

Home-Based Providers in the NSECE

CCPRC Presentation
October 24, 2012

Jill Connelly and Ann Witte



National Survey of Early Care & Education

Overview of Today's Presentation

- Motivation
- Dual-frame approach
- Questionnaire
- Data collection techniques
- Analysis implications



Motivation

Difficult to get an accurate picture of home-based provider care in the U.S. for several reasons

- Home-based care
 - Small businesses
 - FFN care
 - Individual Workers (e.g., nannies)
- Licensing /registration laws vary widely by location (state rules, local rules)
- “Listable” provider communities of widely varying size in different communities



Challenges

- Identifying and locating home-based providers of all types
- Creating an instrument to collect information from such a diverse group of caregivers
- Providing flexible options for completing the interview to maximize response rates



Dual-frame Approach

- State-level administrative lists (6,845)
 - Licensed and registered home-based providers
- Identified when initially screening the Household sample (5,243)
 - Home-based providers serving general public, but are not on state lists
 - Family, friends, and neighbors
 - Nannies



Questionnaire

- Use of general language about caregiving
- Two main questionnaire paths
 1. For caregivers who had a prior relationship with children they look after
 2. For caregivers who had no prior relationship with the children they look after



Data Collection Techniques

Household Screening

- Many households no longer eligible at time of interview
 - Roughly 40% of households reversed eligibility
 - Almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of these screened in by mail
- Main reasons for change in eligibility
 - No longer providing care
 - Time elapsed between screening and interviewing
 - Questions misunderstood by respondents
 - Reported on their own children
 - Did not provide regular care (at least 5 hours a week)



Data Collection Techniques

Interview, Web & Email

- Two Modes
 - In person or on phone with field interviewer
 - Self-administered by web
- About 60% of cases completed with an interviewer
- About 40% completed by web
 - Roughly 10% web completed with only mail prompting



Data Collection Techniques

No address cases

- Cases with no addresses provided
 - Almost 20% of our HB sample from state administrative lists
- Locating work before and during data collection
- About 50% of these cases completed interviews



Data Collection Summary

- Recognize the limitations of lists
 - Some states will not provide addresses
 - Use a dual sampling-frame approach
- High obsolescence rate of about 1/3
- Design questionnaire to adapt to diversity of providers
- Web & Email are important data collection tools



Analysis Implications

- For Sampling & Analysis
 - On-List vs. identified by household screening
- For analysis
 - Receiving market-level \$ for caring for unrelated children at least 5 hours per week
 - Arm's Length Home-Based Providers (ALHBP)
 - Not receiving market-level \$ for caring for unrelated children at least 5 hours per week
 - Family, Friends & Neighbors Care (FFN)



Analysis Implications

- Characteristics of ALHBP
 - Lists vs. Identified by Household Screening
 - Impacts of Regulation/Registration
- How Do Regulation Affect Mix
 - Announced vs. Unannounced Inspections
 - Stringency of Regulations
- How Do Community Characteristics Affect Mix
 - Low-income, moderate income & high income
 - New immigrant vs. native born communities



Questions?

NORC

at the UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO



National Survey of **Early Care & Education**