

AFS Consumer Survey:

From Parents Receiving Child-Care Assistance

Prepared for Adult and Family Services Division

Oregon Department of Human Resources

by

**Arthur C. Emlen
Professor Emeritus
Portland State University
Regional Research Institute for Human Services**

November, 1998

Acknowledgments

This survey was conducted by the Adult and Family Services Division, Oregon Department of Human Resources. The survey instrument was developed by a work group involving AFS staff and child-care partners. I did the analysis, appendices, and report with the help of my colleagues Paul Koren and Karen Tvedt. It is another collaborative effort of the Oregon Child Care Research Partnership.

**Arthur Emlen
Portland State University
Regional Research Institute for Human Services**

1998

Executive Summary

AFS Child Care Consumer Survey

AFS conducts a periodic survey of parents who receive child-care assistance through the Integrated Child Care Program.* The first child-care consumer survey was conducted in 1990, and provided information that was useful in making extensive changes in program. The survey was carried out again in 1994, and more recently, in 1998. The survey asks questions such as what types of care parents use, how they get to work, what are their work schedules, how they rate their caregiver, whether they have choices, and how often they change caregivers. As a result of including similar questions in other Oregon consumer surveys, these data provide perspective on how AFS clients fare in the child-care market. This information can also be viewed in light of information from the survey of providers conducted at the same time (see *AFS Child Care Provider Survey*). The following provides some highlights from the recent consumer survey.

Characteristics of the Survey Respondents

- More than 90% of the parents were employed, and 54% were employed full time.
- The work or training schedules of 41% of the parents required child care evenings or weekends, and 25% said their child care varied as a result of shift rotation.
- The families were predominantly young—77% had children under the age of six, which is a much higher percentage than other Oregon families who use paid child care
- Of the respondents, 9% reported having a child with disability who required a higher level of child care.
- A majority of parents (60%) reported having no other adult in the household to help with care.

Types of Child Care Used

- One-third of families used multiple child-care arrangements, with 72% of the arrangements taking place outside the child's home—31% in the home of an unrelated provider, 22% in the home of a grandparent or other relative, 15% in a center or nursery school, and 4% in after-school activities or programs.
- Care by a relative, whether in the child's home or not, made up 37% of arrangements.
- More than 80% of the families were satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by their caregiver, the highest satisfaction reported for care by a relative.
- Caregiver flexibility in meeting parents' work and family needs is *very important* in choosing the types of caregiver.

Choosing a Provider

- Parents rated the following factors most highly in choosing their current provider: the parent trusts the provider, their child likes the provider, and the provider is able to meet their schedule.
- Over 80% of the parents said it was very important that their provider have basic health and safety and CPR/First Aid training.
- A higher percentage of parents of children with disabilities (31%) reported "It is very difficult to find child care to match my schedule" than the total sample (17%).
- The relatively high use of a Child Care Resource and Referral Agency by AFS parents (42%) reflects increasing state and local efforts to bring these services to parents.
- **The Integrated Child Care Program primarily serves parents who either participate in JOBS program activities or are employed. A small number of students (259) statewide also receive child-care assistance through this program.**

AFS Consumer Survey

Contents (coded with questionnaire item number)

Introduction

Description of sample

- Age of child (2)
- Employment and Training (9)
- Shift (10)
- Adults in household (20)
- Geographic distribution—zipcode (23)
- Children with disabilities (21)

Types of child care used (2) and satisfaction with current provider (3)

Transportation (17 & 19): time from home to work (18)

Factors important in choosing current provider (4)

In choosing provider, importance of provider training and abilities (12)

Smoking around children in care, how important? (16)

What options did parents have in choosing their current child care?

- Lack of options, choice, or accessibility of child care (5)
- Difficulty finding child care (11)

Caregiver flexibility (14)

Quality of care (15)

Did parents have stability in their child-care arrangements (6)

Did parents use the services of a child care resource and referral service agency (13)

Parent evaluation of AFS program

- Problems with AFS program (7)
- Copay (8)
- Satisfaction with AFS program (22)

Profile of parents of children with a disability (21)

Introduction

Based on a survey conducted by the Adult and Family Services Division of the Oregon Department of Human Resources (AFS), this report summarizes findings about 2,366 parents who were receiving child-care assistance during January of 1998. In order to offer maximum opportunity for parents to respond with written comments, AFS sent their questionnaire to all 15,034 parents receiving child-care assistance, for a response rate of 16 percent. There can be no guarantee that the responding sample is or is not representative of the population surveyed, although geographic distribution of the sample was tested against the population of all TANF and ERDC families. The sample distribution was the same in the south, 1% lower in the east, 3% higher in the west, and 3% lower in the north.

The survey covered questions about the kinds of child care parents were using and their satisfaction with it; about circumstances that affect how parents manage work and child care, such as patterns of employment, shift worked, adults in the household, ages of the children, transportation, and time needed for commuting from home to work. Parents were asked to assess their difficulty in finding child care, the accessibility of options for child care in their neighborhood, the flexibility of their caregiver, and the quality of the care provided. Parents were asked about provider characteristics and selection factors that were important to them in choosing their child-care provider. And parents were asked about the services provided them by AFS or by a child-care resource and referral agency. What problems did they have with the AFS program, their copay, and were they satisfied with the AFS program?

Ten types of child care were distinguished, and an appendix was created for each type of care used, presenting a detailed profile with distributions of all study variables. There are often good reasons of opportunity and choice why different families use different types of child care; so it is useful to examine the users of each type of care as a separate sample.

The following summary highlights the findings that stand out for the overall sample and identifies factors associated with using different types of care. To suggest possible trends, we cite selected findings from previous surveys. To provide perspective on findings, we make comparisons to data from other studies, including the Oregon Population Survey which is representative of Oregon Families.

Description of sample

- More than 90% of the parents responding to this survey were receiving child-care assistance through the Employment Related Day Care program (ERDC); 8% were enrolled in the JOBS program. JOBS parents are included in the overall analyses, and a profile of the JOBS parents is an appendix.
- 54% of all responding parents were employed full time, 25% part time, 4% were waiting to start employment, and 11% were looking for work.
- 9% were full-time students and 5% part-time students.
- For 41% their work or training required child care evenings or weekends, and 25% said their work shift rotated so their child care varied also. For 35% the schedule changed daily, weekly, or monthly. 17% of parents said it was very difficult to find child care to match their schedule, and another 24% said it was somewhat difficult. 35% reported having difficulty dealing with child-care problems during working hours.
- These are predominantly young families, 77% having children under six years of age and 54% having children age 6 or above. This is a much larger percentage with young children than is found in the Oregon population at large among all families using paid child care, and especially than is found among single parents using paid care, with whom the ERDC population is most comparable. This finding deserves highlighting. In terms of labor force

participation and child-care management, the task facing ERDC families—compared to all single-parent families using paid care— is roughly twice as likely to involve pre-school children. Other single parents tend not to enter the market for paid child care until their families are older (Emlen, 1996, "Stage of Family Development").

- 60% of these households have no other adult besides the responding parent. Among those who do have another adult living with them in the household, 11% live with a spouse. Other live-in adults include grandmothers 11%, grandfathers 6%, other adult relative 6%, and other adults not related 7%. Asked how much child care these other adults were able to provide, grandmothers got highest marks: A lot 46%, Some 26%, Not much 27%.
- Nine percent reported a child with a disability in response to the question, "Do you have a child with a disability that requires a higher level of child care?"
- Geographic distribution of the sample by zip code, compared to the TANF, ERDC population:

	East	West	North	South	Total
Sample	267 (11%)	861 (36%)	498 (21%)	735 (31%)	2361 (99%)
Population	12%	33%	24%	31%	100%

Types of child care used and satisfaction with current provider

- More than four-fifths of these families were satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by their current child-care provider. Satisfaction levels dropped somewhat when the care was by a young caregiver, but such care was not frequently used. Satisfaction was highest for a spouse or partner or for care in the home of a relative. Otherwise parents reported only modest differences in satisfaction for other types of care providers. In the right-hand column of the table below, more variation is found comparing providers parents were *very* satisfied with. These satisfaction figures are exceptionally high compared to those reported in employee surveys in which satisfaction with current out-of-home child care arrangements have averaged 50 to 60% (Emlen, 1998, Appendix).
- Families used multiple arrangements—1.3 per family. 72% of the care arrangements are outside the child's home—4% in an after-school program, 15% in a child care center or nursery school, 22% in a provider's family home where the provider is a relative, and 31% in the home of an unrelated caregiver. Care in the home of an unrelated caregiver is usually called "family day care", which in this study includes "group homes" caring for six or more children. Family day care was the most frequently used form of care—31% of the arrangements and used by 41% of the families. Care by a relative, whether in the child's home or not, totaled 37% of the arrangements.

Type of Care Used	Frequency *	% of Arrange- ments	% of Families Using Arrangement	% Satisfied (or Very Satisfied) with Provider	% Very Satisfied with Provider
In the home of a relative or ex-spouse	679	22	29	90	75
In the home of a non-relative (family day care)	964	31	41	85	61
In a child care center or nursery school	468	15	20	83	57
In after-school activities or programs	126	4	5	78	52
At home with my spouse or partner	102	3	4	92	82
At home with adult relative age 18 or over	314	10	13	84	78
At home with adult non-relative age 18 or over	218	7	9	85	68
At home with non-relative under 18	47	2	2	83	45
At home with an older brother or sister <18	61	2	3	61	41
Looks after self	64	2	3	52	38
Other	72	2	3	82	69
Number of arrangements Number of families	3115 2366	100%	132%		

* The consumer sample was 2461, but 95 respondents had missing data for type of care used or the satisfaction variable. Frequency of care type used by families is percentaged on N=2366 families. This adds up to 132 percent, which means an average of 1.32 arrangements per family. The frequency of care arrangements by type is percentaged by the total number of arrangements (N=3115), which adds up to 100 percent.

Transportation and time from home to work

- In getting to work or school, 73% reported depending on their own car, another 8% rode with someone else, 12% took the bus, and 4% walked.
- 41% said their child required transportation during child-care hours—
 - 30% for school
 - 9% for medical
 - 4% for other care arrangements
 - 5% for other.

" Parents were asked, "What is the usual amount of time (in minutes) you take to travel one way from home to school or work (including getting your child to child-care arrangements?" 38% of full-time and 57% of part-time employed parents reported travelling less than 30 minutes one way to work, while 15% of full-time and 17% of part-time workers reported travelling one hour or more. The detailed distribution for full and part-time employed parents is shown in the following table. Note the bimodal distribution of travel time for part-time workers whose transportation tended to be either less than 30 minutes or over 45, while for full-time workers 30 to 45 minutes was modal and average. One is struck by the large number making long and probably expensive commutes. Their transportation costs have low pay-off in wages compared to such ratios for high-income employees.

Minutes One Way	Full Time			Part Time		
	f	%	Cum.%	f	%	Cum %
Less than 15 minutes	102	8	8	45	10	10
15 minutes, less than 30 minutes	374	30	38	208	47	57
30 minutes, less than 45 minutes	418	34	72	38	9	66
45 minutes, less than 60 minutes	166	13	85	75	17	83
1 hour, less than 1 hour 15 minutes	121	10	95	54	12	95
1 hour 15 minutes, less than 1 1/2 hrs.	11	1	96	17	4	99
1 hour, 30 minutes or more	45	4	100	6	1	100
Total	1237	100%		443	100%	

Factors most important in choosing current provider

• Parents checked a number of factors that were most important to them in choosing a provider: In order of frequency they were:

- 86% I trust my provider.
- 85% My child likes my provider.
- 72% Provider was able to meet my schedule.
- 68% The location of my provider.
- 41% Provider is registered or licensed with the Child Care Division.
- 41% The amount charged by my provider.
- 37% Provider has completed training.
- 14% Other

In choosing provider, importance of provider training and abilities.

• Parents were asked, "In choosing your child-care provider, how important is it that the provider have the following types of training?". The percent who said it was *Very Important* :

- 87% Basic health and safety

83%	CPR/First Aid
77%	Child abuse prevention
63%	Child development
60%	Infant-toddler caregiving
46%	Professional certification
42%	Caring for children with special needs
40%	Multi-cultural/diversity

Smoking around children in care, how important?

- How important is it to you that the provider not allow smoking around children in care?

68%	Very important
16%	Important
11%	Somewhat important
6%	Not important

What options did parents have in choosing their current provider?

Two questions dealt with difficulty finding child care—one in relation to work schedules and one in relation to choice of the child care they wanted:

- "Right now, how hard is it to find child care to match your schedule?" Parents said:

Very easy	30%	
Somewhat easy	29	
Somewhat difficult	24	
Very difficult	<u>17</u>	<u>Very or somewhat difficult: 41%</u>
	100%	

- "What best describes the options you had in choosing your current child care provider?"

To the statement, "I had difficulty finding the child care I want," parents said:

Yes	56%
No	44%

This difference suggests that in addition to the problem of work schedules, parents perceive themselves to lack options in choosing the child care they want.

Three additional questions dealt with the options parents had in choosing their provider. Shown below with the percent of parents who said *Yes* or *No*, these responses measure the lack of options, choice, or accessibility of child care that parents feel they have.

<u>Item</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>
When I chose this provider I had more than one option.	69	31
There are good options where I live	54	46
In choosing child care I had to take whatever I could get.	27	73

In policy discussions, the question is raised as to whether parents receiving child-care assistance have as many options, or options as good, as do parents with higher incomes. This study has some data that are relevant to an answer, though they are not easy to interpret. One potential answer could come from comparing parents who rely on relatives for their child care and parents who enter the child-care market to find family day care or a child care center, since low-income families tend to use relatives more than higher-income families do. In the survey *Quality of Care From a Parent's Point of View*, 17% of the low-income parents reported paid care by relatives, compared to 5% of the high-income parents:

Low income (under \$20,000)	N=270 parents	17% used paid relatives
High income (\$20,000 +)	N=521 parents	5% used paid relatives

This sample—mostly families using paid care—was not representative of the Oregon population. Similar findings, though, came from the 1994 Oregon Population Survey which surveyed all Oregon households with children under age 13. Overall in the population, 7% of parents used paid care in the home of a relative. By level of household income it was as follows:

Under \$25,000	12%
\$25,000 to \$44,999	6%
\$45,000 or above	3%

Among the types of child care arranged with relatives, compared to care parents found in the out-of-home child-care market, one would expect different perceptions of one's choices. Do these parents receiving child-care assistance use relatives as child-care providers as a matter of choice or for lack of alternatives? Do they say they lack options? In the satisfaction data reported earlier, we saw that care by relatives compared very favorably to market care—relative care scoring slightly higher.

But what about the underlying options and choice of care?

The following table shows the percent who said *Yes* or *No* to the statement:

<u>Type of Child Care Used</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>
Home of a non-relative (family day care)	70	30
Child care center	75	25
At home with an adult relative	68	32
In the home of a relative	64	36

Users of market care were slightly more likely to say they had more than one option. The following table shows the percent who said *Yes* or *No* to the statement:

<u>Type of Child Care Used</u>	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>
Home of a non-relative (family day care)	42	58
Child care center	52	48
At home with an adult relative	52	48
In the home of a relative	46	54

Those using centers reported having had somewhat better options than those using family day care, but center users reported having good options where they live no more than parents whose care was at home with an adult relative. It is something of a draw. We find little evidence that these parents whose relatives are caring for their children perceive their options as limited, at least as compared to those using market care. Those who used relatives for child care were slightly *less* likely than center or family day care users to report difficulty finding child care. That makes sense, because those with relatives as a child-care option were not as likely to experience difficulties finding care. Although it can be argued that relatives are often used when alternatives are not available or affordable, parents must seek other alternatives when relatives are not available. The percent of parents who reported difficulty finding child care was slightly higher for users of market care.

<u>Type of Child Care Used</u>	Percent Reporting Difficulty	
	<u>% Yes</u>	<u>% No</u>
Home of a non-relative (family day care)	62	38
Child care center	55	45
At home with an adult relative	52	48
In the home of a relative	48	52

But how do these perceived options compare to those of parents who do not use child-care assistance—either at higher-incomes or among non-assistance low-income families? The above items were not strictly comparable to those asked in the 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey, because the response categories were changed for the AFS survey, dropping a middle category of "somewhat". By ignoring those responses in the 1996 survey and recalculating the percentages, however, a plausible comparison of the *yeses* and *no's* was possible. In general, the differences ranged from slight to moderate. The assistance parents were slightly more likely (69% vs. 64%) to say they had more than one option, but slightly less likely to report good options where they lived (54% vs. 58%). However, assistance parents were more likely to feel that in choosing child care they had to take whatever they could get (27% vs. 12%), and they were more likely to report difficulty finding the child care they wanted (56% vs. 36%). However, these comparisons are not consistent with findings from the 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey. Within that survey, ERDC parents reported slightly *less* difficulty finding the child care they wanted—33% vs. 37% for non-assistance, higher-income parents. One possible interpretation is that in 1998 the current ERDC sample is experiencing more difficulty finding the child care they want than the ERDC sample reported in 1996, perhaps due to increased effort to use market care; but one must suspect quirks of methodology and sampling. Overall, our impression is that these parents who receive child-care assistance frequently have restricted options for choice of child care and experience increasing difficulty finding child care when they enter the child-care market, where, despite limited financial resources, they report difficulties similar to those reported by higher-income parents who enter the child-care market.

Caregiver flexibility

Among the options that employed parents have are those that give them the flexibility they need to make it all work. To manage work, family, and child care successfully requires flexibility. The flexibility has to come from somewhere, and there are only so many places it can come from. The three most important are:

- family flexibility—having someone who can share responsibilities.
- work flexibility—having a manageable work schedule and leeway to handle emergencies.
- caregiver flexibility—having a care provider one can rely on when unexpectedly late.

Parents are amazingly inventive in how they work out the flexibility they need, and parents who receive child-care assistance appear to be more inventive than most. What AFS’s single parents lack in family flexibility they make up for by finding unusually flexible caregivers. These findings are from the 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey and are reported in Emlen, 1998 and on <http://www.teleport.com/~emlenart> They were confirmed by this AFS Consumer Survey.

• Parents were asked about their child-care provider as a source of needed flexibility in managing work and family. A high percent said Yes to the following:

- 88% I can count on my caregiver when I’m late.
- 88% My caregiver is willing to work with me about my schedule.
- 87% My caregiver understands the demands of my job and what goes on for me at work.
- 79% I rely on my caregiver to be flexible about my hours.

These positive results are consistent with previous research finding that parents who receive child-care assistance tend to seek providers they score higher-than-average on measures of caregiver flexibility. This makes sense since they are less likely to have a spouse or partner with whom to share child-care responsibilities, and since their jobs frequently demand difficult schedules. These parents are resourceful in compensating for their lack of family and work flexibility by arranging child care with providers who give them the flexibility they need.

• Caregiver flexibility was also a factor associated with the type of child care parents chose. Parents using centers reported significantly less caregiver flexibility than parents using family day care or than parents using relatives at home or in the relatives home:

P E R C E N T YES

	Center	Family Day Care	Home of Relative	At Home with Relative
Can count on caregiver when late.	72	91	93	93
Caregiver willing to work with me about schedule.	71	91	91	92
Caregiver understands the demands of job and work.	74	89	89	90
I rely on my caregiver to be flexible about hours.	57	80	87	87

For this reason, parents who want to take advantage of center care may need more flexibility from their work schedule or family situation. Also, parents need good backup care. 55% reported that they had good backup arrangements in case of an emergency. Parents using relatives for child care may need backup arrangements less frequently than other parents. Also, some parents are probably more creative than others at working out flexibility for themselves in their work arrangements, family relationships, and with their caregivers.

Quality of care

- Parents' perception of their child care based on specific aspects of its quality is generally consistent with parents' ratings of their satisfaction with their provider, although the specific judgments reflect greater concern regarding some characteristics of care, such as whether their child is getting individual attention.

<u>Items Measuring Quality of Child Care</u>	<u>Percent Who Said <i>Always</i></u>
My child is safe with this caregiver.	90
My child feels safe and secure.	85
It's a healthy place for my child.	83
My caregiver is warm and affectionate.	76
My caregiver is open to new information.	68
My child gets a lot of individual attention.	54

- There was little difference in perceived quality among the different types of child care, because so much variation in reported quality occurs within every type of child care. Nevertheless, on all six of the quality-of-care items AFS selected for use in this survey, a pattern of differences in parent-reported quality of care favored homes over centers and relatives over non-relatives.

<u>Items Measuring Quality of Child Care</u>	<u>Percent Who Said <i>Always</i></u>			
	<u>Center</u>	<u>Family Day Care</u>	<u>Relative's Home</u>	<u>Child's Home with a Relative</u>
My child is safe with this caregiver.	86	88	92	95
My child feels safe and secure.	79	83	88	90
It's a healthy place for my child.	78	80	84	91
My caregiver is warm and affectionate.	66	76	80	83
My caregiver is open to new information.	61	69	71	75
My child gets a lot of individual attention.	38	48	63	67

Concerning the measurement of quality of child care, it should be pointed out that these parent-reported findings are at odds with the body of research based on quality ratings made by trained observers in adherence to the standards and criteria of early childhood education. In that research, parents rated their care much higher than trained observers did, and they rated family day care higher than care in the home of relatives. For example, see *Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes* by Suzanne Helburn et al. (University of Colorado at Denver, Economics Department, 1995) and *Quality in Family Child Care and Relative Care* by Susan Kontos, Carollee Howes, Marybeth Shinn, and Ellen Galinsky (NY: Teachers College Press, 1996). Without trying to reconcile these

research discrepancies, it is worth noting them and pointing out that parents appear to be discriminating different kinds of child care based on some characteristics of care that they value. For background on the parent measures of quality, see Emlen, "From a Parent's Point of View: Flexibility, Income, and Quality of Child Care," Background Paper for Bethesda Conference, May 1, 1998.

The 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey found no relationship between reported quality of care and household income—similar averages and spread in reported quality of care at every level of household income, just as there is a range of quality within all major types of care. The most dramatic finding concerned the relationship between flexibility and reported quality of care. To the extent that parents succeeded in finding flexibility from work, family, and caregiver, to that extent they also succeeded in finding higher-quality child care, from their assessment.

How do quality-of-care data from the AFS sample compare to figures from the Oregon Population Survey? Such a comparison is possible on three items. The AFS child-care assistance parents were slightly lower in reported quality of care than the Oregon population of parents using paid care and than those Oregon parents with household incomes under \$25,000, but higher than a sample of bank employees, higher than a 1966 ERDC sample, and higher than parents using child care resource and referral services. Parents who use R&R services tend to have more complex and stressful child-care needs they try to meet in a strange and uncertain marketplace.

Sample	My child feels safe and secure in care.	My caregiver is open to new information and learning.	My child gets a lot of individual attention.
1998 AFS Consumer Survey—N=2360 parents receiving child-care assistance for 3115 arrangements.	85	68	54
1996 Oregon Population Survey—All Oregon parents of children <13 in paid care N=1085	89	73	59
Oregon population by household income:	89	74	61
Under \$25,000 N=300; 306; 310	83	67	56
\$25,000 - 44,999 N=312; 321; 321	94	77	62
\$45,000 or above N=431; 432; 432			
Samples from 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey	72	46	28
Bank employees, statewide N=264	84	60	42
ERDC N=106	64	54	34
Parents using R&R services			

Did parents have stability in their child-care arrangements?

Parents were asked, "Have you changed your child care provider(s) in the past six months?"

- 66% reported no changes; 23% reported one change; 7% two changes, and 4% three or more.

That's 34% with a change in the past six months, comparing favorably to the 46% reported in the 1991 consumer survey of ERDC parents. Above, the 11% with two or more changes compares to 14% in the ERDC study of 1995.

Did parents use the services of a Child Care Resource and Referral Agency?

- Parents were asked, "Have you ever used the services of a Child Care Resource and Referral Agency?", and 42% said they had. Among center users, 50% reported using an R&R. Among family day care users, 53% had. It was 31% among those currently with care in the home of a relative, and 27% among those whose care was at home with an adult relative.

These figures would not have been found five years ago, and they show a substantially higher rate of R&R use than has been found among employed parents in employee surveys. These results reflect a sustained agency policy of supporting and collaborating with the Oregon Child Care R&R Network, and of encouraging clients to take advantage of R&R services.

- Of the 1002 parents who used R&R services, 62% reported that the service was helpful.
- Of the 1386 parents who had not used R&R services:
 - 756 or 55% already had child care
 - 345 or 25% did not know about the services
 - 221 or 16% said the services did not meet their need
 - 38 or 3% said the services were not available in their community
 - 137 or 10% said the services were not convenient to their schedule.

Parent evaluation of AFS child-care assistance program:

- 48% of parents said, "No problem." to the question, "Have you had any problems this month or last month with the AFS child-care assistance program? *Check all that apply.*"
- Half of the parents reported a problem among the following:
 - 31% I have to pay too much of my income—my copay is too high for my income
 - 20% The number of hours authorized does not cover my child care need
 - 16% My provider thinks AFS rates are too low
 - 11% I have a communication problem with my worker
 - 9% My provider does not like the payment process
 - 8% I was confused about the amount to pay my provider
 - 5% I don't understand the program
 - 3% My provider does not understand the payment process
 - 9% Other
- 112% *Most parents reporting a problem checked only one.*

- "Do you have a copay?"

81% said Yes 19% said No

- "If yes, how do you usually arrange to meet the copay?"

38% pay during the month
 27% pay at the beginning of the month
 18% pay at the end of the month
 4% trade services or other non-cash arrangement
 2% provider does not collect copay
11% other
 100%

- In general, how satisfied are you with the AFS child-care assistance program?

28% Very satisfied
 35% Satisfied
 29% Mixed feelings
 5% Dissatisfied
 3% Very dissatisfied

The 63% satisfied with the program compares to 60% of respondents to the 1995 survey of ERDC parents.

Profile of parents of children with a disability.

- 222 parents—9% of the sample answered Yes to the question, "Do you have a child with a disability that requires a higher level of child care?"
- Parents of children with a disability were significantly different in the level of difficulty and concerns they expressed, compared to the total sample.

P E R C E N T

Item	Parent of Child with a	Total Sample N=246	Difference
I had difficulty finding the child care I wanted.	73	56	17
There are good options for child care where I live.	29	46	-17
I have good backup arrangements in case of an emergency.	39	55	-16
I had difficulty dealing with child care problems during working hours.	50	35	15
It is <i>very difficult</i> to find child care to match my schedule.	31	17	14
In choosing child care I had to take whatever I could get.	38	27	11
When I chose this provider I had more than one option.	59	69	-10
I changed child-care providers 2 or more times in past 6 months.	17	10	7
I have used child care resource and referral services.	56	42	14
I found the services helpful.	50	62	-12
The R&R services did not meet my needs.	17	9	8
<i>Satisfied or very satisfied</i> with the AFS child-care assistance program.	50	63	-13
<i>Any problems</i> this month or last month with the AFS program	65	52	-13

- Among parents receiving child-care assistance, those whose child has a disability are jumping through higher hoops while carrying more baggage.
- Are low-income parents more likely to have a child with a disability? In the 1996 Quality-of-Care Survey, parents were asked about four kinds of disability: emotional or behavioral, health care, learning, and physical. The sample (N=862) was a composite of special samples and not intended to be representative of Oregon children, but a wide range of incomes were represented, making comparison by household income possible. Overall, 8 percent said "Yes" to the statement: *My child has an emotional or behavioral problem that requires special attention*. But those with household income under \$30,000 were three times more likely to have a child with an emotional or behavioral problem than parents with incomes of \$30,000 or above—13.1% vs. 4.3%. ERDC parents were heavily represented among the low income parents. See appendix for detail on all incomes and all disabilities.

References

- Bergin, Linda. Child Care Data from the 1996 Oregon Population Survey. Oregon Department of Employment, 1998.
- Emlen, Arthur C., Paul E. Koren, Kathryn S. Yoakum, and Matthew D. Emlen. A Survey of Family Day Care Providers in AFS Programs. A Report to Oregon Department of Human Resources, Adult and Family Services Division, Income Maintenance Section, with Tina Harman and Larry Shadbolt. Portland Oregon: Arthur Emlen & Associates, Inc. in cooperation with Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University, July 1991.
- Emlen, Arthur C., Paul E. Koren, Kathryn S. Yoakum, and Matthew D. Emlen. AFS Survey of Child Care Consumers. A Report to Oregon Department of Human Resources, Adult and Family Services Division, Income Maintenance Section, with Tina Harman and Larry Shadbolt. Portland Oregon: Arthur Emlen & Associates, Inc. in cooperation with Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University, July 1991.
- Emlen, Arthur C. and Paul E. Koren. "Estimating Child-Care Demand for Statewide Planning." 1993 Proceedings of the Government Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association, pp. 77-82.
- Emlen, Arthur C., Kathryn Schultze, and Paul E. Koren. AFS Families as Child-Care Consumers. Report of a Consumer Survey by Adult and Family Services of Parents in Three Programs: Employment Related Day Care (ERDC), Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), and JOBS. Adult and Family Services Division, Oregon Department of Human Resources. June 1995.
- Emlen, Arthur C. "Stage of Family Development: Some Findings with Implications for Self-Sufficiency", NACCRRRA 8th Annual Policy Symposium, Washington. DC, March 1, 1996.
- Emlen, Arthur C. "From a Parent's Point of View: Flexibility, Income, and Quality of Child Care." Background Paper for Conference *Child Care in the New Policy Context: New Perspectives on Child Care Quality*, SEED 2000, DHHS, NICHD, and Child Trends, Inc. NIH Campus, Bethesda, Maryland, May 1, 1998.
- Oregon Child Care Research Partnership. "Quality of Care From a Parent's Point of View: A Questionnaire About Child Care." Arthur C. Emlen, Portland State University, 1996, <http://www/teleport.com/~emlenart>