



June 10, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION LIST

From: Nancy Mathiowetz *NM*
Office of the Associate Director, SDMS

Subject: Report on Cognitive Research on the Child
Support Enforcement Questionnaire--April
Supplement to the Current Population Survey

During the Spring of 1991, the Bureau of the Census conducted cognitive interviews with respondents using the child support enforcement questionnaire--the April supplement to the Current Population Survey. Respondents were recruited from the Washington, D.C. and suburban Maryland areas; we posted advertisements in local child support offices, grocery stores, libraries and other public places, spoke with officers of local chapter of Parents without Partners, and advertised in local newspapers. In our initial recruiting we were able to successfully interview seven respondents, which although a small number, represented a cross-section of the population, with respect to race, employment status, education, and age.

Respondents were asked questions from either the 1990 April Supplement or from a revised version of the questionnaire developed in 1991 (The 1990 questionnaire is included in Appendix A; the revised questions used in the cognitive interviews are included in the question by question review presented in Section I). Respondents' statements were probed as a means to understanding how respondents formulated an answer as well as to understand the respondent's interpretation of the question and to clarify what was or was not included in the response. Respondents were asked, at times, to describe what technical terms meant to them (e.g. joint custody) and at the end of the interview, were asked about the sensitive nature of any of the questions. All of the interviews were tape recorded and the summaries of the interviews are included in Appendix B.

The primary focus of these interviews was threefold: (1) to test a new introduction to the questionnaire designed to capture the universe of children/parents at risk of receiving child support; (The questionnaire used in 1988 and 1990 omitted all custodial fathers as well as women who had been married only once.) (2) to attempt to understand the reasons for the high item nonresponse

rates to the supplement and determine if the question wording was the source of the problem; and (3) to get a general understanding of respondents' interpretations of several of the questions. The overall goal was to design a revised questionnaire that was both more comprehensive in identifying the universe and which would lead to a lower rate of item nonresponse.

This report is organized into two sections. The first section consists of an item-by-item review of the questionnaire. The format follows that of the 1990 questionnaire but juxtaposes comments concerning the revised questionnaire with comments related to the original question wording. In the second section, recommendations for changes in the questionnaire for the 1992 survey are provided as well as some suggestions for further testing.

I. Item-by-Item Review of Questionnaire(s)

Questions 29-40: Identification of Population at Risk

Since we had agreed that these questions did not adequately identify the universe, no testing was done using the original questionnaire. The new questionnaire begins with the question "Does.....have any children 21 years old or younger living in this household whose (father/mother) lives elsewhere?. None of the respondents had any problem with this question (although this is not a good test of the question, since each of the respondents had come to be interviewed in response to our ads). Experience with a similar question in the Survey of Income and Program Participation suggests that there is little to no problem with this question.

The identification of the universe included a question which asked the respondent to identify all of his or her children whose (father/mother) lived somewhere else. There was no reluctance on the part of the respondents to provide names; most of the respondents only had one child (although one had three children) with an absent parent, so that issues related to multiple absent fathers were not raised during these interviews.

Q.41: Does the children's father live in:.....

[Alternative wording: Where does.....(father/mother) live?]

Several respondents reported a city and probing had to be done to determine the state. This was not a difficult question for any of the respondents.

Q.42: Does the children's father have visitation privileges, joint custody, or neither?

[Alternative: (1) Do you and (child's) (father/mother) have joint legal custody?

(2) Does.....'s (father/mother) have visitation privileges?]

Joint legal custody was interpreted by each of the respondents as an arrangement in which the child spent about equal amounts of time with each parent. One respondent stated that this meant "sharing responsibilities". Another respondent simply stated that she didn't know what this meant. If the parents have never gone to court concerning custody or child support, this question makes little sense. Visitation privileges were interpreted as meaning that the custodial parent permits the other parent to see the child--"there is nothing written down...it's just up to my discretion"--and not in reference to a legal decree concerning visitation.

Although their interpretation of the question may not have been correct, only one of the respondents was not able to formulate an answer about joint legal custody (albeit erroneous) and all reported that the absent parent had visitation privileges.

Q.43: During 1990, how many days did the children's father have custody of or visit the children?

[Alternative: composed of two questions--

- (1) Did ... 's (father/mother) see the child during 1990?

and three alternatives to the second question--

- (2a) During 1990, approximately how many days didsee or spend time with (his/her) (father/mother)?
- (2b) same wording as alternative #1, but with response categories.
- (2c) During 1990, how often didsee or spend time with (his/her) (father/mother)?

The first problem with this question was that respondents needed to be reminded to focus on 1990 rather than the current year. For example, one respondent offered a quick "no" response and then stated "not since last summer". After a reminder by the interviewer that the question referred to 1990, the respondent gave further thought to the question and reported yes. One respondent interpreted the word "see" literally and responded "yes" although she stated that the father probably only saw the child at court appearances.

With respect to the estimation of the number of days that the absent parent saw the child, this is either a very simple question (because the parent only saw the child once) or an incredibly difficult estimation process. For four of the respondents, the absent parent only "saw" the child for a couple of days (and in two cases it was only one day for a couple of hours or less). For the other respondents, who had arrangements ranging from "every other weekend and every other holiday" to "summer vacation and some holidays" the estimation was very difficult. For these respondents, providing them with categories aided in their ability to answer the question, since they were more comfortable with their responses:

....usually its every other weekend...but there are weekends that he works, so that it might be the third weekend.....

At this point the respondent was unable to come up with a number; the interviewer provided her with the possible ranges in which case she stated:

....I'm trying to figure this out...I know that last

summer he was up there three weeks to a month...right there that's 30 days...I don't want to overestimate or underestimate. I'd say its 31 to 60 days.....it couldn't be over 60 days.....

The alternative question which asked about "how often" did not help the respondents, since none of these respondents had a consistent pattern of interaction between the child and the absent parent.

Q.44: Were child support payments agreed to or awarded

- [Alternative: (1) Do you have a child support order for.....?
- (2) Child support payments can result from a voluntary agreement made between a child's parents or from a decision by the court. Has there every been a written voluntary agreement or a court order concerning support for.....?
- (3) How was the decision for child support first made? Was it: A voluntary agreement, not sanctioned; a voluntary agreement, legally sanctioned, or a court order?

The question concerning whether the parent does or does not have a child support order was fairly easy for respondents to answer--the exception to this generalization was the one respondent who did not have a child support order. She was unclear as to what this meant, "do you mean does my social worker take care of that....". In response to whether support payments were agreed to or awarded (the original question 44 or the revised question numbered 2 above), most of the respondents responded "both" and then proceeded with a long story about awards first being agreed to and then being awarded. "Agreed to" was interpreted several different ways ranging from (1) a verbal agreement made between the parents; (2) agreeing with the other parent's lawyer concerning the level of child support; (3) agreeing with his or her own lawyer about the appropriate amount; (4) having an "agreement" notarized. With respect to the question attempting to separate agreements that were sanctioned vs. not sanctioned, it was impossible for respondents to answer this question. The problems were twofold--first, the terminology was not comprehensible by the respondents and second, since most of the respondents began with some "agreement" between the parents that eventually went to court (either as part of the divorce process or because the child support arrangement originally made was not honored by the noncustodial parent) the story is much more complex than a respondent (and

subsequently an interviewer) could categorize into one of these three response options.

Q. 45: Why were child support payments not agreed to or awarded?

Only one of the seven respondents was not receiving child support. She has pursued child support but to date has not been successful in obtaining support. The respondent reported that the child support office could not locate the father when in fact she knew exactly where the father was and had provided all of the locating information to the office. She later reported that the child support office stated that she may not be eligible for support since she and the father had never been married.

In this case, coding "unable to locate father" would have been an erroneous response. Clearly the reason she has not received child support to date is that the paperwork has not yet moved through the child support office (the child was about 8 months old at the time of the interview).

Q.46: In what year were these payments first agreed to or awarded?

Although the question clearly asks for when the payments were first agreed to or awarded, the respondents answers were all in terms of the year of the court order, e.g. the year they got divorced or the date of the court order which awarded them support. Only when probed (e.g. "when were these payments first agreed to" if the respondent had stated that they had an agreement followed by a court order) did respondents report the year of the initial agreement or order. The misinterpretation occurred regardless of education level of the respondent---respondents simply did not hear that the question referred to the year of the "first" agreement.

Q. 47: Has the amount every changed?

Several types of "changes in the amount" were reported-- (1) a court ordered change; (2) a reduction in the amount sent via the support agency because the noncustodial father owes IRS and it is being taken out of the child support payment; (3) one of the children listed in the original order is now over the age of 18 and the father has reduced the payment by some amount; (4) the custodial parent feels they don't need the money any longer and sends it back to the noncustodial parent. Most of the respondents interpreted this question literally and reported yes, regardless of the reason for the change.

Q.48: In what year was the most recent change?

Not difficult for the respondents to report--the change had either occurred rather recently or they were able to reconstruct with a little encouragement from the interviewer.

Q.49: Is health insurance now included as part of the child support agreement?

Q.57: Did the children's father actually provide health insurance in 1990 for the children?

[Alternative: Were all or some of the medical expenses forpaid for by health insurance provided by (his/her) (father/mother)?]

Respondents were able to state whether health insurance was included or not as part of the support agreement, although one respondent insisted that the court agreement states that the father must carry insurance but the lawyers state that he is not responsible for the health insurance. The provision of health insurance (old question 57) vs. the use of the health insurance (alternative question) results in different responses--for example the one respondent noted that the father carried the daughter on his HMO policy, but since the daughter preferred going to physicians other than those covered by the HMO, the mother paid all of the medical expenses.

Q.50: During calendar year 1990supposed to receive any child support payments?

[Alternative: During 1990 did you receive child support for....?]

No problems with either of these questions.

Q.51: Were these payment to be received---directly from the child's father, through a court or public agency, or by some other method?

[Alternative: Were these payments received: directly from's (father/mother), in the form of cash or a check, through a court or public agency, or by some other method?]

Even with the revised question wording, there is some confusion on the part of the respondents--if the check is processed through an agency, regardless of whether the agency simply passes the check on to the custodial parent or issues a new check, respondents report "through a court or public agency". Two respondents reported that the payments were obtained directly from the noncustodial parent's wages--one of these was military pay and the other was employed in the private sector.

Q52. Why were you or your children not supposed to receive payments in 1990?

Not asked of any of the respondents.

Q53. Did you receive these child support payments...regularly, occasionally, seldom, or never?

[Alternative: (1) How often do you receive child support payments?

(2) Are these payments made on time: always, most of the time, sometimes, or never?]

These two sets of questions clearly are asking about different concepts. The original question is interpreted by respondents to mean do they usually get their check, regardless of whether it is late or not; the revised questions ask for the timeliness of the payments. "Regularly" was interpreted as meaning all of the following:

"they come within a week of the date"

"...means month after month..."

"...its suppose to be twice a month...I know I had a check at least once a month...."

From probing, it appears that if the payments are continuous, regardless of whether they meet the court ordered agreement, respondents had a tendency to report "regularly". There was less ambiguity with respect to alternative question two, since the question asks about the timing of the checks.

Q.54:What was the main reason you did not receive these payments regularly.....

Not asked of these respondents.

Q. 55: In total, how much in child support payments were you SUPPOSED to receive in 1990?

The responses to this question indicate:

(1) Respondents are unable to provide a total off the top of their head but were quite capable of noting the amount of the award and the frequency of the payment, e.g. \$250 times twelve. Mathematical mistakes were made when those who were paid twice a month attempted to come up with a monthly total and then multiply by 12.

(2) Confusion occurred with respect to arrearage and whether or not to add that amount into the total or whether this amount should refer only to the court ordered agreement.

(3) The one case in which the father cut down the amount during the year, due to the fact that the son was 21 years old and the court agreement

provided for payments only until he was 18 caused further problems. The original court order was \$325; in April, 1990 the father reduced the payments to \$250 for the other two children. Technically, he could have done this two years earlier. What is the amount that she should have received and should have reported at this question?

Q.56: How much in child support payments did you ACTUALLY receive in 1990?

For respondents who received all of their payments, this was a fairly easy question, however, similar to the prior question, respondents tended to respond in term of amount per month, times twelve months, or simply stated "all of it". For at least one of the respondents, this question was impossible. (In her case, she was to receive \$50 a week {but also reported that it was \$200 a month} and that she would get a check, miss a week, get two checks, etc. As much as the interviewer tried to help her, she could not make an estimate, but could only state that it wasn't the entire amount.

Q58. Have you ever contacted any government agency for aid in obtaining child support.....

Several of the respondents reported "no" and then went on to say "only the child support office" or "only my social worker". When they were questioned about their response, three of the respondents stated that they didn't consider county-run agencies as government agencies; their interpretation of government included only the federal government.

Q.59: In what year did you last contact such an agency

In half of the interviews this question was asked before question 60 ("what type of help") and in the remaining interviews it was asked after question 60. It appears that it is easier for the respondent to remember the year after they have discussed the type of help they have received.

Q60. What type of help did this office provide?

This question was difficult for many of the respondents. They had difficulty in interpreting what "help" meant. Several responded in terms of processes rather than the final desired outcome, e.g. "filling in papers", "telling how to do things". If the outcome of contacting the agency had not been successful, the respondent often reported "they haven't been of any help".

Two new questions: (1) Did you have Medicaid coverage for (any of) your children in 1990?

(2) Did you receive AFDC support, public assistance, or welfare payments for (any of) your children in 1990?

Respondents answered these questions with seemingly little effort (although that does not necessarily indicate that the quality of the responses is high). The responses to the Medicaid question were made quickly (only one respondent questioned "that's where someone else pays, right? ...no I don't get Medicaid). With respect to the global question concerning AFDC, public assistance, etc. one respondent was unable to distinguish between programs and stated that these programs were all welfare and yes, she did receive support. A second respondent reported living in subsidized housing but that was the only program she was involved with....did that count? One respondent reported being on Medicaid but receiving no other aid; another respondent reported that she had a state pharmacy card for her child and food stamps were her only other public support.

New placement of dates of marriage and divorce questions.

The dates of the (most recent) divorce and marriage were placed prior to question 61 on the 1990 questionnaire. None of the respondents had any difficulty reporting the year of the divorce and marriage; many were unable to come up with the months of the events.

Q. 62-Q68: Alimony questions.

These questions were not the focus of the cognitive interviews and were asked merely as a means of ending the interview. None of the respondents had any difficulty with the questions, although extensive probing was not done to examine interpretation of questions or to clarify responses.

II. Recommendations for questionnaire revisions

Clearly, seven interviews is a small number from which to draw conclusions. However, it is clear from the transcripts of the interviews that there are several problem areas in the questionnaire that can be addressed in a reworking of the individual items. The high item nonresponse rates remains a puzzle. Apart from the questions which ask the respondent for a number (the number of visitation days, the total amount of child support), none of the interviews suggested problems that would be indicative of the item nonresponse rates evident in 1988. I hope that these nonresponse rates can be reduced by providing the interviewer and respondent with some guidelines for the difficult questions and by addressing the issue in interviewer training.

The recommendations listed below are presented in order of the questions in 1990 document.

Questions 29 through 40: Identification of the Universe.

The present research indicates that these questions should be replaced with a set of items which focus on whether there are any children of Person X whose father or mother lives somewhere else. These items would be asked of each adult (or whatever subset is of analytic interest). We will need to be sure to have a question which gets a count of the total number of children at risk of receiving child support.

Questions 33 and 34, concerning the dates of the marriage and divorce can be moved prior to question 61. To reduce the respondent's burden on these items, we would recommend asking only for the year of the marriage and divorce rather than the month and year.

Question 41: where parent lives

Change wording and response categories to ask in what state the absent parent lives. Include a response category for other places.

Question 42: custody and visitation

Separate this question into two questions--one which asks about joint custody and one which asks about visitation. Clearly respondents interpreted joint custody as a sharing of time with the child; if we continue to ask this question we need to clarify the question to the respondent; however I think that more research is needed to do this well. (You need to decide whether, given the interpretation of most respondents, it is worth retaining this question for 1992). Similarly, visitation is being interpreted as the custodial parent permitting the other parent to see the child rather than a legal interpretation of visitation. If it is

important to distinguish the two, we will need to provide clarification to the respondent. Once again, our timeschedule for this initial research has not permitted us to examine alternate question wording which would distinguish the legal interpretation of "visitation".

Question 43: number of days of visitation

I would recommend the following:

- (1) The respondent needs to be anchored in the year of interest--the previous calendar year. Many of the respondents who were interviewed began to respond with respect to the current year. This is the first question (of many) in which we are asking about the previous year and we need to distinguish that to the respondent.
- (2) A filter question which asks whether the absent parent saw the child during the previous year eliminates some of the sensitivity of the current question, which implies that the answer should be greater than zero.
- (3) We should determine response categories which will serve the analytic purpose of this question and provide them to the interviewer and the respondent. The tradeoff, I believe, is between an estimated response vs. an unacceptable item nonresponse rate. By providing a set of response categories we accomplish the following: (1) reduce respondent burden; (2) provide the guidelines for the estimation purpose; and (3) provide the interviewer with a means for helping the respondent.

Q. 44 agreement or award of child support

The present question is really intended to address two questions: (1) is there a child support agreement and if so, (2) what process was used to arrive at the support. For several of the respondents the answer was "both" since they started out with an agreement and then had a court order. I would recommend the following:

- (1) Separate the two intentions of this question (as was done in the revised questionnaire) and begin by asking whether or not there is a child support order for the child(ren).
- (2) Clarify to the respondent that the question concerns how the decision was first made.
- (3) Clarify that voluntary means between the two parents. Without further research on question wording I do not think we can hope to impress upon the respondent the meaning of a "voluntary written agreement".

- (4) Do not attempt to have the respondent distinguish between a voluntary agreement that is legally sanctioned and one that is not.

Q45. reasons for no child support payments

We have little information for suggesting a revision to this question; only one of the respondents was not receiving child support.

Q46 through 48: year of awards and changes.

No information in the interviews to suggest why questions 46 and 48 suffer from a 40 percent nonresponse rate. With respect to question 47, we need to be clear on the intent of this question. If it literally means whether the amount has ever changed, we can leave the current question. However, if the intent is whether the courts have ever changed the amount, the wording of the question needs to be changed to reflect the purpose.

Q49 and Q57: health insurance.

Similar to question 47, we need to be clear as to the intent of these questions, especially question 57. For some respondents, question 49's reference to "now" was confusing (since we had been talking about the original award).

Q50: suppose to receive child support.

No proposed changes.

Q.51: How payments were to be received.

The major problem with this question is that respondents misclassify checks that come from the father through the courts as "payments received through a court or public agency". The revised question wording, in which we specified "directly from (father/mother) in the form of cash or a check" was clearer, although the word "directly" indicates to the respondent that the check is sent directly to the custodial parent. Providing responses which state the source of the check rather than how received may further reduce confusion (e.g. cash or check from the (father/mother), check issued by the court or a public agency, etc.). In addition, we discussed at an earlier meeting adding a category for "wages withheld". This response came up in two of the seven interviews--adding the category will cut down on interviewer burden and post-survey processing.

Q53. How regularly was support received?

If the intent of this question is to know how many of the

payments the respondent received, we should ask that question ("Did you receive all, some, or none of the payments in 1990?"); if we are interested in the timeliness of the payments, we should ask about the frequency and how often the payments are received on time. "Regularly" may be interpreted to mean according to a set periodicity that may or may not be in compliance with the support award.

Q54. Reason for not receiving payments.

Earlier discussions suggested that this question be eliminated since in many cases respondents may not know the reason. What we do with this question is obviously dependent upon the work completed for question 53.

Q55. Payments R was supposed to receive.

The response categories for this question should be changed to reflect amount and frequency rather than annual amount. None of the respondents answered according to an annual amount; the result is additional interviewer burden.

Q56. Actual amount.

Once again, none of the respondents answered with respect to an annual amount. Response categories should reflect "all" and "none" for ease in administration, as well as an amount and number of months (e.g. a respondent can often tell you the number of months that were missed). In addition, we should route "don't know" responses to another question which would provide the respondent with an alternative means of answering the question...eg. would you say you received most of the amount you were due, some of the amount, etc. Once again, the goal is to reduce the level of item nonresponse, obtain an answer that would be of analytic interest, and not overburden either the respondent or the interviewer.

Q58. Contact government agency.

If we change the wording to "Have you every contacted a child support enforcement office or any other government agency for aid in obtaining child support?" we may eliminate the oversight observed in two of the interviews in which the respondent did not consider a county office to be a government agency. We could also make the statement read "county or state agency" rather than government. Several of the respondents interpreted "government" as "federal government".

Q59. Year of most recent contact.

Move this to follow question 60, since dates are the most difficult task (cognitively) for a respondent to perform.

Q60. Type of help.

Reading the list to the respondents will eliminate the "process" types of responses (e.g. "filling in papers, explaining procedures").

III. Future Research

The recommendations discussed above do not address all of the problems in the questionnaire. More research needs to be completed to investigate the following issues:

- (1) Question wording concerning joint custody and visitation.
- (2) Voluntary vs. court ordered agreements.
- (3) How to ask about additional funds received by the custodial parent, apart from child support payments.
- (4) Questions concerning funds received even in situations where no child support agreement exists.
- (5) The inclusion of topical modules concerning characteristics of the noncustodial parent.

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Gaile Maller, Office of Child Support Enforcement
Linda Mellgren, ASPE
Ron Tucker, DSD, Bureau of the Census
Greg Weyland, DSD, Bureau of the Census
Susan Hicks, SMD, Bureau of the Census
Charles Nelson, HHES, Bureau of the Census
Gordon Lester, HHES, Bureau of the Census

APPENDIX A:

1990 APRIL SUPPLEMENT

18A. LINE NO.	18B. RELATIONSHIP TO REFERENCE PERSON	18C. PAR'S LINE NO.	18D. AGE	18E. MARITAL STATUS	18F. SPOUSE'S LINE NUMBER	18G1. SEX Male 1 Female 2	18G2. VETERAN STATUS	18H. HIGHEST GRADE ATTENDED	18I. GRADE COMPLETED	18J. RACE	18K. ORIGIN
01	Ref. Person WITH rel. in H'hld	01	0						Yes 1	White..... I	0 0
02	Ref. person with NO rel. in H'hld	02	0	Married—spouse present					No 2	Black..... 2	1 1
03	Husband	03	0							Amer. Indian, Aleut, Eskimo	2 2
04	Wife	04	0							Asian or Pacific Isl....	3 3
05	Natural/Adopted Child	05	1	Married—spouse absent (Excludes separated)			Vietnam Era	1	3	Other..... 5	4 4
06	Step Child	06	2				Korean War	2	4		5 5
07	Grandchild	07	3				World War II	3	5		6 6
08	Parent	08	4				World War I	4	6		7 7
09	Brother/Sister	09	5				Other Service	5	7		8 8
10	Other Rel. of Ref. Person	10	6	Widowed			Nonveteran	6	8		9 9
11	Foster Child	11	7	Divorced							
12	Non-rel. of Ref. Person WITH OWN rel. in H'hld	12	8	Separated							
13	Partner/Roommate	13	9	Never married							
14	Non-rel. of Ref. Person (other than partner/roommate) with NO OWN rel. in H'hld	14	9								

26. CHECK ITEM
(Transcribe from control card item 18)
This person is 16-24 years of age (Ask 26A)
All others (Skip to 26C)

26A. (If 'School' in 19, Verify) LAST WEEK was ... attending or enrolled in a high school, college, or university? (Mark "Yes" if currently on holiday or seasonal vacation. Mark "No" for summer vacation.)
Yes (Verify) No (Skip to 26C)

High school College or Univ. (Ask 26B)

26B. Is ... enrolled in school as a full-time or part-time student?
Full time Part time (Fill 26C)

26C. CHECK ITEM
Who responded to the labor force items for this person?
Self Other Self/Other

REMINDER: ASK THE L. F. ITEMS FOR ALL H.H. MEMBERS BEFORE ASKING THE SUPPLEMENT Approved - O.M.B. No. 0970-0048 - Expires 4-30-90

28. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
A. This unit is in Rotation 1 or 5 (End questions)
Rotations 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 or 8 (Fill 29B)

B. Sex, Age, Presence of Children
This person is:
Male Female 15-17 with No own or adopted children in household (Go To Next Person)
Female 15-17 WITH own or adopted children in household (Fill 29C)
Female 18+

C. Marital Status
Married (Skip to 31)
Widowed (Skip to 31)
Divorced (Skip to 33)
Separated (Skip to 33)
Never married (Ask 30)

This month we are asking some questions concerning child support

30. Has ... ever had any children?
Yes (Skip to 36)
No (Go to next person)

31. Has ... been married more than once?
Yes (Ask 32)
No (Go to next person)

32. Has ... ever been divorced?
Yes (Ask 33)
No (Go to next person)

33. When did ...'s (most recent) divorce/separation take place? (Month)
J F M A M J J A S O N D
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
(Year 19 -)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

34. What was the date of that marriage? (Month)
J F M A M J J A S O N D
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
(Year 19 -)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

35. Has ... ever had or adopted any children?
Yes (Ask 36)
No (Skip to 61 - Ask questions of woman herself)

36. How many children has ... ever had (or adopted)?
I 2 3 4 + (Fill 37)

37. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
(See c.c. Items 14 and 18)
Any (other) H.H. member 20 years old or under? Yes (Fill 38)
No (Skip to 61)

38. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
This person is currently:
Never married (Ask 39)
All other (Skip to 40)

REMINDER: ASK ITEMS 39 THROUGH 68 OF THE WOMAN HERSELF - IF NOT PRESENT MAKE TELEPHONE CALLBACK(S)

39. Are any of your children living here now?
Yes No (Go to next person)
How many?
I 2 3 4 + (Skip to 41)

40. How many of the children living here now were fathered or adopted by your (most recently) divorced/separated husband?
None (Skip to 61)
I 2 3 4 + (Ask 41)

41. Does the child(ren)'s father live in:
Same State as you
Different State
Other - Specify

42. Does the child(ren)'s father have visitation privileges, joint custody, or neither?
Visitation privileges (Ask 43)
Joint custody
Neither (Skip to 44)

43. During 1989, how many days did the child(ren)'s father have custody of or visit the child(ren)? (Days)
0 1 2 3
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
None

44. Were child support payments agreed to or awarded (Last divorce or separation)?
Yes Was it a Voluntary written agreement? Court ordered? Other (Skip to 46)
No (Ask 45)

45. Why were child support payments not agreed to or awarded?
Final agreement pending
Other financial agreement made
Father lives in household
Wanted child support but:
Did not pursue an award
Father financially unable to pay (Skip to 57)
Unable to locate father
Unable to establish paternity
Other Specify

46. In what year were these payments first agreed to or awarded? (Year 19 -)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

47. Has the amount ever been changed?
Yes (Ask 48)
No (Skip to 49)

48. In what year was the most recent change? (Year 19 -)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

49. Is health insurance now included as part of the child support agreement?
Yes
No

50. During calendar year 1989 were you or your child(ren) SUPPOSED to receive any child support payments (Last divorce or separation)?
Yes (Ask 51)
No (Skip to 52)

51. Were these payments to be received -- (Read categories)
Directly from the child(ren)'s father? (Skip to 53)
Through a court or public agency?
By some other method? (Specify in notes)

52. Why were you or your child(ren) not supposed to receive payments in 1989?
Child(ren) too old
Payments not awarded or agreed to until calendar year 1990 (Skip to 57)
Child(ren)'s father died before 1989
Other - Specify

53. Did you receive these child support payments (Read Categories)
Regularly (Skip to 55)
Occasionally
Seldom or (Ask 54)
Never?

54. What was the main reason you did not receive these payments regularly, was it because (Read categories)
The father refused to pay?
You were unable to locate father?
Or was there some other reason? (Specify in notes)

55. In total, how much in child support payments were you SUPPOSED to receive in 1989?
0 0 0 0 0
1 1 1 1 1
2 2 2 2 2
3 3 3 3 3
4 4 4 4 4
5 5 5 5 5
6 6 6 6 6
7 7 7 7 7
8 8 8 8 8
9 9 9 9 9
\$.00

56. How much in child support payments did you ACTUALLY receive in 1989?
0 0 0 0 0
1 1 1 1 1
2 2 2 2 2
3 3 3 3 3
4 4 4 4 4
5 5 5 5 5
6 6 6 6 6
7 7 7 7 7
8 8 8 8 8
9 9 9 9 9
None

57. Did the child(ren)'s father actually provide health insurance in 1989 for the child(ren)?
Yes
No

58. Have you ever contacted any government agency for aid in obtaining child support (for child(ren) of last divorce or separation)?
Yes (Ask 59) No (Skip to 61)

59. In what year did you last contact such an agency? (Year 19 -)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

60. What type of help did this office provide? (Mark all that apply)
Locate the father
Establish paternity
Establish support obligation
Enforce support order
Obtain collection
No help provided
Other - (Specify in notes)

61. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
This person is currently:
Never married (Go to next person)
All others (Ask 62)

62. Concerning your (last) divorce/separation, were alimony or maintenance payments agreed to or awarded?
Yes (Ask 63) No (Skip to 64)

63. During 1989 were you SUPPOSED to receive alimony or maintenance payments?
Yes No

64. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
This person is currently:
Separated (Skip to 66)
All others (Ask 65)

65. After your (last) divorce, did you receive a property settlement such as: (Read categories and mark all that apply)
A one time cash settlement
Some other type of settlement
Or was there no settlement reached

66. At the time of your (last) separation, were you working?
Yes (Ask 67)
No (Skip to 69)

67. Were you working 35 hours or more per week or less than 35 hours per week?
35+ per week
Less than 35 hours per week (End Questions)

68. Did you work at any time during the 5 years before your (last) separation?
Yes No