

Full Report: A Qualitative Interview Study Regarding Barriers and Facilitators of Engagement in Two Online Education Programs for Separating or Divorcing Parents

GRANTEE INSTITUTION

Indiana University, Bloomington

RESEARCH TEAM:



Amy G. Applegate

GRANT LISTED LEADERSHIP TEAM:



Amy Holtzworth-Munroe



Claire Tomlinson

Judge Kimberly Dowling



Brittany Rudd

Acknowledgement: This work was supported by grants from two funders: the Indiana Supreme Court, and the Fatherhood Research and Practice Network (FRPN) under grant #90PR0006 from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) to Temple University and the Center for Policy Research, Denver, Colorado. The Indiana Supreme Court and FRPN acted independently in funding the research studies referenced herein, and neither funder expresses any opinion as to the goals or mission of the other funder. These research studies were conducted through an academic judicial partnership with the Delaware Circuit Court located in Muncie, Indiana. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Indiana Supreme Court, the Delaware Circuit Court, FRPN, or OPRE. We thank the Indiana Supreme Court, FRPN, OPRE, and the Delaware Circuit Court, particularly Delaware Circuit Judges Kim Dowling and Marianne Vorhees, and Delaware Circuit Court Administrator Emily Anderson, for their support of evidence-based research and practice. We also thank our research assistants, law interns, and the litigants who participated in these studies.

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Methods | 6 |
| Participants..... | 6 |
| Recruitment Procedures..... | 6 |
| Qualitative Interview and Interviewers..... | 7 |
| Interview Coding System and Coders..... | 7 |
| Results | 8 |
| Study Participant Demographics..... | 8 |
| Interview Subsamples..... | 8 |
| Hypothetical Court Website Barriers..... | 9 |
| Parenting Program Facilitators..... | 10 |
| Parenting Program Barriers..... | 11 |
| Discussion | 12 |
| The Court's Role: Lack of Party Compliance with the Court Order and Resulting Lack of Awareness of the Programs..... | 12 |
| Ways to Change Online Parenting Programs to Increase Parental Participation | 14 |
| Study Limitations | 16 |
| Conclusions | 17 |
| References | 18 |
| Tables | 20 |



Executive Summary

Children experiencing parental divorce or separation are at risk for a variety of emotional and behavioral problems. Improving co-parenting and parenting quality attenuates the link between parental separation and child adjustment problems. Thus, many U.S. courts have implemented educational parenting programs, usually brief and in-person, for separating parents. However, parents and courts are concerned about access to such programs (e.g., transportation, time, childcare). To address such barriers, courts have begun to implement online parenting programs, which are assumed to be more accessible, though there are no data relevant to this issue. We found that only 47% of parties sent a court order to access a website, to learn if they were court-ordered to complete an online parenting program, did so (i.e., estimates of 51% of divorced parents and 28% of unmarried parents based on data from the last six months of the project). Among those who accessed the court website and were assigned to a program, 81% participated in the program (i.e., estimates of 83% of divorced parents and 63% of unmarried parents, based on data from parties who consented to a related study). Thus, the current qualitative interview study was implemented to explore barriers and facilitators to participation in online parenting programs that parents were court-ordered to pursue. We interviewed 61 parents who had received a court order, 30% of whom participated in the parenting program and 70% of whom did not. Their responses were coded to capture themes. While many parents reported positives of the online parenting programs (e.g., convenience, privacy, and benefits from the programs such as improved communication), others reported barriers to program participation, including barriers previously associated with in-person programs (e.g., inconvenience) and new barriers associated with the online programs (e.g., technology problems). Unmarried parents were particularly likely to mention technology, length concerns, and confusion as barriers. Improving understanding of such barriers and facilitators may help courts consider how to better assist families during the separation process and offers insights on how courts might better implement orders for services like parent education to improve compliance.



Introduction

The divorce rate in the United States is 40% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). Additionally, 40.3% of children in the U.S. are born to unmarried parents (Martin et al., 2013), with these children experiencing parental instability at a higher rate than those born to married parents (Osborne et al., 2007). On average, children whose parents separate¹ are at higher risk to experience problematic psychological adjustment and engage in risky behaviors than peers whose parents remain together (Amato, 2010). Effective parenting (e.g., child monitoring, consistent discipline, parental affection and support, and good parent-child communication) may diminish after parental separation (Amato, 2010), potentially contributing to children's negative adjustment. Thus, supporting parenting can mitigate the negative effects of parental separation on children (Sigal et al., 2011). Similarly, positive co-parenting can help reduce the negative repercussions on children of parental conflict following separation (Amato, 2010) by improving the quality of the interparental relationship (Sullivan, 2008) and increasing contact between the child and the non-residential parent (Whiteside & Becker, 2000).



In light of these findings, family courts have turned to parenting programs to educate parents about separation, parenting, and co-parenting (Pollet & Lombreglia, 2008). A 2008 study found that 46 U.S. states offered or required parent education programs (Pollet & Lombreglia, 2008). Court-ordered parenting programs are often in-person and tend to be short; 30% are one to three hours long and the remaining majority are under five hours (Fackrell et al., 2011). But courts across the country have indicated concern regarding the rate of parent program attendance (Cookston et al., 2002; Thoennes & Pearson, 1999). While there is limited research specific to barriers and facilitators to parent participation in court-mandated programs, there is more relevant research on community-based programs.

Regarding barriers to participation in general parenting programs (not specific to separating parents), practical concerns, such as lack of transportation and childcare, along with time demands and scheduling conflicts, are major hindrances identified by parents (Mytton et al., 2014). Similarly suggesting issues with program convenience, individuals from single-parent families, larger families, or poor neighborhoods (Mytton et al., 2014) struggle with low engagement. With regard to the programs, those that require a larger time commitment, such as multiple sessions or homework assignments, struggle with attendance rates (Gorman-Smith et al., 2002).

There also are factors associated with increased participation in general parenting programs. Parents who report high child maladjustment for their children (Cunningham et al., 2000) or who utilize negative or ineffective parenting strategies (Baydar et al., 2003) are more likely to attend, possibly because they realize their need for parenting help. Higher parent education and income levels are associated with increased attendance (Winslow et al., 2009). Regarding the programs, those with clear objectives, content with a strong theoretical basis, and led by practitioners who successfully deliver the program content have greater success in maintaining parental participation (Barlow et al., 2008). Additionally, programs that provide peer support to families, in the form of groups, classes, or social media,

¹We will use the term "separation" to refer to both parental divorce and the separation of unmarried parents.



have increased engagement (Mytton et al., 2014). Regarding programs for divorcing parents, programs offered close to the time of divorce were more successful in retention (Winslow et al., 2009).

Engagement strategies have been implemented to facilitate parent involvement in general parenting programs. Some programs provide transportation and childcare to families (Mytton et al., 2014), offer programs at more convenient locations, or provide incentives for participation (Spoth & Redmond, 2000). Others offer phone calls between sessions (Axford et al., 2012). There is some evidence of the effectiveness of person-to-person, motivational enhancement strategies, such as teacher endorsement and a motivational call by providers (Winslow et al., 2016). While there is limited research on factors related to enhanced participation in court-affiliated programs, Thoennes and Pearson (1999) indicated that attendance rates for programs were highest in settings with strong judicial support and court oversight.

To address barriers to in-person parenting program access, some court systems are moving to the use of online programs for separating parents. These programs are assumed to be more time- and cost-efficient (Bowers et al., 2011), but there is no evidence to support this conclusion. Thus, the goal of the current study is to assess barriers and facilitators to participation in court-ordered online parenting programs for separating parents. As an additional exploratory goal, we aimed to compare findings for study subsamples of divorcing versus unmarried parents. Doing so is important, given the rising rate of nonmarital births in the United States (Martin et al., 2013), the fact that the relationships of unmarried parents can be unstable (Osborne & McLanahan, 2007), the potential risks to children when unmarried parents separate (Cooper et al., 2011), and the demographic differences between divorced and unmarried parties (e.g., unmarried parties tend to be younger, have less education, and be more likely to experience depression and report problems with drugs and alcohol) (Insabella et al., 2003).

The current study was conducted as part of a randomized controlled trial (RCT) comparing the outcomes for parents assigned to one of two online parenting programs (i.e., Two Families Now (TFN); Caraway & Jones, 2011; Children in Between (CIB); Arbuthnot & Gordon, 1996) or to a no-program control group. The sample includes both divorcing and separating unmarried parents. Eligible parents receive a court order² to access a court website that informs them whether they are court-ordered to complete a parenting program. When parties access the court website, they are assigned to a study condition (i.e., one of two online programs or no program) and invited to participate in a voluntary research study (i.e., the ongoing RCT). The court order is a one-page document. It informs parties that they are allowed 30 days to access and complete a program, and that the online parenting programs can be completed on a variety of devices such as computers, tablets, or smartphones. It also provides information about using public library computers if they do not possess devices to access a program. In addition, the order informs parents that the programs are free, take three to five hours to complete, and parents can complete them in sections and on their own time. The court order is signed by a judge. If the parent has not yet accessed the court website approximately one week after a court order is sent, the parent is reminded to access the court website and follow the instructions on the website.

The RCT study is designed to examine an almost totally online process for a court to order parents to complete a program, for parents to do so, and for researchers to gather data on the effects of the programs. However, we have encountered recruitment issues. As of June 2019, only 47% of parties (i.e., estimates of 51% of divorced parents and 28% of unmarried parents based on data from the last six months of the project³) who were sent a court order actually accessed the court website, as ordered, to find out if they should complete a parent program. Of those who accessed

²The court order was mailed to parties without an attorney; it was provided by email to the attorney for any party who had one. Unfortunately, as researchers do not have access to full information for cases that did not consent to the RCT, we do not know what percentage of parties had an attorney.

³Due to changes in program tracking at the court, separate figures regarding court website access rates for divorced and unmarried parents for the full length of the project are unavailable. Instead, we only had available relevant data for the last six months of study recruitment (i.e., January 1, 2019 - June 30, 2019). These are the data presented. However, note that the overall rate of parties accessing the court website in the last six months of the project (i.e., 41%) tended to be lower than the overall rate of parties accessing the court website across the entire length of the project (i.e., 47%), $X^2(1) = 3.69$, $p < .06$, suggesting that the rates given in the text, for the past six months, and divided into divorcing versus unmarried parents, may not accurately represent what those figures would have been for the full length of the project.

the court website and were assigned to a program, across all parties who were study-eligible, 81% participated in the parenting program as ordered (i.e., estimates of 83% of divorce cases and 63% of unmarried cases based on data from parties in the RCT study⁴). Thus, the current qualitative interview study was implemented to assess facilitators and barriers to complying with the court order and participating in the parenting program, and, in particular, to examine differences across divorced versus unmarried parties.



Methods

Participants

At the time the current interview study was conducted, 990 RCT eligible parties had been sent a court order to access the court website. Eligible parties were involved in either initial divorce cases with children (i.e., DC, or Divorce with Children, cases) or initial cases involving unmarried parents in which the parents were scheduled for a court hearing for child-related issues (i.e., JP, or Juvenile Paternity, cases) in Delaware County, Indiana. Eligible parties had to speak English, be 18 years of age or older, and not be incarcerated. For the current study, parties with attorney representation were excluded due to the complexity of obtaining consent for study participation (i.e., legally, we could not directly contact represented parties). Also, parties had to meet one of the following conditions: they had already had their hearing to decide custody issues, had their case dismissed, or had waived their final hearing. These criteria were intended to reduce the possibilities of parties perceiving any coercion from the court to complete the interview study or falsely believing that completing the study would affect their court outcome. Finally, we could only contact parties for whom we had a court-gathered party contact information sheet. Information thus gathered could include some or all of the following: home address, email address, phone numbers (home, work, and/or cell), and whether the party would accept text messages.

Recruitment Procedures

Participant recruitment for the current qualitative interview study occurred from December 1, 2017, through November 16, 2018. A court intern provided us with court-gathered contact sheets for study eligible parties. We then attempted to contact parties to invite them to participate in the interview. On average, parties were contacted for this study 130.17 days ($SD = 96.02$ days), or 4.34 months, after the initial court order had been sent.

⁴Due to limitations in data collection, we are unable to report the program completion rates, broken down by divorced and unmarried parties, across all parties who were study eligible. Instead, here we are reporting program completion rates of parties who participated in the RCT. While we cannot report rates for divorcing versus unmarried parents across all study eligible parties, it is worth noting that the overall rate of program participation among RCT participants (i.e., 77%) is not significantly different than the overall rate of program participation across all study eligible court parties (i.e., 81%), $X^2(1) = .83, p < .37$.



We received party contact sheets for 422 parties.⁵ Of those, 144 parties were excluded as follows: 76 had attorney representation, 33 had not yet had their first court hearing, and 35 both had an attorney and had not yet had their first hearing. The pool of eligible parties was 278, all of whom we attempted to contact. We attempted to contact each potential participant 12 to 15 times. Participants were initially mailed a study invitation and consent form. Street mailing address information was available for all 278 eligible parties; the 128 parties who provided email addresses were also sent emails. Text messaging was used infrequently, as only 12 parties had agreed to allow contact via text messaging. Participants were then called every two to three days, at different hours of the day, and research assistants left voicemails. When a potential study participant was reached, a research assistant explained the study and invited the party to participate.

Across all methods of recruitment, we reached 97 parties and interviewed 61 parties (62.9% of those reached). Both parties in a given court case, if eligible, were invited to independently participate. There were only nine cases in which both parties participated (18 parties). The remaining 43 interviews (70.5%) were conducted with only one party in a given case. Of the 61 participants, 43 were involved in JP cases (unmarried parents, 31 mothers, 12 fathers). The other 18 were involved in DC cases (divorce, 12 mothers, 6 fathers). Twenty of the 61 parties interviewed stated that they had participated in one of the court-ordered online parenting programs, while the remaining 41 parties reported that they did not participate in a parenting program.⁶ The 41 parties who stated that they had not participated in a parenting program included the following: 10 parties who did not remember receiving the court order, eight parties who remembered receiving a court order but did not access the court website to check their assignment to a parenting program or no program, 16 parties who accessed the court website and were not assigned to a parenting program, and seven parties who accessed the court website and were assigned to a parenting program but did not participate in a program.

Qualitative Interview and Interviewers

A semi-structured interview, designed for this study, included open- and closed-ended questions about parents' experiences with the court website, the court-ordered parenting programs, and the voluntary RCT study. Interviews were conducted by phone and lasted 20 to 45 minutes, depending on parties' level of participation in those experiences.

The current analysis focuses on two interview sections. The first is the section regarding accessing the court website; we focused on the barriers discussed by parties who did not access the court website. The second section focused on the parenting programs, with questions being asked to both parties who did or did not participate in a program. Questions about parenting program participation covered topics such as the participants' ability to access the technology needed to participate in a program and whether they thought the parenting program would be helpful. For participants who participated in a parenting program, questions also gathered party assessment of specific aspects of the program (e.g., content, length, videos, and quizzes). The full interview is available from the authors upon request.

Interviewers were seven undergraduate research assistants, a project coordinator, and a graduate student, each completing an average of 6.78 (*SD* = 7.39) interviews.

Interview Coding System and Coders

The coding system was created by examining the interviews completed part-way through the study and extracting recurring themes that were common both in the gathered data and the existing literature. Open coding theory from Corbin and Strauss (1990) was used. Regarding accessing the court website, codes focused on barriers (e.g., the

⁵Though court orders were sent to 990 parties, 568 parties did not have party contact sheets and we thus were unable to contact them. This is because the court gathering of party contact sheets was not implemented until several months into the RCT.

⁶Given IRB concerns about the original RCT study participants' confidentiality, we were not able to match parties who completed the qualitative interview back to court or RCT records. Instead, we accepted an interviewee's report of their level of compliance with the court order and parenting program.



participant was too busy to access the website). Regarding parenting program participation, codes were divided into either barriers or facilitators. Example facilitator codes included "Technology encouraged program participation," "Completing the program was/would be convenient," and "The participant had a positive perception of the program." Example barriers codes included "Technology was an obstacle to program participation," "Completing the program was/would be inconvenient," and "The participant had a negative perception of the program." A theme was coded as present if it was mentioned at least once at any point in the course of the interview, whether in response to a direct question or spontaneously at some point in the interview. The coding manual is available from the authors upon request.

Coders were undergraduate research assistants. Brennan and Prediger's kappa (1981) was used to determine inter-coder agreement between each coder and a master coder. On average, there was a substantial agreement between each of the three coders and the master coder (mean $k = 0.64$). The master coder's codes were used for all analyses.

Results

Study Participant Demographics

See [Tables 1](#) and [2](#) for information on demographic variables. We compared JP and DC cases to examine possible demographic differences. Significant differences are noted on the tables. Relative to divorcing parents, unmarried parties are, on average, younger, have fewer years of education, spent less time living with the other parent, and are less likely to have a new partner.

Interview Subsamples

A total of 61 parties were interviewed. There were two main points in the ongoing RCT study procedures where we saw drop-off in parents' engagement in the online programs. The first was parents not complying with the court order to access the court website and see if they were ordered to complete a parenting program. Drop-off here was large, with 53% of parties not accessing the website. The second involved parents who did not participate in the online parent program even after accessing the court website and being court-ordered to do so. This occurred for 20% of parents who accessed the court website and were assigned to complete a program. Thus, we separated interview responses into two portions.

First, the eight parties who remembered receiving the court order but did not access the website were asked hypothetical questions about the court website (i.e., "If you had been able to get online, would you have felt comfortable accessing the court website?"). This group of questions is referred to as the "hypothetical court website" questions. Only barriers to accessing the court website are presented in order to explore why parties chose not to access the court website.

Second, of the 61 qualitative study participants, 38⁷ parties did not participate in a parenting program and 20 did. Research assistants determined program participation by asking parties if they had done a program.⁸ The 38 parties who did not do a program (i.e., who did not remember the order, who remembered the order but did not access the court website, who accessed the website but were not assigned to a program, and who were assigned to a program but did not participate in it) were asked hypothetical questions about the parenting program (e.g., "Would you have been willing to participate in an online parenting program?"), as they had not done a program. This group of questions is referred to as the "hypothetical parenting program" questions. The 20 parties who participated in the parenting

⁷Note that three parties who did not participate in the program are excluded here, as, due to changes in the interview, they had not been asked questions about the parenting program. However, note that this group also includes the eight parties, discussed above, who remembered receiving the court order but did not access the court website, as they did not do a program.

⁸Unfortunately, we did not ask interviewees how much of the program they had completed. However, from the program participation RCT study data available to date, we know that the vast majority of parents (91%) who started an online parenting program completed it.



program were asked questions about their actual experiences with a program (e.g., "Was doing the parenting program inconvenient?"). This group of questions is referred to as the "non-hypothetical parenting program" questions.

Regarding program participation questions, we present themes for non-hypothetical and hypothetical questions separately. Themes are presented from most to least commonly endorsed. Main codes are presented first, followed by sub-codes. In the text, we only discuss codes endorsed by more than 25% of the relevant subsample. In addition, we briefly discuss differences in the proportion of both JP versus DC parties and male versus female parties mentioning a given code. Only differences larger than 25% are discussed in the text; given the small subsample sizes, we needed to be conservative in considering subgroup differences. Similarly, we only compare subgroups with at least eight parties, because percentage differences become inflated in smaller subsamples. Given small sample sizes, we do not compare males and females within the JP and DC subsamples. However, [Tables 3 through 7](#) present data by male and female, JP and DC, and male and female within JP and DC.

Hypothetical Court Website Barriers

See [Table 3](#). The eight parties who did not access the court website after receiving a court order to do so identified a variety of hindrances that stood in their way. All reported issues that doing so would have been inconvenient (100%, 8/8). The most commonly mentioned inconvenience was being too busy (100%, 8/8), due to work (63%, 5/8) and/or children (50%, 4/8). Two parties (25%) also endorsed that accessing the court website would have taken too long. For instance, one party noted, "[I] take care of children and grandmother and [I'm] working part time."

General negative perceptions of the court website were mentioned by the majority of this group (75%, 6/8). Parties reported feeling that the court website would not be helpful (a prompted question) (50%, 4/8) or feeling that they were already a good parent and thus did not need a court website or parenting program to help them improve their parenting (50%, 4/8). Other parties indicated that they did not understand why they had been ordered to access the court website (general confusion; 38%, 3/8) and were not even aware that they had been required to access it in the court order (25%, 2/8).

A few parties identified technology issues as potential barriers to their accessing the court website (38%, 3/8). As an example, one party indicated his struggle with accessing the court website: "If I had had WIFI, and known I was supposed to get on the website, I would have done it." Twenty-five percent (2/8) of parties stated that they would have liked to have been notified about the court website in another manner. For example, one party stated, "[I] would have liked them to tell [me] in the court room not through written notice."⁹ Twenty-five percent (2/8) of parties believed that the court website would have been upsetting. For example, one party said that accessing the court website would have been difficult "... because [father] threatened me."

Seven of the eight interviewees who did not access the court website were JP parties; only one DC party participated in this section on the interview. JP parties mentioned being too busy (100%, 7/7; the DC party also mentioned), due to work (58%, 5/7; also mentioned by the DC party) and/or childcare (57%, 4/7; not mentioned by the DC party); having a negative perception of the website (71%, 5/7; also mentioned by the DC party), such as that the website would not have been helpful (43%, 3/7; also mentioned by the DC party), or that they were already a good parent (43%, 3/7; also mentioned by the DC party). JP parties also reported confusion about why they were assigned to access the website (43%, 3/7; not mentioned by the DC party), and noted that they were not aware that they were required to access it

⁹While it could be useful to explore other ways for the court to notify parties, it should be noted that in the study, this parent's suggestion (of being told about the program in the courtroom) would not have been possible. Parties were usually not seen in the courtroom, for their hearing, until later in the process, after they should have done a parenting program. At the initial filing, one party may be at the courthouse and could be told by court staff about the programs, but the non-filing party is not at court and is thus mailed a notice of action and the court order (or if they have an attorney, that information is provided by email to the attorney).



(43%, 3/7; not mentioned by the DC party). JP parties reported wishing that the court would have notified them of the court website in another manner (25%, 2/8; not mentioned by the DC party).

Parenting Program Facilitators

Non-Hypothetical Facilitators. See [Table 4](#). All parties (20/20) who participated in a program reported a positive perception of some aspect of the program. All parties felt the program was helpful (a prompted question). When provided with a list of possible ways the program was helpful, 50% or more of the 20 parties identified that the program improved communication, improved co-parenting skills, improved parenting ability, and helped their child. More JP parties felt that the program improved communication with the other parent (82%, 9/11) than DC parties (56%, 5/9). In addition, 88% (7/8) of male parties endorsed improved communication, compared to only 58% (7/12) of women. In contrast, more DC parties felt that the program helped their child (67%, 6/9), than JP parties (37%, 4/11).

In response to questions that were similar but specifically focused on the program they had actually completed, 95% (19/20) of parties who participated in a program gave a positive review of some aspect, and generally liked many aspects, of the program. DC parties (100%, 9/9) seemed to like the program, in general, more often than JP parties (72%, 8/11). When given a list of program components, some parties identified enjoying the quizzes (80%, 16/20) and videos (70%, 14/20), and others noted that the program was clear and easy to follow (25%, 5/20). One party indicated, "It was simple, everything was self-explanatory [and] I am very computer illiterate."

Three-quarters (15/20) stated that a court factor (e.g., the program was mandatory) facilitated their participation in a program. Women more often cited the fact that the program was mandatory as a reason to participate (83.3%, 10/12) than men (62.5%, 5/8). One party stated, "I was under the impression that it was required, a step in the process and could not continue the court programs without it." JP parties were the only parties who endorsed participating in the program to look good for the judge (37%, 4/11); 0% (0/9) of DC parties did so.

The majority of parties who participated in a program noted that they enjoyed that the program was online, versus in-person, when asked if they preferred one format or the other (70%, 14/20). Male parties (87.5%, 7/8) were more likely to prefer an online program than female parties (58.3%, 7/12). Some male parties, not female parties, went on to state that the privacy of an online program encouraged their program participation (25.0%, 2/8 of males versus 0.0%, 0/12 of females).

Eighty percent (16/20) of parties who participated in a program felt that it was convenient, after being prompted to consider how convenient or inconvenient the program was or through spontaneous responses. Relative to JP parties, DC parties endorsed a few convenience sub-codes more often, including the length of the program (77.7%, 7/9 of DC parties; 54%, 6/11 of JP parties) and the ability to participate in the program in a variety of contexts (55.5%, 5/9 of DC parties; 18%, 2/11 of JP parties). Forty percent (8/20) of parties who participated in a program reported, through spontaneous response, that doing the program on their technology facilitated their program participation. Some parties spontaneously noted that they possessed the necessary technology to access the program (25%, 5/20). Male parties were more likely to do so than females (37.5%, 3/8 of men; 16.6%, 2/12 of women).

Hypothetical Facilitators. See [Table 5](#). The large majority of parties who did not actually participate in a program said that they would have found program participation convenient (94.74%, 36/38). Most commonly, parties noted that the program would have been convenient due to the online nature of the program, with 65.8% (25/38) of parties who did not participate in a program, in their spontaneous reports, noting that technology would have helped them access and participate in the parenting program. Females were more likely than males to endorse the hypothetical positive of technology usage (73.1%, 19/26 versus 50%, 6/12). The majority of parties noted that they possessed the technology that would have been required to participate in the program (63.2%, 24/38). One party indicated, "... like anybody else, I usually have my phone or tablet with me."



Of those who did not participate in a program, 65.8% (25/38) still reported a positive perception of the program. They thought the program would have been helpful (60.5%, 23/38). DC parties were more likely to say that the program would have been helpful than JP parties (77.8%, 7/9 versus 55.2%, 16/29). Parties were presented with a list of things they might have liked to have learned from the program, with parties most commonly identifying that they would have liked to learn how to improve their parenting (50%, 19/38). DC parties were more likely than JP parties to endorse that they would have liked the program to improve their co-parenting (33.3%, 3/9 of DC parties; 6.9%, 2/29 of JP parties). One party stated that he would have liked to ". . . get a better sense of how to better parent. I'm a good dad, but any other information would be helpful."

Fifty-five percent (19/38) of parties who did not participate in a program believed that some social or personal factor (e.g., privacy) would have increased their ability to participate in the program after being asked if they would have preferred a face-to-face or online course or through spontaneous response. DC parties (77.8%, 7/9) hypothetically preferred the online course more often than JP parties (48.3%, 14/29). One party indicated his preference for an online course: "I just like to do things on the computer, I feel like I'm not comfortable doing [a program] with people I don't know."



Parenting Program Barriers

Non-Hypothetical Barriers. See [Table 6](#). Sixty-five percent (13/20) of parties who actually participated in a program disliked some aspect of the program. When given a list of possible aspects they may have disliked, some parties identified the videos (30%, 6/20). DC parties were more likely to report that they did not like the videos (44.4%, 4/9) than JP parties (18.2%, 2/11).

Half (10/20) who participated in a program encountered some problem related to technology use. Most commonly, parties reported a problem accessing or participating due to the required technology (35%, 7/20), while others reported confusion regarding how to navigate or access the program online (30%, 6/20). JP parties seemed to encounter more technology issues

than DC cases on almost every code, with 72.3% (8/11) of JP parties mentioning such an issue (e.g., lack of technology, uncomfortable with technology), in comparison to 22.2% (2/9) of DC parties. Specifically, 54.5% (6/11) of JP parties identified a technology issue with the program itself (e.g., "the program log-in did not work"), in comparison to 11.1% (1/9) of DC parties. Males were more likely to endorse technology issues than females (50%, 4/8 versus 25%, 3/12). For example, one party described, "During the parenting program, one of the segments got stuck and wouldn't move on even after I completed it. I was clicking "continue" or "next" or whatever, but it wouldn't do anything." In addition, 45.5% (5/11) of JP parties thought that accessing the program was confusing (e.g., "I couldn't find the program"), compared to 11.1% (1/9) of DC parties. Also, females were more likely than males to have found accessing the program confusing (41.7%, 5/12 versus 12.5%, 1/8).

Forty-five percent (9/20) of parties who participated in a program reported that it was inconvenient. JP parties were more likely to endorse this as an issue than DC parties (54.6%, 6/11 versus 33.3%, 3/9). Some parties took issue with the length of the program (35%, 7/20), with JP parties being more likely to find it a problem (45.5%, 5/11), than DC parties (22.2%, 2/9). Other parties reported that participating in the program was difficult, given their busy schedules (25%, 5/20). One party noted, "I am very busy, so it was a time burden . . . I . . . cancelled work hours to do it."



Approximately a third of parties who participated in a program noted that they would have preferred an in-person class when asked if they preferred an online or in-person course (30%, 6/20), with female parties (41.6%, 5/12) being more likely to prefer an in-person class than males (12.5%, 1/8). Some parties explained their preference for an in-person class; all noted that they would have liked some form of social support, and all of these parties were female. For instance, one woman stated, "I learn from other people, so I would have liked to have that interaction from other people."

One-quarter (5/20) of parties who participated in a program endorsed a court-related factor that hindered their engagement in the program. Some parties indicated that they would have preferred a different form of communication from the court regarding the program (25%, 5/20), such as clearer presentation of information in the court order or details regarding the benefits of the program. Interestingly, all five of the parties making such suggestions were JP parties. Among JP cases, male parties were more likely to endorse this problem than females (37.5%, 3/8 versus 2/12, 16.7%). One participant said, "I think they could have made [the court order] more clear about what [the program] is with something like a synopsis," while another participant said, "I think that you should text more people."¹⁰

One-quarter (5/20) of parties who participated in the program viewed some aspect of the program negatively. Males were more likely than females to endorse a negative perception of the program (37.5%, 3/8 of males; 16.7%, 2/12 of females). One party indicated, "I am 43 years old, I have 4 children, I kind of have the parenting thing down and so, I don't think it was necessarily helpful."

Hypothetical Barriers. See [Table 7](#). Half (19/38) of the parties who did not actually participate in a parenting program indicated that some social or personal factor, such as the lack of social support, would have discouraged their participation in an online program. One party indicated, "I'm a better face to face learner, so I think I would learn better that way."

Of parties who did not participate in the program, 28.9% (11/38) identified some negative perception of the program. However, all who did so (29%, 11/29) were JP parties (0%, or 0/9 of DC parties), and all eight parties who noted that the program would not have been helpful were JP parties (27.6%). One party stated, "I know everything to take care of a child."

Discussion

The current study was developed in response to much lower than expected rates of parent enrollment in various phases of our ongoing RCT study comparing two online parent education programs, to one another and to no program, for initial divorce and paternity cases in a family court system. Online programs were designed to be more accessible to parents than the traditional, in-person programs. However, we encountered problems with low compliance and attendance in court-ordered, online parenting programs. Thus, the current study was designed to seek party input on barriers and facilitators to program participation. In addition, we explored differences between the unmarried and divorcing parties given known demographic differences between these subgroups.

The Court's Role: Lack of Party Compliance with the Court Order and Resulting Lack of Awareness of the Programs

To date, the RCT has revealed that only 47% of parents (i.e., 51% of divorced parents and 28% of unmarried parents, as estimated from six months of data) sent a court order to go to a court website to find out whether they were court-ordered to complete an online parenting program actually accessed the court website (even with a reminder phone call from the court). The failure of parents to comply with the court order is thus a major drop-off point in getting

¹⁰As noted earlier, on the court-gathered contact information sheet, the vast majority of parties had not given the court permission to contact them by text.



parents to complete an online parenting program. Participants in the current qualitative interview study reported many reasons for not complying with the court order, including busyness, feeling that the website would not have been helpful, general confusion about why they were ordered to access the court website, and a lack of awareness that the court order required them to access the website in the first place.

Our findings suggest that if courts want parents to complete parenting programs, they should consider using both more and more varied forms of contact with parties than a court order either mailed to parties or provided to party attorneys via email. Regarding the content of those communications, in our study, the mailed court order included attempts to decrease potential barriers to program access. The order detailed how the programs could be accessed and ease of access, including the facts that that program was free, not very long, and convenient to complete (i.e., from various devices and at one's convenience in sections). All parents who did not access the court website were reminded to do so.¹¹ However, the court order (and the reminder phone call to those who did not immediately comply) did not address why the court wanted parents to participate in a program, discuss possible benefits of the program, or give extensive details about program content. Party responses to our qualitative interview suggest that doing so might have increased parent compliance with accessing the court order. However, it should be noted that given a lack of empirical studies of the impact of online parenting programs, the court, reasonably, did not know if the programs being tested in the RCT (or any online programs) actually are effective and thus was reluctant to mention possible benefits. However, consistent with past research demonstrating the importance of strong judicial support for programs (Thoennes & Pearson, 1999), the current study findings suggest that if courts want parents to complete parenting programs, they may have to take additional actions beyond sending a court order.

Researchers have explored avenues to improving initial engagement in general parenting programming. In a study of an online informational website for parents, parents were randomly assigned to either a control condition with no emails or to study conditions receiving email newsletters about the website with varying degrees of information. Participants who received emails with more information were significantly more likely to login to the program than participants who did not receive emails (Clarkson, 2014). In another study of parenting program engagement methods, parents were offered free access to the program and were randomly assigned to either a control condition, in which participants received a brochure (e.g., program location/time, childcare provided, topics covered), or an experimental condition that included the brochure and other engagement methods (e.g., a family testimonial flyer, reminder calls, teacher endorsement). Parents approached with multiple methods were more likely to attend both a first session of the program and more program sessions than parents who only received a brochure (Winslow et al., 2016). Thus, while not tested in samples of separating parents, but consistent with our study interview findings with such parents, previous research suggests that providing more information, through multiple methods, can help increase program engagement. Including such information is consistent with basic behavioral economics principles, supporting a need for courts to use clear, persuasive language and communication (e.g., Mayer et al., 2015).

Continued court support for program participation beyond the initial court order. In interviews with all of the participants in our study (i.e., not just those who did not access the court website), parents identified that beyond the initial court order, court actions might either help or hinder their participation in a parenting program. Many parties mentioned completing a program because it was mandatory, indicating that the court order did motivate some parents to complete it. However, some parties noted dissatisfaction regarding how the court communicated the program mandate; all parties mentioning this theme were unmarried. In addition, unmarried parents were the only parties to mention completing a program to look good for the judge. These data indicate that the court plays a particularly crucial role in unmarried parents' decisions to participate in programming, even though their ultimate rate

¹¹Unfortunately, due to difficulties with tracking, we do not have reliable information about the percentage of parties who were called or were successfully reached by phone for these reminders.



of compliance with the court order was lower than the rate for divorcing parents. When coupled with the fact that a significantly smaller percentage of unmarried parties were represented by attorneys, unmarried parents may require (and benefit from) additional guidance from the court through the process, such as through clearer materials about a program or assistance from court staff when trying to complete a program (Insabella et al., 2003).

Additionally, some parents reported that they would have liked court acknowledgement of successful completion of a program, or, alternatively, some form of negative consequence if a program was not completed (note that the latter was usually suggested for use with the other parent, not oneself). Past research has indicated that monetary incentives increase enrollment in parent programs (Dumas et al., 2010), though evidence is anecdotal for the success of other incentives, such as food or childcare (Axford et al., 2012). Regarding negative consequences for non-compliance with court orders, the criminal law system has explored such options by imposing threats such as incarceration or community service, with some success (Weisburd et al., 2008). These consequences may not be as appropriate for the family law system (especially as in our court's situation, which was ordering parents to programs whose effectiveness was unknown). While there is little research to support the use of negative consequences for non-compliance in parent programming, some states do impose such restrictions (e.g., holding a parent who fails to attend the program in contempt, denying that parent shared parental responsibility or time-sharing, or not granting a divorce until both parents have completed the program; Pollet & Lombreglia, 2008). However, such mandates may be problematic. Among divorcing parties, they may be used by one parent to elongate the divorce process, thereby "punishing" the other parent, and they may not apply to unmarried parents who do not receive a divorce decree.

In the current qualitative study, as already noted, the judges chose not to impose consequences for failure to participate in the program as ordered, given the lack of evidence supporting the effectiveness of online parent education programs. They reasoned that it was not fair to penalize a parent for not attending a program when we do not know if the programs are beneficial or harmful, particularly as part of a study investigating exactly that question. We encourage future researchers to work with their judicial partners to increase court support for parent program participation, doing so in creative ways that recognize, and are consistent with, judicial reservations regarding penalizing lack of program participation when the court does not know if the program is effective (e.g., delaying non-emergency hearings or the issuance of a divorce decree until proof of compliance is demonstrated or positively recognizing party compliance). It may take an additional level of encouragement for party compliance in unmarried cases, in which there is no divorce decree to be granted and child support orders are often established and enforced automatically. In studying the efficacy and effectiveness of new programs, researchers should help courts to understand that study findings can be compromised by low participation rates, undermining the potential ability of researchers to draw firm conclusions about program effects. One option might be to draw from implementation science approaches (e.g., Bauer et al., 2015), which emphasize not only conducting program evaluation research, but also research on how to encourage practitioners, which would include courts, to actually implement programs that have empirical support.

Ways to Change Online Parenting Programs to Increase Parental Participation

Beyond the court's role in encouraging, supporting, and requiring parents to do a parent program, we gathered feedback about parents' perceptions of the programs themselves, from both parents who did and did not participate in a program. Study participant feedback can be useful to consider how to design and implement such programs to increase parent participation.

Positive and negative perceptions of the programs. Nearly one-third of participants who did not participate in a parenting program reported a negative perception of some aspect of such programs, with JP parties doing so more frequently than DC parties. However, all participants who participated in a parenting program reported a positive perception of some aspect of the parenting program, with JP parents more apt than DC parents to report that it



improved communication. These findings suggest that once parents actually participate in a program, it is perceived positively, but to increase initial program engagement, we need to improve participants' initial perceptions of online programs, particularly among JP parties. Such findings are consistent with our above findings that parent programs require intensive initial engagement strategies to increase parental awareness and knowledge of the potential benefits of a program.

It is possible that parents undergoing separation or divorce may not be focused on completing a parenting program, as the benefits of doing so will occur in the future. Such indications are consistent with behavioral economics literature indicating that adults struggle to give up present things they enjoy (e.g., time) for the future—called the present bias. In a parenting context, parents may struggle with allowing additional time for a parenting program when first, they are already experiencing the stress related to the separation, and second, the return on their time investment in the program will not occur until some point in the future (Mayer et al., 2015). Unmarried parents may be even less likely to complete parent programming, given additional levels of stress due to the increased likelihood of economic disadvantage (Insabella et al., 2003).

Behavior scientists have proposed several of ways of addressing the present bias. First, some have used parental commitment to encourage future participation, such as through a written pledge. Studies indicate that individuals are more likely to carry out an activity if they have recorded their intended participation (Giné et al., 2010). Program creators may benefit from using a commitment tool to incentivize continued participation. While the current study used one reminder phone call, other researchers have used more consistent reminders across multiple platforms (e.g., texting) to increase program compliance (Richburg-Hayes et al., 2014). Increased use of reminders to access and complete programming may increase participation rates.

Social factors related to program engagement. Participants reported that social factors could either encourage or discourage their participation in the parenting program. More specifically, some participants reported that they would have been, or were, discouraged by the lack of social support offered by an online program. However, others reported that they would have appreciated, or did appreciate, the privacy of an online program.

A systematic review of 75 studies of online parenting resources found that the majority of resources offered some form of parent socialization, most commonly through informational pages, group forums, email, or an online chat capability, where parents who desired additional social support could participate as they saw fit. Content analysis of online parent communication across the studies showed overall consistent high levels of parent satisfaction whenever online social support was offered (Nieuwboer et al., 2013). In one feasibility study investigating how online tools can be used to engage parents, an online version of a parenting program was administered to a sample of high-risk parents; the program included a social media network containing discussion boards, an avatar for parents, and a facilitator to respond to posts, answer questions, share work, and monitor the site. The majority of participants in this study reported feeling engaged by the social media platform (Love et al., 2016).

It is important to note that only some participants in our study, particularly women, desired more social support than was offered in the programs we tested. Thus, it is possible that including an optional form of online social support, such as a social media network or discussion board, could increase participant engagement by honoring the desires of both participants who wanted more social support and those who did not. It is also possible that, when resources are available to do so, offering parents a choice between an online program and an in-person program could increase engagement by allowing parents to select what best fits their needs for social support.

Convenience of the programs. Some participants reported that participating in a program would have been, or was, inconvenient. Notably, unmarried parties mentioned inconvenience, particularly inconvenience associated with the length of the program, more often than divorcing parties, indicating that these parties require additional efforts from



the courts to reduce commonly encountered inconveniences. However, most parties reported that participating in a program was, or would have been, convenient.

Previous studies have addressed inconvenience in a variety of ways. In one review, the authors suggested individually tailoring support to meet parents' needs, whether by providing connections to other organizations, transportation, or childcare (Koerting et al., 2013). Participants in a qualitative study aimed at increasing the engagement of young parents in parenting programs reported that provision of on-site childcare, accessibility to public transportation, and other factors such as voluntary attendance and food would encourage program attendance (Taylor et al., 2012). Another study of educational services offered through Head Start randomly assigned parents to either receive childcare and transportation or to a control group not provided with either benefit. The group of parents provided childcare and transportation demonstrated a higher level of participation (Watterson, 2001). Length of the program may also be an avenue to address inconvenience problems, particularly for unmarried parties. Courts have implemented short (e.g., one to three hours) programs in an attempt to provide parties with parenting strategies while limiting inconvenience of the programs (e.g., Bowers et al., 2011). However, there is no strong evidence demonstrating positive impacts of such short programs on child and parent well-being, parenting strategies, or other outcomes. Thus, program developers and researchers should continue to explore how programming can be shortened, to allow for greater convenience, while still producing effective outcomes.

The findings of researchers above suggest online parenting programs, which generally do not require transportation or formal childcare, should be a feasible option for parent education. However, the inconveniences reported by our study participants, particularly unmarried parents (who were more concerned about inconvenience), suggest that even online parenting programs can benefit from supplementary supports, such as allowing additional time to complete a program or alternative locations to participate in a program (e.g., offering computer access and childcare at the court).

Technology associated with the programs. Many participants reported that they enjoyed, or would have enjoyed, the use of technology and that they had, or would have had, access to the technology required to complete the programs. These findings are consistent with previous research. Studies surveying accessibility of online parenting programs found that even among low-income or disadvantaged families, the majority of participants had smartphones and access to the internet for personal use (Mcgoron et al., 2018). Additionally, participants reported high levels of comfort using technology and prior experience using technology to gain information or a new skill (Mcgoron et al., 2018; Love et al., 2016).

It is, however, important to note that a small percentage of parties in our study, in particular unmarried parties, encountered some form of confusion or difficulty associated with the technology of the online program. Thus, methods to alleviate parent's technology issues or discomfort could be important to incorporate into programs. One study of barriers to parental education, for parents of children returning from residential treatment for behavioral challenges, found that although many parents were comfortable navigating an online program, some who were less familiar with technology relied more heavily on in-program prompts and online technology support. The author suggested that for parents with less technology familiarity, continued online support, in the form of informational pages or being able to call an Information Technology specialist, may be necessary (Robinson, 2018). Such technology support might assist divorcing and separating parents in completing parenting programs.

Study Limitations

Given the small sample size, the current study findings may not be generalizable to all divorcing or separating parents sent court orders in Delaware County. Unfortunately, we are unable to compare the descriptive demographics of those who did and did not participate in the qualitative study, as we lack demographic data on



those who did not. Similarly, our current study findings may not be generalizable to different court jurisdictions, which can vary across multiple factors, including family demographics, type of parent program offered, resources available for program implementation, and existing statutes regarding parenting program requirements.

The qualitative data collected in this study are self-reports. Although interviewers informed participants that no person in the court system would have access to their responses, results may have been impacted by parents' social desirability or their mistaken belief that reviewing a program favorably would somehow benefit them in court. Due both to the fact that the qualitative study was not designed until the RCT was partially completed and to our qualitative study eligibility criteria (e.g., case must have had a court hearing), some participants were contacted months after they were assigned to complete a parenting program. Thus, a participant may have forgotten details about the parenting program and their reasons for participating in it or not.

It is important to note that a large majority of our collected interview responses were from parties who had not participated in a program but were asked hypothetical questions about the programs. The literature has indicated that individuals asked to respond hypothetically may be more likely to inflate the likelihood of perceived barriers when they have not actually experienced such barriers (e.g., Gilbert et al., 1998). Thus, future researchers should continue to explore actual encountered barriers to participation in parent programming.

Conclusions

The results of this study are useful for understanding barriers and facilitators to educational parenting program access and participation among parents opening a court case for divorce or separation. Parents' reports indicated the important role that the court can (and should) play in increasing parental engagement, particularly among unmarried parties. In addition, both negative opinions about the programs (e.g., it would not be helpful, problems with technology) and inconvenience (e.g., busyness) are important barriers to consider when attempting to increase parent engagement in such programs. Further systematic studies of methods to increase parent engagement are required to fully understand effective methods of making programs more accessible to divorcing and separating parents alike.



While the interview responses in the current study are helpful in providing ideas to increase program participation, researchers, in conjunction with court systems, must first, or perhaps concurrently, determine if online parent programs are effective before investing heavily in ways to increase parent engagement in programs. For example, many parents in the current study endorsed busyness and an inability to complete a program due to its length, and when prompted, identified that they would have liked a shorter program (e.g., one to two hours rather than three to five). However, this is in direct contrast to what current research has indicated is effective in parenting programs (i.e., 12- to 16-week, intensive, in-person courses, such as New Beginnings; Wolchik et al., 2009). Future researchers should continue to explore what types of programs are effective for divorcing and separating parents, followed by how to engage these two groups of parents appropriately, who may require differing engagement and retention strategies.



References

- Amato, P. R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of marriage and family, 72*(3), 650–666.
- Arbuthnot, J., & Gordon, D. A. (1996). Does mandatory divorce education for parents work? A sixmonth outcome evaluation. *Family Court Review, 34*(1), 60–81.
- Axford, N., Lehtonen, M., Kaoukji, D., Tobin, K., & Berry, V. (2012). Engaging parents in parenting programs: Lessons from research and practice. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34*(10), 2061–2071.
- Barlow, J., McMillan, A. S., Kirkpatrick, S., Ghate, H., Smith, M., Barnes, J. (2008). Health-Led Parenting Interventions in Pregnancy and Early Years. DCSF. Available at <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research>.
- Bauer, M. S., Damschroder, L., Hagedorn, H., Smith, J., & Kilbourne, A. M. (2015). An introduction to implementation science for the non-specialist. *BMC psychology, 3*(1), 32.
- Baydar, N., Reid, J., & Webster-Stratton, C. (2003). The role of mental health factors and program engagement in the effectiveness of a preventive parenting program for head start mothers. *Child Development, 74*, 1433–1453. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00616.
- Bowers, J. R., Mitchell, E. T., Hardesty, J. L., & Hughes, Jr, R. (2011). A review of online divorce education programs. *Family Court Review, 49*(4), 776–787.
- Brennan, R. L., & Prediger, D. J. (1981). Coefficient kappa: Some uses, misuses, and alternatives. *Educational and psychological measurement, 41*(3), 687–699.
- Caraway, N., & Jones, L. B. (2011). Phase II final report: Parenting through divorce (Grant #: 2R44HD050021-02). Eugene, OR: IRIS Media. Retrieved from http://cec52fdc8e4600862f37e32b446c5ced4df11af0c818d6c260da.r50.cf1.rackcdn.com/files/extra_resources/Parenting-through-divorce-phaseii-final.pdf
- Clarkson, A. C. (2014). *Participation on a Parenting Website: Testing Predictors of Parents' Passive and Active Site Participation* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison).
- Cookston, J. T., Braver, S. L., Sandler, I., & Genalo, M. T. (2002). prospects for expanded parent education services for divorcing families with children. *Family Court Review, 40*(2), 190–203. doi:10.1111/j.174-1617.2002.tb00830.x
- Cooper, C. E., Osborne, C. A., Beck, A. N., & McLanahan, S. S. (2011). Partnership instability, school readiness, and gender disparities. *Sociology of Education, 84*, 246–259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0038040711402361>
- Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative sociology, 13*(1), 3–21.
- Cunningham, C., Boyle, M., Offord, D., Racine, Y., Hundert, J., Secord, M., et al. (2000). Tri-ministry study: Correlates of school-based parenting course utilization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*, 928–933. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.5.928.
- Dumas, J. E., Begle, A. M., French, B., & Pearl, A. (2010). Effects of monetary incentives on engagement in the PACE parenting program. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 39*(3), 302–313.
- Fackrell, T. A., Hawkins, A. J., & Kay, N. M. (2011). How effective are court-affiliated divorcing parents education programs? a meta-analytic study: Divorce education meta-analysis. *Family Court Review, 49*(1), 107–119. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2010.01356.x
- Gilbert, D. T., Pinel, E. C., Wilson, T. D., Blumberg, S. J., & Wheatley, T. P. (1998). Immune neglect: a source of durability bias in affective forecasting. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 75*(3), 617.
- Giné, X., Karlan, D., & Zinman, J. (2010). Put your money where your butt is: a commitment contract for smoking cessation. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 2*(4), 213–235.
- Gorman-Smith, D., Tolan, P., Henry, D., Leventhal, A., Schoeny, M., Lutovsky, K., et al. (2002). Predictors of participation in a family-focused preventive intervention for substance use. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 16*(4S), S55–S64. doi:10.1037/0893-164X.16.4S.S55
- Insabella, G. M., Williams, T., & Pruett, M. K. (2003). Individual and coparenting differences between divorcing and unmarried fathers: Implications for family court services. *Family Court Review, 41*(3), 290–306.
- Koerting, J., Smith, E., Knowles, M. M., Latter, S., Elsey, H., McCann, D. C., Sonuga-Barke, E. (2013). Barriers to, and facilitators of, parenting programmes for childhood behaviour problems: A qualitative synthesis of studies of parents' and professionals' perceptions. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 22*(11), 653–670. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-013-0401-2>
- Love, S. M., Sanders, M. R., Turner, K. M. T., Maurange, M., Knott, T., Prinz, R., Ainsworth, A. T. (2016). Social media and gamification: Engaging vulnerable parents in an online evidence-based parenting program. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 53*, 95–107. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.031>
- Martin, J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Osterman, M. J., Curtin, S. C., & Matthews, T. J. (2013). Births: Final data for 2012 [National Center for Health Statistics]. *National Vital Statistics Reports, 62*, 1–68.
- Mayer, S. E., Kalil, A., Oreopoulos, P., & Gallegos, S. (2015). *Using behavioral insights to increase parental engagement: The parents and children together (PACT) intervention* (No. w21602). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Mcgoron, L., Hvizdos, E., Bocknek, E. L., Montgomery, E., & Ondersma, S. J. (2018). Feasibility of Internet-based parent training for low-income parents of young children. *Children and Youth Services Review, 84*, 198–205. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.12.004
- Mytton, J., Ingram, J., Manns, S., & Thomas, J. (2014). Facilitators and barriers to engagement in parenting programs: A qualitative systematic review. *Health Education & Behavior, 41*(2), 127–137.

- Nieuwboer, C. C., Fukkink, R. G., & Hermanns, J. M. A. (2013). Peer and professional parenting support on the internet: A systematic review. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(7), 518-528. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0547
- Osborne, C., & McLanahan, S. (2007). Partnership instability and child wellbeing. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(4), 1065-1083.
- Pollet, S. L., & Lombreglia, M. (2008). a nationwide survey of mandatory parent education. *Family Court Review*, 46(2), 375-394. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00207.x
- Richburg-Hayes, L., Anzelone, C., Dechausay, N., Datta, S., Fiorillo, A., Potok, L., ... & Balz, J. (2014). Behavioral economics and social policy: Designing innovative solutions for programs supported by the Administration for Children and Families. *Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, US Department of Health and Human Services*.
- Robinson, W. (2018). *Exploring parenting self-efficacy among parents of children In residential treatment: evaluating a combined online psychoeducational intervention* (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University).
- Sigal, A., Sandler, I., Wolchik, S., & Braver, S. (2011). Do parent education programs promote healthy postdivorce parenting? Critical distinctions and a review of the evidence. *Family Court Review*, 49(1), 120-139.
- Spoth, R., & Redmond, C. (2000). Research on family engagement in preventive interventions: Toward improved use of scientific findings in primary prevention practice. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 21, 267-284. doi:10.1023/A:1007039421026.
- Sullivan, M. J. (2008). Coparenting and the parenting coordination process. *Journal of Child Custody*, 5(1-2), 4-24.
- Taylor, C., Mills, A., Schmied, V., Dahlen, H., Shuiringa, W., & Hudson, M. E. (2012). What works to engage young parents into services? Findings from an appreciative inquiry workshop. *Contemporary Nurse*, 42(2), 258-271. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5172/conu.2012.42.2.258
- Thoennes, N., & Pearson, J. (1999). Parent education in the domestic relations court: A multisite assessment. *Family Court Review*, 37(2), 195-218.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). Detailed tables: Number, timing and duration of marriages and divorces, 2009. s, 2009. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 3, 2011, from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p70-125.pdf>
- Watterson, K. J. (2001). *Head Start parent education participation: A study of motivating factors* (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest Information & Learning).
- Weisburd, D., Einat, T., & Kowalski, M. (2008). The miracle of the cells: An experimental study of interventions to increase payment of courtordered financial obligations. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 7(1), 9-36.
- Whiteside, M. F., & Becker, B. J. (2000). Parental factors and the young child's postdivorce adjustment: A meta-analysis with implications for parenting arrangements. *Journal of family psychology*, 14(1), 5.
- Winslow, E. B., Bonds, D., Wolchik, S., Sandler, I., & Braver, S. (2009). Predictors of enrollment and retention in a preventive parenting intervention for divorced families. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 30(2), 151-172.
- Winslow, E. B., Poloskov, E., Begay, R., Tein, J. Y., Sandler, I., & Wolchik, S. (2016). A randomized trial of methods to engage Mexican American parents into a school-based parenting intervention. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 84(12), 1094.
- Wolchik, S. A., Sandler, I. N., Jones, S., Gonzales, N., Doyle, K., Winslow, E., ... & Braver, S. L. (2009). The new beginnings program for divorcing and separating families: Moving from efficacy to effectiveness. *Family Court Review*, 47(3), 416-435.

Table 1. Individual Demographic Data

| | | JP Mean (SD) | DC Mean (SD) | JP N/N (%) | DC N/N (%) |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Gender | Female | | | 31/43 (72.1) | 12/18 (66.6) |
| | Male | | | 12/43 (27.9) | 6/18 (33.3) |
| Age in years | | 31.77 (7.20) ** | 37.22 (9.64) ** | | |
| Education | Years | 12.93 (1.14) * | 13.83 (2.09) * | | |
| Hispanic or Latino (% yes) | | | | 2/42 (4.7) | 1/18 (5.5) |
| Race | White | | | 29/42 (69) | 15/18 (83.3) |
| | Black | | | 10/42 (23.8) | 3/18 (16.6) |
| | Biracial or multiracial | | | 3/42 (7.1) | 0/18 (0) |
| Main daily activities (could choose more than one) | Working full time | | | 22/41 (53.7) | 10/17 (58.8) |
| | Working part time | | | 11/40 (27.5) | 4/17 (23.5) |
| | Full time home/family responsibilities | | | 5/40 (13.5) | 1/17 (5.8) |
| | Student | | | 2/40 (5) | 0/17 (0) |
| | Disabled | | | 0/40 (0) | 1/17 (5.8) |
| | Unemployed | | | 0/40 (0) | 1/17 (5.8) |
| Finances at the end of the month | Not enough to make ends meet | | | 18/42 (42.9) | 6/18 (33.3) |
| | Enough to make ends meet | | | 13/42 (31) | 6/18 (33.3) |
| | Some money left over | | | 11/42 (26.2) | 6/18 (33.3) |
| Number of own children under age 18 currently living in household | | 1.47 (1.35) | 1.18 (1.07) | | |
| Number of other children under 18 currently living in household | | .19 (.51) | .22 (.73) | | |
| Housemates | None | | | 28/42 (66.7) | 10/18 (55.6) |
| | New partner | | | 6/43 (14) | 3/18 (16.7) |
| | Roommate, acquaintance, friend | | | 4/43 (9.3) | 2/18 (11.1) |
| | Other relatives | | | 2/43 (4.7) | 1/18 (5.6) |
| | Other parent in this case | | | 1/43 (2.3) | 1/18 (5.6) |
| | Parents | | | 1/43 (2.3) | 0/18 (0) |
| | Other | | | 0/43 (0) | 1/18 (5.6) |

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$



Table 2. Relationship Demographic Data

| | | JP Mean (SD) | DC Mean (SD) | JP N/N (%) | DC N/N (%) |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Current parenting time arrangement | 1 = All time spent with mother | | | | |
| | 4 = Time spent equally | 2.36 (1.47) | 2.89 (1.40) | | |
| | 7 = All time spent with father | | | | |
| Time parents lived together in years | | 6.0 (4.93) *** | 11.28 (5.26) *** | | |
| Time parents have been separated in years | | 2.46 (2.94) | 1.773 (1.75) | | |
| Number of children the parents in the case share | | 1.53 (.77) | 1.78 (1.35) | | |
| Party has a new partner | | | | 14/43 (32.6) * | 11/18 (61.1) * |
| Party reports that other parent has a new partner | | | | 21/40 (52.5) | 10/17 (58.8) |
| Current level of conflict between parents | 0 = No Conflict | | | | |
| | 4 = Very High | 1.65 (1.43) | 1.03 (1.29) | | |

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$



Table 3. Hypothetical Court Website: Barriers

| Main Code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N(%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | |
| Inconvenient | | | 8/8 (100.0%) | 7/7 (100.0%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | | | | 2/3 (66.6%) | 4/4 (100.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | Too busy | | 8/8 (100.0%) | 7/7 (100%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | | | | 3/3 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | | Too busy due to work | 5/8 (62.5%) | 4/7 (57.1%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | | | | 2/3 (66.6%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 4/4 (100.0%) | 4/4 (100.0%) |
| | | Too busy due to kids | 4/8 (50.0%) | 4/7 (57.1%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 1/4 (25.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 3/4 (75.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 3/4 (75.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | Too long | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 2/4 (50.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 0/4 (0.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) |
| | Inadequate transportation | | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| | Online | | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 1/4 (25.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 0/4 (0.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) |
| Negative Perception of Some Aspect of Website | | | 6/8 (75%) | 5/7 (71.4%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 3/4 (75.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | | | | 2/3 (66.6%) | 3/4 (75.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 3/4 (75.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | Would not be helpful | | 4/8 (50.0%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 2/4 (50.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 2/4 (50.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | Already a good parent | 4/8 (50.0%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 2/4 (50.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 2/4 (50.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | Not going back to court | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 1/4 (25.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) |
| | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 0/4 (0.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 0/4 (0.0%) | |
| | Confused as to why assigned | | 3/8 (37.5%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | Not aware mandated | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/7 (28.6%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 1/4 (25.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/4 (25.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 1/4 (25.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| Technology | | | 3/8 (37.5%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 3/4 (75.0%) |
| | Uncomfortable | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/7 (28.6%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | Lack of technology | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/7 (28.6%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| Notified in Another Manner | | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/7 (28.6%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 2/4 (50.0%) |
| Social/Personal Factor | | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 1/1 (100.0%) | | 1/4 (25.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) | 1/1 (100.0%) | N/A | 1/4 (25.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) |
| | Upsetting | | 2/8 (25.0%) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Upsetting to discuss other parent | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 0/1 (0.0%) | | 0/4 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) | |
| | | | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) | 0/1 (0.0%) | N/A | 0/4 (0.0%) | 1/4 (25.0%) | |



Table 4. Non-Hypothetical Parenting Program: Facilitators

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) | |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | | |
| Positive perception | Helpful | | 20/20 (100.0%) | 11/11 (100.0%) | | 9/9 (100.0%) | | 8/8 (100.0%) | | |
| | | | 5/5 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 12/12 (100.0%) | | | |
| | | | 20/20 (100.0%) | 11/11 (100.0%) | | 9/9(100.0%) | | 8/8 (100.0%) | | |
| | | | 5/5 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 12/12 (100.0%) | | | |
| | | | Improved communication | 14/20 (70.0%) | 9/11 (81.8%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) | |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 7/12 (58.3%) | | |
| | | | Parenting | 13/20 (65.0%) | 7/11 (63.6%) | | 6/9 (66.7%) | | 6/8 (75.0%) | |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 7/12 (58.3%) | | |
| | | | Co-parenting | 10/20 (50.0%) | 6/11 (54.5%) | | 4/9 (44.4%) | | 4/8 (50.0%) | |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 6/12 (50.0%) | | |
| | | | Helped child | 10/20 (50.0%) | 4/11 (36.4%) | | 6/9 (66.7%) | | 4/8 (50.0%) | |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 6/12 (50.0%) | | |
| | | | Learned discipline | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| | | | Interest | 4/20 (20.0%) | 3/11 (27.3%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 1/6 (16.7%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.7%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| Positive review | Program in general | | 19/20 (95.0%) | 10/11 (90.9%) | | 9/9 (100.0%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) | | |
| | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 12/12 (100.0%) | | | |
| | | | 17/20 (85.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 9/9 (100.0%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) | | |
| | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 6/6 (100.0%) | 10/12 (83.3%) | | | |
| | | | Quizzes | 16/20 (80.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 8/9 (88.9%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) | |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 5/6 (83.0%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 10/12 (83.3%) | | |
| | | | Videos | 14/20 (70.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 6/9 (66.7%) | | 6/8 (75.0%) | |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 4/6 (80.0%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 8/12 (66.7%) | | |
| | | | Clarity | 5/20 (25.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 3/12 (25.0%) | | |



Table 4. Non-Hypothetical Parenting Program: Facilitators (continued)

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) Female Total N (%) |
|-------------------------|--|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | |
| Court factors | | | 15/20 (75.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 5/8 (62.5%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 10/12 (83.3%) |
| | Mandatory | | 15/20 (75.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 5/8 (62.5%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 10/12 (83.3%) |
| | Look good | | 4/20 (20.0%) | 4/11 (36.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 2/12 (16.7%) |
| Social/personal factors | | | 14/20 (70.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 6/9 (66.6%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 4/6 (66.6%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 7/12 (58.3%) |
| | More privacy | | 2/20 (10.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) |
| | No social interaction required | | 1/20 (5.0%) | 0/11 (0.0%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.7%) | 0/12 (0.0%) |
| Convenience | | | 16/20 (80.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 8/9 (88.9%) | | 7/8 (87.5%) |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 4/6 (66.6%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 9/12 (75.0%) |
| | Length of program | | 13/20 (65.0%) | 6/11 (54.5%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 6/8 (75.0%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 7/12 (58.3%) |
| | Complete the program wherever/whenever | | 7/20 (35.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 2/6 (40.0%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 4/6 (66.7%) | 4/12 (33.3%) |
| Technology | | | 8/20 (40.0%) | 4/11 (36.4%) | | 4/9 (44.4%) | | 4/8 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 4/12 (33.3%) |
| | Possess technology | | 5/20 (25.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 2/3 (66.7%) | 1/6 (16.7%) | 2/12 (16.7%) |
| | Comfortable with technology | | 4/20 (20.0%) | 3/11 (27.3%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.7%) | 2/12 (16.7%) |



Table 5. Hypothetical Parenting Program: Facilitators

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | |
| Convenience | | | 36/38 (94.7%) | 27/29 (93.1%) | | 9/9 (100.0%) | | 12/12 (100.0%) | |
| | | | 10/10 (100.0%) | 17/19 (89.5%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 7/7 (100.0%) | 24/26 (92.3%) | | |
| | Complete wherever/whenever | | 5/38 (13.2%) | 4/29 (13.8%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 3/19 (15.8%) | 1/2 (50.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 3/26 (11.5%) | | |
| | No childcare needed | | 1/38 (2.6%) | 0/29 (0.0%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| 0/10 (0.0%) | | | 0/19 (0.0%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | | | |
| Technology | | | 25/38 (65.8%) | 20/29 (69.0%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 6/12 (50.0%) | |
| | | | 5/10 (50.0%) | 15/19 (78.9%) | 1/2 (50.0%) | 4/7 (57.1%) | 19/26 (73.1%) | | |
| | Possess technology | | 24/38 (63.2%) | 19/29 (65.5%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 6/12 (50.0%) | |
| | | | 5/10 (50.0%) | 14/19 (73.7%) | 1/2 (50.0%) | 4/7 (57.1%) | 18/26 (69.2%) | | |
| | Comfortable with technology | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| 0/10 (0.0%) | | | 2/19 (10.5%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 2/26 (7.7%) | | | |
| Positive perception | | | 25/38 (65.8%) | 18/29 (62.1%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 8/12 (66.7%) | |
| | | | 6/10 (60.0%) | 12/19 (63.2%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 5/7 (71.4%) | 17/26 (65.4%) | | |
| | Helpful | | 23/38 (60.5%) | 16/29 (55.2%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 8/12 (66.7%) | |
| | | | 6/10 (60.0%) | 10/19 (52.6%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 5/7 (71.4%) | 15/26 (57.7%) | | |
| | Improved parenting | | 19/38 (50.0%) | 14/29 (48.3%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 6/12 (50.0%) | |
| | | | 4/10 (40.0%) | 10/19 (52.6%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | 13/26 (50.0%) | | |
| | Helped child | | 9/38 (23.7%) | 6/29 (20.7%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 4/12 (33.3%) | |
| | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 4/19 (21.1%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | 5/26 (19.2%) | | |
| | Improved co-parenting | | 5/38 (13.2%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 3/7 (42.9%) | 4/26 (15.4%) | | |
| | Learn discipline | | 3/38 (7.9%) | 3/29 (10.3%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| | | | 0/10 (0.0%) | 3/19 (15.8%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 3/26 (11.5%) | | |
| | Improve communication | | 3/38 (7.9%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | 2/26 (7.7%) | | |
| | Interest in program | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| 1/10 (10.0%) | | | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | | | |



Table 5. Hypothetical Parenting Program: Facilitators (continued)

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | |
| Social/personal factors | | | 21/38 (55.3%) | 14/29 (48.3%) | | 7/9 (77.8%) | | 9/12 (75.0%) | |
| | | | | 7/10 (70.0%) | 7/19 (36.8%) | 2/2 (100.0%) | 5/7 (71.4%) | 12/26 (46.2%) | |
| | Privacy | | 5/38 (13.2%) | 4/29 (13.8%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | 3/26 (11.5%) | |
| | No social interaction | | 4/38 (10.5%) | 3/29 (10.3%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 1/7 (14.3%) | 2/26 (7.7%) | |
| Court factors | | | 3/38 (7.9%) | 3/29 (10.3%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 2/26 (7.7%) | |
| | Mandatory | | 3/38 (7.9%) | 3/29 (10.3%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 2/26 (7.7%) | |
| | Look good | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | |



Table 6. Non-Hypothetical Parenting Program: Barriers

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | |
| Negative review | | | 13/20 (65.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 5/9 (55.6%) | | 5/8 (62.5%) | 5/8 (62.5%) |
| | | | | 4/5 (80.0%) | 4/6 (66.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 4/6 (66.6%) | 8/12 (66.7%) | 8/12 (66.7%) |
| | Videos | | 6/20 (30.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 4/9 (44.4%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 4/12 (33.3%) | 4/12 (33.3%) |
| | Outdated | | 3/20 (15.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | 1/12 (8.3%) |
| | Quizzes | | 3/20 (15.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | 1/12 (8.3%) |
| | Unclear | | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | 0/8 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | 1/12 (8.3%) |
| Technology | | | 10/20 (50.0%) | 8/11 (72.7%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 4/8 (50.0%) | 4/8 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 5/6 (83.3%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 6/12 (50.0%) | 6/12 (50.0%) |
| | Technology issues | | 7/20 (35.0%) | 6/11 (54.6%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 4/8 (50.0%) | 4/8 (50.0%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 3/12 (25.0%) | 3/12 (25.0%) |
| | Accessing the program was confusing | | 6/20 (30.0%) | 5/11 (45.5%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/8 (12.5%) |
| | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 4/6 (66.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 5/12 (41.7%) | 5/12 (41.7%) | |
| Inconvenience | | | 9/20 (45.0%) | 6/11 (54.6%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) | 3/8 (37.5%) |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 6/12 (50.0%) | 6/12 (50.0%) |
| | Too long | | 7/20 (35.0%) | 5/11 (45.5%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 5/12 (41.7%) | 5/12 (41.7%) |
| | Too busy | | 5/20 (25.0%) | 3/11 (27.3%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 2/8 (25.0%) | 2/8 (25.0%) |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 3/12 (25.0%) | 3/12 (25.0%) |
| | | Too busy due to kids | 2/20 (10.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | 0/8 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | 2/12 (16.7%) |
| | | Too busy due to work | 2/20 (10.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | 0/8 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | 2/12 (16.7%) |
| | Program expired | | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | 0/8 (0.0%) |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | 1/12 (8.3%) |
| | No childcare | | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | 1/8 (12.5%) |
| | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) | |



Table 6. Non-Hypothetical Parenting Program: Barriers (continued)

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) | |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | | |
| Social/personal factors | | | 6/20 (30.0%) | 3/11 (27.3%) | | 3/9 (33.3%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | | |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 3/6 (50.0%) | 5/12 (41.6%) | | |
| | | | Lack of social support | 4/20 (20.0%) | 2/11 (18.2%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | |
| Court factors | | | 5/20 (25.0%) | 5/11 (45.5%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) | | |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | Communication was problematic | 5/20 (25.0%) | 5/11 (45.5%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) | |
| | | | | 3/5 (60.0%) | 2/6 (33.3%) | 3/3 (100.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | Additional reminders | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | |
| | | | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| Negative perception | | | 5/20 (25.0%) | 3/11 (27.3%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 3/8 (37.5%) | | |
| | | | | 2/5 (40.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | Not helpful | 3/20 (15.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | Already good parent | 2/20 (10.0%) | 0/11 (0.0%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 1/3 (33.3%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | | |
| | | | Other parent needed | 1/20 (5.0%) | 0/11 (0.0%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | | |
| | | | No co-parenting happening | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/8 (0.0%) | |
| | | | | 0/5 (0.0%) | 1/6 (16.6%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 1/12 (8.3%) | | |
| Did not understand assignment | | 1/20 (5.0%) | 1/11 (9.1%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/8 (12.5%) | | | |
| | | 1/5 (20.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/3 (0.0%) | 0/6 (0.0%) | 0/12 (0.0%) | | | | |



Table 7. Hypothetical Parenting Program: Barrier

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | | JP Male N (%) | JP Female N (%) | DC Male N (%) | DC Female N (%) | | | | |
| Social or personal barrier factor | | | 19/38 (50.0%) | 15/29 (51.7%) | | 4/9 (44.4%) | | 4/12 (33.3%) | | | |
| | | | 3/10 (30.0%) | 12/19 (63.2%) | | 1/2 (50.0%) | | 3/7 (42.9%) | | 15/26 (57.7%) | |
| | | | No social support | 7/38 (18.4%) | 6/29 (20.7%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | Concerned about personal information | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| Negative perception | | | 11/38 (29.0%) | 11/29 (37.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 5/12 (41.7%) | | | |
| | | | Not helpful | 8/38 (21.1%) | 8/29 (27.6%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 6/19 (31.6%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 0/7 (0.0%) | | 6/26 (23.1%) |
| | | | Already good parents | 3/38 (7.9%) | 3/29 (10.3%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | | |
| | | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 0/7 (0.0%) | | 2/26 (7.7%) |
| | | | Separation peaceful | 1/38 (2.6%) | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| Inconvenience | | | 9/38 (23.7%) | 7/29 (24.1%) | | 2/9 (22.2%) | | 5/12 (41.7%) | | | |
| | | | Busyness | 5/38 (13.2%) | 4/29 (13.8%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 4/12 (33.3%) | | |
| | | | | 4/10 (40.0%) | 3/19 (15.8%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 2/7 (28.6%) | | 4/26 (15.4%) |
| | | | | 4/10 (40.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 1/26 (3.8%) |
| | | | Busy due to work | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 0/7 (0.0%) | | 0/26 (0.0%) |
| | | | Busy due to kids | 2/38 (5.3%) | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | | |
| | | | | 1/10 (10.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 1/26 (3.8%) |
| | | | Online requirement | 3/38 (7.9%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| | | | | 0/10 (0.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 3/26 (11.5%) |
| | | | Lack of childcare | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 0/7 (0.0%) | | 0/26 (0.0%) |
| | | | Too long | 2/38 (5.3%) | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 1/9 (11.1%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | | |
| 0/10 (0.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 1/7 (14.3%) | | 2/26 (7.7%) | | | |
| Did not want to complete the program | 1/38 (2.6%) | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | | | | | |
| | 1/10 (10.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | | 0/2 (0.0%) | | 0/7 (0.0%) | | 0/26 (0.0%) | | | |



Table 7. Hypothetical Parenting Program: Barrier (continued)

| Main code | Sub-Code | Sub-Sub-Code | Total N (%) | JP Total N (%) | | DC Total N (%) | | Male Total N (%) | Female Total N (%) |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Court factors | | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| | Not mandatory | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/10 (20.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 0/26 (0.0%) | |
| | | | | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| Technology | | | 5/38 (13.2%) | 5/29 (17.2%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | Lack of technology | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 1/10 (10.0%) | 4/19 (21.1%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 4/26 (15.4%) | |
| | | | | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 1/12 (8.3%) | |
| | Technology Issue | | 1/38 (2.6%) | 0/10 (0.0%) | 2/19 (10.5%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | |
| | | | | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| | Accessing the program was confusing | | 1/38 (2.6%) | 0/10 (0.0%) | 1/19 (5.3%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | |
| | | | | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| | Uncomfortable with computers | | 1/38 (2.6%) | 1/10 (10.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 1/26 (3.8%) | |
| | | | | 1/29 (3.4%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 0/12 (0.0%) | |
| | Negative review | | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) |
| Court communication of program assignment was problematic | | | 2/38 (5.3%) | 2/10 (20.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 0/26 (0.0%) | |
| | | | | 2/29 (6.9%) | | 0/9 (0.0%) | | 2/12 (16.7%) | |
| | | | | 2/10 (20.0%) | 0/19 (0.0%) | 0/2 (0.0%) | 0/7 (0.0%) | 0/26 (0.0%) | |

