

# **W-2 Child Support Demonstration Evaluation**

## **Technical Report 5**

### **Design and Content of the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families**

Margaret L. Kreckler  
Institute for Research on Poverty  
University of Wisconsin–Madison

April 2001



## Introduction

The Survey of Wisconsin Works Families is a panel study of resident mothers and nonresident fathers selected from the research population.<sup>1</sup> We collected data in two waves. The first period of data collection, Time 1, gathered information in 1999 on families' experiences during 1998, the first year that W-2 was in place. The second period, Time 2, focused one year later on 1999 experiences. This report describes the sample design, tracking and locating efforts, data collection methods, and outcomes of the fieldwork. Analyses of survey coverage—how well the survey samples (defined below) reflect the population—and characteristics of respondents are also reported. Technical Report 4 and Technical Report 6 provide additional analyses of survey respondents and nonrespondents, discuss the development of survey sampling and nonresponse weights, and describe the relationship between the survey sample and other samples used in the Child Support Demonstration Evaluation.

## Sample Design

The survey population is a subset of the research population. The core administrative data sources for the research population, CARES and KIDS, served as the sample frame; that is, they provided the list of cases (the frame) from which we selected the survey sample.

Technical Report 1 discusses the derivation of the *research population* and examines how accurately it reflects the characteristics of the population of all W-2 cases. Briefly, the research population includes all W-2 cases assigned to one of three groups (experimental group, control group, or neither group) between September 1, 1997, and July 8, 1998, excluding (a) cases in which there was no living father; (b) cases in which there was a good-cause exemption from pursuing child support, usually because of evidence of domestic violence; (c) cases in which the resident parent or a child received SSI; and (d) cases in which the father was the resident parent. Families receiving SSI were not eligible to receive a partial pass-through of child support and therefore were excluded from the experiment. Cases in which the father was the resident parent are very few (about 2 percent of the population) and are sufficiently different from resident-mother cases to render comparisons difficult. The total number of cases remaining was 15,977.

The survey design involved interviewing resident mothers and the nonresident fathers associated with them.<sup>2</sup> All of the cases that were excluded from the research population also were excluded from the *survey population* and from the frame for the survey sample. The survey population is the aggregation of W-2 cases from which we selected resident mothers and nonresident fathers whom we planned to interview. This aggregation includes all W-2 cases in the research population except the group of cases not assigned to experimental or control status. This group was not originally to be included in the evaluation analysis and was not eligible to be in the survey population.

---

<sup>1</sup>I thank Nancy Mathiowetz and Nora Cate Schaeffer for comments on an earlier version of this report. Maria Cancian advised on part of the analysis, and Tymofiy Mylovanov provided helpful research assistance.

<sup>2</sup>By “nonresident father” we mean the legal father for whom paternity has been established or who was married to the child’s mother at the child’s birth. Although KIDS has information about “potential” fathers, we do not include them in our sample. These men do not always become legal fathers and some children have multiple potential fathers listed.

After excluding those cases, we selected a stratified probability sample, the *survey sample* of 3,000 resident mothers. The sample that was ultimately fielded was somewhat smaller (2,980) owing to errors that we identified in the sample frame before fieldwork began, rendering 20 cases ineligible. These were cases in which updates in the administrative records showed that the mother had never participated in W-2 or that the selected mother died before field efforts began.

To prepare a survey sample of nonresident fathers, we selected a focal child using information from CARES and KIDS that was attached to the sample frame. We randomly selected a child from among those listed on the W-2 case record at entry and who would be under age 18 on December 31, 1999.<sup>3</sup> Children who would be 18 or older on December 31, 1999, were not eligible to be a focal child because they could “age out” of child support and not be exposed to the full or partial pass-through policy during the entire period of the study. Because we sampled from a population of W-2 cases, the focal child was selected without reference to the status of his or her father. A nonresident father may or may not be subsequently identified for that child, and the father might or might not be alive at the time the focal child was selected.

The nonresident fathers of the randomly selected focal children make up the survey sample of fathers. This group should accurately reflect the characteristics of all nonresident fathers in the survey population, with the following exceptions: cases in which the father was a minor on January 1, 1999 (which would mean that parental permission would be required), and cases in which there was a good-cause exemption from pursuing child support. We excluded the latter to minimize the possibility that the study would lead to unwanted contact between the parents and possible harm to an individual. After these exclusions, there were 2,028 fathers in the Time 1 survey sample.<sup>4</sup>

### Survey Samples at Time 2

At Time 2, we went into the field to interview 2,950 resident mothers and 2,225 nonresident fathers. The Time 2 samples remained largely unchanged from Time 1. Although the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families is a panel study, we did not restrict the follow-up only to persons who participated at Time 1. Mothers and fathers were included in the sample even if they had not responded at Time 1 and the designated focal child remained the same.<sup>5</sup>

Changes in the survey sample at Time 2 (i.e., the cases selected from the sample frame for the second survey) resulted from information gained from CARES and KIDS, including errors in the frame, death of a sample member or focal child, or changes in nonresident parent status. Specifically, the resident

---

<sup>3</sup>In a small number of cases, the only child listed was born after W-2 entry. For each case, “W-2 entry” is the date on which there was an initial interview with a W-2 caseworker or a “request for assistance.” Technical Report 1 defines this term and discusses its implications for analysis.

<sup>4</sup>By design, the survey includes only one nonresident father per case even though a W-2 case may include more than one father. The survey weights (discussed later in this report and in Technical Report 4) adjust for the differential probabilities of selection for multiple- and single-father cases. This design also makes the unweighted survey population of fathers less comparable to the research population of all nonresident fathers insofar as multiple-father cases differ systematically from one-father cases and the former are disproportionately represented in the research population. These differences are discussed later in this report.

<sup>5</sup>We later discovered five cases in which a different focal child was inadvertently selected at Time 2, potentially involving a different nonresident father. These cases were excluded from analyses.

mother and the nonresident father became ineligible at Time 2 if we found errors in the sample frame indicating that the mother had never participated in W-2, if she entered W-2 after July 8, 1998, or if the focal child died before December 31, 1999. In addition, some fathers had been incorrectly identified as the nonresident father of a focal child at Time 1, and a small number of paternity decisions had been reversed or vacated. These cases were excluded at Time 2, although some instances involved the identification of a new, correctly identified nonresident father, who was then included in the study.

If a mother or a focal child died before December 31, 1999, the father became ineligible for the Time 2 interview. If a mother or father was reported dead during the fieldwork at Time 1 but this information was not confirmed in CARES or KIDS, the surviving parent remained eligible for a Time 2 interview. Fathers also became ineligible if a good-cause exemption had been established between January 1 and December 31, 1999.

The largest change in the Time 2 sample involved the addition of 201 newly identified nonresident fathers. If paternity for the focal child had been established between January 1 and December 31, 1999, this nonresident father was included in the Time 2 survey sample. Three cases (mother and father) became ineligible because the focal child died. Four resident mothers and 18 nonresident fathers died before December 31, 1999. One additional good-cause exemption appeared in the administrative record.

To summarize, we selected *survey samples* of resident mothers and nonresident fathers at Time 1 and Time 2 stratified by case type and initial W-2 tier placement, as described below. The survey samples include one resident mother per W-2 case and at most one nonresident father. For many W-2 cases, there was not a corresponding nonresident father because we could not identify a legal nonresident father for the randomly selected focal child. In addition, the survey sample of nonresident fathers excludes fathers for whom there was a good-cause exemption and fathers who were minors on January 1, 1999. The survey sample of resident mothers should have characteristics that are similar to all resident mothers in the survey population, but the survey sample of nonresident fathers may differ slightly from all nonresident fathers in the survey population because of its exclusions.

### Sample Stratification

The original sample was stratified by case type (an AFDC case that transitioned to W-2, as opposed to new W-2 cases) and initial W-2 tier placement (upper two or lower three tiers). The strata, and the proportion allocated to each, were selected to ensure adequate coverage of the population of W-2 cases and to permit comparisons between cases entering in different tiers and between new entrants and cases that transitioned from AFDC. AFDC and new W-2 cases were selected at equal fractions of 0.50 (compared with a distribution of 70-30 in the research population). Within case type, the sample was to be stratified so that one-third of the cases were from upper tiers of W-2 and two-thirds were from lower tiers. However, decreasing rates of entry into W-2 generated too few cases in the upper tiers. As a result, all new W-2 cases in the upper tier were selected, and a larger proportion of AFDC-transitioned cases in the upper tiers were included to obtain the desired sample size.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>The original survey design called for a sample of 4,000 cases, but there were not enough upper-tier cases to achieve the desired size of the upper-tier strata. Several months before the survey was fielded, we reduced the sample size to 3,000 cases. There actually was a sufficient number of cases in the survey population to sample from cases assigned to the upper tiers, rather than select all such cases, but this was not discovered until after the original sample was scaled back to 3,000. The reduction to 3,000 cases was achieved by eliminating 10 survey replicates (random subsamples of 100) rather than redrawing the entire sample.

Table TR5.1 shows the final sample strata and the proportion of cases represented in each. Proportions are shown for the strata by case type and initial tier placement as well as initial assignment to control or experimental group or to neither group. The latter is shown because rates of assignment to these three groups changed over the period during which the research population developed (September 1, 1997, to July 8, 1998), as described in Technical Report 1. Initially, cases were randomly assigned to experimental, control, or neither group at rates of 20, 20, and 60 percent, respectively. Because cases were entering W-2 at much lower rates than anticipated, this assignment regime would yield too few cases to achieve the final desired sample sizes in the control and experimental groups. To increase the number of available cases, the assignment rates were adjusted by the state. Initial assignments of 20-20-60 were in place from September 1, 1997, to March 16, 1998. From March 17, 1998, to May 10, 1998, the rates were 30-30-40. An insufficient number of new W-2 cases was still anticipated, and the rates changed to 50-50-0 on May 11, 1998. The final survey data are weighted to adjust for disproportionate stratification and differential rates of entry into experimental and control groups. Survey sample weights are discussed at the end of this report.

### **Comparison of Research and Survey Populations at Time 1 and Time 2**

Table TR5.2 presents descriptive statistics on the initial characteristics of resident mothers as reported in administrative data at the time of entry to W-2. Data are shown for the research population, the Time 1 and Time 2 survey populations, and the Time 1 and Time 2 survey samples. By comparing the characteristics of mothers in these different groups, we can assess how well the survey samples represent the populations from which they were drawn as well as the larger research population. Frequencies are unweighted. Percentages for the research and survey populations are weighted to adjust for differential assignment to experimental or control group over the study period. Survey sample data are weighted to adjust for differential rates of assignment and stratification by case type and initial W-2 tier.<sup>7</sup>

The only difference, by design, between the research population and the survey populations at Time 1 and Time 2 is the exclusion from the survey of cases originally not assigned to the treatment or control group. Thus, the survey population should closely reflect the research population as a whole. Indeed, the resident mothers eligible to be selected for the survey sample are indistinguishable, at least on the basis of characteristics examined here, from the research population. The only notable difference occurs by design and involves the large number of cases in the research population in which the resident mother was assigned to neither treatment nor control group.

Resident mothers selected for the survey at Time 1 and at Time 2 also mirror the survey populations from which they were drawn. The survey samples tend to include slightly larger proportions of younger mothers, between the ages of 18 and 25, mothers who are African American, and mothers residing in Milwaukee or in rural counties rather than in other urban counties. Compared to the populations from which they were drawn, the survey samples also include a slightly larger proportion of mothers with one child.

It is more difficult to present a straightforward comparison between the research population of nonresident fathers and the fathers in the survey populations. The fathers' populations are subject to the same exclusion as the mothers—that is, if the resident mother was not assigned to either treatment or

---

<sup>7</sup>Technical Report 1 discusses differential rates of assignment over the study period. Technical Report 4 discusses weights used for administrative and survey data.

**Table TR5.1**  
**Sample Stratification by Initial W-2 Tier, Case Type, and Assignment Rate**

Initial W-2 Tier	Case Type		Case Type, by Assignment Rate to E/C/N Groups			
	AFDC	New W-2	AFDC		New W-2	
	All	All	20/20/60 <sup>a</sup>	20/20/60 <sup>a</sup>	30/30/40 <sup>b</sup>	50/50/0 <sup>c</sup>
Lower Tier	0.317	0.324	0.317	0.147	0.066	0.111
Upper Tier	0.198	0.160	0.198	0.098	0.024	0.038
Total	0.515	0.485	0.515	0.245	0.09	0.149

**Notes:** Table entries are cell percentages based on a survey sample of 2,884 (final number of cases eligible for interviews according to information in administrative records on the sample frame). Assignment rates pertain to the rate of assignment to each of three research groups during the period September 1, 1997, to July 8, 1998. E = Experimental group, C = Control group, N = Neither group. See Technical Report 1 for a discussion of changes in the assignment rate. Upper tiers of W-2 are Unsubsidized Jobs and Trial Jobs. Lower tiers are Community Service Jobs, W-2 Transition, and Caretakers of Newborn. AFDC cases are active AFDC cases on August 31, 1997, that subsequently transitioned to W-2. New W-2 cases were not active on August 31, 1997, and subsequently entered W-2.

<sup>a</sup>Assignment rate September 1, 1997, to March 16, 1998.

<sup>b</sup>March 17, 1998, to May 10, 1998.

<sup>c</sup>May 11, 1998, to July 8, 1998.

**Table TR5.2**

**Initial Characteristics of Resident Mothers in the Research Population, Survey Population, and Survey Samples (Weighted Percentages)**

	Research Population		Time 1				Time 2			
			Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	15,977		7,010		2,884		6,990		2,873	
<b>Age</b>										
16–17	6	0.0%	4	0.0%	1	0.0%	4	0.0%	1	0.0%
18–25	7,507	46.9	3,336	47.3	1,425	48.9	3,329	47.3	1,423	49.1
26–30	3,276	20.6	1,461	21.0	597	20.8	1,457	21.0	596	20.9
31 or older	5,186	32.4	2,207	31.7	860	30.2	2,198	31.6	853	30.0
Unknown	2	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Race</b>										
White	4,001	25.1	1,835	25.1	834	25.3	1,829	25.1	827	25.2
African American	9,640	60.3	4,199	60.8	1,682	62.0	4,190	60.8	1,678	62.0
Hispanic	1,200	7.5	494	7.2	190	6.9	494	7.3	190	6.9
Native American	365	2.3	159	2.2	70	2.1	158	2.2	70	2.1
Asian	274	1.7	104	1.5	27	1.0	102	1.5	27	1.0
Other	16	0.1	10	0.1	1	0.0	10	0.1	1	0.0
Unknown	481	3.0	209	3.0	80	2.7	207	3.0	80	2.7
<b>Education</b>										
Less than high school	8,605	53.8	3,672	53.0	1,449	52.6	3,660	53.0	1,447	52.7
High school	5,829	36.6	2,624	37.2	1,131	37.9	2,619	37.2	1,126	37.8
More than high school	1,543	9.7	714	9.8	304	9.5	711	9.8	300	9.4
<b>Language</b>										
English speaker	15,498	97.0	6,810	97.0	2,826	97.7	6,792	97.1	2,815	97.7
Non-English-speaker	479	3.0	200	3.0	58	2.3	198	3.0	58	2.3



**Table TR5.2, continued**

	Research Population		Time 1				Time 2			
			Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Residential Location</b>										
Milwaukee County	11,856	74.2	5,145	74.8	2,030	75.6	5,135	74.8	2,026	75.7
Other urban counties	746	17.2	1,217	16.6	509	15.3	1,210	16.6	503	15.2
Rural counties and tribes	1,375	8.6	648	8.6	345	9.1	645	8.6	344	9.1
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>										
No UI-covered employment	3,227	20.2	1,434	20.9	523	20.1	1,427	20.8	522	20.1
1–4 quarters	6,764	42.4	2,875	42.6	1,111	42.3	2,869	42.6	1,108	42.4
5–7 quarters	4,131	25.8	1,796	25.0	807	25.9	1,792	25.0	804	25.8
All 8 quarters	1,854	11.6	905	11.6	443	11.7	902	11.6	439	11.7
Unknown/missing SSN	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>										
\$0	3,227	20.2	1,434	20.9	523	20.1	1,427	20.8	522	20.1
\$1–\$5,000	10,688	66.9	4,598	66.8	1,863	67.0	4,589	66.9	1,857	67.1
\$5,001–\$15,000	1,928	12.1	908	11.6	461	12.1	905	11.6	458	12.1
\$15,001 or more	133	0.8	70	0.8	37	0.8	69	0.8	36	0.8
Unknown/missing SSN	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>AFDC Receipt<sup>a</sup></b>										
None	2,005	12.6	1,145	12.9	616	13.1	1,142	12.9	612	13.1
1–18 months	5,332	33.4	2,343	32.8	1,012	33.1	2,338	32.8	1,009	33.1
19–24	8,640	54.0	3,522	54.3	1,256	53.9	3,510	54.3	1,252	53.9
<b>Number of Children</b>										
No children at W-2 entry	145	0.9	79	1.0	35	0.7	78	1.0	35	0.7
One	5,169	32.4	2,325	31.9	1,036	33.9	2,316	31.9	1,030	33.9
Two	4,677	29.3	2,027	28.9	823	28.3	2,022	28.9	819	28.2
Three or more	5,986	37.4	2,579	38.3	990	37.1	2,574	38.3	989	37.2

**Table TR5.2, continued**

	Research Population		Time 1				Time 2			
			Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Age of Youngest Child</b>										
Unborn	1,599	10.0	723	9.7	311	9.5	722	9.7	310	9.5
0–2	7,685	48.1	3,370	48.2	1,395	49.0	3,362	48.2	1,389	49.0
3–5	2,872	18.0	1,221	17.8	505	17.8	1,218	17.8	504	17.8
6–12	3,106	19.5	1,369	19.7	556	19.3	1,362	19.7	553	19.2
12–18	695	4.3	318	4.5	117	4.4	318	4.5	117	4.4
No child with known birthdate <sup>b</sup>	20	0.1	9	0.1	0	0.0	8	0.1	0	0.0
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>										
Legal father, unknown how	26	0.2	14	0.2	5	0.2	14	0.2	5	0.2
Nonmarital child	14,109	88.3	6,183	88.4	2,515	88.5	6,166	88.4	2,505	88.6
Marital child	1,825	11.4	807	11.3	364	11.3	805	11.3	363	11.3
Unknown	17	0.1	6	0.1	0	0.0	5	0.3	0	0.0
<b>Number Legal Fathers</b>										
None	4,798	30.1	2,138	29.3	892	29.2	2,130	29.3	887	29.2
One	8,076	50.5	3,544	51.0	1,469	51.9	3,535	51.0	1,464	51.9
Two or more	3,103	19.5	1,328	19.6	523	18.9	1,325	19.7	522	18.9
<b>Child Support Order<sup>c</sup></b>										
No order	7,053	44.1	3,175	43.8	1,329	43.4	3,167	43.8	1,324	43.5
Has order	8,924	55.9	3,835	56.3	1,555	56.6	3,823	56.2	1,549	56.5
<b>Child Support Paid by All Nonresident Parents<sup>a</sup></b>										
\$0	10,714	67.1	4,738	67.2	1,928	66.2	4,726	67.2	1,921	66.3
\$1–\$999	2,519	15.8	1,119	16.3	450	16.5	1,116	16.4	446	16.4
\$1,000 or more	2,744	17.2	1,153	16.5	506	17.3	1,148	16.5	506	17.3

**Table TR5.2, continued**

	Research Population		Time 1				Time 2			
			Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Research Group Assignment</b>										
Control	3,475	21.8	3,470	49.5	1,438	49.5	3,464	49.5	1,434	49.6
Experimental	3,544	23.4	3,540	50.5	1,446	50.5	3,526	50.5	1,439	50.5
Neither	8,958	54.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Case Type</b>										
AFDC	11,333	70.8	4,457	70.2	1,485	70.2	4,443	70.2	1,478	70.2
W-2	4,644	29.2	2,553	29.8	1,399	29.8	2,547	29.8	1,395	29.8
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment</b>										
W-2 Transition	1,540	9.7	683	9.3	264	8.9	678	9.2	262	8.8
Community Service Job	8,094	50.6	3,523	51.0	1,277	51.3	3,515	51.0	1,275	51.4
Caretaker of Newborn	1,392	8.8	703	8.8	307	8.9	700	8.8	304	8.8
Upper tier	4,951	30.9	2,101	31.0	1,036	31.0	2,097	31.0	1,032	31.0
<b>Quarter of Entry</b>										
4th quarter of 1997	8,754	54.7	3,487	55.0	1,321	54.2	3,479	55.0	1,316	54.2
1st quarter of 1998	5,702	35.7	2,307	35.5	946	36.4	2,299	35.5	942	36.4
2nd quarter of 1998	1,521	9.6	1,216	9.5	617	9.4	1,212	9.5	615	9.4

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the 12 months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>There was no child with a known birthdate who was under 18 and listed on the resident parent's CARES case at W-2 entry or who was born within seven months of W-2 entry.

<sup>c</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

control group, none of the legal fathers listed on her case record was eligible to be in the survey population. (If these fathers were *also* listed as legal fathers on another W-2 case, and that case was in the control or experimental group, then they would be included in the survey population.) However, there are two additional differences, as noted above: the fathers' survey populations include those for whom paternity was identified between July 8, 1998, and December 31, 1998 (Time 1), or subsequently determined by December 31, 1999 (Time 2), and the research population includes *all* fathers listed on a W-2 case, whereas the survey populations include only one father per case. If multiple-father cases differ systematically from those in which only one nonresident father is identified, the distribution of characteristics among the survey populations will differ from those in the research population. That is, analysis of the survey population will contribute the characteristics of one nonresident father and one resident mother per case. Analysis of the research population will contribute the characteristics of all nonresident fathers associated with a case and the characteristics of the resident mother may be included multiple times, once for each nonresident father on the case.

Table TR5.3 attempts to sort out the factors likely to contribute to the largest differences between the research population and the survey populations. It includes characteristics of fathers in the Time 1 and Time 2 surveys and all fathers in the research population, dividing the latter into those cases in which only one legal father was identified when the resident mother entered W-2 and those in which two or more legal fathers were identified. Differences between the survey populations and the research population should be attributable to inclusion of multiple fathers in the research population. Put another way, the survey population should closely resemble the subset of cases in the research population in which there is only one nonresident father.<sup>8</sup>

As compared to the research population of all nonresident fathers, the survey populations are noticeably younger, include a larger proportion of fathers who are white, represent larger families with younger children, have lower levels of child support orders, and are less likely to include fathers who have been paying child support. The mothers associated with fathers in the survey populations have more years of schooling as compared to mothers in the research population, and are more likely to live in rural counties or in urban counties other than Milwaukee, and to include higher proportions of new W-2 entrants. All of these differences also appear in a comparison of columns 2 and 3, showing characteristics of fathers in one-father cases and multiple-father cases. The remaining differences are those associated with newly identified paternities that were not originally included in the research population.

The survey samples at Time 1 and Time 2 accurately reflect the survey populations from which they were drawn (Table TR5.4). Small differences occur in the ages of children, the likelihood of child support payments, and the location of the resident parent at W-2 entry. The Time 1 and Time 2 samples include a larger share of children under age 12 and a slightly higher proportion of fathers who paid child support to the resident mother prior to W-2 entry as compared to their respective survey populations. In addition, a higher percentage of the partners of men in the survey samples lived in Milwaukee at W-2 entry and a slightly smaller fraction lived in other urban counties.

---

<sup>8</sup>Percentages reported for the research population are weighted to adjust for differential rates of assignment to control and experimental groups. Percentages for the survey sample populations are adjusted for differential assignment as well as the probability that the father was selected (i.e., the ratio of his children on a case to the total number of children on the case).

**Table TR5.3**  
**Initial Characteristics of Nonresident Fathers in the Research Population and in the Survey Population,**  
**by Number of Legal Fathers on the W-2 Case Record (Weighted Percentages)**

	Research Population						Survey Population			
	All Cases		One Father		Multiple Fathers		Time 1		Time 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	14,343		7,858		6,485		4,387		4,911	
<b>Age</b>										
16–17	20	0.1%	0	0.2%	0	0.6%	20	0.5%	33	0.7%
18–25	3,997	27.8	2,583	32.8	1,414	21.8	1,401	31.9	1,638	33.4
26–30	3,777	26.4	1,787	22.8	1,990	30.7	1,096	25.0	1,198	24.4
31 or older	6,435	44.9	3,406	43.4	3,029	46.7	1,839	41.9	2,009	40.9
Unknown	114	0.8	66	0.8	48	0.7	31	0.7	33	0.7
<b>Race</b>										
White	1,814	12.7	1,130	14.4	684	10.6	685	15.6	772	15.7
African American	5,911	41.2	3,053	39.0	2,858	44.0	1,795	40.9	2,093	42.6
Hispanic	600	4.2	399	5.1	201	3.1	202	4.6	247	5.0
Native American	234	1.6	119	1.5	115	1.8	73	1.7	83	1.7
Asian	85	0.6	71	0.9	14	0.2	30	0.7	31	0.6
Unknown	5,699	39.7	3,086	39.1	2,613	40.3	1,602	36.5	1,685	34.3
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>										
No UI-covered employment	4,119	28.8	2,211	28.2	1,908	29.5	1,222	27.9	1,374	28.0
1–4 quarters	3,414	23.8	1,900	24.2	1,514	23.3	1,063	24.2	1,203	24.5
5–7 quarters	2,927	20.4	1,611	20.5	1,316	20.3	914	20.8	1,030	21.0
All 8 quarters	3,213	22.5	1,756	22.4	1,457	22.5	996	22.7	1,084	22.1
Unknown/missing SSN	670	4.7	380	4.8	290	4.5	192	4.4	220	4.5

**Table TR5.3, continued**

	Research Population						Survey Population			
	All Cases		One Father		Multiple Fathers		Time 1		Time 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>										
\$0	4,119	28.8	2,211	28.2	1,908	29.5	1,222	27.9	1,374	28.0
\$1–\$5,000	5,248	36.6	2,957	37.6	2,291	35.3	1,645	37.5	1,865	38.0
\$5,001–\$15,000	2,836	19.8	1,521	19.4	1,315	20.4	861	19.6	946	19.3
\$15,001 or more	1,470	10.2	789	10.1	681	10.5	467	10.6	506	10.3
Unknown/missing SSN	670	4.7	380	4.8	290	4.5	192	4.4	220	4.5
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>										
Legal father, unknown how	43	0.3	24	0.3	19	0.3	7	0.2	14	0.3
Paternity established	11,941	83.2	6,200	78.9	5,741	88.4	3,668	83.6	4,127	84.0
Father by marriage	2,359	16.5	1,634	20.8	725	11.3	712	16.2	770	15.7
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>										
No children at W-2 entry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	31	0.7	48	1.0
One	9,690	67.6	4,740	60.4	4,950	76.4	2,793	63.7	3,155	64.2
Two	3,044	21.2	1,901	24.2	1,143	17.6	999	22.8	1,093	22.3
Three or more	1,609	11.2	1,217	15.5	392	6.0	564	12.9	615	12.5
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>										
Unborn	193	1.3	138	1.7	55	0.9	57	1.3	71	1.4
0–2	3,592	25.1	2,391	30.5	1,201	18.5	1,234	28.1	1,413	28.8
3–5	4,028	28.1	2,229	28.4	1,799	27.7	1,096	25.0	1,125	22.9
6–12	5,382	37.6	2,516	32.0	2,866	44.3	1,407	32.1	1,465	29.8
12–18	1,103	7.7	574	7.2	529	8.2	294	6.7	313	6.4
No child with known birthdate <sup>b</sup>	45	0.3	10	0.1	35	0.5	299	6.8	524	10.7
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent's Case</b>										
No legal father at W-2 entry	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	446	12.1	741	17.4
One	7,858	54.8	7,858	100.0	0	0.0	2,781	71.5	2,976	67.7
Two or more	6,485	45.3	0	0.0	6,485	100.0	1,160	16.4	1,194	15.0

**Table TR5.3, continued**

	Research Population						Survey Population			
	All Cases		One Father		Multiple Fathers		Time 1		Time 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>c</sup></b>										
No order	3,774	26.3	2,236	28.3	1,538	23.9	1,465	33.4	1,896	38.6
Has order	10,569	73.7	5,622	71.7	4,947	76.1	2,922	66.6	3,015	61.4
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>										
No child support paid	8,840	61.7	4,869	61.9	3,971	61.4	2,859	65.2	3,332	67.8
\$1–\$999	2,809	19.6	1,505	19.2	1,304	20.1	771	17.6	801	16.3
\$1,000 or more	2,694	18.8	1,484	18.9	1,210	18.6	757	17.3	778	15.8
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>										
Less than high school	7,632	53.0	4,030	51.1	3,602	55.4	2,155	49.1	2,440	49.7
High school	5,320	37.2	29,080	38.1	2,340	36.3	1,732	39.5	1,925	39.2
More than high school	1,391	9.7	848	10.9	543	8.4	500	11.4	546	11.1
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>										
Milwaukee County	10,865	75.8	5,790	73.8	5,075	78.3	3,133	71.4	3,488	71.0
Other urban counties	2,238	15.5	1,319	16.7	919	14.1	783	17.8	897	18.3
Rural counties and tribes	1,240	8.7	749	9.5	491	7.7	471	10.7	526	10.7
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>										
Control	3,102	21.6	1,700	21.3	1,402	22.0	2,169	49.4	2,448	49.8
Experimental	3,146	22.9	1,760	23.6	1,386	22.0	2,218	50.6	2,463	50.2
Neither	8,095	55.5	4,398	55.1	3,697	56.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>										
AFDC	10,835	75.5	5,721	72.8	5,114	78.8	2,894	66.0	3,151	64.2
W-2	3,508	24.5	2,137	27.2	1,371	21.2	1,493	34.0	1,760	35.8

**Table TR5.3, continued**

	Research Population						Survey Population			
	All Cases		One Father		Multiple Fathers		Time 1		Time 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>										
W-2 Transition	1,396	9.8	859	11.0	537	8.3	456	10.4	495	10.1
Community Service Job	7,371	51.4	3,948	50.1	3,423	52.9	2,107	48.0	2,355	48.0
Caretaker of Newborn	719	5.1	458	5.9	261	4.1	350	8.0	467	9.5
Upper tier	4,857	33.8	2,593	33.0	2,264	34.7	1,474	33.6	1,594	32.5
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>										
4th quarter of 1997	7,922	55.2	4,419	56.2	3,503	54.0	2,251	56.2	2,488	55.6
1st quarter of 1998	5,319	37.1	2,767	35.2	2,552	39.3	1,458	34.7	1,604	34.3
2nd quarter of 1998	1,102	7.7	672	8.6	430	6.7	678	9.2	819	10.1

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>Measured for the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>There was no child with a known birthdate who was under 18 and listed in resident parent's CARES household at W-2 entry; or, child was not born within 7 months of W-2 entry or has not yet been found to legally be the child of nonresident parent.

<sup>c</sup>Measured as of October 1, 1997.



**Table TR5.4**

**Initial Characteristics of Nonresident Fathers in the Survey Population and the Survey Samples at Time 1 and Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1				Time 2			
	Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	4,387		1,936		4,911		2,130	
<b>Age</b>								
16–17	20	0.6%	14	0.9%	33	0.9%	22	1.3%
18–25	1,401	34.5	621	35.0	1,638	35.8	717	36.1
26–30	1,096	24.0	489	24.4	1,198	23.4	519	23.6
31 or older	1,839	40.3	802	39.3	2,009	39.3	859	38.5
Unknown	31	0.6	10	0.4	33	0.6	13	0.6
<b>Race</b>								
White	685	16.8	326	16.1	772	16.8	361	16.2
African American	1,795	40.8	774	41.5	2,093	42.5	882	42.7
Hispanic	202	4.8	95	5.1	247	5.3	108	5.4
Native American	73	1.7	32	1.7	83	1.8	35	1.7
Asian	30	0.7	7	0.4	31	0.7	7	0.3
Unknown	1,602	35.1	702	35.3	1,685	33.0	737	33.8
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>								
No UI-covered employment	1,222	26.7	522	26.0	1,374	27.1	589	26.9
1–4 quarters	1,063	25.0	459	24.3	1,203	25.0	505	23.9
5–7 quarters	914	20.9	418	21.7	1,030	21.0	452	21.5
All 8 quarters	996	23.2	454	24.2	1,084	22.6	490	23.7
Unknown/missing SSN	192	4.2	83	3.9	220	4.3	94	4.1

**Table TR5.4, continued**

	Time 1				Time 2			
	Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>								
\$0	1,222	26.7	522	26.0	1,374	27.1	589	26.9
\$1–\$5,000	1,645	39.0	718	38.5	1,865	39.3	789	38.2
\$5,001–\$15,000	861	19.6	405	21.3	946	19.2	441	20.9
\$15,001 or more	467	10.5	208	10.4	506	10.1	217	10.0
Unknown/missing SSN	192	4.2	83	3.9	220	4.3	94	4.1
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>								
Legal father, unknown how	7	0.1	4	0.2	14	0.3	5	0.2
Paternity established	3,668	82.7	1,602	83.4	4,127	83.1	1,772	83.8
Father by marriage	712	17.2	330	16.4	770	16.6	353	16.0
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>								
No child at W-2 entry	31	0.9	15	0.6	48	1.2	23	0.9
One	2,793	59.5	1,247	60.6	3,155	60.2	1,387	61.7
Two	999	24.3	448	24.6	1,093	23.8	476	23.7
Three or more	564	15.3	226	14.2	615	14.8	244	13.8
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>								
Unborn	57	1.5	33	1.9	71	1.7	44	2.2
0–2	1,234	32.1	619	36.5	1,413	32.6	747	39.2
3–5	1,096	24.5	509	26.4	1,125	22.5	524	24.8
6–12	1,407	28.6	652	29.5	1,465	26.6	685	28.3
12–18	294	5.8	123	5.8	313	5.5	130	5.5
No child with known birthdate <sup>b</sup>	299	7.5	0	0.0	524	11.1	0	0.0

**Table TR5.4, continued**

	Time 1				Time 2			
	Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent's Case</b>								
No legal father at W-2 entry	446	12.1	209	12.1	741	17.4	329	17.0
One	2,781	71.5	1,240	72.3	2,976	67.7	1,310	68.8
Two or more	1,160	16.4	487	15.5	1,194	15.0	491	14.2
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>c</sup></b>								
No order	1,465	34.0	653	33.0	1,896	39.1	817	37.6
Has order	2,922	66.0	1,283	67.0	3,015	60.9	1,313	62.4
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>								
No child support paid	2,859	65.5	1,231	63.9	3,332	68.1	1,412	66.5
\$1-\$999	771	17.5	347	18.1	801	16.3	354	16.7
\$1,000 or more	757	17.0	358	18.0	778	15.6	364	16.8
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>								
Less than high school	2,155	48.3	911	47.9	2,440	48.9	1,018	48.5
High school	1,732	40.1	798	41.0	1,925	39.8	866	40.4
More than high school	500	11.6	227	11.1	546	11.3	246	11.1
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>								
Milwaukee County	3,133	70.9	1,324	72.2	3,488	70.7	1,460	72.5
Other urban counties	783	18.2	341	16.0	897	18.4	374	15.8
Rural counties and tribes	471	11.0	271	11.9	526	10.9	296	11.8
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>								
Control	2,169	49.2	966	49.0	2,448	49.7	1,068	49.5
Experimental	2,218	50.8	970	51.0	2,463	50.3	1,062	50.5
Neither	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

**Table TR5.4, continued**

	Time 1				Time 2			
	Survey Population		Survey Sample		Survey Population		Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>								
AFDC	2,894	69.7	1,072	71.0	3,151	67.9	1,131	68.8
W-2	1,493	30.3	864	29.0	1,760	32.1	999	31.2
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>								
W-2 Transition	456	10.3	196	10.2	495	10.0	208	9.9
Community Service Job	2,107	47.7	811	48.2	2,355	47.7	892	48.2
Caretaker of Newborn	350	7.5	158	7.1	467	9.0	209	8.6
Upper tier	1,474	34.4	771	34.5	1,594	33.3	821	33.3
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>								
4th quarter of 1997	2,251	56.2	937	56.0	2,488	55.6	1,011	55.4
1st quarter of 1998	1,458	34.7	632	35.2	1,604	34.3	684	34.9
2nd quarter of 1998	678	9.2	367	8.8	819	10.1	435	9.7

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>There was no child with a known birthdate who was under 18 and listed in resident parent's CARES household at W-2 entry; or, child was not born within 7 months of W-2 entry or has not yet been found to legally be the child of nonresident parent.

<sup>c</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

## Survey Content

The research objectives outlined in the evaluation plan (Institute for Research on Poverty, 1998) guided the content of the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families. Questionnaire development had three specific aims: (a) to collect data on constructs that were needed to test hypotheses for the evaluation of the child support policy and that were not available from administrative sources or were incompletely or poorly measured in administrative sources; (b) to collect data that would allow us to validate measures from administrative data or to check other known or knowable characteristics about mothers' or fathers' participation in the experiment or in W-2; and (c) to collect data that would support analyses of other aspects of W-2 or of the experiences of a low-income population more generally. We developed the survey instruments using standard measures that would permit comparisons of mothers' and fathers' reports as well as comparisons with national studies or surveys in other states.

Although administrative records provide much of the data needed to address questions outlined in the evaluation plan, the survey augments these records in important ways. It provides measures of independent and dependent variables that are not available in administrative records (e.g., child well-being, parental contact, and conflict between parents). It provides the opportunity to assess the extent to which participants in the experimental and control groups were aware of the requirements and procedures of the treatment to which they were assigned. It also serves as a source of information about participants' knowledge of the W-2 program generally and of the rules that govern the availability of W-2 services. Finally, it provides some ability to assess independently the completeness of the administrative records on which the evaluation largely depends.

Table TR5.5 summarizes the content of the survey instrument. We asked mothers about their experiences with the Wisconsin Works program at Time 1 and Time 2 as well as their attitudes toward the program, contact with a W-2 caseworker, and attitudes toward the caseworker. For respondents who were participating in a W-2 assignment at the time of the interview, these questions elicited a description of the main activities that were performed in the assignment. Since the administrative data only include tier location, the survey data will offer a better understanding of the W-2 assignments and the kinds of jobs for which they might prepare participants. We also asked mothers about their knowledge of W-2 rules, including the existence and length of time limits. We asked mothers and fathers about their knowledge of the child support policy and how the rules concerning a full or partial pass-through of child support affected them or would affect them under various circumstances.

Measures of economic resources included questions about family income. The mothers' instrument asked about use of public assistance (Food Stamps, SSI), but the fathers' instrument did not. At Time 2, we added questions to both instruments about help received in the form of cash assistance from family and friends. All four surveys included comparable measures of economic hardship (e.g., difficulty making payments for rent, telephone, utilities), help received from family or friends to pay household bills, and the kind and frequency of help received from private charities or community groups. Questions about formal child support paid or received permit comparisons between self-reports and administrative data, and measures of the kind and value of informal child support supplement administrative records, which do not capture these transfers by fathers.

The child care sequence was designed to meet several objectives: (a) to identify the constellation of care providers that are available to mothers for all the young children in her household; (b) to measure the cost of child care and the use of W-2 or other government programs to help defray these costs; (c) to ascertain the main child care provider for the focal child, the quality and stability of this care, and whether

**Table TR5.5**  
**Summary of the Content of the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families**

Measurement Construct	Mothers' Questionnaire	Fathers' Questionnaire
<b>Experience with Wisconsin Works</b>		
W-2 services (e.g., bus passes, job search, training programs)	X	
Attitudes about W-2	X	
Frequency of contact with W-2 caseworker	X	
Attitudes about W-2 caseworker	X	
Knowledge of W-2 rules and time limits	X	
Knowledge of child support policy	X	X
Main activities in W-2 assignment	X	
<b>Economic Resources</b>		
Employment, earnings, work stability	X	X
Training programs (Time 2 only)	X	X
Health insurance coverage (Time 2 only)	X	X
Use of public assistance (e.g., AFDC, W-2, SSI)	X	
Use of food assistance (Food Stamps, WIC)	X	
Family income	X	X
Economic hardship, assets and debts, food insecurity	X	X
Assistance from friends, family, private charities	X	X
Receive/pay formal child support, amount received/paid	X	X
Receive/provide informal support (e.g., gifts, money, expenses)	X	X
Total amount informal support received/provided	X	X
<b>Child Care</b>		
Sources and cost of child care	X	
Child care by focal child's father or by father's family	X	X
Main child care provider for focal child	X	
Quality of child care, preferred child care arrangement	X	
Child care problems interfere with work, school	X	
<b>Focal Child's Education</b>		
Expected educational attainment	X	X
Grade in school	X	
Grade retention, performance in school, absences from school	X	
Parental involvement in school (e.g., PTA, teacher meetings)	X	
Parental involvement with child (e.g., homework, games)	X	X

**Table TR5.5, continued**

Measurement Construct	Mothers' Questionnaire	Fathers' Questionnaire
<b>Focal Child's Health</b>		
Health status, limitations	X	X
Regular health care provider	X	
Doctor, dental visits for routine care, visits for illness/injury	X	
Health at birth (premature, low weight)	X	
Health insurance (including provision by father)	X	X
<b>Focal Child's Behavior Problems</b>		
Suspended or expelled from school	X	
Smoke tobacco, drink alcohol	X	
<b>Father Contact with Focal Child</b>		
Frequency of contact	X	X
Activities with child	X	X
Involvement in decision-making	X	X
<b>Contact between Parents</b>		
Frequency of contact	X	X
Areas and intensity of conflict	X	X
Parental assessment of self and of other parent	X	X
<b>Paternity Establishment</b>		
Sources of paternity establishment		X
Age of child at paternity establishment		X
<b>Social Networks (Time 2 Only)</b>		
Help given/received from family or friends	X	X
Number of close friends, frequency of contact	X	X
<b>Proxy Reports about Other Parent</b>		
Age, education	X	X
Employment and income	X	X
City and state of residence during reference year	X	X
<b>Household and Demographic Characteristics</b>		
Household composition	X	X
Coresidence with focal child's other parent	X	X
Educational attainment	X	X
Social background (parents' education, two-parent household)	X	X
Date of birth	X	X
Race and ethnicity	X	X
Health status, limitations	X	X

this is the mother's preferred arrangement; and (d) to determine whether mothers have problems with child care that make it difficult to go to work or school or participate in a training program. Child well-being measures included questions about child care, focal child's education, focal child's health, and behavior problems among focal children age 10 or older.

The survey collected information about family relationships that is unavailable in administrative records. Mothers and fathers were asked to report on the frequency and type of contact that fathers had with their children as well as contact and conflict between parents. As described in the evaluation plan, father contact and family relationships are outcomes of interest in themselves and also may be important factors in understanding the effects of the Child Support Demonstration on fathers' employment and child support payments.

At Time 2, we added questions about help and social support that mothers and fathers receive from, and provide to, family and friends. We also asked about the size of their social support network (number of friends), whether any close friends lived nearby, and the frequency of contact with friends. These questions provide additional information about informal sources of support that were missing from Time 1, which focused on formal support and government services.

Because we anticipated difficulty in locating sample members, especially fathers, we included a short section asking each participant about the demographic characteristics and economic resources of the other parent. We did this to maximize the number of couples about which we would have at least basic demographic information.

Finally, we collected information on household composition and standard demographic items. The household roster makes it possible to identify the size and age structure of the current household (in addition to the age and sex of biological or adopted children), to construct the age and gender composition of sibships, and, in the mother's version, to assess stability of household composition. Measures of current and past coresidence of the parents of the focal child were critical to several hypotheses in the evaluation plan (e.g., transfer of informal resources, quality of family relationships).

The content of the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families makes it possible to examine a wide range of questions about the experiences of low-income mothers and fathers during a period of welfare reform. The use of standard measures makes it possible to compare experiences of mothers and fathers in Wisconsin with those in national studies or with evaluations of welfare reforms in other states.

## **Data Collection**

We conducted interviews by telephone and in person, using computer-assisted telephone- and personal-interviewing (CATI and CAPI) technology. At Time 1, data were collected from mothers between February 22, 1999, and July 31, 1999, and from fathers between April 23, 1999, and July 31, 1999. At Time 2, we interviewed mothers from February 3, 2000, to July 15, 2000, and fathers from March 22, 2000, to July 31, 2000.<sup>9</sup> Both data-collection periods were extended four to six weeks from their originally proposed end dates to allow more time to locate sample members and to conduct in-person interviews. The University of Wisconsin Survey Center was the contractor for the fieldwork.

---

<sup>9</sup>In-person interviewing efforts began approximately one month after the initial fielding dates. At Time 1, personal interviewing of mothers began on March 22, 1999, and of fathers on May 3, 1999. Corresponding dates for Time 2 were February 20, 2000, and April 17, 2000.



### Dual Mode of Administration and Sample Management

We conducted telephone and in-person interviews simultaneously throughout the Time 1 and Time 2 field periods, but we attempted to reach as many respondents as possible by telephone. All telephone interviews were conducted centrally in the contractor's telephone laboratory at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. As a result, telephone interviews were less expensive, expedited data processing, and could be more easily monitored and supervised to ensure data quality. We anticipated that a significant proportion of sample members could not easily be contacted by telephone. Among low-income populations, rates of nontelephone households are higher, telephone service is interrupted more often, and residential mobility occurs more frequently. Our own tracing efforts provided evidence consistent with these patterns. Just prior to the beginning of Time 1 fieldwork, we had telephone numbers for almost all mothers, but for only 60 percent of the fathers. Among all those for whom we had telephone numbers, early tracing efforts revealed that 20 to 25 percent of the telephones were disconnected, and another 8 percent of mothers and 20 percent of fathers could no longer be reached at the number that was called.<sup>10</sup>

Because the telephone and in-person efforts were being conducted at the same time, we developed decision rules to guide the flow of the sample. Cases for which we did not have telephone numbers were assigned to CAPI interviews immediately. Thereafter, coversheets in the telephone lab were reviewed on a weekly basis and reassigned to a personal interviewer if they met one or more of the following conditions: (a) a “privacy manager” was reached more than two times;<sup>11</sup> (b) the call reached an answering machine ten to fifteen times or the call was not answered on ten to fifteen separate attempts; (c) the respondent was reached and agreed to a date and time to be called back but subsequently broke these appointments three to five times; (d) the respondent was reached at a cellular telephone or pager, did not have another telephone at which he or she could be reached, and did not wish to be interviewed by cell phone; or (e) the respondent stated that he or she would call to complete the interview, did not do so after two weeks had elapsed, and efforts to contact the respondent again were unsuccessful after three to five attempts.<sup>12</sup> In addition, a small number of telephone refusals were reassigned to a personal interviewer if the notes from the interaction suggested that face-to-face contact might be successful.

---

<sup>10</sup>Tracing efforts are described in more detail below.

<sup>11</sup>The “privacy manager” service was most common in the Milwaukee area. Individuals who elect to receive this feature in their telephone service can block calls that are not on a pre-identified list of callers. Ineligible callers can leave a recorded message. Since some respondents elected to receive our calls after we initially were blocked by a privacy manager, cases were not reassigned to CAPI unless they were blocked on more than two separate attempts.

<sup>12</sup>The last group involved cases where the respondent did not have a permanent telephone but retrieved messages at the household of a friend or relative.

### CAPI Zones

We conducted telephone interviews with persons regardless of their state or county of residence at the time of the survey.<sup>13</sup> However, efforts to interview respondents in person were restricted to particular regions in Wisconsin. The majority of the W-2 population—and of the survey sample—was located in and near the Milwaukee area, and a smaller proportion of cases resided in the less densely populated counties in northern Wisconsin or in rural areas. It was neither cost efficient nor feasible for personal interviewers to pursue small numbers of cases in these sparsely populated areas, especially given the short field period of 10 to 12 weeks for in-person efforts.

We fielded personal interviewers in Wisconsin cities and metropolitan areas where there were at least ten cases (mothers and fathers combined) that could not be reached by telephone. In practice, the application of this rule concentrated personal interviewers in the central and southwestern corridors of the state, especially the Milwaukee metropolitan area (Milwaukee, Racine, and Kenosha counties), and another cluster of cases in and around Madison (Dane County) and Janesville (Rock County). The neighboring counties of Green, Jefferson, Walworth, Waukesha, Washington, and Ozaukee also received consistent attention by CAPI staff throughout the field period. Later in the field period, after the telephone contacts proved unsuccessful and the outstanding cases were reviewed, additional metropolitan areas became eligible for in-person efforts. These included Appleton, Fond du Lac, Green Bay, and Eau Claire, as well as the triangular regions outlined by LaCrosse, Sparta, and Trempealeau and by Baraboo, Portage, and Poynette. Notable exceptions to this rule were communities located within Indian reservations (e.g., Neopit, Keshena, Shawano). Our research indicated that gaining access to these regions would require permission from the tribal council, a process that could have taken several months.

### “Full-” and “Partial-Effort” Replicates

The original survey sample of 3,000 resident mothers was subdivided into independent replicates of 100 cases each. Cases were randomly assigned so that each replicate was a representative subsample, to help control achieved sample size and minimize the effects of instrument errors or other problems discovered after interviewing began. The fathers’ survey sample also was subdivided into replicates, and fathers were assigned to the same replicate number as the corresponding resident mother and focal child. Fathers’ replicates generally comprised fewer than 100 cases, because the sample was limited to legal fathers. Replicate assignments remained the same at Time 1 and Time 2.

We used the replicate structure to subdivide the fathers’ sample into two representative subsamples, only one of which was eligible for CAPI effort. All mothers in the survey sample were eligible for in-person interviews if their address was located in a CAPI zone, but only a subsample of fathers was subject to the more intensive effort associated with in-person tracing and face-to-face interviews. One-third of the fathers’ sample was eligible for telephone *and* in-person interviews (replicates 1 through 10), composing a subsample subject to “full effort.” The remaining two-thirds of the sample (replicates 11 through 30) were designated “partial effort” and could only be interviewed by telephone. Fathers in these replicates for whom we did not have a telephone number or could not be reached by telephone were not assigned to a personal interviewer for in-person tracing or interviewing, even if they lived in a CAPI zone.

---

<sup>13</sup>By definition, mothers in the study, as participants in W-2, were residents of Wisconsin at some point during the period of the evaluation. The overwhelming majority were living in the state at the time of the survey, but some mothers had moved out of the state and a slightly larger number of fathers lived outside Wisconsin. At Time 1, over 95 percent of mothers and 92 percent of fathers who completed interviews were living in Wisconsin, although the proportion of Wisconsin residents is probably lower among nonrespondents.

We had two main objectives in subdividing the fathers' sample. First, we wanted to maximize our response rate among at least a representative subsample of fathers, if not the entire sample. Even though we did not have sufficient resources to pursue in-person interviews with all the fathers who could not be reached by telephone, we could focus our resources on approximately one-third of the sample. (The full-effort replicates included 677 cases at Time 1 and 736 at Time 2.)

Second, we wanted to acquire information that would help us understand likely nonrespondents in the telephone-only (partial-effort) subsample. A frequently used approach for understanding unit nonresponse involves employing more intensive tracing techniques among a subsample of survey nonrespondents at the conclusion of the study, perhaps using an abbreviated instrument or one designed to shed light on the characteristics of likely nonrespondents. Our strategy involved a similar exercise, but one that was conducted simultaneously by applying equivalent levels of telephone effort across the two subsamples for cases that would otherwise be eligible for CAPI based on their geographic location. Coversheets were reviewed blind with respect to subsample designation. Fathers with call records and addresses that were determined to be eligible for reassignment to a personal interviewer were pulled from the telephone laboratory if they were in a partial-effort replicate. No additional call attempts were made for these cases. Thus, we sacrificed overall number of completed interviews—i.e., the additional interviews that might have been completed in replicates 11 through 30 if telephone attempts had continued—in favor of a more focused allocation of resources that might inform our understanding of nonresponse.<sup>14</sup>

### Interviewer Characteristics

At Time 1, 91 individuals conducted interviews with sample members. Seventy-two of these interviewed by telephone and 19 performed interviews in person.<sup>15</sup> Telephone interviewers were generally about 22 years old and had one to six months experience conducting standardized interviews. Thirty percent of the staff had one or more years of experience. Women comprised 71 percent of the telephone interviewers. The personal interviewing staff was older, more experienced, and more predominantly women—all but two of the personal interviewers were women. They ranged in age from 22 to 48, with an average age of 37 years, and their prior interviewing experience ranged from less than one year to 35 years (the mean was five years).<sup>16</sup>

At Time 2, 70 telephone interviewers and 14 personal interviewers worked on the study.<sup>17</sup> The typical Time 2 telephone interviewer was a woman about 21 years old and had slightly less than one year of interviewing experience. Again, all but two of the personal interviewers were women. They were generally about 41 years old and had about seven years of interviewing experience.

---

<sup>14</sup>Technical Report 6 provides information on how this subsampling strategy is used to address unit nonresponse in the fathers' survey.

<sup>15</sup>Seven of the telephone interviewers also conducted personal interviews late in the field period, when effort focused on difficult-to-locate sample members.

<sup>16</sup>Three personal interviewers did not provide their age or date of birth.

<sup>17</sup>Five telephone interviewers also conducted face-to-face interviews late in the field period.

### Interviewer Training

Interviewers were trained in small groups of 20 to 30, and sometimes as few as 10. Training sessions were led by the survey contractor's project manager and IRP's survey manager.<sup>18</sup> Formal training sessions at Time 1 consisted of two half-day sessions that briefed interviewers on the purpose and goals of the project, how the results of the study would be used, the nature of the sample, and our previous contacts with the sample through notification letters and tracing interviews (described below). Key terms and concepts also were reviewed.

Interviewers "walked through" the questionnaire by taking turns reading questions aloud with either the project or survey manager acting as respondent. As interviewers acquired familiarity with the instrument, the "respondent" used this opportunity to reinforce good interviewing practices, often by acting as a reluctant or difficult respondent who gave vague or ambiguous answers. This created opportunities for interviewers to practice asking questions (and recording answers) verbatim, using neutral probes to clarify incomplete or ambiguous responses, executing interviewer instructions or on-screen directives, and developing their skills with difficult questions or concepts. Experienced telephone interviewers or supervisors also participated by leading role-playing sessions, reviewing good interviewing practices, and assisting individual interviewers during the instrument review to ensure that they did not fall behind.

The second half of formal training used exercises to practice "question and answer" scripts and techniques for refusal conversions; i.e., gaining cooperation from respondents who initially refused. Guidelines for eliciting cooperation from reluctant respondents were reviewed, and interviewers practiced obtaining contact information for the sample member when the listed telephone number reached a relative or friend. Additional time was spent reviewing the concepts and technical issues involved in entering data in two particularly complex sections of the instrument—the household roster and formal child support payments.

After completing the formal training session, all interviewers paired up to practice the questionnaire using sets of respondent characteristics outlined by the training staff. The respondent profiles were designed to ensure that the interviewers became skilled with the entire instrument, even though some questions or sets of questions might actually arise less frequently. These narratives also were used by supervisory staff to conduct "certification interviews," which involved a supervisor or designated trainer (senior interviewer) acting as respondent to assess an interviewer's skill with the instrument. All phases of good interviewing practice were reviewed during this process—reading questions exactly as worded, recording answers verbatim, probing neutrally, using on-screen directives appropriately—as was facility with the instrument itself. Interviewers began calling sample members only after successfully completing three certification interviews.

The mothers' sample was fielded several weeks before that of the fathers, so all interviewers were thoroughly trained and certified on the mothers' instrument first. Additional training sessions were held when the fathers' sample was fielded. The organized training sessions were used to review the fathers' instrument, particularly the few areas where that instrument differed from the mothers', as well as to participate in role-playing exercises for gaining cooperation from fathers. All interviewers were required to

---

<sup>18</sup>All interviewers, telephone and in-person, completed general interviewer training sessions administered by the survey contractor prior to the beginning of this study. In addition, all telephone interviewers were required to have some interview experience on another project before they were trained to work on the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families.

conduct additional practice interviews with a partner, but there was not a second certification process specific to the fathers' instrument.

Training sessions for Time 2 were similar in both content and structure. All but a small number of interviewers had worked on the study at Time 1 and were familiar with its goals and the general content of the interview. During half-day formal training sessions, we briefly reviewed the background and objectives of the study. Most of the training session involved practicing the questionnaire, role-playing questions and answers and refusal conversions, and entering data on more complex screens. Interviewers were given a set of scenarios to conduct practice interviews informally with a partner. All interviewers were required to successfully complete three certification interviews before they began calling respondents.

Using the experience we gained at Time 1, we provided more supplemental training at Time 2. Additional training modules were administered at various times throughout the second field period. These sessions focused on using neutral probes, obtaining detailed information on occupation, asking questions in the household roster, and gaining cooperation from fathers.

Training for personal interviewers included the same material covered in telephone training, but the formal training sessions were two days long and more time was spent practicing the questionnaire. In addition, two field supervisors with extensive personal interviewing experience led components of the training that focused on tracing sample members in the field, eliciting cooperation face-to-face, and general interviewing practices. Technical personnel from the survey contractor provided instruction on the use and care of the laptop computers, as well as procedures for downloading data from completed interviews.

All personal interviewers were required to successfully complete three certification interviews before they began contacting sample members. Each new interviewer was paired with a more experienced interviewer who served as a mentor and provided additional training. New interviewers accompanied experienced interviewers to observe interviews (and to be observed interviewing) for one to two days before they began contacting sample members on their own.

Because the vast majority of in-person interviewing was conducted in Milwaukee and nearby counties, the survey contractor maintained a field office in Milwaukee throughout the field period. Interviewers were required to meet with the field coordinator once a week to review their caseload and to deliver data from completed interviews. One field supervisor was generally present as well, and she used these meetings to provide additional training tailored to each interviewer depending on the nature of his or her caseload and the issues that had arisen that week.

To help ensure data of high quality, telephone interviewers were monitored on a regular basis by a shift supervisor. Interviewers were monitored for 15 minutes at random each week, and a complete interview was monitored once every four weeks. The work of personal interviewers was examined by the field supervisors and the field coordinator. We attempted to conduct verification interviews<sup>19</sup> using an abbreviated interview schedule for 10 percent of the cases performed by new or less experienced CAPI staff and 5 percent of the cases completed by experienced CAPI staff.

#### Mode and Length of Completed Interviews

The majority of respondents at both time periods were interviewed by telephone. At Time 1, 70 percent of respondent mothers and 84 percent of respondent fathers were interviewed by telephone. At

---

<sup>19</sup>These interviews involve re-asking a small number of factual questions (e.g., age, education) to verify that the original interviewer elicited correct answers.

Time 2, these percentages dropped slightly, to 64 and 81 percent. The higher proportion of telephone interviews with fathers—or, conversely, the much smaller percentage of face-to-face interviews—reflects the fact that only one-third of the fathers' sample was eligible for in-person interviews. However, even among this full-effort subsample, two-thirds of the completed interviews were administered by telephone. A higher proportion of interviews were conducted face-to-face with fathers at Time 2, for several reasons: (a) the full-effort subsample, like the sample as a whole, was larger at Time 2 because of the addition of newly identified fathers; (b) the length of the CAPI field period was slightly longer than at Time 1; and (c) the sample was managed more efficiently at Time 2 and produced a more consistent flow of cases to CAPI interviewers.

Interviews with mothers lasted about 45 minutes on average at Time 1 and Time 2, and those with fathers were about 40 minutes long at Time 1 and 37 minutes at Time 2. The time differential is not surprising, because the fathers' instrument was less complex and shorter than the mothers' version. Questions about W-2 program participation and child care arrangements were not asked of fathers, and material covering income and the focal child's health and education was less detailed. Interviews conducted face-to-face were not significantly longer than telephone interviews, but there was greater variability in their length (standard deviations of 4 to 7 minutes greater than for telephone interviews).

### **Strategies to Reduce Nonresponse: Tracing, Incentives, and Prenotification Letters**

Previous studies of low-income populations and separated families suggested that locating sample members would be a significant challenge. Studies such as the Parents' Fare Share evaluation, state-sponsored studies of persons leaving welfare programs, and IRP studies of parents who live apart consistently report difficulty in locating large proportions of their samples (Abt Associates, 1997; Bartfeld 1991; Cantor and Cunningham, 1999; Weiss and Bailar, 1999; Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, 1998). The survey population is likely to include many who are difficult to locate because they live with relatives and do not have a telephone listed under their name, because they have an unlisted number, because of frequent moves, or because they do not have a telephone or do not maintain telephone service continuously. As described earlier, we conducted interviews by telephone and in person to ensure coverage of sample members in households without telephones. Efforts to locate mothers and fathers in the survey sample and to encourage them to participate began several months before data collection and continued throughout both field periods. They included the establishment of a special tracing staff, preproduction (i.e., before the field period began) tracing interviews, prenotification letters, "promised" as well as prepaid incentives, and the incorporation of locating questions in the survey instrument itself, all described below.

#### Designated Tracing Staff

In June 1998, when the first survey sample cases were selected, the survey contractor established a small group of staff whose sole purpose was to trace, and very often re-trace, members of the sample. Their task was to obtain address and telephone numbers of mothers and fathers in the survey sample by searching electronic databases, using updated information from the sample frame, or by contacting third parties identified during the preproduction tracing interviews.

The sample frame (CARES and KIDS) provided initial address and telephone data, but this information was sometimes incorrect or incomplete, especially among fathers. The tracing staff used identifying information in the sample frame (name, date of birth, and social security number) to search for more current addresses and telephone numbers in electronic databases. These included Directory

Assistance, Internet-based information sources and cross-listing directories, CD-ROMs that are updated every three months and contain compilation of telephone white pages as well as address information gathered from subscription services, and credit bureau databases that provide address and telephone information. In addition, IRP provided “address refreshes” each month. These electronic files provided updated data for cases in which the administrative record showed a change since the previous month in any fields that contained locating or identifying data—address, telephone number, social security number, sample member’s name, sample member’s date of birth, focal child’s name, or focal child’s date of birth.

IRP, with the cooperation of the state’s Bureau of Child Support and other state agencies, assisted the tracing efforts by searching other administrative data sources as well. Survey cases that yielded no leads and were considered “dead-ends” midway through the field period were returned to IRP. Staff from IRP or state agencies searched records from the Department of Transportation and the New Hires database<sup>20</sup> for location information on these cases. At Time 2, we obtained records on individuals in Wisconsin state prisons from the Department of Corrections to help locate sample members who were incarcerated. Although we did not conduct interviews with persons in jails or prisons, these data were useful in identifying sample members who were incarcerated (and would be for the duration of the study), so that tracing resources could be allocated more efficiently.

### Preproduction Tracing Interviews

Following a protocol designed for the evaluation of Parents’ Fair Share (Abt Associates, 1997), we conducted brief telephone interviews with mothers and fathers during the months leading up to the first survey. The objectives of this brief interview were (a) to confirm that the address and telephone information we had for the respondent was correct; (b) to collect the correct address if our information was incorrect or incomplete; (c) to obtain the name, telephone number, and address of up to two friends or family members who would know how to reach the respondent if he or she moved or changed telephone numbers within the next several months; and (d) to remind the respondent about the purpose of the study, how he or she had been selected, and that we would call again in a few months to conduct an interview.

We completed preproduction tracing interviews with 45.4 percent of the mothers for whom we had telephone numbers (86.8 percent of the sample at that time). Completion rates were lower among fathers (29.1 percent). We had telephone numbers for a much smaller proportion of fathers (40.7 percent), but the fathers’ sample received slightly less effort for a shorter period of time. Attention to the tracing interviews was greatest during late summer and fall 1998, as tracing activities were gearing up and prenotification letters (described below) were being mailed. Fewer personnel resources were available later in the fall, when we were preparing and debugging the survey instrument and training interviewers for the pretest interviews. The tracing interview protocol proved less useful for the fathers’ sample, for at least two reasons. First, that sample was not finalized until early 1999, when paternity cases adjudicated as of December 31, 1998, could be identified. By this time, the CATI pretest and production phase of the project was beginning and tracing interviews were no longer being conducted. Second, we had telephone numbers for a much smaller fraction of the fathers’ sample. Those cases for which we did have telephone numbers

---

<sup>20</sup>The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 required the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop the National Directory of New Hires, a database of information on all newly hired employees, quarterly wage reports, and unemployment insurance claims, in the country. The national new hire reporting program retains a state-based system for employers to report new hires. Once new hire information is entered into the State Directory of New Hires, states have two days to match this information to their child support caseloads and transmit an income withholding order to an employer.

received full effort, and the maximum number of call attempts, by tracing interviewers. The designated tracing staff, using an electronic database and other resources, worked on a larger share of the fathers' sample during this time as they searched for valid addresses and telephone numbers.

### Tracing Conducted by Interviewers

Interviewers performed additional tracing activities as they attempted to contact the respondent or while conducting the interview. The efforts of in-person interviewers were critical to finding many respondents. If the respondent was not available at the address listed on the coversheet, personal interviewers were instructed to contact neighbors, the office manager of a rental property, or other possible leads to obtain a current address or telephone number for the respondent or someone who would know how to reach the respondent. The most diligent interviewers followed leads as tenuous as an indication that the respondent usually visited a nearby store or used a particular day care center to locate and eventually interview the mother or father. Interviewer business cards and letters in sealed envelopes left at the residence were used extensively to encourage respondents to participate in the study by contacting the interviewer or calling a toll-free number that was connected to the central telephone laboratory. Personal interviewers frequently included in the letters handwritten notes containing their cell phone numbers or reminding respondents of an interview appointment.

Telephone interviewers were trained to inquire about a current telephone or address for a respondent if a call attempt reached the incorrect household. This procedure included verifying the telephone number that was dialed as well as the address listed on the coversheet. Frequently, the telephone number and address did not correspond to the same location, and when an address was not determined to be wrong (even if the telephone number was incorrect), cases could be reassigned to CAPI more efficiently.

Finally, the survey instrument itself was designed to help locate members of the sample. At the completion of the interview, each respondent was asked for location information about the other parent of the focal child. We explained that in another part of the study we would like to contact the child's other parent and ask him or her to participate. The respondent was asked to provide contact information for the other parent or for someone who might know how to reach the other parent. Interviewers were instructed to record even scant information (e.g., "he is living in Arizona" or "I don't know the address but it's a yellow house near the intersection of 4<sup>th</sup> and Main"). Very often, these fragments helped tracing staff confirm or disconfirm a possible address or made it possible for personal interviewers to track down the correct household. At Time 1, 30.5 percent of mothers provided telephone numbers for the father in the sample and 43.9 percent gave some address information.<sup>21</sup> Somewhat higher proportions of fathers provided similar information about the mother—43.8 percent and 44.9 percent responded with telephone or address data, respectively.

### Incentives

Survey participants received both prepaid and "promised" incentives at Time 1 and Time 2. The original survey design included incentives that would be paid after completing an interview. We expected that financial incentives would be very cost-effective, because in their absence the cost of locating and persuading respondents would be higher than the cost of the incentives. We decided to include prepaid incentives when we learned from other surveys of their effectiveness among similar populations and when the challenges of locating respondents, especially fathers, became more apparent.

---

<sup>21</sup>We asked mothers for location information about the father only if the father was in the sample.



Survey participants were paid \$15 after completing an interview at Time 1 and \$25 after completing an interview at Time 2. Prenotification letters (see below) also included a one-dollar bill at Time 1 and a two-dollar bill at Time 2. Sample members were informed that they would receive a check for \$15 (\$25 at Time 2) after they completed an interview.

The amount of the incentive was the same for mothers and fathers, and we did not employ a strategy of “differential incentives” in which persons who were more difficult to locate or more difficult to interview would be offered a larger incentive. We believed that differential incentives were intrinsically unfair, might cause resentment that would harm efforts for follow-up interviews, or might encourage less cooperative behavior among sample members either in our own panel design or when contacted to participate in other studies. In particular, we expected that a significant proportion of mothers and fathers in the survey sample had at least some contact with each other. If information about differential incentives was shared by the two parties, it might foster resentment towards the study and its sponsor and possibly generate conflict between the couple.

We used prepaid incentives in the form of telephone calling cards that provided the recipient with 15 minutes of long distance telephone calls to any place in the United States. All the cards were valid when mailed; they did not require any action on the part of the recipient to activate them. At Time 1, we implemented this strategy on a small scale in an effort to achieve our response rate targets. We mailed approximately 250 calling cards to mothers and fathers for whom we did not have telephone numbers or could not reach by telephone and whose addresses were outside designated CAPI zones. The calling cards were enclosed with a letter encouraging the sample member to participate in the study and call a toll-free number to be interviewed. The cards had a generic “thank you” message on them.

At Time 2, we mailed telephone calling cards to all members of the sample. Again, the cards provided 15 minutes of long distance telephone calls to any place in the United States. The face of the card included the name of the survey and its logo as well as the words “Thank You” and the toll-free number of the telephone laboratory. The calling cards were mailed to mothers and fathers about four to six weeks after the beginning of each field period. Since some sample members would already have completed an interview while we would still be attempting to contact others, we enclosed the calling card in a letter thanking them for their help with the study. If they had not yet completed an interview, we encouraged them to call a toll-free telephone number to arrange to be interviewed.

### Prenotification Letters

As preparation for the interviews at Time 1, we sent sample members three letters in advance, explaining the purpose of the study, how he or she was chosen for the interview, how their answers to the survey questions would be used, and assuring confidentiality and the voluntary nature of their participation. Each letter included what we believed to be the respondent’s current address and telephone number and an address form and business reply envelope to confirm the information or to correct or complete the address and telephone number if any part was wrong or missing. Respondents could also call a toll-free number to provide correct or to rectify incomplete contact information. The letters included a one-dollar bill, promised \$15 upon completion of the interview, and were signed by the principal investigators. The first letter was sent about three months before we began interviewing, the second was sent four to six weeks before, and the last letter was sent no more than one week before interviewing began.<sup>22</sup> By January 27, 1999, just a few

---

<sup>22</sup>Some respondents received two letters instead of three because they were selected into the sample later—e.g., fathers who became eligible for the sample after we developed a final list of fathers for whom we could identify paternity as of December 31, 1998.

weeks before interviewing started, 39 percent of mothers and 21 percent of the fathers had returned the address forms.

The third letter also included a red refrigerator magnet, in the shape of the state of Wisconsin. It listed the name of the survey contractor and a toll-free telephone number, and encouraged the respondent to call us if he or she had not been contacted by March 1, 1999. A fourth letter containing the telephone calling card was mailed to a subset of mothers and fathers whom we had not been able to reach by telephone.

At Time 2, we also mailed mothers and fathers three letters. Each explained the purpose of the study, how he or she was chosen for the interview, how the results of the study would be used, and assuring confidentiality. Each letter included an address correction form, a business reply envelope, and a two-dollar bill, with a promise of a check for \$25 upon completion of the interview. The first letter was sent approximately three months before we began interviewing, the second was sent 4–6 weeks before interviewing, and the last letter was sent no more than one week before interviewing began.

The first letter also included a newsletter that summarized highlights of what we had learned from preliminary analyses of the data we collected at Time 1. Separate newsletters were prepared based on the data collected from mothers and from fathers.

We again enclosed a red refrigerator magnet in the third letter. We had discovered at Time 1 that the magnet was an effective memory aid. Respondents recalled the magnet even when they had forgotten about the previous notification letters or the dollar bills. Personal interviewers carried the magnets and found them a very recognizable symbol of the survey, and telephone interviewers could refer to them effectively to help jog respondents' memories about previous contact with the study. We used the same magnet design at Time 2, altering the amount of the cash incentive noted on the face of the magnet and the date to call us if they had not spoken with an interviewer.

A fourth letter, which included the telephone calling card described above, was sent 4–6 weeks after fieldwork began.

## **Outcomes of Survey Fieldwork**

### Final Disposition of Cases

Tables TR5.6 and TR5.7 show the final disposition of cases at Time 1 and Time 2 for the original sample of 3,000. Data for the fathers show final outcomes for the full sample as well as the subsamples that received “full” and “partial” effort. (Appendix Tables TR5.1 through TR5.4 report final dispositions at Time 1 and Time 2 for mothers and fathers by experimental-control status.)

Tables TR5.6–7 contain two sections. The first or upper section lists the outcomes for cases that were eligible for the survey. The second or lower section lists categories of cases that were determined not to be eligible for the survey. Cases were ruled “out-of-scope,” meaning ineligible, when there was new evidence from the sample frame (CARES and KIDS) indicating they were not part of the sample population. A mother, a father, or both the mother and the father could become out-of-scope when

1. Errors identified in the sample frame or changes in the sample frame indicated that the mother never entered W-2 and thus was not exposed to the Child Support Demonstration (case was considered out-of-scope and both parents were deleted from the respective survey population and survey sample, see row labeled “Not in research population”).

**Table TR5.6**  
**Final Disposition of Time 1 Survey Sample**

Disposition	Mothers		Fathers		Fathers, by Replicate Structure <sup>a</sup>			
					Full Effort		Partial Effort	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		3,000		1,000		2,000	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	2,876		1,926		673		1,253	
<u>Interviewed</u>								
Completed	2,362	82.1	643	33.4	289	42.9	354	28.3
Partially completed	54	1.9	61	3.2	19	2.8	42	3.4
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>								
Refusals	94	3.3	112	5.8	43	6.4	69	5.5
Persistently unavailable	44	1.5	64	3.3	28	4.2	36	2.9
No longer at address/phone	33	1.1	73	3.8	14	2.1	59	4.7
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>								
Messages only/no address or phone	35	1.2	63	3.3	28	4.2	35	2.8
Answering machine/no answer	55	1.9	90	4.7	37	5.5	53	4.2
<u>Not Located</u>								
No location information <sup>b</sup>	18	0.6	185	9.6	19	2.8	166	13.2
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>c</sup>	119	4.1	421	21.9	115	17.1	306	24.4
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>								
Language barrier	34	1.2	19	1.0	7	1.0	12	1.0
Too ill/disabled to participate	3	0.1	6	0.3	4	0.6	2	0.2
Incarcerated	22	0.8	171	8.9	65	9.7	106	8.5
Not fielded <sup>d</sup>	1	0.0	8	0.4	2	0.3	6	0.5
Not pursued in error <sup>e</sup>	2	0.1	5	0.3	0	0.0	5	0.4
Other nonresponse <sup>f</sup>	0	0.0	5	0.3	3	0.4	2	0.2

**Table TR5.6, continued**

Disposition	Mothers		Fathers		Fathers, By Replicate Structure <sup>a</sup>			
					Full Effort		Partial Effort	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	124		1,074		327		747	
Not in research population	100	80.6	100	9.3	34	10.4	66	8.8
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	6.5	8	0.7	1	0.3	7	0.9
CARES confidential case	6	4.8	6	0.6	3	0.9	3	0.4
Selected focal child not resident parent's child <sup>g</sup>	3	2.4	2	0.2	1	0.3	1	0.1
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	0	0.0	5	0.5	2	0.6	3	0.4
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	0	0.0	5	0.5	2	0.6	3	0.4
No legal father identified/not in sample	0	0.0	912	84.9	276	84.4	636	85.1
<u>Deceased</u>								
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	1.6	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.3
Resident parent reported dead at interview	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	0	0.0	21	2.0	3	0.9	18	2.4
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	10	0.9	4	1.2	6	0.8
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	2.4	3	0.3	1	0.3	2	0.3

<sup>a</sup>Fathers in survey replicates 1–10 were eligible for telephone and in-person interviews. Fathers in replicates 11–30 were eligible for telephone interviews only; hence “full effort” and “partial effort.”

<sup>b</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no address information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>e</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>f</sup>Among the father's sample, includes 3 cases in which the respondent claimed not to be the focal child's father and 2 cases in which we did not pursue an interview with the father because the mother expressed fear for her safety or the safety of her children.

<sup>g</sup>Mothers' data includes 1 case in which the respondent identified herself as the child's grandmother, but this relationship was not confirmed by CARES.

**Table TR5.7**  
**Final Disposition of Time 2 Survey Sample**

Disposition	Mothers		Fathers		Fathers, By Replicate Structure <sup>a</sup>			
					Full Effort		Partial Effort	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		3,000		1,000		2,000	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	2,871		2,123		735		1,388	
<u>Interviewed</u>								
Completed	2,354	82.0	696	32.8	340	46.3	356	25.6
Partially completed	20	0.7	18	0.8	5	0.7	13	0.9
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>								
Refusals	82	2.9	89	4.2	36	4.9	53	3.8
Persistently unavailable	39	1.4	123	5.8	27	3.7	96	6.9
No longer at address/phone	9	0.3	25	1.2	11	1.5	14	1.0
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>								
Messages only/no address or phone	48	1.7	62	2.9	34	4.6	28	2.0
Answering machine/no answer	27	0.9	123	5.8	19	2.6	104	7.5
<u>Not Located</u>								
No location information <sup>b</sup>	39	1.4	334	15.7	32	4.4	302	21.8
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>c</sup>	178	6.2	439	20.7	126	17.1	313	22.6
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>								
Language barrier	27	0.9	15	0.7	5	0.7	10	0.7
Too ill/disabled to participate	1	0.0	3	0.1	2	0.3	1	0.1
Incarcerated	29	1.0	168	7.9	82	11.2	86	6.2
Not fielded <sup>d</sup>	13	0.5	18	0.8	10	1.4	8	0.6
Not pursued in error <sup>e</sup>	0	0.0	4	0.2	3	0.4	1	0.1
Fielded with error <sup>f</sup>	5	0.2	1	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0
Other nonresponse <sup>g</sup>	0	0.0	5	0.2	2	0.3	3	0.2

**Table TR5.7, continued**

Disposition	Mothers		Fathers		Fathers, By Replicate Structure <sup>a</sup>			
					Full Effort		Partial Effort	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	129		877		265		612	
Not in research population	100	77.5	100	11.4	34	12.8	66	10.8
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	6.2	8	0.9	1	0.4	7	1.1
CARES confidential case	6	4.7	6	0.7	3	1.1	3	0.5
Selected focal child not resident parent's child <sup>h</sup>	3	2.3	2	0.2	1	0.4	1	0.2
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	0	0.0	6	0.7	2	0.8	4	0.7
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.2
No legal father identified/not in sample	0	0.0	715	81.5	216	81.5	499	81.5
<u>Deceased</u>								
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	1.6	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.3
Resident parent died before 12/31/1999	4	3.1	4	0.5	2	0.8	2	0.3
Resident parent reported dead at interview	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1999	0	0.0	21	2.4	3	1.1	18	2.9
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	7	0.8	1	0.4	6	1.0
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	2.3	3	0.3	1	0.4	2	0.3
Focal child died before 12/31/1999	2	1.6	2	0.2	1	0.4	1	0.2

<sup>a</sup>Fathers in survey replicates 1–10 were eligible for telephone and in-person interviews. Fathers in replicates 11–30 were eligible for telephone interviews only; hence “full effort” and “partial effort.”

<sup>b</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>e</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>f</sup>Cases in which a different focal child was inadvertently selected at Time 2.

<sup>g</sup>Among the fathers' sample, includes 1 case in which the respondent claimed not to be the focal child's father and 4 cases in which we did not pursue an interview with the father because the mother expressed fear for her safety or the safety of her children.

<sup>h</sup>Mothers' data includes 2 cases in which the respondent identified herself as a relation other than biological or adoptive mother to the focal child, but this relationship was not confirmed by CARES.

2. There was an error in the W-2 entry date and, contrary to our original belief, the case entered W-2 after July 8, 1998 (case was considered out-of-scope and both parents were deleted from the respective survey population and survey sample).
3. The mother was not the biological or adopted mother of the child but a grandmother or other relative (case was considered out-of-scope and both parents were deleted from the respective survey population and survey sample).
4. The focal child died before December 31, 1998 (Time 1) or before December 31, 1999 (Time 2) (case was considered out-of-scope and both parents were deleted from the respective survey population and survey sample).
5. Errors or changes in the sample frame indicated that the father was not the legal father of the focal child. (The W-2 case was considered in-scope for the survey sample population, but there was no eligible father for the case.)<sup>23</sup>
6. The individual was reported dead at the time of the survey. (The individual mother or father was considered out-of-scope for the corresponding survey sample but the surviving parent remained eligible and in-scope.)

All other cases were considered in-scope and eligible for the survey.<sup>24</sup> Aside from 20 to 30 percent of the 3,000 cases at Time 1 and Time 2 for which a legal father was not identified, errors or changes in CARES and KIDS that removed cases from the sample population were the largest source of ineligible cases. A total of 100 cases were eliminated from the original survey sample because they were found to be ineligible. Small numbers of cases became out-of-scope because they entered W-2 after July 8, 1998, a good-cause exemption was identified, or a parent or the focal child died. Six cases originally selected were removed from the survey population because they were designated as “confidential” cases in the CARES system.<sup>25</sup>

The upper section of Table TR5.6 shows that we completed interviews with 82.1 percent of mothers who were eligible at Time 1. We were less successful among fathers, completing interviews with only one-third of the 1,926 cases that were eligible. Partial interviews represent a small fraction of survey outcomes. Most of the partial interviews ended early in the instrument—after the individual respondent was identified but before a household roster was collected—although a small number completed almost one-half or more of the interview. Efforts to contact the respondent and complete the interview were unsuccessful.

Table TR5.6 also provides information on the main sources of nonresponse (i.e., failure to gain an interview). Refusal rates are respectably low among mothers and fathers, ranging from 3 to 6 percent. This

---

<sup>23</sup>These tables show the cases, among the original 3,000, where there was not a legal father for the focal child. They do not show separate categories for cases in which we originally selected a father and later determined that he was not the legal father or cases in which we did not select a father and subsequently identified a paternity that had been adjudicated.

<sup>24</sup>Evidence used to determine that a case was out-of-scope derived almost entirely from CARES and KIDS. These changes or errors in the administrative data were sometimes identified long after we selected the sample and began fieldwork. As a result, we completed interviews with sample members who were later designated as out-of-scope. At Time 1, we interviewed 83 mothers and 52 fathers who were out-of-scope; at Time 2, 73 mothers and 32 fathers were not included in the survey population. These cases are excluded from the analyses.

<sup>25</sup>Technical Report 1 and Technical Report 2 provide detailed information on the numbers of cases excluded from the research and survey populations and reasons for the exclusions.

figure rises to about 10 percent among mothers and 20 percent among fathers if we include cases involving partial interviews, persistent unavailability, broken appointments, or unanswered messages as polite forms of refusal. It is likely that some, but certainly not all, of these cases represent a passive decline to participate. A more important source of nonresponse, especially among fathers, was our inability to locate the respondent. Over 30 percent of fathers could not be interviewed at Time 1 because we did not have a valid address or telephone number. This figure drops to 20 percent among the subsample of fathers who were eligible for full effort (in-person and telephone interviews), but remains a significant source of nonresponse.

A small fraction of mothers and fathers could not be interviewed at Time 1 because they were too ill, because of fielding errors,<sup>26</sup> or language barriers. We prepared only an English-language instrument and instructed interviewers not to translate the questionnaire, in part or in whole, into another language. A few Spanish-speaking interviewers were used to talk to people not in the sample who answered the phone or the door and who did not speak English, in order to make contact with sample members. A small number of fathers were not interviewed because they claimed that they were not the father of the focal child or because the mother requested that we not contact the father because she feared for her safety or the safety of her children.

Almost 9 percent of fathers were not interviewed because we located them in prison and they remained there throughout the field period. These fathers were part of the survey population and eligible for the survey, but we chose not to conduct interviews in prison. Our choice was governed by restrictions for conducting research with prisoners and by our belief that substantial portions of the survey instrument would be inapplicable for imprisoned fathers. A thorough understanding of these fathers' situations and their experiences with their children required a different survey instrument that could not be developed and fielded in the time available.

The distribution of final dispositions at Time 2 shows a similar pattern (Table TR5.7). We completed interviews with 82 percent of mothers and about one-third of fathers. We were more successful among fathers in the full-effort replicates at Time 2, completing interviews with 46.3 percent of them, but we fared less well in the partial-effort replicates (25.6 percent). Refusal rates decreased at Time 2 for mothers and fathers: even the most comprehensive definition of refusal yields 7 and 15 percent of mothers and fathers, respectively. In contrast, slightly larger proportions of mothers and fathers could not be located for the second survey. At Time 1, we could not locate about 5 percent of mothers and 31 percent of fathers; these figures rose to almost 8 and 36 percent at Time 2.

### Response Rates

Table TR5.8 reports response rates for mothers, fathers, and couples at Time 1 and Time 2. We report response rates for Time 1 and Time 2 as cross-sectional surveys as well as a panel response rate—i.e., a panel composed of persons who completed both interviews. Response rates are computed as the number of completed interviews divided by the total number of eligible cases. Specifically, a response rate (RR) is computed as

$$RR = I / (I + P + R + NC + O)$$

---

<sup>26</sup>Cases that at the time of the survey were thought to be ineligible and were later found to be eligible.



where

I = Complete interview

P = Partial interview

R = Refusal

NC = Noncontact

O = Other noninterview

“Noncontact” includes persons who were located but with whom we could not make contact as well as persons who could not be located. “Other noninterview” includes cases in which the person was too ill to be interviewed, could not be interviewed in English, was incarcerated, was eligible but not fielded, was not pursued in error, or was fielded with errors. Partial interviews are not included in the numerator, and data from partial interviews are not analyzed in the evaluation, because they were small in number and most ended too early in the instrument to provide useful data across research domains.

Cases are omitted from the denominator if they are ruled ineligible or “out-of-scope,” as described in the preceding section. Individual mothers and fathers also are excluded from the denominator if they were reported dead at the time of the survey, even if this information was not confirmed in CARES or KIDS. Other than a report of death, we make the conservative assumption that all nonlocated and noncontacted cases were eligible for the survey (in-scope) unless an error or change in CARES or KIDS ruled them ineligible.

We consistently achieved high response rates for the mothers’ sample, completing interviews with 82 percent of mothers at Time 1 and Time 2 and 73 percent of the panel at both time periods. Among all fathers in the sample, we completed interviews with about one-third at Time 1 and Time 2 and 22 percent in the panel. Completion rates for fathers in the subsample eligible for telephone and in-person interviews were higher (43 and 46 percent), but the panel component represents only 32 percent of nonresident fathers in the sample population. We completed interviews with about 30 percent of couples at Time 1 and Time 2, but less than 20 percent in the panel. The low response rate among fathers depresses the rate of completions among couples, though there are some cases in which we interviewed the father but not the mother. Response rates computed at Time 1, Time 2, and as a panel differ slightly by experimental-control status, but they do not follow a consistent pattern over time or across samples and no differences are statistically significant.

Although the response rates for the fathers are lower than those often reported by surveys of the general population, they compare favorably with other studies of separated families. The Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics completed interviews with 19.8 percent of the fathers who lived apart from the children in its sample. The resident parent (or “primary caregiver”) would not provide information about the father in almost one-third of the cases. Among those cases where the father was identified—a set of cases with roughly comparable location information available in our study—interviews were completed with 28.5 percent of the fathers (Hofferth et al., 1997). This figure is similar to ours of 33.4 and 32.8 percent. The Parents’ Fair Share (PFS) study, one of the few other studies that attempted to interview low-income nonresident fathers, achieved much higher response rates (ranging from 74 to 82 percent across different sites and intake periods). However, the PFS sample and study design differ markedly from the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families and contribute, in ways that cannot be easily quantified, to its success. For example, PFS focused specifically on fathers during sample design and selection. It recruited fathers into the study after their participation in a court hearing about child support

**Table TR5.8**  
**Response Rates for Mothers, Fathers, and Couples at Time 1 and Time 2 (Percentages)**

	All	Experimental Group	Control Group	E-C Difference	P-value
<b>Mothers</b>					
Time 1	82.1%	83.2%	81.1%	2.2%	0.1
Time 2	82.0	81.8	82.2	-0.5	0.8
T1 and T2 Panel	72.6	72.8	72.5	0.3	0.8
<b>Fathers (All)</b>					
Time 1	33.4	33.0	33.8	-0.9	0.7
Time 2	32.8	33.6	32.0	1.5	0.5
T1 and T2 Panel	22.3	22.7	21.8	1.0	0.6
<b>Fathers (Full Effort)<sup>b</sup></b>					
Time 1	42.9	44.2	41.8	2.4	0.5
Time 2	46.3	47.4	45.2	2.3	0.5
T1 and T2 Panel	31.5	31.2	31.9	-0.7	0.8
<b>Fathers (Partial Effort)<sup>b</sup></b>					
Time 1	28.3	27.2	29.3	-2.1	0.4
Time 2	25.7	26.6	24.6	2.0	0.4
T1 and T2 Panel	17.3	18.4	16.1	2.4	0.3
<b>Couples</b>					
Time 1	29.8	29.6	30.1	-0.5	0.8
Time 2	29.0	29.9	28.1	1.8	0.4
T1 and T2 Panel	18.3	18.8	17.9	0.9	0.6

<sup>a</sup>Response rates are computed as the number of completed interviews divided by the total number of eligible cases.

<sup>b</sup>Fathers in survey replicates 1 through 10 were eligible for telephone or in-person interviews, or “full effort.” Fathers in survey replicates 11 through 30 were eligible only for telephone interviews, or “partial effort.”

and after a referral from a local child support enforcement agency. In addition, the PFS program involved services provided directly to fathers (e.g., job search, skills training, peer support) (Abt Associates, 1997). These characteristics of the design and program intervention should have increased the level of contact with fathers over the study period and made it much easier to locate and interview fathers. In contrast, the sample design for the Survey of Wisconsin Works Families focuses on the resident mother, her entry into the W-2 program, and her eligibility for child support. We sampled fathers indirectly, through their attachment to a W-2 case and subsequent identification of their paternity of a focal child. The child support pass-through policy itself is probably only remotely associated with a father's recognition of the survey, and he does not reap any direct benefit from the policy under evaluation.

#### Characteristics of the Target Survey Samples and the Achieved Samples

Tables TR5.9 and TR5.10 show descriptive statistics of mothers and fathers in the Time 1 and Time 2 survey samples—all mothers and fathers who were eligible for interviews—and the achieved samples—the mothers and fathers with whom we completed interviews. Comparing characteristics of these different groups allows us to make an initial assessment of how well the respondents reflect the survey populations from which they were selected.<sup>27</sup>

We examine two types of achieved samples: all mothers and fathers who were in-scope and completed interviews, and the analysis sample, the subset of cases in which the mother was interviewed and met our definition of “resident parent” at the time of the interview and the father was interviewed and met our definition of “nonresident parent” at the time of the interview.<sup>28</sup> The mother was considered to be the resident parent of the focal child if, based on her survey responses, the child lived with her at least six months during the reference year or “usually” lived with her.<sup>29</sup> The father was included in the analysis sample as a nonresident parent unless he and the focal child lived together, apart from the mother, at least six months during the reference year. (Fathers are included in the analysis survey sample if mother-father-child lived together during the reference year.) The few cases in which the focal child was reported dead at the time of the interview also were excluded from the analysis sample. The analysis sample is thus the sample of survey participants used to test hypotheses outlined in the evaluation plan and discussed in Volume I.

The first three columns of Table TR5.9 show characteristics at W-2 entry of all mothers eligible for interviews at Time 1 (the survey sample), of all mothers who completed interviews (in-scope respondents), and of mothers who completed interviews and were resident parents of a focal child during 1998 (the analysis sample). The survey and achieved samples at Time 1 and Time 2 share similar characteristics. Achieved samples had slightly higher proportions of residents from Milwaukee County at the expense of other urban counties, and Hispanics and Native Americans were less likely to be represented than whites and African Americans. Respondents included a slightly higher proportion of mothers who had child support orders established at W-2 entry, and they were more likely to have paternity established for at

---

<sup>27</sup>See Technical Report 6 for analyses that compare respondents and nonrespondents.

<sup>28</sup>Although the sample design excluded cases in which someone other than the mother was the resident parent at W-2 entry, physical placement of the focal child may have changed after the sample was selected.

<sup>29</sup>The use of “usual residence” to define resident parent status for mothers was meant to cover situations in which the focal child was very young and may not have been born until after July 1998. In practice, a small number of cases were defined as a resident parent based on “usual residence,” but this included a few situations in which the child was several years old and had not lived with the mother for six months during the reference year.

**Table TR5.9**

**Initial Characteristics of Mothers in the Survey Samples and Achieved Samples at Time 1 and Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample <sup>a</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample <sup>b</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	2,884		2,362		2,295		2,873		2,354		2,242	
<b>Age</b>												
16–17	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
18–25	1,425	48.9	1,164	49.0	1,138	49.0	1,423	49.1	1,168	49.4	1,128	50.1
26–30	597	20.8	505	21.4	489	21.4	596	20.9	485	20.5	456	20.2
31 or older	860	30.2	692	29.6	667	29.6	853	30.0	701	30.1	658	29.7
<b>Race</b>												
White	834	25.3	708	26.3	681	26.0	827	25.2	703	26.1	652	25.3
African American	1,682	62.0	1,396	62.9	1,364	63.2	1,678	62.0	1,404	63.3	1,354	64.0
Hispanic	190	6.9	133	5.8	129	5.8	190	6.9	129	5.6	123	5.7
Native American	70	2.1	49	1.9	47	1.8	70	2.1	44	1.7	41	1.7
Asian	27	1.0	10	0.4	9	0.4	27	1.0	10	0.4	9	0.4
Other	1	0.0	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	80	2.7	65	2.7	64	2.7	80	2.7	64	2.8	63	2.9
<b>Education</b>												
Less than high school	1,449	52.6	1,167	51.9	1,128	51.7	1,447	52.7	1,157	51.4	1,082	50.6
High school	1,131	37.9	938	38.4	917	38.7	1,126	37.8	940	38.9	909	39.5
More than high school	304	9.5	257	9.7	250	9.7	300	9.4	257	9.7	251	9.9
<b>Language</b>												
English speaker	2,826	97.7	2,343	99.1	2,276	99.0	2,815	97.7	2,334	99.0	2,223	99.1
Non-English-speaker	58	2.3	19	0.9	19	1.0	58	2.3	20	1.0	19	1.0

**Table TR5.9, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample <sup>a</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample <sup>b</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Residential Location</b>												
Milwaukee County	2,030	75.6	1,676	76.0	1,638	76.4	2,026	75.7	1,681	76.5	1,620	77.4
Other urban counties	509	15.3	398	14.8	378	14.5	503	15.2	404	14.9	370	14.3
Rural counties and tribes	345	9.1	288	9.2	279	9.1	344	9.1	269	8.6	252	8.4
<b>Employment History<sup>c</sup></b>												
No UI-covered employment	523	20.1	409	19.5	403	19.8	522	20.1	387	18.5	368	18.6
1–4 quarters	1,111	42.3	900	42.0	871	41.9	1,108	42.4	903	42.3	854	42.1
5–7 quarters	807	25.9	671	26.2	653	26.2	804	25.8	688	26.9	664	27.1
All 8 quarters	443	11.7	382	12.2	368	12.2	439	11.7	376	12.3	356	12.3
<b>Earnings History<sup>c</sup></b>												
\$0	523	20.1	409	19.5	403	19.8	522	20.1	387	18.5	368	18.6
\$1–\$5,000	1,863	67.0	1,519	66.8	1,465	66.3	1,857	67.1	1,535	67.7	1,456	67.4
\$5,001–\$15,000	461	12.1	400	12.8	394	13.0	458	12.1	397	12.9	385	13.1
\$15,001 or more	37	0.8	34	0.9	33	0.9	36	0.8	35	0.9	33	0.9
<b>AFDC Receipt<sup>c</sup></b>												
None	616	13.1	488	12.6	477	12.7	612	13.1	490	12.8	467	12.8
1–18 months	1,012	33.1	831	32.8	805	32.7	1,009	33.1	829	32.8	786	32.5
19–24 months	1,256	53.9	1,043	54.7	1,013	54.6	1,252	53.9	1,035	54.5	989	54.7
<b>Number of Children</b>												
None	35	0.7	29	0.7	29	0.7	35	0.7	28	0.7	28	0.7
One	1,036	33.9	843	33.7	835	34.4	1,030	33.9	844	34.0	821	34.7
Two	823	28.3	678	28.5	661	28.4	819	28.2	687	28.8	662	29.1
Three or more	990	37.1	812	37.1	770	36.5	989	37.2	795	36.5	731	35.5

**Table TR5.9, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample <sup>a</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample <sup>b</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Age of Youngest Child</b>												
Unborn	311	9.5	253	9.4	246	9.4	310	9.5	249	9.3	233	9.2
0–2	1,395	49.0	1,156	49.9	1,124	49.9	1,389	49.0	1,131	48.7	1,085	49.0
3–5	505	17.8	410	17.5	403	17.7	504	17.8	418	18.0	403	18.3
6–12	556	19.3	451	19.1	433	18.9	553	19.2	457	19.4	429	19.0
12–18	117	4.4	92	4.1	89	4.1	117	4.4	99	4.6	92	4.5
<b>Focal Child’s Parentage</b>												
Legal father, unknown how	5	0.2	2	0.1	2	0.1	5	0.2	5	0.2	4	0.2
Nonmarital child	2,515	88.5	2,060	88.6	2,003	88.6	2,505	88.6	2,053	88.6	1,963	88.9
Marital child	364	11.3	300	11.4	290	11.3	363	11.3	296	11.2	275	10.9
<b>Number of Legal Fathers</b>												
No legal father	892	29.2	699	28.1	682	28.1	887	29.2	681	27.4	653	27.5
One	1,469	51.9	1,214	51.9	1,181	52.1	1,464	51.9	1,223	52.7	1,159	52.6
Two or more	523	18.9	449	20.0	432	19.8	522	18.9	450	19.9	430	20.0
<b>Child Support Order<sup>d</sup></b>												
No order	1,329	43.4	1,039	41.4	1,011	41.5	1,324	43.5	1,022	41.1	970	40.8
Has order	1,555	56.6	1,323	58.6	1,284	58.5	1,549	56.5	1,332	58.9	1,272	59.2
<b>Child Support Paid by All Nonresident Parents<sup>c</sup></b>												
\$0	1,928	66.2	1,543	64.8	1,501	65.0	1,921	66.3	1,534	64.6	1,471	64.9
\$1–\$999	450	16.5	385	17.3	371	17.1	446	16.4	384	17.3	354	16.8
\$1,000 or more	506	17.3	434	17.9	423	18.0	506	17.3	436	18.2	417	18.3

**Table TR5.9, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample <sup>a</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample <sup>b</sup>		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Research Group Assignment</b>												
Control	1,438	49.5	1,163	48.9	1,121	48.4	1,434	49.6	1,179	50.0	1,113	49.7
Experimental	1,446	50.5	1,199	51.1	1,174	51.6	1,439	50.5	1,175	50.0	1,129	50.3
<b>Case Type</b>												
AFDC	1,485	70.2	1,224	70.5	1,185	70.4	1,478	70.2	1,216	70.4	1,165	70.7
W-2	1,399	29.8	1,138	29.5	1,110	29.7	1,395	29.8	1,138	29.6	1,077	29.3
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment</b>												
W-2 Transition	264	8.9	210	8.5	201	8.3	262	8.8	201	8.2	185	7.9
Community Service Job	1,277	51.3	1,043	51.4	1,014	51.4	1,275	51.4	1,052	51.9	1,005	52.2
Caretaker of Newborn	307	8.9	251	8.8	243	8.9	304	8.8	244	8.5	230	8.4
Upper tier	1,036	31.0	858	31.3	837	31.4	1,032	31.0	857	31.4	822	31.5
<b>Quarter of Entry</b>												
4th quarter of 1997	1,321	54.2	1,071	53.4	1,037	53.2	1,316	54.2	1,071	53.8	1,014	53.4
1st quarter of 1998	946	36.4	795	37.4	776	37.6	942	36.4	783	36.9	757	37.4
2nd quarter of 1998	617	9.4	496	9.2	482	9.2	615	9.4	500	9.3	471	9.2

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>Of the 2,884 mothers in the Time 1 survey sample, 2,876 were deemed in-scope. The sample of 2,884 included two cases in which the resident mother was reported dead at interview and one case in which the sample member claimed to be the focal child's grandmother. In addition, 5 cases in the Time 1 survey sample were never fielded because either the mother or the focal child died before December 31, 1998.

<sup>b</sup>The Time 2 survey sample excludes 11 cases listed in the Time 1 survey sample: 6 cases in which the mother died before December 31, 1999, and 5 cases in which the focal child died before December 31, 1999.

<sup>c</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>d</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

**Table TR5.10**

**Initial Characteristics of Fathers in the Survey Samples and Achieved Samples at Time 1 and Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	1,936		643		575		2,130		696		608	
<b>Age</b>												
16–17	14	0.9	5	1.0	5	1.1	22	1.2	5	0.8	5	0.9
18–25	621	35.0	205	34.7	180	33.8	717	36.1	222	35.6	200	36.1
26–30	489	24.4	160	24.2	145	24.5	519	23.6	154	21.7	133	21.8
31 or older	802	39.3	272	40.1	244	40.5	859	38.5	313	41.9	269	41.1
Unknown	10	0.4	1	0.1	1	0.1	13	0.7	2	0.1	1	0.1
<b>Race</b>												
White	326	16.1	154	22.3	142	22.9	361	16.2	170	23.3	149	23.6
African American	774	41.5	226	37.0	199	36.4	882	42.7	246	36.2	224	37.6
Hispanic	95	5.1	21	3.1	18	3.0	108	5.4	22	3.1	19	3.1
Native American	32	1.7	11	1.9	9	1.8	35	1.7	10	1.6	8	1.5
Asian	7	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	702	35.3	231	35.7	207	35.9	737	33.8	248	35.8	208	34.2
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>												
No UI-covered employment	522	26.0	99	14.2	89	14.3	589	26.9	129	18.2	116	18.6
1–4 quarters	459	24.3	130	21.2	119	21.5	505	23.9	157	22.6	142	23.5
5–7 quarters	418	21.7	170	26.1	153	26.3	452	21.5	174	26.1	154	26.1
All 8 quarters	454	24.2	223	35.4	196	34.8	490	23.7	217	30.8	184	30.1
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	21	3.2	18	3.1	94	4.1	19	2.3	12	1.6



**Table TR5.10, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	522	26.0	99	14.2	89	14.3	589	26.9	129	18.2	116	18.6
\$1–\$5,000	718	38.5	229	37.7	208	38.1	789	38.2	255	38.9	227	39.3
\$5,001–\$15,000	405	21.3	190	29.1	165	27.9	441	20.9	199	28.2	176	28.1
\$15,001 or more	208	10.4	104	16.0	95	16.7	217	10.0	94	12.4	77	12.4
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	21	3.2	18	3.1	94	4.1	19	2.3	12	1.6
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>												
Legal father, unknown how	4	0.2	2	0.2	2	0.2	5	0.2	2	0.2	2	0.2
Paternity established	1,602	83.4	508	81.5	459	82.1	1,772	83.8	555	82.3	496	83.9
Father by marriage	330	16.4	133	18.3	114	17.7	353	16.0	139	17.5	110	15.9
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>												
None	15	0.6	10	1.3	10	1.5	23	0.9	14	1.7	14	2.0
One	1,247	60.6	408	61.1	373	62.6	1,387	61.7	437	60.0	385	60.5
Two	448	24.6	162	26.3	140	25.4	476	23.7	169	25.9	148	25.8
Three or more	226	14.2	63	11.2	52	10.5	244	13.8	76	12.5	61	11.8
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>												
Unborn	33	1.9	13	2.2	12	2.3	44	2.2	19	3.3	19	3.8
0–2	619	36.5	225	38.6	207	39.6	747	39.2	244	38.7	219	39.1
3–5	509	26.4	158	25.0	135	23.6	524	24.8	175	25.8	155	26.1
6–12	652	29.5	208	28.8	186	29.0	685	28.3	213	26.5	177	25.2
12–18	123	5.8	39	5.3	35	5.6	130	5.5	45	5.7	38	5.9
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent's Case</b>												
None	209	12.1	79	13.3	77	14.4	329	17.0	115	17.9	110	19.4
One	1,240	72.3	416	73.4	369	73.0	1,310	68.8	424	68.8	358	67.0
Two or more	487	15.5	148	13.3	129	12.6	491	14.2	157	13.3	140	13.6

**Table TR5.10, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>b</sup></b>												
No order	653	33.0	217	31.8	193	31.7	817	37.6	254	35.1	219	34.8
Has order	1,283	67.0	426	68.2	382	68.3	1,313	62.4	442	64.9	389	65.3
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	1,231	63.9	327	51.8	302	52.9	1,412	66.5	395	58.0	348	57.8
\$1–\$999	347	18.1	146	22.4	121	21.2	354	16.7	136	19.9	118	20.2
\$1,000 or more	358	18.0	170	25.9	152	25.9	364	16.8	165	22.1	142	22.0
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>												
Less than high school	911	47.9	286	45.5	254	45.5	1,018	48.5	317	47.6	275	47.6
High school	798	41.0	274	42.2	247	42.7	866	40.4	284	40.4	250	40.6
More than high school	227	11.1	83	12.3	74	11.9	246	11.1	95	12.0	83	11.8
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>												
Milwaukee County	1,324	72.2	390	64.6	345	64.4	1,460	72.5	426	65.9	375	66.1
Other urban counties	341	16.0	121	17.7	106	17.3	374	15.8	135	17.7	115	17.6
Rural counties and tribes	271	11.9	132	17.7	124	18.4	296	11.8	135	16.4	118	16.4
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>												
Control	966	49.0	325	50.4	292	50.3	1,068	49.5	341	49.2	295	48.6
Experimental	970	51.0	318	49.6	283	49.7	1,062	50.5	355	50.8	313	51.4
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>												
AFDC	1,072	71.0	324	66.2	287	65.5	1,131	68.8	358	67.4	315	67.9
W-2	864	29.0	319	33.8	288	34.5	999	31.2	338	32.6	293	32.1

**Table TR5.10, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample		Survey Sample		In-Scope Respondents		Survey Analysis Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>												
W-2 Transition	196	10.2	71	11.9	62	11.5	208	9.9	79	12.1	64	11.4
Community Service Job	811	48.2	237	43.3	217	44.4	892	48.2	255	43.4	227	43.5
Caretaker of Newborn	158	7.1	66	9.2	60	9.2	209	8.6	82	10.5	72	10.7
Upper tier	771	34.5	269	35.7	236	34.9	821	33.3	280	34.0	245	34.4
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>												
4th quarter of 1997	937	56.0	310	56.2	279	56.5	1,011	55.4	341	57.2	298	58.1
1st quarter of 1998	632	35.2	214	35.3	189	35.2	684	34.9	214	33.1	183	32.0
2nd quarter of 1998	367	8.8	119	8.5	107	8.3	435	9.7	141	9.8	127	10.0

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

least one child, but were somewhat less likely to receive child support. Since interviews were conducted only in English, it is not surprising that almost all respondents (99 percent) were listed as English speakers in the administrative data. There are almost no differences between the sample of all respondents and the analysis samples that exclude nonresident mothers.

Differences between the survey and achieved samples for fathers at Time 1 and Time 2 are greater than among mothers (Table TR5.10). Compared with the survey samples as a whole, the achieved samples of all respondents at Time 1 and Time 2 appear to represent a more advantaged group. Respondents included a higher proportion of fathers who were white and relatively fewer African Americans or Hispanics; over one-third of respondents were employed for all eight quarters prior to W-2 entry (compared with 24 percent in the target sample), with corresponding differences in earnings; and they were more likely to pay child support and to pay at least \$1,000 a year. Fathers in the achieved samples were somewhat more likely to be fathers by marriage than by paternity establishment, and their partners were less likely to have multiple legal fathers identified on the W-2 case record. The partners of fathers who responded also had more years of schooling, tended to be new entrants to W-2, and lived outside of Milwaukee at W-2 entry. At Time 2, respondents tended to be somewhat older than the sample as a whole and were more likely to have a child support order established with the resident parent of the focal child at W-2 entry.

The analysis samples exclude 68 and 88 fathers at Time 1 and Time 2, respectively, who it was learned were the resident parents of the focal child during the reference year. The exclusion of these fathers does not exacerbate, and sometimes lessens, the differences between the analysis and survey samples. The analysis sample includes a slightly higher proportion of men who were fathers by paternity, yielding a distribution of parentage that more closely mirrors the sample as a whole. The analysis sample also includes a higher proportion of newly identified paternities—i.e., cases in which there was not a legal father identified when the resident parent entered W-2.<sup>30</sup>

#### Characteristics of Respondents by Mode of Interview

Tables TR5.11 and TR5.12 show characteristics of mothers and fathers by the mode of interview. Mothers who completed interviews in person share several characteristics of a more disadvantaged population. At both Time 1 and Time 2, mothers who were interviewed in person had fewer years of schooling, less stable patterns of employment and lower earnings, and larger families. These mothers also had a longer history of AFDC receipt prior to entering W-2: over 60 percent of them had 19-24 months of AFDC receipt in the two-year period before entering W-2 as compared with about one-half of women who completed interviews by telephone. Mothers interviewed in person were more likely to have a child support order at W-2 entry, and a slightly larger share of women interviewed by telephone received payments of \$1,000 or more. The focal children of mothers interviewed in person were more likely to be nonmarital births, and a somewhat larger proportion of these women had more than one legal nonresident father identified on their W-2 case records.

Reflecting the distribution of W-2 cases and the concentration of in-person interviewing efforts, over 85 percent of women who completed interviews in person were living in Milwaukee at W-2 entry. About 10 percent were living in other urban counties and less than 5 percent resided in rural areas. In addition, women interviewed in person were much more likely to be African American and less likely to be

---

<sup>30</sup>While it seems counterintuitive that the survey of nonresident fathers includes cases in which there is “no legal father,” recall that these characteristics are measured at W-2 entry. Thus, cases in which a father was selected into the survey sample and the case record reports no legal father at W-2 entry reflects a recently identified paternity.

**Table TR5.11**

**Initial Characteristics of Mothers, by Mode of Interview at Time 1 and Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	2,362		1,640		722		2,354		1,498		856	
<b>Length of Interview (Minutes)</b>												
Mean (standard deviation)	46.5 (12.6)		47.1 (11.9)		45.2 (14.0)		45.8 (13.5)		45.6 (10.7)		46.1 (17.0)	
<b>Age</b>												
16–17	1	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
18–25	1,164	49.0	799	48.4	365	50.2	1,168	49.4	712	47.9	456	51.8
26–30	505	21.4	355	22.2	150	19.8	485	20.5	309	19.7	176	21.9
31 or older	692	29.6	486	29.5	206	29.9	701	30.1	477	32.4	224	26.3
<b>Race</b>												
White	708	26.3	595	32.1	113	14.2	703	26.1	546	32.6	157	15.9
African American	1,396	62.9	864	57.0	532	75.0	1,404	63.3	797	56.9	607	73.4
Hispanic	133	5.8	88	5.5	45	6.4	129	5.6	77	5.3	52	6.2
Native American	49	1.9	38	2.1	11	1.4	44	1.7	35	2.2	9	1.0
Asian	10	0.4	9	0.6	1	0.2	10	0.4	7	0.5	3	0.3
Other	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	65	2.7	45	2.6	20	2.8	64	2.8	36	2.5	28	3.2
<b>Education</b>												
Less than high school	1,167	51.9	741	47.6	426	60.7	1,157	51.4	649	44.8	508	61.9
High school	938	38.4	690	40.8	248	33.7	940	38.9	661	44.0	279	30.8
More than high school	257	9.7	209	11.6	48	5.6	257	9.7	188	11.3	69	7.3

**Table TR5.11, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Language</b>												
English speaker	2,343	99.1	1,628	99.2	715	98.9	2,334	99.0	1,487	99.1	847	98.9
Non-English-speaker	19	0.9	12	0.8	7	1.1	20	1.0	11	0.9	9	1.1
<b>Residential Location</b>												
Milwaukee County	1,676	76.0	1,065	70.6	611	87.2	1,681	76.5	986	71.2	695	85.1
Other urban counties	398	14.8	313	16.9	85	10.4	404	14.9	282	16.7	122	12.1
Rural counties and tribes	288	9.2	262	12.5	26	2.4	269	8.6	230	12.1	39	2.9
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>												
No UI-covered employment	409	19.5	274	18.8	135	21.0	387	18.5	240	18.2	147	19.0
1–4 quarters	900	42.0	609	41.3	291	43.6	903	42.3	535	39.7	368	46.6
5–7 quarters	671	26.2	477	27.0	194	24.5	688	26.9	454	28.1	234	25.0
All 8 quarters	382	12.2	280	12.9	102	10.9	376	12.3	269	14.0	107	9.4
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	409	19.5	274	18.8	135	21.0	387	18.5	240	18.2	147	19.0
\$1–\$5,000	1,519	66.8	1,044	66.4	475	67.6	1,535	67.7	946	65.8	589	70.7
\$5,001–\$15,000	400	12.8	297	13.9	103	10.6	397	12.9	289	15.0	108	9.6
\$15,001 or more	34	0.9	25	0.9	9	0.8	35	0.9	23	1.0	12	0.8
<b>AFDC Receipt</b>												
None	488	12.6	389	14.7	99	8.2	490	12.8	341	14.3	149	10.3
1–18 months	831	32.8	597	34.8	234	28.5	829	32.8	569	36.0	260	27.6
19–24 months	1,043	54.7	654	50.5	389	63.3	1,035	54.5	588	49.7	447	62.0

**Table TR5.11, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Number of Children</b>												
None	29	0.7	22	0.8	7	0.5	28	0.7	19	0.8	9	0.5
One	843	33.7	647	37.7	196	25.5	844	34.0	568	37.0	276	29.4
Two	678	28.5	468	28.6	210	28.2	687	28.8	455	30.2	232	26.6
Three or more	812	37.1	503	32.9	309	45.9	795	36.5	456	32.1	339	43.5
<b>Age of Youngest Child</b>												
Unborn	253	9.4	183	9.8	70	8.5	249	9.3	151	8.8	98	10.1
0–2	1,156	49.9	808	49.8	348	50.3	1,131	48.7	715	48.7	416	48.7
3–5	410	17.5	280	17.4	130	17.8	418	18.0	264	17.6	154	18.6
6–12	451	19.1	299	18.7	152	20.0	457	19.4	298	19.7	159	19.0
12–18	92	4.1	70	4.4	22	3.5	99	4.6	70	5.2	29	3.7
<b>Focal Child’s Parentage</b>												
Legal father, unknown how	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0	5	0.2	3	0.2	2	0.2
Nonmarital child	2,060	88.6	1,397	86.6	663	92.6	2,053	88.6	1,271	86.4	782	92.1
Marital child	300	11.4	241	13.3	59	7.4	296	11.2	224	13.4	72	7.7
<b>Number of Legal Fathers</b>												
None	699	28.1	499	28.9	200	26.6	681	27.4	444	28.4	237	25.9
One	1,214	51.9	845	52.3	369	51.2	1,223	52.7	783	53.4	440	51.5
Two or more	449	20.0	296	18.8	153	22.3	450	19.9	271	18.2	179	22.5
<b>Child Support Order<sup>b</sup></b>												
No order	1,039	41.4	744	42.9	295	38.4	1,022	41.1	656	41.7	366	40.1
Has order	1,323	58.6	896	57.1	427	61.6	1,332	58.9	842	58.3	490	59.9

**Table TR5.11, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Child Support Paid by All Nonresident Parents<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	1,543	64.8	1,063	64.5	480	65.4	1,534	64.6	958	63.7	576	65.8
\$1–\$999	385	17.3	257	16.5	128	18.7	384	17.3	236	16.6	148	18.4
\$1,000 or more	434	17.9	320	18.9	114	15.8	436	18.2	304	19.7	132	15.8
<b>Research Group</b>												
Control	1,163	48.9	813	49.5	350	47.6	1,179	50.0	749	50.2	430	49.7
Experimental	1,199	51.1	827	50.5	372	52.4	1,175	50.0	749	49.8	426	50.3
<b>Case Type</b>												
AFDC	1,224	70.5	800	67.9	424	75.9	1,216	70.4	721	67.2	495	75.4
W-2	1,138	29.5	840	32.1	298	24.1	1,138	29.6	777	32.8	361	24.6
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment</b>												
W-2 Transition	210	8.5	168	9.8	42	5.6	201	8.2	137	8.9	64	7.1
Community Service Job	1,043	51.4	656	46.9	387	60.6	1,052	51.9	603	47.2	449	59.4
Caretaker of Newborn	251	8.8	188	9.7	63	7.0	244	8.5	160	8.9	84	7.9
Upper tier	858	31.3	628	33.5	230	26.8	857	31.4	598	35.1	259	25.6
<b>Quarter of Entry</b>												
4th quarter of 1997	1,071	53.4	747	54.5	324	51.2	1,071	53.8	681	54.6	390	52.4
1st quarter of 1998	795	37.4	530	36.0	265	40.4	783	36.9	484	35.5	299	39.1
2nd quarter of 1998	496	9.2	363	9.6	133	8.4	500	9.3	333	9.9	167	8.5

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.



**Table TR5.12**

**Initial Characteristics of Fathers, by Mode of Interview at Time 1 and Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	643		537		106		696		561		135	
<b>Length of Interview (Minutes)</b>												
Mean (standard deviation)	39.5 (13.8)		39.3 (12.8)		40.8 (18.5)		37.0 (14.7)		37.7 (14.0)		34.3 (17.1)	
<b>Age</b>												
16–17	5	1.0	5	1.2	0	0.0	5	0.8	3	0.6	2	1.7
18–25	205	34.7	164	33.0	41	42.7	222	35.6	170	34.0	52	41.6
26–30	160	24.2	138	25.0	22	20.0	154	21.7	123	20.8	31	24.7
31 or older	272	40.1	229	40.7	43	37.3	313	41.9	263	44.5	50	32.0
Unknown	1	0.1	1	0.1	0	0.0	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0
<b>Race</b>												
White	154	22.3	151	26.4	3	2.0	170	23.3	156	27.0	14	9.5
African American	226	37.0	169	33.2	57	56.2	246	36.2	180	32.4	66	50.6
Hispanic	21	3.1	15	2.2	6	7.6	22	3.1	19	3.2	3	2.7
Native American	11	1.9	10	2.0	1	1.1	10	1.6	9	1.7	1	1.4
Unknown	231	35.7	192	36.2	39	33.1	248	35.8	197	35.8	51	35.9
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>												
No UI-covered employment	99	14.2	84	14.3	15	13.7	129	18.2	106	18.3	23	17.7
1–4 quarters	130	21.2	103	20.1	27	27.1	157	22.6	118	21.6	39	26.2
5–7 quarters	170	26.1	142	25.9	28	27.1	174	26.1	140	25.8	34	27.3
All 8 quarters	223	35.4	194	37.4	29	25.4	217	30.8	180	31.7	37	27.4
Unknown/missing SSN	21	3.2	14	2.5	7	6.7	19	2.3	17	2.6	2	1.4

**Table TR5.12, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	99	14.2	84	14.3	15	13.7	129	18.2	106	18.3	23	17.7
\$1–\$5,000	229	37.7	189	36.8	40	42.2	255	38.9	194	37.2	61	45.6
\$5,001–\$15,000	190	29.1	156	28.6	34	31.3	199	28.2	160	28.1	39	28.5
\$15,001 or more	104	16.0	94	17.9	10	6.1	94	12.4	84	13.9	10	6.8
Unknown/missing SSN	21	3.2	14	2.5	7	6.7	19	2.3	17	2.6	2	1.4
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>												
Legal father, unknown how	2	0.2	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.2	2	0.2	0	0.0
Paternity established	508	81.5	409	79.0	99	93.9	555	82.3	436	80.4	119	89.3
Father by marriage	133	18.3	126	20.8	7	6.1	139	17.5	123	19.3	16	10.7
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>												
None	10	1.3	10	1.6	0	0.0	14	1.7	14	2.2	0	0.0
One	408	61.1	341	61.7	67	58.4	437	60.0	350	59.7	87	61.2
Two	162	26.3	132	25.1	30	32.4	169	25.9	137	25.1	32	28.6
Three or more	63	11.2	54	11.6	9	9.3	76	12.5	60	13.0	16	10.3
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>												
Unborn	13	2.2	12	2.5	1	0.8	19	3.3	17	3.6	2	2.0
0–2	225	38.6	190	38.2	35	40.9	244	38.7	189	36.8	55	45.9
3–5	158	25.0	131	25.2	27	24.0	175	25.8	137	25.5	38	26.9
6–12	208	28.8	173	28.9	35	28.4	213	26.5	177	27.4	36	23.0
12–18	39	5.3	31	5.2	8	6.0	45	5.7	41	6.7	4	2.2
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent's Case</b>												
None	79	13.3	72	14.2	7	9.0	115	17.9	88	17.0	27	21.4
One	416	73.4	346	72.8	70	76.5	424	68.8	345	69.5	79	66.2
Two or more	148	13.3	119	13.1	29	14.6	157	13.3	128	13.5	29	12.5

**Table TR5.12, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>b</sup></b>												
No order	217	31.8	195	33.4	22	23.7	254	35.1	206	35.3	48	34.4
Has order	426	68.2	342	66.6	84	76.3	442	64.9	355	64.7	87	65.6
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>												
No child support paid	327	51.8	270	50.6	57	57.8	395	58.0	304	55.4	91	68.0
\$1–\$999	146	22.4	113	20.7	33	30.7	136	19.9	110	20.3	26	18.3
\$1,000 or more	170	25.9	154	28.7	16	11.5	165	22.1	147	24.3	18	13.7
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>												
Less than high school	286	45.5	218	41.5	68	65.3	317	47.6	245	45.6	72	54.8
High school	274	42.2	245	45.5	29	26.0	284	40.4	234	41.3	50	37.0
More than high school	83	12.3	74	13.1	9	8.7	95	12.0	82	13.0	13	8.2
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>												
Milwaukee County	390	64.6	297	60.0	93	87.6	426	65.9	313	60.3	113	87.0
Other urban counties	121	17.7	112	19.4	9	9.1	135	17.7	119	19.9	16	9.5
Rural counties and tribes	132	17.7	128	20.6	4	3.3	135	16.4	129	19.8	6	3.5
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>												
Control	325	50.4	262	48.0	63	62.1	341	49.2	271	48.0	70	53.5
Experimental	318	49.6	275	52.0	43	38.0	355	50.8	290	52.0	65	46.6
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>												
AFDC	324	66.2	259	64.5	65	74.5	358	67.4	280	66.4	78	71.1
W-2	319	33.8	278	35.5	41	25.5	338	32.6	281	33.6	57	28.9

**Table TR5.12, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person		All Respondents		By Telephone		In-Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>												
W-2 Transition	71	11.9	60	11.9	11	11.7	79	12.1	74	14.3	5	4.1
Community Service Job	237	43.3	187	41.1	50	54.1	255	43.4	187	39.8	68	57.0
Caretaker of Newborn	66	9.2	61	10.4	5	3.2	82	10.5	69	10.9	13	8.7
Upper tier	269	35.7	229	36.6	40	31.0	280	34.0	231	35.0	49	30.3
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>												
4th quarter of 1997	310	56.2	266	58.2	44	46.2	341	57.2	285	60.2	56	45.5
1st quarter of 1998	214	35.3	170	33.1	44	45.9	214	33.1	158	29.6	56	46.3
2nd quarter of 1998	119	8.5	101	8.6	18	7.9	141	9.8	118	10.2	23	8.2

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

white: at Time 1 and Time 2 about three-quarters of these mothers were African American and only about 15 percent were white. In contrast, nearly one-third of telephone respondents were white and less than 60 percent were African American.

The distribution of fathers' characteristics shows similar differences by mode of interview (Table TR5.12). Fathers who participated in person were slightly younger, were much more likely to be fathers by paternity, and tended to have younger children, especially at Time 2. There are no remarkable differences in the establishment of a child support order at W-2 entry, but fathers interviewed in person were less likely to be paying child support or tended to pay lower amounts. The partners of these fathers also had less schooling, were more likely to be living in Milwaukee at W-2 entry, and a larger share entered W-2 by transitioning from AFDC rather than as a new entrant. Finally, fathers who completed interviews in person had less stable employment patterns and lower earnings. About one-third of fathers interviewed by phone were employed for all eight quarters prior to the resident parent's entry into W-2, and almost one-fifth earned more than \$15,000.

#### Characteristics of Respondents, by Time of Participation

Analyses in Volume I report on survey respondents at Time 1 or at Time 2, but these data may represent different individuals, since some sample members responded only at Time 1 and others only at Time 2. Comparisons across these data represent, to some extent, changes in the composition of respondents. The analyses in this section assess differences among mothers and fathers who participated in only one survey and those who participated in both (the panel).

Table TR5.13 shows characteristics of mothers in the Time 1 survey sample, all Time 1 respondents, all Time 2 respondents, mothers who responded only at Time 1, only at Time 2, or at both Time 1 and Time 2. Because the mothers' survey samples at Time 1 and Time 2 are essentially identical, only the Time 1 target survey sample is shown.<sup>31</sup> The main differences between Time 1 and Time 2 respondents reflect changes in survey participation rather than the composition of the survey samples. Mothers who participated in only one survey, whether Time 1 or Time 2, differ from those in the survey sample as a whole in several characteristics. They were more likely to be African American or Hispanic and less likely to be white. A higher proportion of one-time-only participants had less than a high school education, had been employed less steadily prior to entering W-2, and had younger children. Since we were generally successful in completing interviews with sample members if they could be located, it is not surprising that mothers who participated in only one survey share characteristics that decreased the chances that we would find them. These included the absence of a child support order, the lack of any child support receipt from a nonresident father, and, at least at Time 1, no legal fathers established for any of the children on their W-2 case record. In addition, one-time-only participants were among those more apt to leave W-2 more quickly or to receive a cash grant for a relatively shorter period of time—i.e., new entrants to W-2 with no history or only a brief history of AFDC receipt. Contact information from CARES and KIDS was one of the most effective tracing tools, but these records were less likely to be updated with valid addresses, telephone numbers, or other useful data (e.g., corrected dates of birth) if the mother did not have a child support order, was not receiving child support payments, or was not receiving cash assistance from W-2.

In addition, Time-1-only respondents include a smaller share of mothers who lived in Milwaukee at W-2 entry and a larger proportion of women assigned to the experimental treatment. Women participating

---

<sup>31</sup>The Time 2 survey sample excludes 11 cases listed in the Time 1 sample: 6 cases in which the mother had died before December 31, 1999, and 5 cases in which the focal child had died.

**Table TR5.13**

**Initial Characteristics of Mothers Who Participated in Only One Survey or in Both Surveys (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	2,884		2,362		277		2,354		269		2,085	
<b>Age</b>												
16–17	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
18–25	1,425	48.9	1,164	49.0	141	48.9	1,168	49.4	145	52.9	1,023	49.0
26–30	597	20.8	505	21.4	61	23.5	485	20.5	41	16.0	444	21.1
31 or older	860	30.2	692	29.6	74	27.3	701	30.1	83	31.2	618	29.9
<b>Race</b>												
White	834	25.3	708	26.3	73	22.9	703	26.1	68	21.4	635	26.7
African American	1,682	62.0	1,396	62.9	163	63.1	1,404	63.3	171	66.4	1,233	62.9
Hispanic	190	6.9	133	5.8	21	7.7	129	5.6	17	6.3	112	5.6
Native American	70	2.1	49	1.9	12	3.9	44	1.7	7	2.9	37	1.6
Asian	27	1.0	10	0.4	1	0.4	10	0.4	0	0.0	10	0.5
Other	1	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	80	2.7	65	2.7	7	2.0	64	2.8	6	3.0	58	2.8
<b>Education</b>												
Less than high school	1,449	52.6	1,167	51.9	155	58.6	1,157	51.4	145	54.4	1,012	51.0
High school	1,131	37.9	938	38.4	101	34.5	940	38.9	103	38.1	837	39.0
More than high school	304	9.5	257	9.7	21	7.0	257	9.7	21	7.4	236	10.0
<b>Language</b>												
English speaker	2,826	97.7	2,343	99.1	271	97.2	2,334	99.0	262	96.8	2,072	99.3
Non-English-speaker	58	2.3	19	0.9	6	2.8	20	1.0	7	3.2	13	0.7

**Table TR5.13, continued**

	Survey Sample		Time 1				Time 2				Times 1 and 2	
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Residential Location</b>												
Milwaukee County	2,030	75.6	1,676	76.0	189	72.9	1,681	76.5	194	77.2	1,487	76.5
Other urban counties	509	15.3	398	14.8	44	14.0	404	14.9	50	15.0	354	14.9
Rural counties and tribes	345	9.1	288	9.2	44	13.2	269	8.6	25	7.8	244	8.6
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>												
No UI-covered employment	523	20.1	409	19.5	61	23.8	387	18.5	39	15.0	348	19.0
1–4 quarters	1,111	42.3	900	42.0	118	46.8	903	42.3	121	49.7	782	41.4
5–7 quarters	807	25.9	671	26.2	54	17.7	688	26.9	71	23.4	617	27.3
All 8 quarters	443	11.7	382	12.2	44	11.7	376	12.3	38	11.9	338	12.3
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	523	20.1	409	19.5	61	23.8	387	18.5	39	15.0	348	19.0
\$1–\$5,000	1,863	67.0	1,519	66.8	174	65.5	1,535	67.7	190	73.3	1,345	67.0
\$5,001–\$15,000	461	12.1	400	12.8	40	10.3	397	12.9	37	11.0	360	13.1
\$15,001 or more	37	0.8	34	0.9	2	0.4	35	0.9	3	0.7	32	0.9
<b>AFDC Receipt<sup>a</sup></b>												
None	616	13.1	488	12.6	64	14.3	490	12.8	66	16.2	424	12.3
1–18 months	1,012	33.1	831	32.8	97	34.8	829	32.8	95	34.6	734	32.5
19–24 months	1,256	53.9	1,043	54.7	116	50.9	1,035	54.5	108	49.3	927	55.1
<b>Number of Children</b>												
None	35	0.7	29	0.7	5	0.8	28	0.7	4	0.6	24	0.7
One	1,036	33.9	843	33.7	99	33.1	844	34.0	100	35.9	744	33.8
Two	823	28.3	678	28.5	70	24.9	687	28.8	79	27.5	608	29.0
Three or more	990	37.1	812	37.1	103	41.3	795	36.5	86	36.0	709	36.6

**Table TR5.13, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2					
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Age of Youngest Child</b>												
Unborn	311	9.5	253	9.4	40	13.5	249	9.3	36	13.2	213	8.9
0–2	1,395	49.0	1,156	49.9	146	54.6	1,131	48.7	121	43.8	1,010	49.3
3–5	505	17.8	410	17.5	34	11.3	418	18.0	42	15.3	376	18.3
6–12	556	19.3	451	19.1	50	18.2	457	19.4	56	20.8	401	19.2
12–18	117	4.4	92	4.1	7	2.5	99	4.6	14	6.9	85	4.3
<b>Focal Child’s Parentage</b>												
Legal father, unknown how	5	0.2	2	0.1	0	0.0	5	0.2	3	1.0	2	0.1
Nonmarital child	2,515	88.5	2,060	88.6	244	89.6	2,053	88.6	237	90.0	1,816	88.4
Marital child	364	11.3	300	11.4	33	10.4	296	11.2	29	9.0	267	11.5
<b>Number of Legal Fathers</b>												
None	892	29.2	699	28.1	102	34.9	681	27.4	84	29.1	597	27.2
One	1,469	51.9	1,214	51.9	131	47.9	1,223	52.7	140	54.4	1,083	52.5
Two or more	523	18.9	449	20.0	44	17.2	450	19.9	45	16.5	405	20.3
<b>Child Support Order<sup>b</sup></b>												
No order	1,329	43.4	1,039	41.4	147	48.5	1,022	41.1	130	45.5	892	40.5
Has order	1,555	56.6	1,323	58.6	130	51.5	1,332	58.9	139	54.5	1,193	59.5
<b>Child Support Paid by All Nonresident Parents<sup>a</sup></b>												
\$0	1,928	66.2	1,543	64.8	198	71.0	1,534	64.6	189	68.8	1,345	64.0
\$1–\$999	450	16.5	385	17.3	38	14.5	384	17.3	37	14.6	347	17.6
\$1,000 or more	506	17.3	434	17.9	41	14.5	436	18.2	43	16.5	393	18.4
<b>Research Group</b>												
Control	1,438	49.5	1,163	48.9	124	42.3	1,179	50.0	140	52.1	1,039	49.7
Experimental	1,446	50.5	1,199	51.1	153	57.7	1,175	50.0	129	47.9	1,046	50.3



**Table TR5.13, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2				Times 1 and 2	
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Case Type</b>												
AFDC	1,485	70.2	1,224	70.5	138	68.4	1,216	70.4	130	67.0	1,086	70.8
W-2	1,399	29.8	1,138	29.5	139	31.6	1,138	29.6	139	33.1	999	29.2
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment</b>												
W-2 Transition	264	8.9	210	8.5	26	8.9	201	8.2	17	6.5	184	8.4
Community Service Job	1,277	51.3	1,043	51.4	122	51.0	1,052	51.9	131	55.9	921	51.4
Caretaker of Newborn	307	8.9	251	8.8	32	10.2	244	8.5	25	6.8	219	8.7
Upper tier	1,036	31.0	858	31.3	97	30.0	857	31.4	96	30.8	761	31.5
<b>Quarter of Entry</b>												
4th quarter of 1997	1,321	54.2	1,071	53.4	123	51.2	1,071	53.8	123	54.4	948	53.7
1st quarter of 1998	946	36.4	795	37.4	98	39.9	783	36.9	86	35.5	697	37.1
2nd quarter of 1998	617	9.4	496	9.2	56	8.9	500	9.3	60	10.1	440	9.2

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

only at Time 2 tended to be somewhat younger than the target sample, and over one-half were under age 25 at W-2 entry.

In contrast, resident mothers who participated at Time 1 and Time 2, while differing much less markedly from the survey sample, have characteristics that suggest greater residential stability, the resources to maintain uninterrupted telephone service, and an increased likelihood of obtaining updated information in CARES or KIDS. These include more years of schooling, at least one legal father identified on the W-2 case record, a child support order at W-2 entry, and a history of at least some child support receipt prior to entering W-2. The panel data also include only a small fraction of mothers who were listed as non-English-speakers on the administrative record.

Unlike the mothers' samples, the fathers' survey sample at Time 2 included 201 new cases that were not part of the survey sample at Time 1. These are cases in which we were able to identify the establishment of a legal father for a focal child between January 1, 1998, and December 31, 1999.<sup>32</sup> Thus, characteristics of fathers who responded only at Time 2 may reflect compositional differences in the survey sample as well as our ability to locate and elicit cooperation from sample members.

Table TR5.14 compares the characteristics of fathers in the Time 1 survey sample and fathers who were added to the sample at Time 2. The addition of these newly identified fathers affected the composition of the sample at Time 2 by making it younger, including a larger proportion of fathers who were African American or Hispanic, and increasing the share of fathers with minimal economic resources as well as the number without a child support order or not paying child support. Almost one-third of fathers added to the sample at Time 2 did not have any employment in UI-covered jobs or report any UI earnings during the eight quarters prior to October 1, 1997. Their families were smaller and had younger children, over two-thirds having a child under age 3. The partners of the 201 fathers added to the sample had fewer years of schooling, were slightly more likely to live in Milwaukee at W-2 entry, and were disproportionately new entrants to W-2.

Compared to all respondents at either Time 1 or Time 2, fathers who participated in only one survey (Table TR5.15) comprised a larger share of African American fathers, had younger families, and were less likely to pay child support to the resident parent. The partners of these fathers were somewhat more likely to be living in Milwaukee upon entry to W-2 and less likely to have families with more than one legally identified father. The partners of fathers who responded only at Time 1 also were more likely to be assigned to the control group.

Like the mothers represented in the panel data, fathers who participated at Time 1 and Time 2 share characteristics that suggest a more stable population with more economic resources or with ties to the child support system that make it easier to locate them. Fathers in the panel tended to be older, had more stable employment histories and higher earnings, were more likely to be the father of the focal child by marriage rather than paternity, and relatively fewer of them were African American or Hispanic. Although these men were no more or less likely to have a child support order for the resident parent, a larger proportion of them were paying child support. Only about one-third of fathers in the Time 1 survey sample were paying child support prior to W-2 entry, as compared to one-half of fathers represented in the panel data. In addition, the partners of these fathers had more years of schooling, tended to live outside of Milwaukee, and were new entrants to W-2.

---

<sup>32</sup>A net increase of 194 cases in the Time 2 survey sample occurred because 5 cases in the Time 1 sample were determined to be out-of-scope and not part of the survey population.

**Table TR5.14**  
**Initial Characteristics of Fathers in the Time 1 Survey Sample and Those Who Became Eligible for the Survey at Time 2 (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1 Survey Sample		Fathers Added to the Survey Sample at Time 2		Time 2 Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	1,936		201		2,130	
<b>Age</b>						
16–17	14	0.9	8	3.8	22	1.3
18–25	621	35.0	99	47.9	717	36.1
26–30	489	24.4	31	15.1	519	23.6
31 or older	802	39.3	60	30.5	859	38.5
Unknown	10	0.4	3	2.6	13	0.6
<b>Race</b>						
White	326	16.1	36	17.0	361	16.2
African American	774	41.5	112	55.6	882	42.7
Hispanic	95	5.1	13	7.2	108	5.4
Native American	32	1.7	3	2.0	35	1.7
Asian	7	0.4	0	0.0	7	0.3
Unknown	702	35.3	37	18.2	737	33.8
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>						
No UI-covered employment	522	26.0	68	35.4	589	26.9
1–4 quarters	459	24.3	48	21.0	505	23.9
5–7 quarters	418	21.7	37	20.1	452	21.5
All 8 quarters	454	24.2	36	17.6	490	23.7
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	12	5.8	94	4.1
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>						
\$0	522	26.0	68	35.4	589	26.9
\$1–\$5,000	718	38.5	76	37.1	789	38.2
\$5,001–\$15,000	405	21.3	36	16.4	441	20.9
\$15,001 or more	208	10.4	9	5.3	217	10.0
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	12	5.8	94	4.1
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>						
Legal father, unknown how	4	0.2	1	0.5	5	0.2
Paternity established	1,602	83.4	177	88.2	1,772	83.8
Father by marriage	330	16.4	23	11.3	353	16.0
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>						
None	15	0.6	8	3.1	23	0.9
One	1,247	60.6	144	71.4	1,387	61.7
Two	448	24.6	30	15.3	476	23.7
Three or more	226	14.2	19	10.2	244	13.8

**Table TR5.14, continued**

	Time 1 Survey Sample		Fathers Added to the Survey Sample at Time 2		Time 2 Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>						
Unborn	33	1.9	11	5.0	44	2.2
0–2	619	36.5	131	65.9	747	39.2
3–5	509	26.4	16	9.6	524	24.8
6–12	652	29.5	35	16.8	685	28.3
12–18	123	5.8	8	2.7	130	5.5
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent’s Case</b>						
None	209	12.1	122	64.4	329	17.0
One	1,240	72.3	72	33.8	1,310	68.8
Two or more	487	15.5	7	1.8	491	14.2
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>b</sup></b>						
No order	653	33.0	166	81.3	817	37.6
Has order	1,283	67.0	35	18.7	1,313	62.4
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>						
\$0	1,231	63.9	185	90.9	1,412	66.5
\$1–\$999	347	18.1	9	4.8	354	16.7
\$1,000 or more	358	18.0	7	4.3	364	16.8
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>						
Less than high school	911	47.9	110	54.0	1,018	48.5
High school	798	41.0	72	35.5	866	40.4
More than high school	227	11.1	19	10.5	246	11.1
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>						
Milwaukee County	1,324	72.2	140	74.5	1,460	72.5
Other urban counties	341	16.0	36	15.1	374	15.8
Rural counties and tribes	271	11.9	25	10.4	296	11.8
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>						
Control	966	49.0	105	52.7	1,068	49.5
Experimental	970	51.0	96	47.3	1,062	50.5
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>						
AFDC	1,072	71.0	64	48.3	1,131	68.8
W-2	864	29.0	137	51.7	999	31.2

**Table TR5.14, continued**

	Time 1 Survey Sample		Fathers Added to the Survey Sample at Time 2		Time 2 Survey Sample	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>						
W-2 Transition	196	10.2	12	6.3	208	9.9
Community Service Job	811	48.2	85	49.3	892	48.2
Caretaker of Newborn	158	7.1	51	22.2	209	8.6
Upper tier	771	34.5	53	22.1	821	33.3
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>						
4th quarter of 1997	937	56.0	76	48.4	1,011	55.4
1st quarter of 1998	632	35.2	57	33.4	684	34.9
2nd quarter of 1998	367	8.8	68	18.2	435	9.7

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

**Table TR5.15**

**Initial Characteristics of Fathers Who Participated in Only One Survey or in Both Surveys (Weighted Percentages)**

	Time 1						Time 2						Times 1 and 2	
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 2			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	1,936		643		217		2,130		696		270		426	
<b>Age</b>														
16–17	14	0.9	5	1.0	2	1.5	22	1.2	5	0.8	2	0.9	3	0.8
18–25	621	35.0	205	34.7	76	35.8	717	36.1	222	35.6	93	37.9	129	34.0
26–30	489	24.4	160	24.2	64	26.8	519	23.6	154	21.7	58	19.9	96	22.8
31 or older	802	39.3	272	40.1	75	35.8	859	38.5	313	41.9	116	41.2	197	42.3
Unknown	10	0.4	1	0.1	0	0.0	13	0.7	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
<b>Race</b>														
White	326	16.1	154	22.3	37	15.6	361	16.2	170	23.3	53	19.5	117	25.8
African American	774	41.5	226	37.0	90	43.8	882	42.7	246	36.2	110	40.3	136	33.6
Hispanic	95	5.1	21	3.1	10	4.2	108	5.4	22	3.1	11	3.9	11	2.6
Native American	32	1.7	11	1.9	5	2.5	35	1.7	10	1.6	4	1.7	6	1.6
Asian	7	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Unknown	702	35.3	231	35.7	75	34.0	737	33.8	248	35.8	92	34.7	156	36.5
<b>Employment History<sup>a</sup></b>														
No UI-covered employment	522	26.0	99	14.2	30	13.5	589	26.9	129	18.2	60	23.9	69	14.5
1–4 quarters	459	24.3	130	21.2	53	26.1	505	23.9	157	22.6	80	28.5	77	18.8
5–7 quarters	418	21.7	170	26.1	55	22.4	452	21.5	174	26.1	59	23.3	115	28.0
All 8 quarters	454	24.2	223	35.4	67	32.2	490	23.7	217	30.8	61	21.2	156	36.9
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	21	3.2	12	5.8	94	4.1	19	2.3	10	3.2	9	1.8

**Table TR5.15, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2							
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Earnings History<sup>a</sup></b>														
\$0	522	26.0	99	14.2	30	13.5	589	26.9	129	18.2	60	23.9	69	14.5
\$1–\$5,000	718	38.5	229	37.7	87	38.8	789	38.2	255	38.9	113	41.8	142	37.1
\$5,001–\$15,000	405	21.3	190	29.1	58	26.4	441	20.9	199	28.2	67	24.7	132	30.4
\$15,001 or more	208	10.4	104	16.0	30	15.5	217	10.0	94	12.4	20	6.5	74	16.2
Unknown/missing SSN	83	3.9	21	3.2	12	5.8	94	4.1	19	2.3	10	3.2	9	1.8
<b>Focal Child's Parentage</b>														
Legal father, unknown how	4	0.2	2	0.2	0	0.0	5	0.2	2	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.3
Paternity established	1,602	83.4	508	81.5	178	82.5	1,772	83.8	555	82.3	225	84.3	330	81.0
Father by marriage	330	16.4	133	18.3	39	17.5	353	16.0	139	17.5	45	15.7	94	18.7
<b>Number of Children with Resident Parent</b>														
None	15	0.6	10	1.3	1	0.3	23	0.9	14	1.7	5	1.5	9	1.9
One	1,247	60.6	408	61.1	140	60.8	1,387	61.7	437	60.0	169	58.0	268	61.3
Two	448	24.6	162	26.3	55	26.5	476	23.7	169	25.9	62	25.3	107	26.2
Three or more	226	14.2	63	11.2	21	12.4	244	13.8	76	12.5	34	15.3	42	10.6
<b>Age of Youngest Child with Resident Parent</b>														
Unborn	33	1.9	13	2.2	5	2.0	44	2.2	19	3.3	11	4.8	8	2.3
0–2	619	36.5	225	38.6	80	40.9	747	39.2	244	38.7	99	40.6	145	37.5
3–5	509	26.4	158	25.0	50	23.5	524	24.8	175	25.8	67	25.9	108	25.7
6–12	652	29.5	208	28.8	68	27.5	685	28.3	213	26.5	73	21.7	140	29.5
12–18	123	5.8	39	5.3	14	6.1	130	5.5	45	5.7	20	7.0	25	5.0

**Table TR5.15, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2							
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 2		Times 1 and 2	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Number of Legal Fathers on Resident Parent's Case</b>														
None	209	12.1	79	13.3	26	12.9	329	17.0	115	17.9	62	24.7	53	13.5
One	1,240	72.3	416	73.4	148	75.7	1,310	68.8	424	68.8	156	63.5	268	72.2
Two or more	487	15.5	148	13.3	43	11.4	491	14.2	157	13.3	52	11.8	105	14.3
<b>Child Support Order with Resident Parent<sup>b</sup></b>														
No order	653	33.0	217	31.8	77	31.2	817	37.6	254	35.1	114	39.8	140	32.1
Has order	1,283	67.0	426	68.2	140	68.8	1,313	62.4	442	64.9	156	60.2	286	67.9
<b>Child Support Paid to Resident Parent<sup>a</sup></b>														
\$0	1,231	63.9	327	51.8	124	57.0	1,412	66.5	395	58.0	192	71.8	203	49.1
\$1-\$999	347	18.1	146	22.4	48	20.7	354	16.7	136	19.9	38	14.8	98	23.2
\$1,000 or more	358	18.0	170	25.9	45	22.2	364	16.8	165	22.1	40	13.4	125	27.7
<b>Education of Resident Parent</b>														
Less than high school	911	47.9	286	45.5	100	48.4	1,018	48.5	317	47.6	131	53.1	186	44.0
High school	798	41.0	274	42.2	91	40.7	866	40.4	284	40.4	101	36.5	183	43.0
More than high school	227	11.1	83	12.3	26	11.0	246	11.1	95	12.0	38	10.4	57	13.0
<b>Location of Resident Parent</b>														
Milwaukee County	1,324	72.2	390	64.6	148	69.1	1,460	72.5	426	65.9	184	71.3	242	62.3
Other urban counties	341	16.0	121	17.7	36	16.7	374	15.8	135	17.7	50	17.1	85	18.2
Rural counties and tribes	271	11.9	132	17.7	33	14.2	296	11.8	135	16.4	36	11.6	99	19.5
<b>Research Group of Resident Parent</b>														
Control	966	49.0	325	50.4	117	52.2	1,068	49.5	341	49.2	133	48.7	208	49.5
Experimental	970	51.0	318	49.6	100	47.8	1,062	50.5	355	50.8	137	51.3	218	50.5



**Table TR5.15, continued**

	Time 1						Time 2						Times 1 and 2	
	Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 1		Survey Sample		All Respondents		Only at Time 2			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Case Type of Resident Parent</b>														
AFDC	1,072	71.0	324	66.2	111	67.0	1,131	68.8	358	67.4	145	69.9	213	65.8
W-2	864	29.0	319	33.8	106	33.0	999	31.2	338	32.6	125	30.1	213	34.2
<b>Initial W-2 Assignment of Resident Parent</b>														
W-2 Transition	196	10.2	71	11.9	18	8.3	208	9.9	79	12.1	26	9.6	53	13.8
Community Service Job	811	48.2	237	43.3	91	48.0	892	48.2	255	43.4	109	47.2	146	40.9
Caretaker of Newborn	158	7.1	66	9.2	14	6.0	209	8.6	82	10.5	30	9.9	52	10.8
Upper tier	771	34.5	269	35.7	94	37.8	821	33.3	280	34.0	105	33.2	175	34.6
<b>Quarter of Resident Parent's Entry</b>														
4th quarter of 1997	937	56.0	310	56.2	99	55.2	1,011	55.4	341	57.2	130	57.8	211	56.7
1st quarter of 1998	632	35.2	214	35.3	75	36.5	684	34.9	214	33.1	75	30.6	139	34.7
2nd quarter of 1998	367	8.8	119	8.5	43	8.3	435	9.7	141	9.8	65	11.6	76	8.6

**Notes:** All characteristics measured at W-2 entry unless otherwise noted. See Technical Report 1 for a definition of W-2 entry.

<sup>a</sup>In the twelve months prior to October 1, 1997.

<sup>b</sup>As of October 1, 1997.

## Weighting<sup>33</sup>

Analyses of survey data were weighted to adjust for differential rates of assignment over the study period (see Sample Stratification, earlier in this report), the disproportionate stratification of the sample, and nonresponse bias. Because changes in assignment rates would affect the composition of the sample and alter the probabilities of selection across cases entering W-2 at different times, the final survey sample is weighted to adjust for these differential assignment rates.

The original survey sample of 3,000 resident mothers was stratified disproportionately to ensure sufficient numbers of cases in upper tiers of W-2 and cases that were new to W-2. The survey sampling weights adjust for this stratification so that analyses of survey data can be used to generalize to the whole population. Because the selection of nonresident fathers was also affected by this disproportionate stratification, these weights are also used to adjust the fathers' survey sample. In addition, we only sampled one legal father per W-2 case, even though some cases include more than one legally identified nonresident father. Thus, a father's chances of being included in the survey sample are also affected by the number of children with whom he is identified and the number of other children on the case record. The final sampling weight for the fathers' survey data adjusts for the differential rate of assignment of the resident parent, the disproportionate stratification by case type and initial tier of placement, and the ratio of the number of children of the selected father to the total number of children on the resident mother's W-2 case record.

Weights to correct for nonresponse bias were developed for the mothers' and fathers' survey data and are discussed in Technical Report 6. The final weights used for analyses of survey data are the product of the sampling and nonresponse weights.

## Conclusion

The Survey of Wisconsin Works Families was designed to supplement core administrative databases to test hypotheses for evaluation of the Wisconsin Child Support Demonstration. As such, its content and design were governed in large part by the goals of that evaluation: to ascertain the effects of child support policy reform on families participating in W-2 and to collect data that were not available in administrative sources or were incompletely recorded there. Nonetheless, the breadth of the survey's content and the inclusion of mothers *and* fathers in the sample design permit analyses of a wide range of policy-relevant outcomes and make a significant contribution to a small but growing body of data on nonresident fathers and their family experiences.

How well has the survey accomplished its goals? By one standard, it performed as well or better than many other comparable studies. We succeeded in interviewing over 80 percent of the mothers in the sample at Time 1 and Time 2, for an overall panel response rate of 73 percent. The completion rates for fathers, although much lower, are comparable to those achieved in other studies with similar designs and are significantly higher among a representative subsample. Further substantive analyses, and comparisons with nationally representative studies or surveys of low-income populations in other states, are necessary to more fully evaluate the utility of these data.

---

<sup>33</sup>Technical Report 4 discusses the construction of sampling weights for the survey and administrative data.

**Appendix Table TR5.1**  
**Final Disposition of Mothers' Time 1 Survey Sample, by Experimental/Control Status**

Disposition	All Mothers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		1,511		1,489	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	2,876		1,441		1,435	
<u>Interviewed</u>						
Completed	2,362	82.1	1,199	83.2	1,163	81.0
Partially completed	54	1.9	21	1.5	33	2.3
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>						
Refusals	94	3.3	44	3.1	50	3.5
Persistently unavailable	44	1.5	22	1.5	22	1.5
No longer at address/phone	33	1.1	14	1.0	19	1.3
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>						
Messages only/no address or phone	35	1.2	21	1.5	14	1.0
Answering machine/no answer	55	1.9	29	2.0	26	1.8
<u>Not Located</u>						
No location information <sup>a</sup>	18	0.6	9	0.6	9	0.6
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>b</sup>	119	4.1	53	3.7	66	4.6
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>						
Language barrier	34	1.2	18	1.2	16	1.1
Too ill/disabled to participate	3	0.1	0	0.0	3	0.2
Incarcerated	22	0.8	9	0.6	13	0.9
Not fielded <sup>c</sup>	1	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
Not pursued in error <sup>d</sup>	2	0.1	2	0.1	0	0.0
Other nonresponse	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	124		70		54	
Not in research population	100	80.6	55	78.6	45	83.3
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	6.5	5	7.1	3	5.6
CARES confidential case	6	4.8	3	4.3	3	5.6
Selected focal child not resident parent's child <sup>e</sup>	3	2.4	3	4.3	0	0.0
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No legal father identified/not in sample	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

**Appendix Table TR5.1, continued**

Disposition	All Mothers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Deceased</u>						
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	1.6	1	1.4	1	1.9
Resident parent reported dead at interview	2	1.6	1	1.4	1	1.9
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	2.4	2	2.9	1	1.9

<sup>a</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>b</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>e</sup>Includes 1 case in which the respondent identified herself as the child's grandmother but the relationship was not confirmed by CARES.

**Appendix Table TR5.2**  
**Final Disposition of Fathers' Time 1 Survey Sample, by Experimental/Control Status**

Disposition	All Fathers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		1,511		1,489	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	1,926		965		961	
<u>Interviewed</u>						
Completed	643	33.4	318	33.0	325	33.8
Partially completed	61	3.2	35	3.6	26	2.7
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>						
Refusals	112	5.8	57	5.9	55	5.7
Persistently unavailable	64	3.3	32	3.3	32	3.3
No longer at address/phone	73	3.8	35	3.6	38	4.0
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>						
Messages only/no address or phone	63	3.3	31	3.2	32	3.3
Answering machine/no answer	90	4.7	45	4.7	45	4.7
<u>Not Located</u>						
No location information <sup>a</sup>	185	9.6	103	10.7	82	8.5
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>b</sup>	421	21.9	201	20.8	220	22.9
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>						
Language barrier	19	1.0	10	1.0	9	0.9
Too ill/disabled to participate	6	0.3	2	0.2	4	0.4
Incarcerated	171	8.9	88	9.1	83	8.6
Not fielded <sup>c</sup>	8	0.4	5	0.5	3	0.3
Not pursued in error <sup>d</sup>	5	0.3	3	0.3	2	0.2
Other nonresponse <sup>e</sup>	5	0.3	0	0.0	5	0.5
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	1,074		546		528	
Not in research population	100	9.3	55	10.1	45	8.5
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	0.7	5	0.9	3	0.6
CARES confidential case	6	0.6	3	0.5	3	0.6
Selected focal child not resident parent's child	2	0.2	2	0.4	0	0.0
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	5	0.5	2	0.4	3	0.6
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	5	0.5	3	0.5	2	0.4
No legal father identified/not in sample	912	84.9	456	83.5	456	86.4

**Appendix Table TR5.2, continued**

Disposition	All Fathers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Deceased</u>						
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
Resident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	21	2.0	12	2.2	9	1.7
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	10	0.9	5	0.9	5	0.9
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.2

<sup>a</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>b</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>e</sup>Includes 3 cases in which the respondent claimed not to be the focal child's father, and 2 cases in which we did not pursue an interview with the father because the mother expressed fear for her safety or the safety of her children.

**Appendix Table TR5.3**  
**Final Disposition of Mothers' Time 2 Survey Sample, by Experimental/Control Status**

Disposition	All Mothers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		1,511		1,489	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	2,871		1,437		1,434	
<u>Interviewed</u>						
Completed	2,354	82.0	1,175	81.8	1,179	82.2
Partially completed	20	0.7	10	0.7	10	0.7
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>						
Refusals	82	2.9	30	2.1	52	3.6
Persistently unavailable	39	1.4	16	1.1	23	1.6
No longer at address/phone	9	0.3	5	0.3	4	0.3
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>						
Messages only/no address or phone	48	1.7	33	2.3	15	1.0
Answering machine/no answer	27	0.9	13	0.9	14	1.0
<u>Not Located</u>						
No location information <sup>a</sup>	39	1.4	18	1.3	21	1.5
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>b</sup>	178	6.2	92	6.4	86	6.0
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>						
Language barrier	27	0.9	18	1.3	9	0.6
Too ill/disabled to participate	1	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0
Incarcerated	29	1.0	17	1.2	12	0.8
Not fielded <sup>c</sup>	13	0.5	7	0.5	6	0.4
Not pursued in error <sup>d</sup>	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Fielded with error <sup>e</sup>	5	0.2	2	0.1	3	0.2
Other nonresponse	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	129		74		55	
Not in research population	100	77.5	55	74.3	45	81.8
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	6.2	5	6.8	3	5.5
CARES confidential case	6	4.7	3	4.1	3	5.5
Selected focal child not resident parent's child <sup>f</sup>	3	2.3	3	4.1	0	0.0
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No legal father identified/not in sample	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

**Appendix Table TR5.3, continued**

Disposition	All Mothers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Deceased</u>						
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	1.6	1	1.4	1	1.8
Resident parent died before 12/31/1999	4	3.1	2	2.7	2	3.6
Resident parent reported dead at interview	1	0.8	1	1.4	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	2.3	2	2.7	1	1.8
Focal child died before 12/31/1999	2	1.6	2	2.7	0	0.0

<sup>a</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>b</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>e</sup>Cases in which a different focal child was inadvertently selected at Time 2.

<sup>f</sup>Includes 1 case in which the respondent identified herself as a relation other than biological or adoptive mother of the focal child, but this was not confirmed by CARES.



**Appendix Table TR5.4**  
**Final Disposition of Fathers' Time 2 Survey Sample, by Experimental/Control Status**

Disposition	All Fathers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Cases</b>	3,000		1,511		1,489	
<b>In-Scope (Eligible) Cases</b>	2,123		1,058		1,065	
<u>Interviewed</u>						
Completed	696	32.8	355	33.6	341	32.0
Partially completed	18	0.8	9	0.9	9	0.8
<u>Contacted but Not Interviewed</u>						
Refusals	89	4.2	44	4.2	45	4.2
Persistently unavailable	123	5.8	61	5.8	62	5.8
No longer at address/phone	25	1.2	11	1.0	14	1.3
<u>Located but Not Contacted</u>						
Messages only/no address or phone	62	2.9	28	2.6	34	3.2
Answering machine/no answer	123	5.8	59	5.6	64	6.0
<u>Not Located</u>						
No location information <sup>a</sup>	334	15.7	166	15.7	168	15.8
Bad telephone number and/or address <sup>b</sup>	439	20.7	220	20.8	219	20.6
<u>Other Reasons for No Interview</u>						
Language barrier	15	0.7	7	0.7	8	0.8
Too ill/disabled to participate	3	0.1	2	0.2	1	0.1
Incarcerated	168	7.9	83	7.8	85	8.0
Not fielded <sup>c</sup>	18	0.8	6	0.6	12	1.1
Not pursued in error <sup>d</sup>	4	0.2	4	0.4	0	0.0
Fielded with error <sup>e</sup>	1	0.0	1	0.1	0	0.0
Other nonresponse <sup>f</sup>	5	0.2	2	0.2	3	0.3
<b>Out-of-Scope (Ineligible) Cases</b>	877		453		424	
Not in research population	100	11.4	55	12.1	45	10.6
W-2 entry date after 7/8/1998	8	0.9	5	1.1	3	0.7
CARES confidential case	6	0.7	3	0.7	3	0.7
Selected focal child not resident parent's child	2	0.2	2	0.4	0	0.0
Nonresident parent in good-cause case 12/31/1998	6	0.7	3	0.7	3	0.7
Nonresident parent was minor 1/1/1999	1	0.1	1	0.2	0	0.0
No legal father identified/not in sample	715	81.5	361	79.7	354	83.5

**Appendix Table TR5.4, continued**

Disposition	All Fathers		Experimental Group		Control Group	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Deceased</u>						
Resident parent died before 12/31/1998	2	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
Resident parent died before 12/31/1999	4	0.5	2	0.4	2	0.5
Resident parent reported dead at interview	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1998	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nonresident parent died before 12/31/1999	21	2.4	12	2.6	9	2.1
Nonresident parent reported dead at interview	7	0.8	4	0.9	3	0.7
Focal child died before 12/31/1998	3	0.3	2	0.4	1	0.2
Focal child died before 12/31/1999	2	0.2	2	0.4	0	0.0

<sup>a</sup>Cases not attempted because we had no information or address was a post office box, or person was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>b</sup>Includes some cases where the address was assumed to be good but was outside the zone for in-person interviews.

<sup>c</sup>Cases not included in the fieldwork because we believed they were ineligible at the time of the survey.

<sup>d</sup>Cases not pursued by interviewers because they were incorrectly believed to be ineligible.

<sup>e</sup>Cases in which a different focal child was inadvertently selected at Time 2.

<sup>f</sup>Includes 1 case in which the respondent claimed not to be the focal child's father, and 4 cases in which we did not pursue an interview with the father because the mother expressed fear for her safety or the safety of her children.

## References

- Abt Associates, Inc. 1997. *Surveys of Custodial and Noncustodial Parents for the Parents' Fair Share (PFS) Demonstration: Methodological Report*. Prepared for Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation. Cambridge, MA.
- Bartfeld, Judi. 1991. "Parent Survey 2: Field Report." Child Support Demonstration Project, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI.
- Cantor, David, and Patricia Cunningham. 1999. "Methods for Obtaining High Response Rates in Telephone Surveys." Paper presented at the Workshop on Data Collection on Low Income and Welfare Populations, December 16–17, 1999, Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs, Washington, DC.
- Hofferth, Sandra, Pamela E. Davis-Kean, Jean Davis, and Jonathan Finkelstein. 1997. *Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics: 1997 User Guide*. Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Institute for Research on Poverty. 1998. "Evaluation Plan for the Wisconsin Works Child Support Waiver Demonstration." Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI.
- Weiss, Charlene, and Barbara A. Bailar. 1999. "High Response Rates for Low Income Population in In-Person Surveys." Paper presented at the Workshop on Data Collection on Low Income and Welfare Populations, December 16–17, 1999, Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring the Effects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs, Washington, DC.
- Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development. 1998. *First Quarter 1998 Leavers Study: Preliminary Process Report*. Madison, WI: Department of Workforce Development. November 6.

