different positions on things.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	f. <b>[PACT PARTNER] blames me for things that go wrong. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	g. <b>Even when arguing we can keep a sense of humor. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r
BSF 15 month follow-up	h. <b>When we argue, I feel personally attacked by [PACT PARTNER]. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d	r

B1 NE 6 (PARTNER IS ALIVE) AND B6 NE 6 (HAS SOME CONTACT WITH PARTNER)

**D4.** continued: **I am going to read you some statements about things you may experience when you are with [PACT PARTNER]. Please tell me if this happens with you and [PACT PARTNER]. Tell me if this often happens, sometimes happens, almost never happens, or never happens. [STATEMENT i-q]**

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR I-K, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**Does this happen often, sometimes, almost never, or never?**

CODE ONE PER ROW

			OFTEN	SOMETIMES	ALMOST NEVER	NEVER	DK REF
BSF 15 month follow-up	i.	<b>When we discuss something, [PACT PARTNER] acts as if I am totally wrong..</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
BSF 36 month follow-up	j.	<b>During arguments, we are good at taking breaks when we need them.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
BSF 36 month follow-up	k.	<b>When we argue, one of us is going to say something we will regret.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
BSF 36 month follow-up	l.	<b>[PACT PARTNER] seems to view my words or actions more negatively than I mean them to be. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
BSF 36 month follow-up	m.	<b>When we argue, one of us withdraws and refuses to talk about it anymore.....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
BSF 15 month follow-up	n.	<b>I feel respected even when we disagree.</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
PACT	o.	<b>One or both of us continue to hold grudges even after discussing our disagreements. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
IF BASELINE A9A=1 FILL "HE"							
IF BASELINE A9A=2 FILL "SHE"							
PACT	p.	<b>When [PACT PARTNER] raises a problem in our relationship, [he/she] makes me feel like I need to defend myself. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r
PACT	q.	<b>[PACT PARTNER] and I compromise during disagreements. ....</b>	1	2	3	4	d r

B1=1 OR B2= 1, 2  
 B1 = 1, FILL "marriage", B2=1 OR 2 FILL "relationship"

**D5. In the last three months, have you ever thought your [marriage/relationship] was in trouble?**

SHM

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

B1 NE 6 (PARTNER NOT DECEASED) AND B2 NE 4

**D6. Sometimes couples are not always faithful to each other. Since [RA DATE] has [PACT PARTNER] cheated on you with someone else? Is that...**

BSF 15 mo follow-up

IF B2=3 (NOT IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP): **Please think only about the time after [RA DATE] and before your romantic relationship with [PACT PARTNER] ended.**

CODE ONE ONLY

- definitely yes,**..... 1
- probably yes,**..... 2
- probably no, or** ..... 3
- definitely no?**..... 4
- WAS NEVER IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP .....99 GO TO D8
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

D6 NE 99

**D7. Since [RA DATE], have you cheated on [PACT PARTNER] with someone else?**

BSF 15 mo follow-up

IF B2=3 (NOT IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP): **Please think only about the time after [RA DATE] and before your romantic relationship with [PACT PARTNER] ended.**

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- WAS NEVER IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP .....99
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

B1 NE 6 AND B2 NE 4

IF B2=3 (NOT IN A ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP) SKIP D8a, b, c, and d

**D8. The next questions are about changes that may have occurred over the past year. Please tell me if you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements.**

PACT  
Developed

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

**[STATEMENT a-f] Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree...**

	CODE ONE PER ROW					
	STRONGLY AGREE	SOMEWHAT AGREE	SOMEWHAT DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DK	REF
a. I feel closer to <b>[PACT PARTNER]</b> than I did a year ago. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
b. <b>[PACT PARTNER]</b> and I have less trouble working out disagreements than we did a year ago. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
c. I feel more understood by <b>[PACT PARTNER]</b> than I did a year ago. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
d. Compared to a year ago, I am more hopeful that my romantic relationship with <b>[PACT PARTNER]</b> will work out. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
e. I know more about what it takes to have a good relationship than a year ago. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r
f. I feel better about my future financial situation than I did a year ago. ....	1	2	3	4	d	r

## E. ECONOMIC STABILITY

Now, I would like to ask some questions about your work.

ALL

**E1. Do you currently have a paid job?**

WIA	YES.....	1	GO TO E2
	NO.....	0	GO TO E2
	DON'T KNOW.....	d	GO TO e2
	REFUSED.....	r	GO TO E2

**E2. Have you had any jobs in the past three months?**

PACT developed	YES.....	1	GO TO E6
	NO.....	0	GO TO E14
	DON'T KNOW.....	d	GO TO E14
	REFUSED.....	r	GO TO E14

NOTE: SPACE FOR JOBS 3-6 WILL BE IN CATI PROGRAM.

	JOB 1	JOB 2
<p>E1=1 (CURRENTLY EMPLOYED)  <b>E3. Please tell me who you work for. This could be the name of a company, organization, person, or it could be yourself.</b></p> <p>WIA</p>	<p>COMPANY NAME (SPECIFY)1            _____(STRING 50)            SELF-EMPLOYED (SPECIFY) 2            _____(STRING 50)            DON'T KNOW..... d            REFUSED ..... r</p>	<p>(SPECIFY) _____(STRING 50)</p>
<p>E1=1 (CURRENTLY EMPLOYED)  <b>E4. Do you have any other jobs now?</b></p> <p>PACT developed</p>	<p>YES ..... 1 GO TO E3, JOB 2            NO ..... 0 GO TO E5            DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO E5            REFUSED ..... r GO TO E5</p> <p>IF E1=1 LOOP E3 AND E4 UP TO 6 JOBS UNTIL E4=0,d, r. WHEN E4= 0,d,or r GO TO E5, JOB 1.</p>	<p>YES ..... 1 GO TO E3, JOB 3            NO ..... 0 GO TO E5            DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO E5            REFUSED r GO TO E5</p> <p>IF E1=1 LOOP E3 AND E4 UP TO 6 JOBS UNTIL E4=0,d, r. WHEN E4= 0,d,or r GO TO E5, JOB 1.</p>
<p>E1=1 (CURRENTLY EMPLOYED)            IF E3=6 JOBS GO TO E8.  <b>E5. Have you had any other jobs in the past three months that you haven't told me about?</b></p> <p>PACT Developed</p> <p>INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION:            ASK RESPONDENT FOR A DIFFERENT NAME THAN GIVEN AT E3.</p>	<p>YES ..... 1 GO TO E6, JOB 1            NO ..... 0 GO TO E8            DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO E8            REFUSED ..... r GO TO E8</p>	<p>COMPANY NAME (SPECIFY)..... 1            _____(STRING 50)            SELF-EMPLOYED ..... 2            _____(STRING 50)            YES..... 1 GO TO E6, JOB 1            NO ..... 0 GO TO E8            DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO E8            REFUSED ..... r GO TO E8</p>
<p>E2=1 (NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED BUT EMPLOYED IN PAST 3 MONTHS) OR F5=1  <b>E6. Please tell me who you worked for?</b>  <b>This could be the name of a company, organization, person, or it could be yourself.</b></p> <p>FOR JOBS 2-6 ASK RESPONDENT THAN GIVEN AT E6, JOB 1.</p> <p>WIA</p>	<p>COMPANY NAME (SPECIFY)99            _____(STRING 50)            SELF-EMPLOYED 2</p>	
<p>E2=1 (NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED BUT EMPLOYED IN PAST 3 MONTHS)            IF E3+ E6= 6 JOBS GO TO E8  <b>E7. Have you had any other jobs in the past three months that you haven't told me about?</b></p> <p>PACT developed</p>	<p>YES ..... 1 GO TO E6, JOB 2            NO ..... 0 GO TO E8            DON'T KNOW..... d GO TO E8            REFUSED ..... r GO TO E8</p> <p>IF E1=0, D OR R AND E2=1 LOOP E6 AND E7 UNTIL E7=0,d, or r UP TO 6 JOBS.            WHEN E7=0, d, or r GO TO E8, JOB 1</p>	<p>YES..... 1 GO TO E6, JOB 3            NO ..... 0 GO TO E8            DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO E8            REFUSED ..... r GO TO E8</p> <p>IF E1=0, D OR R AND E2=1 LOOP E6 AND E7 UNTIL E7=0,d, or r UP TO 6 JOBS.            WHEN E7=0, d, or r GO TO E8, JOB 2</p>
<p>E1=1 OR E2=1  <b>E8. Now thinking of the job you do at [JOB NAME 1] when did you <u>start</u> working for [JOB NAME 1]?</b></p> <p>WIA</p> <p>INTERVIEWER: RECORD MONTH AND YEAR.            NOTE: ALLOW SKIP ON MONTH.</p>	<p>____/____/____            MONTH YEAR            (1-12) (1990-20162014)            DON'T KNOW..... d            REFUSED ..... r</p>	<p>____/____/____            MONTH YEAR            (1-12) (1990-20162014)            DON'T KNOW ..... d            REFUSED ..... r</p>

	JOB 1	JOB 2
E1=1 OR E2=1 <b>E9. When did that job end?</b> INTERVIEWER: RECORD MONTH AND YEAR.	/               (1-12) (2013-2016) MONTH YEAR (1-12) (2013-2014) STILL AT JOB..... 2 DON'T KNOW..... d REFUSED ..... r	/               (1-12) (2013-2016) MONTH YEAR (1-12) (2013-2014) STILL AT JOB..... 2 DON'T KNOW ..... d REFUSED ..... r
E1=1 OR E2=1 FILL "ARE" IF E9=98, ELSE FILL "WERE" <b>E10. Which of the following best describes your work at [JOB NAME]?</b> (Are/Were) you working . . .	<u>CODE ONE ONLY</u> <b>as a regular full-time or part-time employee</b> ,..... 1 <b>for a temporary help agency</b> , .... 2 <b>self-employed</b> ,..... 4 <b>as a day laborer</b> , ..... 5 <b>or something else (PLEASE specify)?</b> ..... 99 _____ (STRING (100)) DON'T KNOW..... d REFUSED ..... r	<u>CODE ONE ONLY</u> <b>as a regular full-time or part-time employee</b> , ..... 1 <b>for a temporary help agency</b> , .... 2 <b>self-employed</b> ,..... 4 <b>as a day laborer</b> , ..... 5 <b>or something else (PLEASE specify)?</b> ..... 99 _____ (STRING (100)) DON'T KNOW ..... d REFUSED ..... r
E1=1 OR E2=1 FILL "IS" AND "CURRENT" IF E9=98, ELSE FILL "WAS" AND "MOST RECENT" <b>E11. What [(was/is)] your [(most recent/current)] rate of pay, before taxes and deductions, at that job?</b> <b>PROBE: If your pay [(varies/ varied)], please provide an average amount.</b> INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: ACCEPT MOST CONVENIENT PAY PERIOD. SOFT CHECK: IF ANSWER IS GREATER THAN \$50 PER HOUR, \$2000 PER WEEK, \$4000 ONCE EVERY 2 WEEKS, \$4000 TWICE A MONTH, \$100,000 PER YEAR, \$400 DAY/DAILY, OR \$8000 MONTH, SAY: "I RECORDED [F7 ANSWER]. IS THAT CORRECT?"	\$         ,         .         AVERAGE (0-999,999.99) AMOUNT PER HOUR..... 1 PER WEEK..... 2 MONTH ..... 3 ONCE EVERY TWO WEEKS ..... 4 TWICE A MONTH..... 5 PER YEAR ..... 6 DAY/DAILY ..... 7 PER EVENT/ACTIVITY/UNIT/ JOB ..... 8 PLUS TIPS/COMMISSION/ BONUS ..... 9 OTHER (SPECIFY)..... 99 _____ (STRING (100)) DON'T KNOW..... d REFUSED ..... r	\$         ,         .         AVERAGE (0-999,999.99) AMOUNT PER HOUR ..... 1 PER WEEK ..... 2 MONTH ..... 3 ONCE EVERY TWO WEEKS ..... 4 TWICE A MONTH ..... 5 PER YEAR ..... 6 DAY/DAILY ..... 7 PER EVENT/ACTIVITY/UNIT/ JOB ..... 8 PLUS TIPS/COMMISSION/ BONUS ..... 9 OTHER (SPECIFY) ..... 99 _____ (STRING (100)) DON'T KNOW ..... d REFUSED ..... r
E1=1 OR E2=1 IF E9=98 FILL 'ARE', ELSE FILL "WERE" <b>E12. Which of the following benefits [(are/were)] available to you on your job (READ EACH ITEM) . . .</b> INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION: SELECT IF AVAILABLE, BUT NOT USED.	<u>CODE ALL THAT APPLY</u> <b>Health insurance or membership in an HMO or PPO plan?</b> ..... 1 <b>Paid leave for holidays, vacation or illness?</b> ..... 2 NONE AVAILABLE ..... 3 DON'T KNOW..... d REFUSED ..... r	<u>CODE ALL THAT APPLY</u> <b>Health insurance or membership in an HMO or PPO plan?</b> ..... 1 <b>Paid leave for holidays, vacation or illness?</b> ..... 2 NONE AVAILABLE ..... 3 DON'T KNOW ..... d REFUSED ..... r

	JOB 1	JOB 2
E1=1 OR E2=1 IF F9=98 FILL "DO", ELSE FILL "DID"	_ _  HOURS PER WEEK (0-98)	_ _  HOURS PER WEEK (0-98)
<b>E13.</b> How many hours [(do/did)] you usually work in a week on this job? Your best estimate is fine.	99 OR MORE HOURS PER WEEK ..... 99	99 OR MORE HOURS PER WEEK ..... 99
WIA	DON'T KNOW ..... d	DON'T KNOW ..... d
	REFUSED ..... r	REFUSED ..... r
	IF E3=1 OR E3c=1 GO TO E4 [JOB 2-6].	IF E3=1 OR E3c=1 GO TO E4 [JOB 2-6].
	WHEN (E3 NE 1 AND E3c NE 1) OR # OF JOBS COLLECTED =6, GO TO E10.	WHEN (E3 NE 1 AND E3c NE 1) OR # OF JOBS COLLECTED =6, GO TO E10.

ALL

**E14.** Thinking about the past 3 months, was there anything else you did for pay, such as odd jobs, under-the-table jobs, side jobs or informal jobs, that we haven't already talked about?

PACT developed

- YES .....1 GO TO E11  
 NO .....0 E16  
 DON'T KNOW .....d E16  
 REFUSED .....r E16

IF E1=0, DK OR R AND E2=0, DK OR R AND E10=0, DK OR R GO TO E17

E14=1

**E15.** What is your best guess of how much money you made from these activities over the past three months? Please do not include money you made from any jobs we talked about earlier.

PACT developed

PROBE: Your best guess is fine.

\$|\_|\_|, |\_|\_|\_| IN PAST THREE MONTHS  
(0-99,999)

- DON'T KNOW .....d  
 REFUSED .....r

SOFT CHECK:  
 IF AMOUNT IS GREATER THAN 20,000 FOR 3 MONTHS PLEASE CONFIRM WITH RESPONDENT AND REVISE ANSWER IF NECESSARY.E1=1

E1=1

**E16. How satisfied are you with your current job? Would you say very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, or not satisfied?**

PACT developed

CODE ONE ONLY

- VERY SATISFIED .....1 GO TO E20
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED.....2 GO TO E17
- NOT SATISFIED .....3 GO TO E17
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO E17
- REFUSED .....r GO TO E17

E16 NE 1

IF E1=1 OR E10OR E14=1 FILL "BETTER JOB" ELSE ORE2=1, E14=0FILL "JOB"

**E17. In the past month have you taken steps to find a [job/better job]?**

PACT developed

- YES .....1 GO TO E19
- NO.....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

E13 NE 1 AND E12E17 NE 1

IF E1=1 OR E10E14=1 FILL "BETTER JOB" OR DK, R AND E2=0, DK, R AND E14=0, DK OR RELSE FILL "JOB"

**E18. Are you planning to take steps to get a [job/better job] soon?**

PACT developed

- YES .....1
- NO.....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

E16 NE 1

**E19. Do you have an updated resume that you can give to employers?**

PACT developed

- YES .....1
- NO.....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d

ALL

**E20. Are you better off financially now than you were a year ago?**

- FACT developed YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**E21. Do you know how to handle your money and bills better than you did a year ago?**

- FACT developed YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

## F. MENTAL HEALTH

The next questions are about how you are doing.

ALL

**F1.** Over the last two weeks, how often have you been bothered by any of the following problems?

PHQ-8

**[STATEMENT a-h] Would you say that the problem happened not at all, on several days, on more than half the days, or on nearly every day in the last two weeks?**

PROGRAMMER INSTRUCTION: MAKE RESPONSE CATEGORIES BOLD FOR A-C, UNBOLD FOR REMAINDER.

CODE ONE RESPONSE PER ROW

	NOT AT ALL	SEVERAL DAYS	MORE THAN HALF THE DAYS	NEARLY EVERY DAY	DK	REF
a. <b>Little interest or pleasure in doing things.</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
b. <b>Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
c. <b>Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
d. <b>Feeling tired or having little energy. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
e. <b>Poor appetite or overeating. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
f. <b>Feeling bad about yourself—or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
g. <b>Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r
h. <b>Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed? Or the opposite - being so fidgety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual. ....</b>	0	1	2	3	d	r

## G. SERVICE RECEIPT

Now, I'd like to ask you some questions about services you may have received since [RA MONTH YEAR].

ALL

**G1.** Since [RA MONTH YEAR] did you participate in any group activities to help your relationship? These could have been referred to as classes, workshops, seminars, meetings, or group sessions.

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up  
modified  
for PACT

- YES .....1
- NO .....0 GO TO G4
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO G4
- REFUSED .....r GO TO G4

G1 = 1

**G2.** Since [RA MONTH YEAR], about how many hours in total did you attend these group activities?

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up  
modified  
for PACT

**PROBE:** Your best estimate of the number of hours you attended is fine.

\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF HOURS  
(10-99)

- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

G2= d OR r

**G2a.** I just need to know a range. Can you tell me if it was...?

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up  
modified  
for PACT

CODE ONE ONLY

- 1-5 hours,** .....1
- 6-10 hours,** .....2
- 11-15 hours,** .....3
- 16-20 hours,** .....4
- 21-30 hours, or** .....5
- more than 30 hours?** .....6
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

G1 = 1 AND B1 NE 6

**G3. (IF G2=1, D, or R) Did [PACT PARTNER] attend the group activity with you?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

**(IF G2 ≥ 2) Did [PACT PARTNER] usually attend the group activity with you?**

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

ALL

**G4. Since [RA MONTH YEAR], did you meet with a social worker, counselor, or clergy member to work on your relationship in sessions that were not part of a workshop, class, or group?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO G8
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO G8
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO G8

IF G4 = 1

**G5. Since [RA MONTH YEAR], about how many times did you meet with a social worker, counselor or clergy member to work on your relationship?**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

\_\_\_\_ NUMBER OF SESSIONS  
(1-99)

**PROBE: Your best estimate of the number of sessions you attended is fine.**

- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

IF G4 = 1  
 IF G5=1, D, OR R FILL "the", IF G5 ≥ 2 FILL "each"

**G6. About how long did [the/each] meeting last?**

BSF 15  
 month  
 follow-up

\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_|  
 (0.1-99.9)

- HOURS .....1
- MINUTES .....2
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

SOFT CHECK: IF G6 ANSWER GE 4 HOURS SAY: "I recorded [ANSWER] hours. Is that correct?"

G6= d OR r

**G6a. I just need to know a range. Can you tell me if it was...?**

BSF 15  
 month  
 follow-up  
 modified  
 for PACT

CODE ONE ONLY

- 1-5 hours,** .....1
- 6-10 hours,** .....2
- 11-15 hours,** .....3
- 16-20 hours,** .....4
- 21-30 hours, or** .....5
- more than 30 hours?** .....6
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

IF G4=1 AND B1 NE 6

**G7. (IF G5=1, D, or R) Did [PACT PARTNER] attend the meeting with you?**

BSF 15  
 month  
 follow-up

**(IF G5 ≥ 2) Did [PACT PARTNER] usually attend the meetings with you?**

- YES .....1
- NO .....0
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

ALL

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

**G8. Since [RA MONTH YEAR], have you...[STATEMENT A-G]**

**(If G8a or G8d = 1) How many hours in total did the class last? PROBE: YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IS FINE.**

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

a. participated in any classes to help you improve your parenting skills? Include any workshops or groups you attended on parenting.....

BSF 15  
month  
modified

b. participated in a training program for a specific job, trade, or occupation? .....

BSF 15  
month  
modified

c. received names of employers who were interviewing from any organizations, or did any organizations set up interviews with employers for you? .....

BSF 15  
month  
modified

d. participated in any classes that helped you get a job in other ways? For example, they may have helped you create a resume, practice interviewing, or talk to you about how to look for a job. ....

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

e. taken any classes to help you with reading, writing, math skills, learning English, a program to get a GED, or a college degree? .....

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

f. received services to help you with anger management?.....

BSF 15  
month  
follow-up

g. received services to help you deal with a mental health, alcohol or substance use problem? .....

G8 (a-g)				IF G8a = 1 or G8d =1
CODE ONE PER ROW				CODE ONE PER ROW
YES	NO	DK	REF	NUMBER OF HOURS
1	0	d	r	_ _
1	0	d	r	
1	0	d	r	
1	0	d	r	_ _
1	0	d	r	
1	0	d	r	
1	0	d	r	

TREATMENT GROUP ONLY

**G9. Overall, on a scale from 1 to 10 where 1 is not satisfied and 10 is very satisfied, how satisfied were you with [NAME OF HM PROGRAM]?**

PACT developed

\_\_\_\_\_  
(1-10)

NEVER ATTENDED THE PROGRAM.....0 GO TO G11

TREATMENT GROUP ONLY AND G9 NE 99

**G10. I'm going to ask you some questions about how much [NAME OF HM PROGRAM] helped you. Tell me if the program services helped you, a lot, some or not at all? [STATEMENT A-C]...would you say a lot, some or not at all?**

CODE ONE RESPONSE PER ROW

A LOT	SOME	NOT AT ALL	DK	REF
-------	------	------------	----	-----

PACT developed

a. How much, if at all, did [NAME OF HM PROGRAM] help prepare you for a job or help you get a job? ... 1 2 3 d r

PACT developed

b. How much, if at all, did [NAME OF HM PROGRAM] help you be a better parent for your children? ..... 1 2 3 d r

B1 NE 6

PACT developed

c. How much, if at all, did [NAME OF HM PROGRAM] help you with your relationship with [PACT PARTNER]? ..... 1 2 3 d r

TREATMENTGROUP ONLY

**G11. How likely are you to recommend [NAME OF HM PROGRAM] to others? Would you say...**

PACT developed

CODE ONE ONLY

- a lot,.....1
- some, or .....2
- not at all? .....3
- DON'T KNOW .....d
- REFUSED .....r

## H. INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

BASELINE A3A=2 (RESPONDENT IS FEMALE) AND B1 NE 6 (PARTNER IS ALIVE)  
ELSE GO TO I1

The next set of questions asks about experiences that may or may not have happened to you. There will be some questions about physical injuries and harassing behaviors. Remember, you don't have to answer any questions that you don't want to. We suggest that you be in a private setting to answer this set of questions. If, at any time, you do not feel physically or emotionally safe, you can just say "Goodbye". I will understand and I will not call you back. You can call me back if you'd like at 855-284-3440.].

H1. Next I'm going to read a list of things that might have happened to you in the past year. Please answer "yes" or "no" to each of the following statements. In the past year, did [PACT PARTNER] [STATEMENT A-M]...

	CODE ONE PER ROW			
Conflict Tactic Scale	YES	NO	DK	REF
a. CTS 24.....	1	0	d	r
b. CTS 19.....	1	0	d	r
c. CTS 21.....	1	0	d	r
d. CTS 21.....	1	0	d	r
e. CTS 22.....	1	0	d	r
f. CTS 31.....	1	0	d	r
g. CTS 28.....	1	0	d	r
h. CTS 26.....	1	0	d	r
i. CTS 24.....	1	0	d	r
j. CTS 27.....	1	0	d	r
k. CTS 29.....	1	0	d	r
l. burn or scald you on purpose?.....	1	0	d	r
m. CTS 23.....	1	0	d	r

BASELINE A3A=2 (RESPONDENT IS FEMALE)  
B1 NE 6 (PARTNER IS ALIVE)

H2. We're providing the following information to all women who take this survey. Domestic violence can happen and can be very painful. If you or a friend is ever in need of help, you can call 1-800-799-7233, or visit THE HOTLINE DOT ORG, for more information.

## I. CONTACT INFORMATION 2

We are almost finished. I just have a few more questions. These will help us contact you if we need to reach you in the future. We will only use this information, including your social networking accounts, if we cannot reach you with the other information you provided us.

ALL

**11. What is your current address?**

**PROBE: Is there an apartment number?**

**PROBE: This is where we will mail your gift card.**

STREET 1

STREET 2

APT. #

CITY

STATE

ZIP

ALL

**12. What is your current home telephone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

NO LANDLINE AT HOME .....0

DON'T KNOW .....d

REFUSED .....r

ALL

**13. Do you have a cell phone?**

YES .....1

NO .....0 GO TO I7

DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO I7

REFUSED .....r GO TO I7

I3=1

**14. What is your cell phone number?**

|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| - |\_|\_|\_|\_|\_| TELEPHONE  
(201-989) (200-999) (0000-9999)

DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

I3=1

**15. I am going to ask you about the kind of cell phone service plan you have with your cell phone provider.**

Youthbuild

CODE ONE PER ROW

	YES	NO	DK	REF
a. Do you have a contract? .....	1	0	d	r
b. Do you have a 'pay as you go' plan? .....	1	0	d	r
c. Do you have unlimited calling? .....	1	0	d	r
d. Do you have unlimited texting? .....	1	0	d	r
e. OTHER (SPECIFY).....	1	0	d	r
_____ (STRING 100)				

IF OTHER SPECIFY (99): **SPECIFY OTHER TYPE OF PLAN**

I5d=1

**16. Is it okay for us to text you at this number?**

PACT developed

YES .....1  
NO .....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

ALL

**17. What is your email address?**

INTERVIEWER: ENTER E-MAIL ON NEXT SCREEN

\_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)  
DON'T HAVE ONE .....0  
DON'T KNOW .....d  
REFUSED .....r

ALL

**18. Do you have a Facebook account?**

Youthbuild

- YES ..... 1
- NO ..... 0 GO TO THANK YOU
- DON'T KNOW ..... d GO TO THANK YOU
- REFUSED ..... r GO TO THANK YOU

18=1

**18a. What name do you use on Facebook?**

- \_\_\_\_\_ (STRING 50)
- DON'T KNOW ..... d
- REFUSED ..... r

END OF CALL

INTERVIEW COMPLETED

**THANK YOU. Those are all of the questions I have. You will receive \$25 as a token of our appreciation. Thank you for participating in the PACT study.**

**Is [PACT PARTNER] available? I'd like to interview [him/her] too, if [he/she] are around.**

INSTRUCTION: IF [PACT PARTNER] IS AVAILABLE, ASK TO SPEAK TO HIM/HER. CLOSE THE CURRENT CASE AFTER LEAVING A NOTE ABOUT THIS CASE AND OPEN [PACT PARTNER]'S CASE.

INSTRUCTION: IF [PACT PARTNER] ISN'T AVAILABLE, ASK FOR THE BEST TIME TO REACH HIM/HER AND RECORD ON [PACT PARTNER]'S CONTACT SHEET.

GO TO END 2.

IF MAKEDIALPHONE=5 (COMPLETES WITH FIELD LOCATOR)

**FIELD END.** Thank you very much for your time. Those are all the questions I have right now.

**Is [PACT PARTNER] available? I'd like to interview [him/her] too, if [he/she] is around.**

INSTRUCTION: IF [PACT PARTNER] IS AVAILABLE, ASK TO SPEAK TO HIM/HER. CLOSE THE CURRENT CASE AFTER LEAVING A NOTE ABOUT THIS CASE AND OPEN [PACT PARTNER]'S CASE.

INSTRUCTION: IF [PACT PARTNER] ISN'T AVAILABLE, ASK FOR THE BEST TIME TO REACH HIM/HER AND RECORD ON [PACT PARTNER]'S CONTACT SHEET.

**Please hand the phone back to our field locator.**

INTERVIEWER: CONFIRM WITH FIELD LOCATOR THAT SM HAS BEEN PAID.

- YES .....1 GO TO END2
- NO .....0 GO TO END2
- DON'T KNOW .....d GO TO END2
- REFUSED .....r GO TO END4

ALL

**END2.** Interviewer: Do not read. Information required by publisher.  
Note that 10 items in the section entitled "Parenting" are adapted and reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, Florida 33549, from the Parenting Alliance Measure by Richard Abidin, EdD and Timothy R. Konold, PhD, Copyright 1999 by PAR, Inc. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission by PAR, Inc.

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

**This page left intentionally blank for double-sided copying.**

---

## **Mathematica**

Princeton, NJ • Ann Arbor, MI • Cambridge, MA  
Chicago, IL • Oakland, CA • Seattle, WA  
Tucson, AZ • Woodlawn, MD • Washington, DC

## **EDI Global, a Mathematica Company**

Bukoba, Tanzania • High Wycombe, United Kingdom



[mathematica-mpr.com](http://mathematica-mpr.com)