PACT RF Follow-up survey

question-by-question justification

**Table1. Follow-up RF Survey: Question-by-Question Justification**

| Question | Source | Rationale |
| --- | --- | --- |
|
| **Introduction and Contact Information** |
| Introduction (i1-I8) | PACT  | Questions are asked to ascertain whether the respondent is the sample member and to inform the respondent about: the expected length of the interview, the Certificate of Confidentiality, and the possibility that the interview may be recorded. |
| Contact information (A1a-A2) | PACT  | Obtaining the exact spelling of the respondent’s name is important so that we can send them the respondent payment. |
| **Child Roster and Father Involvement** |
| Roster of children born to father since random assignment (B1- B3i) | PACT | Questions are asked about any children the father has had since random assignment for two reasons. First, some men did not have children at random assignment but were expecting babies; it will be important to know how the program has affected the respondent’s parenting of the baby. Second, the program may reduce the likelihood that the father has had more children since random assignment. The questions about the child are the same as the questions about the father’s other children at baseline. |
| For all the children the respondent has had since random assignment: age, gender, name of mother of child, whether married to mother when child was born, whether paternity has been established (B3d and e, B3c, B3f, B3g, B3h, B3i) | PACT |
| Whether father is expecting a baby and if so, how many (B4-B5) |  | The program may affect the likelihood that the father will have unprotected sex. This question asks whether the father is expecting any children at the time of the survey. |
| Closeness to child (B6) | PACT | This question is meant to summarize the quality of the father’s perceived relationship with his child. It is asked of all the respondent’s children. |
| Living arrangements of child (B7-B10) | PACT | The program may affect the living arrangements of the child. The survey asks who the child currently lives with. It then asks how many nights in the past month did the respondent spend with the child. This is important because even if the child does not live with the father, he may spend nights with his child. The question also asks whether the father has lived with the child since random assignment to find out whether the living situation has been stable since random assignment. These questions are asked of all the respondent’s children. |
| Contact with child (B11-B12) | FFCWS, PACT, BSF | The program encourages fathers’ involvement in their children’s lives. To capture multiple types of contact, the survey includes questions on in-person contact and contact through other means, such as phone, letters, or text messages. These questions are asked of all the respondent’s children. |
| Gate-keeping behaviors of mother (B13) | PACT | Mothers play an important role in facilitating or impeding fathers’ involvement with their children, including when parents live apart (Fagan and Barnett 2003). This question addresses the fathers’ perception of the mothers’ gatekeeping behaviors. These questions are asked of all the respondent’s children. |
| Money spent on child directly (B14-B15) | PACT | A key goal of PACT is to promote responsible parenting, including fathers’ material support of their children. This question captures money fathers spend on things for children, such as diapers or clothes. These questions are asked of all the respondent’s children. |
| Attitudes about parenting (B16) | PACT | The programs emphasize the importance of fathers in their children’s lives. These questions are designed to capture fathers’ feelings about their impact on their children’s lives.  |
| Steps toward becoming a better fathers (B17 & B18) | PACT | Change may happen incrementally, with some fathers having taken steps to become better or more responsible fathers and others considering steps. These questions are designed to capture where fathers are in the process of change.  |
| **Parenting of Focal Child\*** |
| Activities conducted with focal child\* (C1) | SHM, EHS, PSID, and PACT  | The RF program intends to improve the quality of parenting. Hence, the survey includes questions about the types of activities that the father may do with the child, focusing on active engagement. The question tailors the activities asked about to the age of the child. |
| Positive parenting of focal child\* (C2) | SHM, PPQ, PACT | The RF program may improve the parenting behaviors of the couple. This question asks about four positive parenting behaviors. |
| Approaches to discipline of focal child\* (C3) | Modified from CTSPC | The RF program may improve the way that the couple disciplines the child. This question asks about positive and negative discipline approaches. |
| Knowledge of good parenting practices (C4a-c) | PACT, AAPI-2 | Parenting styles, such as whether a parent is authoritarian, are associated with children’s outcomes (Baumrind et al. 2010). These questions capture parenting attitudes, such as fathers’ perceptions of whether praise spoils a child.  |
| Feelings of respondent about being a father (C4d-f) | PACT | Programs strive to support fathers’ parenting skills, which may increase their confidence and support their identity as a father. These questions are about fathers’ confidence in parenting, whether he likes being known as a father, and whether parenthood has changed him.  |
| Steps taken to become a better father to the focal child\* (C5-C5b) | PACT | Change may happen incrementally. These questions ask fathers whether they would like to see their child more, whether they have taken steps to see their child more, or considering steps. This question is asked about the focal child.  |
| Perception of the respondent about whether he has become a better father to the focal child\* over the past year (C5c) | PACT | Programs encourage fathers to reach out to their children and make other efforts to strengthen and sustain their relationships. This question asks whether the father’s relationship with the focal child has improved over the past year.  |
| **Relationship of Respondent with Mothers of His Children and His Knowledge of the Child Support System** |
| Marital status of respondent and mother of child (D1) | BSF | A father’s romantic relationship with the child’s mother is related to his contact with his children (Tach, Mincy, and Edin 2010). These questions ask about marital status, romantic involvement, and contact with the mother. They are asked about all the mothers of the respondent’s children. |
| Relationship status of respondent and mother of child (D2-D3) | BSF |
| Living arrangement of respondent with each mother (D4-D5) | BSF | Among romantically involved fathers, fathers that live with mothers are more likely to be involved with their children than fathers who do not (Johnson 2001). These questions capture whether the father lives with the mother and nights he spends with her in the same place. These questions are asked about all the mothers of the respondent’s children. |
| Whether has child support order with mother and amount paid (D6-D7) | PACT | A key goal of PACT is to promote responsible parenting, including fathers’ material support of their children. Financial support of children through formal and informal monetary payments and in-kind purchases will be important measures of PACT’s impact. These questions capture whether the father has paid the mother directly or through formal child support orders. These questions are asked about all the mothers of the respondent’s children. |
| Whether respondent has made other payments to mother and amount paid (D8-D9) | PACT |
| Quality of coparenting with mother (D10) | PSI | The quality of the co-parenting relationship is associated with father involvement (Carlson, McLanahan, and Brooks-Gunn 2008; Sobolewski and King 2005). This question is asked about all the mothers of the respondent’s children. |
| Knowledge of the child support system (D11-D13) | PACT | Several of the programs teach fathers about their legal rights and responsibilities as a parent. Further, they emphasize that fathers can work with child support enforcement to address their needs. These questions ask about fathers’ knowledge and attitudes regarding the child support system.  |
| **Coparenting with Mother of Focal Child\*** |
| Quality of coparenting with focal mother\*\* (E1a-E1e) | PAM | The quality of the co-parenting relationship is associated with father involvement (Carlson, McLanahan, and Brooks-Gunn 2008; Sobolewski and King 2005). These questions taken from the Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM) (Abidin and Brunner 1995) ask for more detailed information on coparenting than asked of about all mothers in question D10. Topic include fathers’ perception of the mother’s judgment, their communication, and problem solving. These questions are asked about the mother of the focal child. |
| Perceptions about improvements in relationship quality with focal mother\*\* since a year ago (E1f-E1h) | PACT | Programs encourage the fathers to work cooperatively with the mothers of their children. These questions assess the father’s perception of whether his relationship with mother of the focal child has improved in the past year.  |
| Steps taken to improve relationship with focal mother\*\* (E2-E2b) | PACT | Fathers may vary in their perception of the need to improve the relationship with the mothers of the focal children and steps they have taken to do so. These questions ask about whether the father wants to show the mother he is a good parent, taken steps to do so, or considered such steps.  |
| Relationship quality with focal mother\*\* (E3) | BSF | Relationship quality is associated with father engagement (Fagan and Palkovitz 2011). These questions ask about several dimensions of the relationship, such as problem solving and conflict management. These questions are asked about the mother of the focal child. |
| **Economic Stability** |
| Information on all jobs respondent has had in the past three months (F1-F9) | WIA | The PACT RF programs all provide some services to assist the participants get a job or a better job. These questions ask about all the jobs that the respondent has currently and in the past three months. We ask about when the job began, ended (if applicable), type of job (e.g. full time, part time, self-employed, day laborer), wage rate, hours worked, and fringe benefits. Earnings over the past three months can be calculated from the wage rate and the number of hours worked. |
| Other earnings from work (F10-F11) | WIA | Many people, especially those with low income, do other work for pay that may not be considered a job. For example, they may babysit, or help out with a family business occasionally. These questions ask about whether they have done work that they do not consider “a job” and the amount they made from that work. |
| Steps made toward improving economic stability (F12-F14) | PACT | Within one year after enrollment in the program, the respondent may not have had time to get a job or improve his earnings. This series of questions asks if the respondent has taken steps to getting a job or better jobs: whether he wants a job or a better job, whether he has planned to take steps, and whether he has actually taken steps. |
| Readiness for job search (F15) | PACT | This question asks if the respondent has an updated resume. |
| Perceptions of economic stability (F17) | PACT | The program may assist the couple become financially better off in ways other than through a job or better job. For example, the program may assist the couple apply for public assistance. This question asks whether the respondent is better off financially compared to a year ago to capture the many ways the program can help the participant. |
| Housing stability (F17-F20) | WFNJ, HII | Housing instability, including homelessness, eviction, frequent movies, involuntary moves due to being unable to pay rent or mortgage, and living with others without paying rent, is experienced by a considerable share of urban men, especially those who have been incarcerated (Geller and Curtis 2011). Understanding the housing circumstances of the PACT sample will help capture the extent of the disadvantage. These questions ask about where the father lives, recent moves, and difficulty paying for housing. |
| **Criminal Justice Involvement** |
| Arrest record (G1-G3) | BSF, SVORI | Recent research suggests that a history of incarceration and involvement with the criminal justice system may be fairly common among fathers in the PACT target population (Pettit and Western 2004). These questions ask about arrests since random assignment. |
| **Respondent’s Well Being** |
| Depressive symptoms (H1) | PHQ-8 | By linking respondents to mental health services, providing opportunities for social interactions, and improving relationships, the PACT RF programs may reduce depression. Eight items from the Parental Health Questionnaire are included in this survey. The PHQ-8 has been shown to be a valid measure of depression in population-based studies (Kroenke et al. 2009) |
| Parenting stress (H2) | PSI | Parental stress is an indicator of parents’ own well-being and is also correlated with father engagement and the quality of the coparenting relationship (Bronte-Tinkew, Horowitz, and Carrano 2010). These questions ask about facets of stress that may be relevant for resident and non-resident fathers, such as feeling trapped by responsibilities and not feeling appreciated. |
| Feelings of optimism and control (H3) | FFCWS, P Scale | Disadvantaged fathers may feel helpless to change their circumstances and pessimistic about the future. These questions ask about fathers’ feeling of hope, enthusiasm, feelings of control over their circumstances, and helplessness (Caprara et al. 2012). |
| Perceptions of change over the past year (H4, H7) | PACT | Fathers in the treatment and control groups may have changed over the past year because of receipt of services, motivation, or other factors. These questions ask about fathers’ perceptions of change on dimensions of fathering, child support, and personal health. |
| Perceptions of economic stability (F5) | PACT | The program may assist the couple become financially better off in ways other than through a job or better job. For example, the program may assist the couple apply for public assistance. This question asks whether the respondent is better off financially compared to a year ago to capture the many ways the program can help the participant. |
| Ability to manage money (H6) | PACT | Some of the PACT RF programs offer classes in managing financing. This question asks about whether the respondent feels that he or she has improved his or her ability to manage his or her finances.  |
| **Service Receipt** |
| Whether participated in an education program and completed it (I1) | WIA | The RF programs may encourage fathers to go back to obtain education or training. These questions ask whether the father has participated in an education or training program and whether they have completed the program. |
| Whether participated in a training program and completed it (I2) | WIA |
| Whether received job leads from an organization (I3) | BSF | Asking both members of the program and control group about the receipt of services will provide information about the “counterfactual”—the services that would have been received in the absence of participation in the program. This series of questions ask about services that the program provides—such as relationship skills education and employment services—as well as services which the program participants may be referred to—such as mental health services. |
| Whether and how many hours participating in group employment services (I4-I4a) | BSF |
| Whether received and how many hours received of one-on-one employment assistance (I5-I5a) | BSF |
| Whether participated in subsidized employment (I6) | BSF |
| Whether participated in a parenting group activity and number of hours spend in group (I7-I7a) | BSF |
| Whether received one-on-one parenting assistance and how many hours received (I8-I8a)  | PACT |
| Whether participated in any relationship skills classes and how many hours participated (I9-I9a) | PACT |
| Whether received help with a child support order (I10) | BSF |
| Whether received help with child custody or visitation arrangements (I11)  | BSF |
| Whether received help with a legal problem other than child support or child custody/visitation (I12) | PACT |
| Whether an organization as helped them go on a family outing (I13) | PACT |
| Whether received services to help with anger management issues (I14) | BSF |
| Whether received mental health or substance use services (I15) | BSF |
| Satisfaction with program (I16-I18) | PACT | Programs would like to know whether the participants feel they benefited from participating in the study. This series of questions, asked only of respondents who are in the program group, ask how the respondent to rate his or her satisfaction with the program, whether they would recommend the program, and to say how much each of the three main types of services—relationship skills education, parenting, and employment—helped him or her. |
| **Contact Information** |
| Contact information | PACT | Additional contact information is required to send the $25 appreciation payment to the respondent and in case an additional wave of interviews will be conducted. A Facebook name is collected in case we have difficulty contacting the respondent using the other information provided. |

RF: Responsible fatherhood

\*Focal child: one child chosen from among the father’s biological and adopted children

\*\*Focal mother: mother of the focal child

Sources: Building Strong Families Study (BSF), American Recovery and Reinvestment Act COBRA Subsidy Study (CBRA), Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (FFCWS), Work First New Jersey (WFNJ), Parenting Alliance Measure (PAM), Rural Welfare-to-Work Demonstration Evaluation (RWTW), Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), Serious Violent Offender Reentry Initiative Evaluation (SVORI), Supporting Healthy Marriage (SHM), Early Head Start survey (EHS), Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation (MIHOPE), Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), Parenting Practices Questionnaire (PPQ), Positivity Scale (P Scale), Conflict Tactics Scale-Parent Child (CTSPC), WIA Gold Standard Follow-up Survey

SURVEYS REFERENCED

The list below contains brief descriptions of the eight surveys referenced in the PACT RF follow-up survey, as well as locations of the surveys referenced. Descriptions were compiled from websites about the surveys and descriptions of Mathematica studies were gathered from project summaries.When necessary, we modified questions drawn from these surveys to make them easier to understand or to have the questions align more closely with the baseline survey’s goals.

1. Building Strong Families Study (BSF)

The United States Department of Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families (ACF) initiated the Building Strong Families (BSF) project to help interested and romantically involved low-income, unwed parents build stronger relationships and thus enhance their child’s well being and their own future. The BSF evaluation being conducted by Mathematica is designed to test the effectiveness of these programs for couples and children. BSF data collection included a baseline information form to collect demographic and socioeconomic data along with two follow-up surveys. The follow-up surveys included questions related to mother-father relationships, family structure, fathers’ involvement in child rearing, parent-child relationships and the home environment, family functioning, child well-being and development, and parental well-being.

*Surveys are available from Mathematica upon request.*

2. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act COBRA Subsidy Study (CBRA)

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, Mathematica’s American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) COBRA Subsidy study examines the effect of the availability of an ARRA COBRA premium subsidy on the take-up of COBRA coverage and other health and employment outcomes. As part of the study, Mathematica will conduct a survey of COBRA-eligible individuals drawn from state Unemployment Insurance recipients. The CBRA survey asks questions related to respondents’ demographic characteristics, employment history, receipt of social services, and health insurance.

*Surveys are available from Mathematica upon request.*

3. Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (FFCWS)

The Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study is a longitudinal study of a cohort of nearly 5,000 children born between 1998 and 2000 from birth through age five. Approximately one-third of the children were born to unmarried parents. Interviews were conducted with both mothers and fathers covering a range of topics including attitudes, relationships, and parenting behavior.

*Study protocols and codebooks can be found here:* [*http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/documentation.asp*](http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/documentation.asp)

4. Work First New Jersey (WFNJ)

Mathematica evaluated the effects of New Jersey’s initiative to help welfare recipients transition from welfare to work. WFNJ interviewed sample members annually for five years documenting changes in household composition, income, employment, and other indicators of well-being.

*Surveys are available from Mathematica upon request.*

5. Rural Welfare-to-Work Demonstration Evaluation (RWTW)

Mathematica’s Rural Welfare-to-Work Strategies Demonstration Evaluation used random assignment to assess innovative approaches to helping welfare-dependent and other low-income families in rural areas to enter, maintain, and advance in employment and to secure family well-being. Data collection included a baseline information form to collect demographic and socioeconomic data on sample members and two follow-up surveys to collect detailed employment history data as well as information on various outcomes related to individual and family well-being.

*Surveys are available from Mathematica upon request.*

6. Evaluation of the Serious Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI)

The Evaluation of the Serious Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) was a multi-year, multi-site evaluation funded by National Institute of Justice. The impact evaluation was designed to measure the impact of enhanced reentry programming on post-release outcomes. As part of the evaluation, interviews were conducted at four points in time.

*Surveys are available from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data.*

7. Supporting Healthy Marriage (SHM)

ACF sponsors the Supporting Healthy Marriage project (SHM). SHM is a multi-year, multi-site evaluation of marriage education programs for low-income married couples. Data collection includes baseline information forms to determine eligibility and collect demographic information, a 12-month follow-up survey to measure short-term impacts of the marriage education program, and a 30-month follow-up survey to measure longer-term impacts.

 *Surveys are available from MDRC.*

**8.****The Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation (***MIHOPE***)**

ACF and the Health Resources and Services Administration jointly administer the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Evaluation. MIHOPE is a multi-year, multi-site evaluation of the Home Visiting program designed to prevent child maltreatment, improve maternal and child health outcomes, and increase school readiness. Data collection includes a baseline survey and a 15-month follow up survey.

 *Surveys are available from MDRC.*

**9.****Early Head Start (EHS)**

 The U.S. Department of health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families funded an evaluation of the Early Head Start program—a program for pregnant women and families with infants and toddlers that is based on the Head Start program model. The Administration for Children and Families sponsored an experimental evaluation of the program based in 17 sites. This study conducted five follow-up surveys after random assignment.

 *Surveys are available from Mathematica Policy Research*

**10. Workforce Investment Act Adult and Dislocated Worker Programs Gold Standard Evaluation (WIA)**

 The U.S. Department of Labor sponsored an experimental evaluation of the Adult and Dislocated Worker programs funded under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA). The study is taking place in 28 randomly-selected local workforce investment areas across the USA. Two follow-up surveys are being conducted with over 6,000 study participants at 15 and 30 months after random assignment.

 *Surveys are available from Mathematica Policy Research.*
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