# Changing Family Roles—Across the Deployment Cycle

**Overview:**
This multi-informant, longitudinal investigation of Army National Guard families’ experience of deployment project focuses on a) the negotiation and management of family roles during deployment cycles, and b) on the impact of technology-based communication during deployment on later psychological distress and role functioning.

**Progress to Date:**
- Recruited 47 families with federal funding for a total of 106 since proposal submission.
- Completed 68 deployment & 233 reintegration data collections.
- Four conference presentations

**Findings Regarding Deployment Communication:**
At-home partners who reported higher levels of support also reported feeling closer to service members. On days when at-home partners reported receiving more support, they also reported feeling closer to service members.

**Findings Regarding Sibling Relationships:**
At-home partners reporting higher levels of warmth and lower levels of agonism also reported lower levels of externalizing behavior in their children. When at-home partners reported their children’s relationship changed over the course of the study, so did their reports of externalizing behavior in their children.

---

**Subject Terms:**
Family Roles, Resilience, Communication, Deployment, Household Tasks, Trajectories

---
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1 INTRODUCTION:
This project focuses on a) the negotiation and management of family roles during deployment cycles, and b) on the impact of technology-based communication during deployment on later psychological distress and role functioning. It builds on a multi-informant, longitudinal investigation of Army National Guard families’ experience of deployment initiated with philanthropic funding. We gather data from families once before deployment, two times during deployment, and three times during reintegration. A team of interviewers travels to the families’ home, interviewing the service members, their spouse / partners and up to two adolescent children. All family members present at the home interview participate in a 10-minute family interaction task, which is video recorded. In addition to the home interviews, we gather additional data using surveys and data bursts – a series of brief data collections within a week. During deployment, the spouse / partner completes a series of surveys regarding daily communication with the (deployed) service member. During reintegration, the service member and partner complete a series of brief telephone interviews regarding their negotiation about household and parenting responsibilities. We are working to understand how these communications impact couples’ trajectories of risk and resilience. This understanding will inform the design of preventive interventions for military couples experiencing deployment.

2 KEYWORDS:
Family Roles, Resilience, Communication, Deployment, Household Tasks, Trajectories

3 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
Below, we describe our year 2 accomplishments and year 3 plans for each task on the approved statement of work.

Task 1: Receive regulatory approval from Purdue IRB and Department of Defense Human Research Protection Office (timeframe, months 1-2).

Year 2 accomplishments:
This task is completed; nonetheless, we continue to maintain good standing with the regulatory bodies.

- HRPO Review of the Continuing Renewal from Purdue completed (and approved) 5 OCT 2015.
- Submitted amendment to Purdue IRB requesting to split the first reintegration data collection protocol (R1) into two home visits – only for families joining the study at reintegration – 27 FEB 2016.
- Received approval from Purdue IRB for the R1 split 18 MAR 2016.
- HRPO review of amendment for R1 split deemed non-substantive and approved 25 APR 2016.
- Continuing Review submitted to Purdue IRB 26 APR 2016
- Continuing Review approved by Purdue IRB 01 JUN 2016.
- Approved Continuing Review with supplementary paperwork submitted to HRPO 22 June.
- HRPO acceptance of Continuing Review approved by Purdue 27 JUN 2016.

Year 3 plans:
- File necessary reports to remain in good standing with both regulatory bodies.
Task 2. Obtain command permission from deploying units to invite their families to participate in this study (timeframe, months 1 – 15).

YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

Deployments among the Indiana National Guard have once again increased. Over the past 12 months, we have successfully obtained permission to attend pre-deployment briefings for five (5) units. One commander failed to respond to our request for permission and we did not attend the predeployment briefing.

YEAR 3 PLANS:

As of this writing, three more briefings are scheduled for the first two quarters of Year 3. We plan to seek permission to recruit families at these three briefings.

Task 3. Successfully complete recruitment of 100 families into the study (timeframe, months 01-17).

With approval of the refreshment sample (last year), families can now join the study at two time-points: either before deployment or at reintegration. Sometimes families who express a strong interest in the study are unable to interview before mobilization. We anticipate these families will join the study at reintegration. Nonetheless, we have decided it is prudent to wait until we actually receive data from a family before counting them as recruited.

NOTE: This study was already in the field when we submitted our proposal (April 2013), as OPTEMPO was slowing. After we received notice our project was recommended for funding in December 2013, we continued to recruit with philanthropic funding. We received HRPO approval grad 14 Nov 2014.
YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
During this past year we have recruited 24 new families with federal funding. (Five of these families joined the study at reintegration; 19 at predeployment). Over the life of this project, we have now recruited 47 families with federal funding, in addition to the 59 families recruited with philanthropic funding. Altogether, we have added 106 families to the study since we submitted our proposal. We have included a chart, above, displaying these totals.

YEARS 3 PLANS:
As of these writing, we anticipate that a substantial number of Indiana National Guard families will attend a predeployment briefing before the end of this calendar year. We are seeking INNG permission to recruit at these briefings. We anticipate requesting a revision to our statement of work after these events. At that time, we will have two additional pieces of information to better estimate our recruitment capacity a) the number of eligible families who express an interest in joining the study at pre-deployment and b) additional experience with recruiting families to join at reintegration.

Task 4. Successfully complete base-line (pre-deployment) data collection with the entire sample (timeframe, months 01-19).

With the introduction of the “refreshment sample” into our study – families joining the study at reintegration – we now gather baseline data at two different time points: predeployment for most, but the first reintegration interview for the refreshment sample.

YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
With our newly adopted operationalization of “joining the study,” we have completed baseline data collection for every family in the study. We do not count them as part of the sample until we have gathered (baseline) data from them. Over the life of this project, we have now gathered baseline data from 47 families with federal funding, and another 52 with philanthropic funding.

YEAR 3 PLANS:
We plan to recruit additional families through this calendar year, and will schedule baseline data collection with those families.

Task 5. Successfully complete two during-deployment data collections (one for deployments shorter than 9 months); and three re-integration data collections with the entire sample of families (timeframe, months 01-42).

YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
- As of 15 AUG 2016, 10 families in the current sample have one or more deployment data collections remaining (although we currently have predeployment interviews scheduled with new families and we plan to recruit more).
- As of 14 AUG 2016, 47 families in the current sample have one or more reintegration data collection remaining (although we currently have predeployment interviews scheduled with new families and we plan to recruit more).
YEAR 3 PLANS:
- Complete deployment data collections with the existing sample and any newly recruited families.
- Complete reintegration data collections with existing sample. We will continue our efforts to refresh the existing sample by inviting families returning from deployment to join the study at reintegration.

Task 6. Quality check received data collected from the field interviews (timeframe, months 1-42).

YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
- We have quality checked 100% of the interviews conducted in the past year, including the task interviews conducted by telephone. At this point in the project, our field interviewers are very experienced. (We have only added one new field interviewer since the beginning of this project. She now has 18 months of experience.) We still systematically check their interviews. No remediation plans have been needed over the past year.
- Telephone interviewers are undergraduate students. Overall, their interviewing skills have developed well. However, when they complete their studies, they leave MFRI and we have to replace them. So detailed quality checks for newer members of this team are routine. This year, we have implemented a system where our (experienced) field interviewers conduct quality checks for telephone interviewers. This gives our field interviewers an opportunity to help mold undergraduates’ skills while it reinforcing their own skills.
- We continue to monitor the quality of iPad data collection. We are now using the Qualtrics offline application for all field interviews. On occasion, field interviewers will identify a problem. We have been assertive about troubleshooting these issues immediately, and Qualtrics technical support has actively engaged with our team to resolve them. Field interviewers always have a paper interview protocol they can switch to if needed. The audio recordings are also available if needed.

YEAR 3 PLANS:
- Continue quality checks until we have completed data collection.


YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
- We went through an extensive data review process. After running descriptive analyses across all six waves, we compared actual numbers of respondents to the expected number (given the number of completed interviews, known demographics, and skip logic patterns in the interview). We looked for outliers and illogical distributions (e.g. an 80 year old service member, unusual numbers of graduate degrees, high endorsement of bad behavior). We also investigated and remedied unexpected patterns of missingness. The exercise gave an opportunity to identify systematic errors in our data collection process and clean gathered data.
• We successfully developed syntax files to cross link Iowa Family Interaction Rating Scale data (from coding video recordings of family interactions) with other interview data.
• We also updated and cross-linked the data files for the during deployment communication data bursts. A paper publishing results from these data is currently under review.

YEAR 3 PLANS:
• The data team will run all of these syntax files at least once in the coming year and inspect the results to verify that the data links are working as designed.
• We will build syntax files to organize and cross-link data from the task interviews.

Task 8. Complete data analysis, scientific reports, and manuscripts for publication (timeframe, months 24-48).

YEAR 2 ACCOMPLISHMENTS:
Although we are still gathering data, we have started to analyze our data from the predeployment and deployment phases. We made four presentations last year from this project.

We have developed a manuscript from the Lee presentation that we are currently revising. A manuscript from the Wilson presentation is currently under review.

As of this writing, two new analyses have been accepted for presentations.

YER 3 PLANS:

- Submit conference presentations as manuscripts for publication.
- Complete three additional manuscripts and submit them for publication.
- Initiate new analyses for conference presentations.

3.1 What opportunities for training and professional development has the project provided?

This project is offering extensive training opportunities for both graduate and undergraduate students who conduct day-to-day operations. Students who are interested in developing these skills have opportunities to manage some aspect of the project, (e.g. scheduling, supplies, logistics, compensation). Students from the Business and Art & Design departments apply their skills to participant recruitment and retention. Students who would like analyst experience have the opportunity to compile, clean and analyze data. Students also work on coding video data and and thematic analyses of transcribed interviews. Finally, students who want research experience have opportunity to participate in primary data collection conducting interviews with service members and their family members. This work gives them hands-on experience with research and an increased understanding of the experiences of military families. The staffing roster, below, reflects the extensive number of students we incorporated into the staff for this project.

As we have begun to analyze these longitudinal nested data, the investigators with statistical expertise have helped graduate students and staff members develop advanced analytical skills appropriate for these data. Major topics over the past year have included missing data imputation, longitudinal reliability testing, and trajectory analyses.

Finally, students working on manuscripts from this project participate in a writing group that meets biweekly during the school year and every week during the summer. Facilitated by a graduate student trained by the Purdue Writing Lab, students take turns reading each other’s manuscripts and providing supportive critique. Students report that over a period of months, they have learned how to “think like a writer” and developed skills that help them write more effectively.

3.2 How were the results disseminated to communities of interest?

Conference presentations and manuscripts have been the focus of our dissemination efforts so far. Over the past year, we have engaged with our partners at the Nathanson Family Resilience Center at UCLA (NFRC) to help us reap the clinical and military significance of this study. Although the work is still in early stages, they see clear potential. The longitudinal nature of the study can show us when in the deployment cycles are the times of highest stress for families. This will help us understand when families might need us most, and in what specific ways. For example, they may need help with communication during pre-deployment & re-integration but parenting support during deployment. This work with NFRC will continue for the rest of the project.
4 IMPACT:

4.1 What was the impact on the development of the principal discipline(s) of the project?

During this past year, we made three presentations from this project at the National Council on Family Relations. Shelley MacDermid Wadsworth chaired the annual meeting for her discipline, the National Council on Family Relations. The theme she chose was Conflict, Violence and War: Family Risks and Resilience. The meeting was held November 11, 2015 - November 14, 2015 in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Two plenary sessions were on military topics: David Finkel, *The Good Soldier*, and Ann Masten *Family and Child Resilience in War and Political Conflict*.

4.2 What was the impact on other disciplines?

We have a collaborator from the Communications Department (Dr. Steven R. Wilson) who presented work from this study at the annual meeting of the Association of Behavioral Cognitive Therapies in November 2016. He has also submitted this work as a manuscript to the Journal of Family Psychology. It is currently under review.

What was the impact on technology transfer?

Nothing to report.

What was the impact on society beyond science and technology?

Nothing to report.

5 CHANGES/PROBLEMS:

5.1 Changes in approach and reasons for change

There are no changes in approach at this time. We continue to pursue our refreshment sampling strategy to augment the number of families participating in the task interview data bursts during the reintegration protocol. OPTEMPO for the Indiana National Guard has picked up. We have learned that two sizeable Indiana National Guard units will mobilize early in 2017. We plan to recruit these units and then assess whether we need to request a Statement of Work revision for Task 3 (recruit 100 families into the study).

5.2 Actual or anticipated problems or delays and actions or plans to resolve them

Although the Indiana National Guard reports that some deployments are scheduled in the six months, we know that units preparing for mobilization can be off-ramped. Furthermore, our refreshment sample strategy has not yielded large numbers to date. Nonetheless, we continue to persist, exploring strategies to refine this process.

5.3 Changes that had a significant impact on expenditures

None at this time.

5.4 Significant changes in use or care of human subjects, vertebrate animals, biohazards, and/or select agents

None at this time.
6 PRODUCTS:

As mentioned above, the team gave four conference presentations this past year. Two additional ones have been accepted for the coming year. Although manuscripts have been submitted, as of this writing, they remain under review.

PARTICIPANTS & OTHER COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Person Months</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Keisha</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Interviewer Management; Data Quality; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates, Alexa</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch, Elise</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin, Jean Francois</td>
<td>Admin/Professional</td>
<td>Quantitative Data Analysis; Data Management; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, Grace</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Video Coding</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrabaszewski, Scott</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Administrative (Operational) Database</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ, Sharon</td>
<td>Co-Investigator</td>
<td>Quantitative Data Analysis; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christiansen, Hannah</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Christy</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Video Coding; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Jody</td>
<td>Admin/Professional</td>
<td>Data Capture (IPad Management)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppola, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Interviewer Management; Data Quality; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan, Alana</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Field Interview Supplies</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily, Mollie</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Participant Retention</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs, Hannah</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Field Interview Scheduling; Interview Fidelity Checking</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot, Amy</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Manuscript Review</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks, Melissa</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomez, Abby</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greiner, Anna</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm, Kathryn</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Manuscript Review</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Kia</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffmeyer, Heather</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Hayley</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Interviewer Management; Data Quality;</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutter, Caitlin</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Interviewer Management; Data Quality;</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Rita</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Data Capture</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchel, Aspen</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leibering, Felicia</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luft, Kathryn</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Person Months</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDermid Wadsworth, Shelley</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Intellectual and Operational Leadership</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marini, Christina</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Data Quality; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCall, Christine</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Interviewer Management; Data Quality; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moench, Kassandra</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Field Interview Scheduling</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, Breanna</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Video Coder</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Kevin</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Interviewer Compensation; Data Cleaning</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plewniak, Nicole</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Interview Fidelity Checking</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relton, Joshua</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Participant Compensation</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaffer, Brittany</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Interview Fidelity Checking</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwell, Kenona</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Qualitative Data Analysis; Data Quality; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Amelia</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Task Interviews; Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topp, Dave</td>
<td>Admin/Professional</td>
<td>Operations Management</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner, Janet</td>
<td>Admin/Professional</td>
<td>Data Management</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteman, Shawn</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Quantitative Data Analysis; Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, Steven</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Manuscript Preparation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yothment, Christopher</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Administrative (Operational) Database</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarco, Juan</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Data Capture and Data Quality</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NATHANSON FAMILY RESILIENCE CENTER (UCLA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Patricia, M.D.</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajal, Nastassia J.</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babayan, Thomas V.</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaneda, Marleen</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiff, Cara</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlottle, Lauren E.</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogil, Catherine E.</td>
<td>Subcontractor</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has there been a change in the active other support of the PD/PI(s) or senior/key personnel since the last reporting period?

Nothing to report.

What other organizations were involved as partners?

As mentioned about, the Nathanson Family Resilience Center at UCLA has begun their subcontract work with us.

7 SPECIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

Quad Chart is attached.
8 APPENDICES:
Quad Chart.
Changing Family Roles Across the Deployment Cycles

Log Number: A-18396
Award Number: W81XWH-14-1-0325
PI: Shelley MacDermid Wadsworth
Org: Military Family Research Institute at Purdue
Award Amount: 3,547,933

- The influence of . . .
  - technology-based communication during deployment, and
  - the process of negotiating and managing family roles throughout the deployment cycle
- Understanding family life in terms of three related but distinct “layers” would be useful to identify points of intervention;
- These layers have implications for many interventions aimed at helping families during deployment cycles.

Timeline and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>FY 15</th>
<th>FY 16</th>
<th>FY 17</th>
<th>FY 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Approvals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of New Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment &amp; Reunion Data Collection w/ Existing Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection New Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bursts re: Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analyses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Budget ($K)</td>
<td>$1160</td>
<td>$915</td>
<td>$799</td>
<td>$674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals/Milestones (Example)

**FY15 Milestones:** ✓ Receive regulatory approval
✓ Initiate Task Negotiation Data Bursts with existing sample

**FY16 Milestones:** □ Complete recruitment of 100 new families
□ Complete base-line (pre-deployment) data collection

**FY17 Milestones:** □ Complete during-deployment data collection, including communication data bursts

**FY18 Milestones:** □ Complete reintegration data collection, including task-negotiation data bursts

Comments/Challenges/Issues/Concerns
- OPTEMPO has once again increased for INNG. Although we are at 99% of our original recruitment goal, 52% of these families were recruited with philanthropic funding. We plan to continue recruiting through CY 2016 and assess whether we need to request an SOW modification at that time.

Budget Expenditure to Date
Projected Expenditure: $2222k through 15 AUG 2016.
Actual Expenditure: $1766k through 30 JUL 2016.