

CAN WE TRUST PARENTAL REPORTS OF CHILD CARE SUBSIDY RECEIPT?



Methodological Brief OPRE 2012-53
December 2012

DISCLAIMER:

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, the Administration for Children and Families, or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

This report and other reports sponsored by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation are available at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/index.html>.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Nicole Forry for her thoughtful reviews in the writing of this brief. We are also appreciative of Deanna Schexnayder's helpful comments. Finally, we are grateful to the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation and the Child Care Policy Research Consortium (CCPRC), particularly its Subsidy Workgroup, for their inspiration and feedback.

This Brief was developed by members of the Child Care Policy and Research Consortium's Child Care Subsidy Workgroup, which is supported by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation through the Child Care and Early Education Policy and Research Analysis and Technical Expertise contract with Child Trends.

CAN WE TRUST PARENTAL REPORTS OF CHILD CARE SUBSIDY RECEIPT?

OPRE 2012-53
December 2012

Submitted to:

Ivelisse Martinez-Beck, PhD., Project Officer
Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Administration for Children and Families
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Submitted by:

Anna D. Johnson, Georgetown University
Chris M. Herbst, Arizona State University

Contract Number: GS10F0030R

Activity Director: Nicole Forry
Child Trends
4301 Connecticut Ave NW
Washington DC, 20008

This report is in the public domain. Permission to reproduce is not necessary. Suggested Citation: Johnson, A. D. & Herbst, C. M. (2012). Can we trust parental reports of child care subsidy receipt? Methodological Brief OPRE 2012-53. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.



GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Georgetown College
Department of Psychology

Introduction

In recent years, increased attention has been paid to analyzing the determinants and consequences of child care subsidy receipt in the U.S. Much of this work capitalizes on rich survey data to describe the characteristics of subsidy recipients or to compare subsidy recipients to non-recipients, (e.g., Herbst, 2008; Johnson, 2011; Tekin, 2005; 2007; Weinraub, Shlay, Harmon, & Tran, 2005), and to examine the relationship between subsidy receipt and characteristics of child care (Berger & Black, 1992; Crosby, Gennetian, & Huston, 2005; Johnson, 2010a; Ryan, Johnson, Rigby, & Brooks-Gunn, 2011; Weinraub et al., 2005) and child developmental outcomes (Griffen, Hawkinson, Dong, & Maynard, 2010; Herbst & Tekin, 2010a; 2010b; 2010c; Johnson, 2010b).

As the body of literature on child care subsidies has grown, however, so have concerns about the measurement of subsidy receipt in survey data. While surveys offer a wealth of information on family background characteristics as well as characteristics of child care and early education settings that cannot be captured in administrative data, questions have been raised regarding the reliability of parental reports of subsidy receipt in survey data sets. Nearly all studies of subsidy receipt using survey data make use of the same question or set of questions asked of parents about whether the family receives assistance paying for their child's care from a government source.¹ In the context of this large and growing body of subsidy research, the extent of measurement error in parental report of subsidy receipt in survey data, and its implications for drawing conclusions about the impact of subsidy use, is not well understood.

There are a number of reasons that parents might misreport receipt of a subsidy. For example, parents who receive subsidies may be sensitive to the stigma associated with receiving a means-tested public benefit and therefore may purposefully report not receiving a subsidy when they in fact do. Misreporting could also stem from memory lapses regarding receipt of a subsidy or from confusion over which funding stream (e.g. CCDF, Head Start, universal pre-kindergarten) is actually paying for the child's care. Indeed, if a parent pays a co-payment and the remaining cost of care is subsidized through a contract paid directly to the provider, for example, the parent may believe that she is paying the full cost of care and is not receiving any subsidy. Regardless of the reason for misreporting, concerns around errors in measuring subsidy receipt using parental report have arisen because inaccuracy in identifying subsidy recipients has implications for our interpretation of emerging findings from subsidy studies.

Specifically, concerns about measurement error with respect to subsidy receipt are justified because, under certain conditions, such error can cause ordinary least squares (OLS) regression estimates to be inconsistent and biased. Given that the potential consequences of measurement error differ according to whether a variable is expressed as a dependent or independent variable, it is useful to consider both scenarios in the case of subsidy receipt. Analyses that use subsidy receipt as the dependent variable assume that the measurement error is unobserved to the researcher and thus is embedded in the error term (usually represented by " ϵ " in a regression framework). As long as the measurement error is not systematically related to one or more of the independent variables, the only consequence is larger error variances (standard errors) of the OLS estimates. However, if the measurement error is non-random with respect to the independent variables, there is a *possibility* that the OLS estimates will be biased. On the other hand, measurement error in subsidy receipt when it is used as an independent variable is thought to be more serious. By definition, the error in subsidy receipt (which is unobserved and included in " ϵ ") must be correlated with the observed measure,

¹ For instance, in the nationally representative Early Childhood Longitudinal Study – Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K), parents were asked: "Did any of the following people or organizations help to pay for...this provider to care for [CHILD]...?"; parents who responded affirmatively that "a social service agency or welfare office" helped to pay for their child's care were considered subsidy recipients (see Herbst & Tekin, 2010a). Similar questions appear in other nationally representative studies, including the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study – Birth Cohort (ECLS-B), the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF), and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP).

thereby leading to a problem known as classical errors-in-variables (CEV). The key implication of CEV is that it renders inconsistent and biased OLS estimates of the impact of subsidy receipt. In particular, estimates of subsidy receipt will be biased downward—or toward zero—increasing the likelihood of failing to reject the null hypothesis of no subsidy effect when in fact there is one.

In light of this discussion, two questions exist around (1) how reliable parents are in reporting subsidy receipt, and (2) to the extent that there is error in parental reports, how is this error likely to affect estimates in studies of the determinants or consequences of subsidy use? Using rich, multi-city survey data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being (FFCW) study, this research brief seeks to address these important questions in several ways. We first examine the extent to which parental reports of child care subsidy receipt overlap with an alternate utilization measure drawn from child care providers. Although a provider-based report of subsidy receipt is itself an imperfect measure, greater reporting agreement across parents and providers increases our confidence in the accuracy of both measures. Then, we predict subsidy receipt from a standard set of family background characteristics used in the literature to study determinants of subsidy receipt. We compare estimates from models predicting provider-reported subsidy receipt to parent-reported subsidy receipt in an effort to understand whether there are systematic or structural differences in the determinants of subsidy receipt across the two approaches to measuring subsidy receipt. In the final section of the brief, we examine the extent to which family background characteristics are systematically related to whether parents and providers *disagree* with the subsidy receipt status of a given child. Assuming that disagreement between parents and providers reflects a source of reporting error; our goal is to determine whether this error is random or non-random with respect to a standard set of background characteristics.

In the following sections of this brief, we summarize the small body of work that has been conducted to address the question of reliability of parent reports of receipt of public benefits, including child care subsidies. We then describe and present the empirical analyses used to explore the question of overlap between parent and child care provider report, and of measurement error in parent report. We conclude by discussing the limitations of our work, as well as by offering suggestions for future directions and policy implications.

Prior Research

Our analysis is informed by research on the reliability of parental reports of other public benefits. Researchers have examined the extent of misreporting participation in other social service programs, such as Medicaid, welfare, WIC, and food stamps, using data from large survey datasets that are frequently employed for analyzing determinants and consequences of public benefit use, such as the American Community Survey (ACS), the Current Population Survey (CPS), the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and Consumer Expenditure Survey (CE Survey). Results from these recent studies suggest that only two-thirds of all families who actually receive food stamps, cash assistance, and WIC report receiving these benefits (Meyer, Mok, & Sullivan, 2009). Similarly, studies looking specifically at underreporting of food stamp receipt find that more than one-third of food stamp recipients erroneously report not receiving benefits (Meyer & Goerge, 2010; Meyer & Sullivan, 2007). A study of Medicaid take-up in California revealed similar results, finding that enrollment estimates increase by nearly 40 percent when underreporting is corrected (Klerman, Ringel, & Roth, 2005). This study also found that underreporting is more severe among families with household incomes above the poverty line, increasing with income, suggesting that stigma contributes to inaccurate reports of receipt of means-tested benefits.

We also build on work looking specifically at the reliability of parental reports of subsidy use. Researchers at the Urban Institute recently investigated the amount and types of child care assistance parents reported receiving using data from the National Survey of America's families (NSAF; Giannarelli, Adelman, & Schmidt, 2003). They identified three primary reasons that parents may underreport subsidy receipt: the parent is not aware that she receives a subsidy, perhaps because she pays a co-payment and the remainder of the cost of care is paid directly to the provider; the parent is embarrassed to report receipt of mean-tested assistance; or the parent reports that her child's unpaid care (e.g., center-based care in which the subsidy covers the full cost and the parent pays no co-pay; a free Head Start or public pre-kindergarten program) is "free" and thus fails to report receiving any assistance. As a result of these potential misspecifications, the authors caution that estimates of subsidy receipt should be interpreted as minimum estimates. However, because child care providers were not interviewed in the NSAF, the parent is the only source of information on child care assistance and thus the extent of misspecification or its potential impact on estimates could not be evaluated.

More recent work to inform the development of questions for the upcoming National Study of Early Care and Education (NSECE) included cognitive testing of items designed to capture information on subsidy receipt from parent interviews (Bowman, Datta, & Yan, 2010). Researchers found that the series of subsidy questions - which are similar to questions used in existing surveys but added the word "subsidy" explicitly (e.g. "did you receive a child care subsidy from the government") - were generally interpreted correctly by respondents in pre-testing interviews. In other words, respondents seemed to understand the intention of the question and the meaning of "subsidy". Some confusion did exist, however, especially around the source of the subsidy. For instance, higher-income families (who were likely not eligible to receive subsidies) were less familiar with the terms associated with, and sources of, child care assistance. In addition, several subsidy recipients expressed confusion over the source of assistance when the provider was paid directly, and between tax credits and subsidies, for example.

To improve the reporting accuracy, the authors suggest including a definition of the word "subsidy," and differentiating it from other sources of assistance like tax credits and flexible spending plans.² They also recommend using the state-specific subsidy program name or name of the local subsidy administration office, which subsidy recipients may be more likely to recognize, to reduce inaccuracies in self-report of subsidy receipt. Nevertheless, Bowman, Datta, and Yan (2010) conclude that confusion around the question wording did not substantially interfere with respondents' ability to understand the question during cognitive testing. In principle, this increases our confidence that parents who have responded to subsidy questions in other surveys may have accurately understood and replied to these questions. However, the majority of survey data used in recent studies of determinants and consequences of subsidy receipt make use of a question that does not include the word "subsidy", as the NSECE did. Instead, as mentioned earlier, the question most typically used in existing data sources is a variant of "do you receive help from the government/social welfare agency/social service office in paying for your child's care?" Thus, empirically we still know little about the reliability of parent report of subsidy receipt as it is captured in existing survey data sets.

² Clearly, Bowman et al. (2010) are concerned that families confuse child care subsidies offered through the CCDF with those offered through a tax policy called the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit (CDCTC). However, such concerns are largely misplaced. Created in 1976, the CDCTC initially provided a *non-refundable* credit of \$4,800 (2+ children) for child care expenses incurred. However, given that families need positive tax liability to be eligible for a non-refundable tax credit, the CDCTC rarely applies to the population of families served through the CCDF. Even tax legislation in 2001—which increased the generosity of the CDCTC—leaves intact the nonrefundable structure of tax credit, making its benefits largely inaccessible to low-income families.

Method

Data Source and Sample

Data for this research brief were drawn from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS) Child Care Supplement (CCS). The FFCWS CCS is uniquely suited for this analysis because it is the only large survey dataset that collected information on child care subsidy receipt from *both* parents *and* child care providers, permitting a comparison between the two measures. The FFCWS is a longitudinal birth cohort study designed to examine associations between non-marital childbearing and child and family outcomes in 20 U.S. cities (see Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, & McLanahan, 2001 for a detailed description of the larger FFCWS design). Data for the CCS were collected in 2002 and 2003, in 14 of the 20 FFCWS cities. As part of the FFCWS, participants in all 20 cities were visited in their homes when focal children were approximately three years old. During this visit, families in 14 of the 20 cities were asked if they used child care for 10 hours or more per week; of those families visited at home in the 14 cities (N = 2,650), 1,150 families were eligible for the CCS because they typically used some form of non-parental care for 10 or more hours per week. The CCS, conducted for both home- and center-based care providers, included an interview with the child's care provider as well as an observational assessment of the quality of the child care setting. For children who received their care in a center-based setting, whenever possible the center director was interviewed; however, when the center director was not available, the child's teacher was interviewed instead.³ For children in a home-based setting, the family child care provider or informal care provider was interviewed. Almost one-half of eligible families did not have associated provider interviews and observations due to families' refusal to allow their child's care provider to participate, provider refusal to participate, or changes in the child care arrangement. Interviews and child care observations were conducted in the child care settings of 777 children. For the purposes of this research brief, we reduced our analytic sample to cases with non-missing data for both the provider *and* parent report of child care subsidies. Thus, our analytic sample included the 604 cases that had data from both sources.

Measures

Subsidy receipt. Child care provider report of subsidy receipt offers a comparison for the often-used parent reported measure. Thus, an analysis assessing the overlap of provider and parent report of subsidy receipt corroborates provider report as much as it does parent report; the greater the overlap between the two measures, the greater our confidence is in both.

During the child care provider interview, providers were first asked "is any part of [focal child's name] care paid for by government support?"⁴ and those that responded affirmatively were then asked "what local, state, or federal programs provide these funds?" Children whose providers responded that the focal child did not receive government support were coded "0", as were children whose providers reported that the child's care was funded through a board of education, a state pre-kindergarten program, Head Start or Early Head Start, a private non-profit foundation, and those who reported sponsorship by or affiliation with a Head Start or public school. All remaining children in the subsidy recipient group had providers who either explicitly reported that the child received a subsidy funded by the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) or that the child received government support from a state or local social service agency likely to receive CCDF funding. Of the 777 children with child care provider report, approximately 26 percent received subsidies according to provider report.⁵

³ For simplicity and consistency, we use the term "provider" across both center- and home-based settings, recognizing that in some cases for children in center-based care, the "provider" report was given by the center director.

⁴ For family child care providers, the word "support" was replaced with the word "subsidy."

⁵ When the sample is limited to the 604 families who have data on subsidies from *both* child care providers and parents, the subsidy utilization rate according to provider report is nearly 29%.

To permit a comparison of provider-reported subsidy use with parent report, we included in our analyses a measure of parent report of subsidy use. At the three-year parent interview, mothers were asked: “Does any person or agency give you money, a voucher, or a scholarship to help pay for child care?” Those who responded affirmatively were then asked “who or what agency gives you money or the voucher or scholarship?” Mothers who responded that their assistance came from “a government agency” or “a child care center” were considered to be subsidy recipients. As mentioned earlier, this method of identifying subsidy recipients from parent report is similar to that used in other large-scale surveys including the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten cohort (ECLS-K), Early Childhood Longitudinal Survey-Birth cohort (ECLS-B), National Survey of America’s Families (NSAF), and Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Of the 777 cases with child care provider data, 604 families had data on parent report of subsidy receipt;⁶ of the 604 families with data on parent-reported subsidy receipt, the subsidy utilization rate according to parent report was approximately 17 percent. **Covariates.** In multivariate models, we included a standard set of family background characteristics used in other subsidy studies (see Table 1). All covariates (except when noted) were drawn from the first in-home parent interview, when children were approximately one-year old, to reduce the threat of simultaneity bias. These covariates were: maternal race (three dummy variables for black, Hispanic, and other race, with white omitted), maternal education (three dummy variables for less than high school, high school diploma/GED, some college, with BA or more omitted), an indicator variable for maternal marital status (1=single), an indicator for maternal immigrant status (1=U.S. born), maternal employment (two dummy variables for employed full-time and part-time, with unemployed omitted) and education status (an indicator for whether the mother was in school [1=in school]), household structure (one dummy variable for whether mother has more children in addition to the focal child [=0] versus the focal child only [=1]), and one dummy variable for whether there are other adults in the household [=1]), indicator variables for whether the mother received welfare, WIC, or food stamps, household income-to-poverty ratio, an indicator for whether the child is the mother’s firstborn, maternal age at focal child’s birth (in years), and the focal child’s age at the 3-year in-home interview (in months).

Results

Table 1 presents means on all covariates for the analytic sample. Given that the FFCWS oversampled families in large cities, as well as unwed births, it is not surprising that the sample appears to be more disadvantaged compared to other large survey data sets. Additionally, as families with younger children are more likely to be less advantaged, and the FFCWS CCS only included families with 3-year-old children, we might expect this sample to be less advantaged than a national sample. Indeed, in the current sample most mothers are non-White, more than half the analytic sample has a high school education or less, nearly half the mothers are single, and close to one-third received welfare and food stamps while approximately three-quarters of the sample received WIC.

We first examined agreement between provider- and parent-reported receipt of a subsidy. Table 2 displays overlap of parent and provider report of subsidy receipt. Generally speaking, our results suggest that there is considerable overlap between provider and parental reports of child care subsidy receipt. For example, of the 174 children who received subsidies according to the provider report of subsidy receipt, 104 received subsidies according to parent report (agreement rate of 59.8 percent). Of the 430 children who did not receive subsidies according to provider report, 368 did not receive subsidies according to parent report (agreement rate of 85.6 percent). These figures represent an overall agreement rate between child care providers and parents of approximately 78 percent.⁷

⁶ As mentioned above, we reduced our analytic sample to the 604 cases with valid data on both provider and parent report of subsidy receipt.

⁷ Note that overlap between parents and providers decreased to 64% when children reported by the provider to be receiving Early Head Start, Head Start, or public pre-kindergarten were counted as subsidy recipients on the provider report measure. This increase in disagreement suggests that parents may tend not to consider other sources of subsidized care as a “subsidy” per se.

Next, we explored whether the predictors of subsidy receipt differ depending on whether subsidy receipt was reported by the provider or the parent. Table 3 presents a comparison of estimates from logistic regression models predicting subsidy receipt from all covariates; the first column presents estimates from the model predicting provider-reported subsidy receipt, and the second column presents estimates from the model predicting parent-reported subsidy receipt. Overall, few systematic differences emerged between the two models. In general, the sign, size, and significance of coefficients across the two models is the same, with the exception of maternal education, which is only predictive of parent-reported subsidy receipt. To confirm this intuition, we conducted a formal specification test of the null hypothesis of equal coefficients (on the family background characteristics) across the provider and parent report models. Results from these tests confirm that only maternal education differentially predicts subsidy receipt across both measures. Such a finding indicates that the underlying determinants of subsidy receipt do not depend on the subsidy measure used, thus providing further confidence in the usefulness of parental reports of subsidy receipt.

Finally, we investigated associations between covariates and *disagreement* between provider- and parent-reported subsidy receipt. We suspect that disagreement is one possible manifestation of the measurement error in subsidy receipt. If observable family characteristics are independent of the measurement error, as conceptualized by disagreement between the two reports, this would bolster our confidence in *both* measures. Table 4 presents results from a logistic regression model predicting disagreement between providers and parents. Overall, it appears that disagreement is relatively random, as only two of the 20 family characteristics have a statistically significant association with disagreement in the subsidy measures. Specifically, disagreement between provider and parent report of subsidy receipt was less likely among mothers with only one child and those who live with other adults were the only significant predictors of.

Summary and Implications

This research brief aimed to empirically test the reliability of parent report of subsidy receipt by comparing it to provider report of subsidy receipt. We found a high degree of overlap between child care providers and parents in their report of whether the child received a subsidy. Multivariate models predicting subsidy receipt from provider- versus parent-report revealed very few systematic differences in family background characteristics associated with subsidy receipt. Finally, only two characteristics were systematically related to disagreement between providers and parents: number of children and the presence of other adults in the household. Taken together, our results suggest that, overall, parental report of subsidy receipt does not differ dramatically from provider report and that whatever disagreement that *does* exist appears to be random and therefore is unlikely to bias OLS estimates of the predictors or effects of subsidy receipt.

Although the percent agreement of subsidy reporting between providers and parents was quite high, it is worth considering what explains the 21 percent of cases that did *not* agree. This disagreement may represent underreporting. As Klerman and colleagues note, one reason for underreporting may be that interviewers administering survey questions are not trained explicitly to extract information on receipt of the public benefit of interest (Klerman et al., 2005). They also found that underreporting was most severe among families with incomes above the poverty line; similarly, results of the cognitive pre-testing of the NSECE suggest that non-poor families were most likely to misinterpret questions about sources of child care assistance. This suggests that families with incomes above the poverty line who actually do receive subsidies may be misclassified as non-recipients if they are embarrassed to respond honestly, and to the extent non-poor families do not understand questions about subsidies or sources of child care help and incorrectly respond affirmatively to questions of benefit receipt, true non-recipients could be misclassified as recipients. Of course, stigma about receipt of means-tested public benefits will continue to exist and is responsible for some amount of chronic underreporting.

Alternately, it may be that disagreement between parents and child care providers may be indicative of limitations in provider report. Just as we assume that the extent of overlap between parents and providers offers corroborative evidence for the strength of both measures, discrepancies between the two may suggest problems with one or both sources of information. We have discussed reasons that parents may misreport subsidy receipt; however, child care providers could also be misreporting. For instance, it is possible that providers who care for multiple children confuse one child's funding source for another. It may also be that providers who receive blended funding incorrectly report a subsidy when in fact the majority of the child's care is funded through another, non-subsidy source. Additionally, as mentioned previously, in some cases for children who received care in a center-based setting, the center director was interviewed while in other cases, the child's teacher was interviewed. If the director handles payments for a given center but the teacher was interviewed, for example, it is possible that the teacher did not have sufficient knowledge of the source of child care assistance the focal child was receiving to accurately report on subsidy receipt.⁸ And, because neither parents nor providers were asked about CCDF subsidies specifically, it is possible that children receiving child care assistance through other sources were mistakenly classified as subsidy recipients. For instance, a parent who receives help paying for child care through his or her local YMCA may have reported receiving assistance directly from his or her child's child care center, and thus could have been mistakenly categorized as receiving a subsidy.

Another source of disagreement between parent and provider report could be the time-frame in which parent and provider respondents were interviewed. As mentioned above, parents were interviewed first, answering questions about child care assistance as well as giving consent for the child care provider to be interviewed later. Based on information collected in this parent interview, child care providers were then contacted and, when possible, interviewed. In most cases, these two interviews occurred within several months of each other. However, in some cases, the distance between the parent interview and the provider interview was up to, or (rarely) slightly over, one year. The questions asked of the parent and of the provider both referred to current subsidy receipt, but, because spells of subsidy receipt are short, it is plausible that a child who was receiving a subsidy at the time of the parent interview was no longer a subsidy recipient at the time of the provider interview.⁹

Cautions should be taken in generalizing the findings in this brief to other survey data sets. As mentioned earlier, the FFCWS only sampled families in large cities and dramatically oversampled unwed births. Although these characteristics may be more representative of the subsidy-eligible population than characteristics of other samples, our findings are nonetheless only generalizable to the population represented by the FFCWS. Additionally, the CCS only sampled families with 3-year-old children who used some type of non-parental care excluding, parents who use no non-parental care (and, most probably, parents who are not in the labor force). We cannot know how sample selection may have affected our results; nonetheless, future research should aim to collect data on subsidy receipt from parents *and* child care providers so that these findings can be replicated on larger, nationally representative data sets.

An additional next step for future research will be to merge administrative data with rich survey data that contains subsidy receipt reported by both parents and providers. As part of the state administrative tracking system, states routinely collect a range of information on the sources and amounts of child care assistance a family receives. These administrative data sets represent a source of information on subsidy receipt that is arguably more accurate than either parent or provider report. Unfortunately, it was not possible in the current study to link state administrative data with the Fragile Families survey data set. This represents both an important next step for researchers as well as a limitation of the current study.

⁸ An extension for future work to consider is the inclusion of controls for (i) whether the teacher or child care director responded to the question regarding subsidy receipt and (ii) whether the child enrolled in center- or family-based child care services.

⁹ Future work should consider adding a control for the amount of time that elapsed between the parent and child care provider interviews.

In spite of its limitations, results from this brief increase our confidence in the quality of parent-reported measures of subsidy receipt used by the many researchers who will continue to rely on survey data to study the predictors and consequences of subsidy receipt. The relatively high degree of overlap between parent and provider report found in the current study suggests that these two commonly-available sources of information on subsidy receipt are satisfactorily consistent with each other. However, researchers are encouraged to interpret results of subsidy studies that draw their data from surveys alone with caution, as parent or provider reported subsidy receipt, without a check with administrative data, may result in an undercount of subsidy use. The ability to check parent (and provider) report of subsidy receipt against administrative records in future studies is a crucial next step for the subsidy research community. This is especially important given that prior work that has found significant underreporting of public benefit receipt in survey data sets when compared to administrative records.

References

- Berger, M. C. & Black, D. A. (1992). Child care subsidies, quality of care, and the labor supply of low income, single mothers. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74, 635-642.
- Bowman, M., Datta, A.R., & Yan, T. (2010). *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Cognitive interview findings report for demand questionnaire*. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center (NORC).
- Crosby, D. A., Gennetian, L., & Huston, A. (2005). Child care assistance policies can affect the use of center-based care for children in low-income families. *Applied Developmental Science*, 9, 86-106.
- Giannarelli, L., Adelman, S., & Schmidt, S. (2003). *Getting help with child care expenses*. (Assessing the New Federalism Occasional Paper 62). Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Griffen, A., Hawkinson, L., Dong, N., & Maynard, R. (2010, November). *The effect of child care subsidies on children's cognitive development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Boston, MA.
- Herbst, C., & Tekin, E. (2010a). Child care subsidies and child development. *Economics of Education Review*, 29, 618-638.
- Herbst, C., & Tekin, E. (2010b). Child care subsidies and childhood obesity. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 8, 199- 230.
- Herbst, C., & Tekin, E. (2010c). *The impact of child care subsidies on child well-being: Evidence from geographic variation in the distance to social service agencies*. (Working paper #16250). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Herbst, C. (2008). Who are the eligible non-recipients of child care subsidies? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30, 1037-1054.
- Johnson, A.D., Martin, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2011). Who uses child care subsidies? Comparing recipients to eligible non-recipients on family background characteristics and child care preferences. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33, 1072-1083.
- Johnson, A.D. (2010a). *Child care subsidies: Do they impact the quality of care children experience?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Johnson, A.D. (2010b). *Child care subsidies and school readiness in kindergarten*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Klerman, J.A., Ringel, J.S., & Roth, B. (2005). *Under-reporting of Medicaid and Welfare in the Current Population Survey*. (Working Paper #169-3). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Meyer, B.D., & Goerge, R.M. (2010). *The analysis of food stamp participation with matched survey and administrative data*. (Working paper). Chicago, IL: Harris School, University of Chicago.
- Meyer, B.D., Mok, W.K.C., & Sullivan, J.X. (2009). *The underreporting of transfers in household surveys: Comparisons to administrative aggregates*. (Working paper). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Meyer, B.D., & Sullivan, J.X. (2007). *Reporting bias in studies of the food stamp program*. (Working paper series 08.01). Chicago, IL: Harris School, University of Chicago.

Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (2001). Fragile families: Sample and design. *Children and Youth Services Review, 23*, 303–326.

Ryan, R.M., Johnson, A.D., Rigby, D.E., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2011). The impact of child care subsidy use on child care quality. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 26*, 320-331.

Tekin, E. (2005). Child care subsidy receipt, employment, and child care choices of single mothers. *Economic Letters, 89*, 1-6.

Tekin, E. (2007). Single mothers working at night: Standard work and child care subsidies. *Economic Inquiry, 45*, 233-250.

Weinraub, M., Shlay, A. B., Harmon, M., & Tran, H. (2005). Subsidizing child care: How child care subsidies affect the child care used by low-income African American families. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20*, 373-392.

Table 1**Sample Descriptives**

	Mean (SD) / Percentage	Range
Mother is White (omitted)	17.5	0-1
Mother is black	62.1	0-1
Mother is Hispanic	17.9	0-1
Mother is other race	2.5	0-1
Mother has < HS education	22.4	0-1
Mother has HS/GED	33.8	0-1
Mother has some college	29.5	0-1
Mother has BA+ (omitted)	14.3	0-1
Mother is single	43.5	0-1
Mother was born in US	92.0	0-1
Mother works full time	53.0	0-1
Mother works part time	19.2	0-1
Mother is unemployed (omitted)	27.8	0-1
Mother is attending school	18.9	0-1
Mother has 1 child	31.5	0-1
Mother lives with any other adult	77.3	0-1
Mother received welfare last year	23.8	0-1
Mother received WIC last year	76.9	0-1
Mother received food stamps last year	35.9	0-1
Household Income-to-Poverty Ratio	2.5 (2.4)	0-12.3
Child is firstborn	40.4	0-1
Mother's age (in years)	25 (5.9)	15-44
Child's age in months	35.3 (2.0)	31-45

N= 604

Table 2**Overlap of parent and provider reports of child care subsidy receipt**

	Parent Report		Total
	Subsidy	No Subsidy	
Provider Report			
Subsidy	104	70	174
No Subsidy	62	368	430
<i>Total</i>	166	438	604

Percent agreement = 78.1%

Table 3

Logistic regression predicting subsidy receipt from family background variables, robust standard errors

	Provider Report			Parent Report			Wald test
	Odds Ratio	Robust SE		Odds Ratio	Robust SE		Chi Sq.
Mother is black	1.60	0.53		1.47	0.56		
Mother is Hispanic	1.13	0.45		1.18	0.52		
Mother is other race	1.18	0.95		3.00	2.84		
Mother has < HS education	1.69	0.87		7.34	5.37	*	3.36
Mother has HS/GED	1.75	0.79		9.09	6.40	**	4.68
Mother has some college	1.76	0.77		6.22	4.42	*	2.72
Mother is single	1.43	0.34		1.45	0.35		
Mother was born in US	0.95	0.42		2.63	1.57		
Mother works full time	0.82	0.21		1.34	0.36		
Mother works part time	1.02	0.31		0.98	0.32		
Mother is attending school	0.90	0.24		1.09	0.30		
Mother has 1 child	0.65	0.19		0.75	0.23		
Mother lives with any other adult	0.44	0.12	**	0.58	0.16	+	
Mother received welfare last year	1.04	0.29		1.32	0.37		
Mother received WIC last year	0.72	0.20		1.40	0.47		
Mother received food stamps last year	1.42	0.37		1.87	0.51	*	0.84
Household Income-to-Poverty Ratio	0.99	0.06		1.02	0.07		
Child is firstborn	0.78	0.23		0.68	0.22		
Mother's age (in years)	0.94	0.02	*	0.94	0.02	*	
Child's age in months	0.97	0.05		1.04	0.05		

Note. N=578; +p<.01; *p<.05; **p<.01

Table 4*Logistic regression predicting disagreement between providers and parents*

	Odds Ratio	Robust SE
Mother is black	1.60	0.58
Mother is Hispanic	0.80	0.36
Mother is other race	0.38	0.42
Mother has < HS education	1.77	0.89
Mother has HS/GED	1.12	0.51
Mother has some college	1.05	0.47
Mother is single	0.93	0.24
Mother was born in US	0.57	0.25
Mother works full time	0.86	0.23
Mother works part time	1.01	0.33
Mother is attending school	1.41	0.39
Mother has 1 child	0.48	0.16
Mother lives with any other adult	0.36	0.11
Mother received welfare last year	1.15	0.35
Mother received WIC last year	1.00	0.32
Mother received food stamps last year	0.83	0.24
Household Income-to-Poverty Ratio	0.90	0.06
Child is firstborn	1.55	0.49
Mother's age (in years)	1.00	0.02
Child's age in months	1.01	0.06

Note. N=578