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## Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

Few issues have provoked as much discussion and debate in North America in recent years as the subject of child care. Dramatic increases in the labour force participation of women with young children, decreased fertility, and the rising incidence of separation and divorce have resulted in major changes in how families rear their children. In 1988 when data were collected for the Canadian National Child Care Study, Statistics Canada's annual labour force averages indicated that $67.3 \%$ of women in Canada with children under the age of 16 were in the labour force. The labour force participation rate of women whose youngest child was less than three years old was $58.4 \%$ in 1988, compared to $31.2 \%$ in 1975. The 1988 participation rate for women whose youngest child was three to five years of age was $65.4 \%$; for those whose youngest child was $6-15$ years of age, the rate was $73.2 \% .1$ Current projections indicate that this trend will likely continue. 2 These figures alone lead to the conclusion that finding and maintaining reliable, good quality child care is a concern shared by most Canadian parents.

In addition, early childhood education programs and child care (in all forms) are used for other purposes, both by parents who are employed outside the home, and by those who remain at home. These other purposes include:

- providing care for children while parents continue their education or participate in training programs;
- providing support to families and care for children with special needs;
- providing children with opportunities to participate in programs designed to stimulate their development, promote personal competence, and foster social skills through interactions with other children and adults; and
- serving as a form of social support by giving parents some respite from the demands of child rearing; and additional assistance during times of unique or peak needs, such as a family illness or emergency, childbirth, instances when usual caregivers are unavailable, school holidays and other situations.

In summary, child care provided by family, friends, paid caregivers, and community agencies, when viewed as a form of social support to families, is a normal and common facet of family life. It also has become an essential resource that most parents depend on in order to enable them to provide for their family's economic well-being and to ensure that their children's physical and psychological needs are met in a stable and nurturing environment. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is unprecedented interest in planning for improved child care services and policies to meet the needs of Canadian children and families.

In 1988-1989, the federal government made specific and major efforts to develop a National Strategy on child care that would address Canada's needs.

Preceding that, the Federal Task Force on Child Care, the InterdepartmentalInterprovincial Working Group on Child Care sponsored by the Status of Women Ministers, and the House of Commons'Special Parliamentary Committee on Child Care had each brought forward proposals for development and reform. At the provincial level, major reviews have been undertaken in almost every province to explore alternative funding arrangements and service approaches to meet the growing demand for child care. While child care has been a highly visible and recurring issue on the social program agenda and much discussion and debate has taken place, the fact remains that the development of a comprehensive and effective approach to meet the needs of Canada's families has not been realized.

One of the factors that has impeded the evaluation of existing policies and services and the development of new ones has been the paucity of relevant and timely information. Although Statistics Canada conducted small-scale studies of families and their child care arrangements in 1967 and 1981, reliable, detailed and more recent information about parents' child care needs and preferences, the kind and quality of care Canadian children are experiencing daily, and the impacts child care arrangements have on children and their parents has been sorely lacking. In effect, until now we have not been able to answer with confidence such basic questions as: Where are children being cared for and by whom? Why are they where they are? What do parents perceive to be the effects of care experiences on their children, themselves, and the workplace? In short, the research data that would normally be used as a basis for formulating social policy and for assessing the effects of anticipated changes have not been available. Given the economic and social importance of the decisions that must be made, it is critical that federal and provincial policy analysts have the kind and quality of data needed for sound decision making, and for measuring the costs and benefits of planned changes in policies, funding, and program delivery systems over the next decades.

The Canadian National Child Care Study was developed to meet these needs. It is a unique collaborative undertaking by academic researchers, provincial governments, professionals in the child care field, and Statistics Canada. The study is also unique in its comprehensiveness, its size, and in the attention and detail that is applied to studying the inter-relationships among child care, family, and employment variables within a policy framework.

The Canadian National Child Care Study has both descriptive and explanatory purposes. It provides reliable, descriptive information at both the national and provincial levels on the nature of current child care needs and child care use patterns, the cost of care, and parental preferences among child care alternatives. The study was also designed to provide information about the ways in which family, child care, and employment variables are inter-related. The findings pertain to program and policy development in several areas through analyses such as those that will:

- link data on parental work schedules to child care needs and use patterns;
- determine the extent to which low and middle income families have difficulty finding and maintaining affordable, stable child care; and
- assess the effects of different child care experiences on parents' labour force participation and productivity.

It is important to emphasize that in this study, child care is conceptualized not only as a service that enables mothers to participate in the labour force, but also, from a broader perspective, as a form of support to families and as a
component in children's lives that affects their development and well-being. For this reason, the CNCCS included families in which a parent is not regularly involved in the paid labour force and has opted to remain at home with one or more children. The child care arrangements used by these families are included in the study, as are questions pertaining to at-home parents' tension in managing family and child care responsibilities.

The Canadian National Child Care Study actually consists of two linked research projects: an extensive national household survey sometimes referred to separately as the National Child Care Survey (or NCCS) and a provincial and territorial policy and program review. The national household survey forms the basis of the study and provides very rich, descriptive information based on responses from over 24,000 parents in families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age. The provincial and territorial policy and program review involved extensive data collection regarding each province's and territory's policies, programs, and funding mechanisms, and historical developments related to child care. Information on these topics, obtained from the provincial and territorial governments and other sources, provides important, contextual background for the survey data, and contributes to effective policy analysis.

In summary, the Canadian National Child Care Study was designed to address a number of policy relevant issues regarding Canadian families and child care in a comprehensive and rigorous manner. The findings will be of interest to researchers from many disciplines, to policy analysts at both the federal and provincial levels, to educators, and to Canadians who are interested in child care and the increasingly important role it has in our changing society.


## Chapter 2

## HISTORY OF THE CANADIAN NATIONAL CHILD CARE STUDY

The lifetime of the Canadian National Child Care Study from its inception to the completion of most major research reports will ultimately span a ten-year period. In this section, the first seven years of the project, from the fall of 1983 to the fall of 1990 will be summarized. The principal investigators consider the recounting of that history as useful and important for a project whose scope, size, and cooperative nature is unique in Canadian social science.

In the fall of 1983, Dr. Hillel Goelman of the University of British Columbia and Dr. Alan Pence of the University of Victoria submitted a proposal to Health and Welfare Canada to host a three day workshop to share information on recent and ongoing Canadian child care research projects and "to plan a coordinated and collaborative cross-provincial study of day care needs and uses...." (Goelman and Pence, 1983). Twelve researchers from across Canada attended the workshop at the University of British Columbia, resulting in the development of a statement regarding priorities for Canadian day care research (Goelman, 1983). One of the most critical priorities identified was the need for a large-scale, national survey of child care that would address such basic and unanswered questions as "Where are the children?". At a follow-up meeting in Montreal in April of 1984, a subgroup of the National Day Care Research Network (NDCRN), headed by Dr. Donna Lero of the University of Guelph, commenced detailed planning of the embryonic national study.

Following consultation with representatives of Health and Welfare Canada, funds for a feasibility study were approved in July, 1984. The NDCRN arranged a subcontract with Statistics Canada's Special Surveys Group to assess various sampling and data collection methodologies, estimate costs, and make recommendations. The report produced by Statistics Canada, entitled A National Survey of Child Care Arrangements, Preferences and NeedsSurvey Options (Statistics Canada, 1984) was incorporated by four Network researchers (Lero, Pence, Goelman and Brockman) into their funding proposal, Where Are The Children? - An Ecological Survey of Families and Their Child Care Arrangements, which was formally submitted to Health and Welfare Canada in January, 1985. The proposal was shared with and benefited from consultation with individuals in Health and Welfare Canada; Employment and Immigration Canada; the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women; the National Child Care Information Centre; the Coordinator of the Interdepartmental-Interprovincial Working Group on Child Care; and many provincial day care directors.

In the spring of 1984, the Federal government, recognizing the growing importance of child care within Canadian society, appointed a four-person Task Force to study the issues of quality child care and adequate parental leave policies in Canada and "to make policy recommendations to the government" (Status of Women, Canada, 1986, xxiii). Chaired by Dr. Katie Cooke, the Task Force commissioned over twenty studies related to various facets of child care,
including one study that involved NDCRN members in a pilot of the Canadian National Child Care Study. The research project, entitled Parents' Needs, Preferences, and Concerns About Child Care: Case Studies of 336 Canadian Families (Lero, Pence, Brockman, Charlesworth, Canning, Esbenson, Morrison and Goelman, 1985), helped advance the planning of the Canadian National Child Care Study and was one of the few Task Force projects that yielded new empirical data. The project undertaken for the Task Force provided valuable insight on a wide range of topics; however, it was not based on a representative sample of Canadian families and could not be used in place of a rigorous, national study.

At the same time that the principal investigators were engaged in beginning the Task Force study (summer of 1984), they were also working to establish funding for the full national study. In June of 1985, a proposal was prepared for submission to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, (SSHRCC) Strategic Grants Division. That proposal, entitled Canadian Families and Their Child Care Arrangements: An Ecological Analysis (Lero, Pence, Goelman and Brockman, 1985) focused on the theoretical significance of the study for social scientists. The request for funding from SSHRCC was based, in part, on the expectation that funding for the complete study could come only from a variety of sources, including the federal and provincial governments, SSHRCC, and possibly private foundations. Following peer review, the SSHRCC proposal was accepted for partial funding support. At the same time, a number of federal departments and provincial governments were asked to participate in a collaborative funding strategy.

In October of 1985, Health and Welfare Canada (National Welfare Grants Division), and the Department of Employment and Immigration enabled work on the project to continue by providing funds for instrument development and pretesting. Instrument development involved the four researchers working collaboratively with Statistics Canada to design the research instruments (which at that time included an interview schedule and a written questionnaire) and to finalize sampling procedures. This period also included continuing consultation with provincial and territorial day care directors and their staff and with various individuals in Health and Welfare Canada. Following the development of training materials for Statistics Canada interviewers, field testing of the pretest instruments and procedures took place in Ontario and Manitoba during April and May of 1986. The results, presented in Statistics Canada's report, National Child Care Survey: Report on the Pretest (1986) described the pretest as "remarkably successful". The achieved response rate was $94 \%$; there were no refusals to share data with the researchers or with provincial governments, and the instruments themselves were well understood and well received, resulting in a shorter average interview time than had been anticipated originally.

By late summer of 1986 most of the preliminary work for the Canadian National Child Care Study had been completed. The Cooke Task Force had been supportive of the need to collect more data concerning the actual state of day care in Canada. Based on their knowledge of child care and child development, members of the NDCRN were called as expert witnesses before the House of Commons'Special Parliamentary Committee on Child Care. The Committee soon recognized the importance and value of the proposed National Child Care Study. "The shortage of reliable data on the supply and demand for child care services, as well as information about children's needs and parents' preferences has already been identified. We need this data to determine whether child care arrangements are meeting the needs of all families and children or whether other forms of care would be advantageous. Without this knowledge, we have only an incomplete basis for debating the future of child care in Canada" (House of Commons, 1987, pg. 41-42). The final report of the Special Parliamentary

Committee recommended that the federal government incorporate an Initiatives and Research Fund "to promote research into child care arrangements in Canada and to determine ways and means of addressing other problems related to child care...." (House of Commons, 1987, pg. 42). The investigators revised the earlier Health and Welfare proposal for submission to the Department of Supply and Services in order to facilitate inter-departmental (and potentially interprovincial) funding of the full proposal whose cost was then estimated at 2.9 million dollars.

The proposal was submitted to the Department of Supply and Services in March of 1987. An announcement concerning the government's plans for child care legislation and related funding support was expected by the summer of 1987. Ultimately, the Federal government's proposed legislation was announced in December. Included in the government's National Child Care Strategy was a proposal for the development of a Child Care Initiatives Fund (CCIF), which would provide financial support for research and innovative pilot programs. The CCIF did not require parliamentary approval to take effect and in May of 1988, the first two projects funded under the CCIF were announced by the Honourable Jake Epp, then Minister for Health and Welfare Canada. One of those projects was the Canadian National Child Care Study. From seminal idea to announcement of funding, four and a half years had elapsed.

The four members of the NDCRN who had taken the lead in the development of the CNCCS (Lero, Pence, Goelman and Brockman) immediately began work on developing the final instruments for data collection. Characteristics of the instruments and the sampling methodology that were employed are discussed later in this report. By the end of October, 1988 over 24,000 interviews had been completed from coast to coast. Data collection was undertaken across the country by trained Statistics Canada interviewers. Statistics Canada's responsibilities also included data entry and preparation of the large and complex data tape for analysis and data verification by the four principal investigators. During the 20 -month hiatus between the completion of data collection and the true beginning of data analysis, the four principal investigators coded all open-ended questions, suggested imputation procedures, identified derived variables that were created by Statistics Canada, reviewed preliminary data, and engaged in careful and extensive planning to ensure accurate, complementary, and coordinated data analysis at each university.

The opportunities for data analysis based on the National Child Care Survey are enormous, given the sample size and the scope of the data that were collected in the study. To expedite data analysis and to ensure that findings were produced as quickly as possible, the four principal researchers made two decisions. The first decision was to divide the areas of research within the study in a fashion that ensured that each researcher had major, separate responsibility for certain components. The second decision was to produce an initial set of descriptive reports so that the basic questions that had been the original impetus for the study could be addressed as soon as possible. More complex, multivariate, model building and model testing analyses would be undertaken at a later point.

As a result, research reports from the study will be released in three stages. The first stage following this Introductory Report consists of six descriptive reports, spanning the three major themes in the study. The three main themes are:
A. Where are the children? An examination of the types of care most commonly used for infants, preschoolers and school-age children;
B. Canadian families and their care arrangements; and
C. The relationships between work, family, and child care.

Each of these descriptive reports is based on the national household survey data and focuses on child care and employment patterns observed in the reference week (the week preceding the parental interviews).

An additional set of reports consists of twelve provincial and territorial reports which combine the national household survey data pertaining to each province with information obtained from each province and territory about its child care policies and programs, and the demographic and economic characteristics of each locale. (Note: No survey data were collected in the Yukon or the Northwest Territories.) The provincial and territorial reports represent the collaborative work of over 65 individuals who participated on writing teams and whose work adds a unique, ecological dimension to the research results derived from the national household survey.

Later reports contain more complex analyses that address a variety of topics and issues covered by the Canadian National Child Care Study. A partial list includes: child care for infants and toddlers; the affordability and availability of child care alternatives; child care patterns over a 12 -month period; the effects of child care on parents' labour force participation and productivity; work-familychild care tension; and inter-provincial comparisons of child care use patterns.

Each of the major sets of reports is described in greater detail in Chapter 7 of this Introductory Report. It is anticipated that the first six descriptive reports and the set of provincial and territorial reports will be available in the summer and fall of 1992. More complex analytical reports will be released as completed towards the end of 1992 and extending through 1993.


## Chapter 3

## GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE CANADIAN NATIONAL CHILD CARE STUDY

The two major goals of the Canadian National Child Care Study were:

- To provide valid, comprehensive data on Canadian families and their child care needs, use patterns, and preferences among care options; and
- To examine the complex relationships between family, work, and child care variables from both a policy and theoretical perspective.

The researchers were influenced in their conceptualization of the study by Urie Bronfenbrenner's systems-based theoretical model of ecological factors that affect human development (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The ecological model provides a way to describe and analyze the linkages between child care, family, and employment variables within contexts defined, in part, by community and provincial resources. An assumption consistent with the ecological perspective is that individual families' work and child care arrangements represent realistic adaptations to a complex set of needs, desires, pressures, and constraints. The use of one or more particular child care arrangements (including care by either parent at home) is appreciated as a factor that affects children's daily experiences, having both direct and indirect effects on each parent, the parents' relationship to each other and to other children, and parents' relationship to the world of work.

The ecological perspective guided the initial conceptualization of the research, including the importance of addressing many variables not ordinarily brought together in one survey. It also dictated the development of new measures and influenced the analytical approach adopted by the principal investigators (see Lero, 1988).

General objectives of the Canadian National Child Care Study that derive from the major goals include the following:

1. To accurately describe the nature of Canadians' child care needs for infants, preschoolers, and school-age children, particularly for care that enables parents to work or study.
2. To accurately depict current child care use patterns -- the number and kinds of arrangements used in an average week for infants, preschoolers, and school-age children based on a nationally representative sample of Canadian families.
3. To obtain information about parents' preferences among work and child care alternatives and their desire for changes in employment practices and benefits which would support them in their role as parents.
4. To investigate how various factors affect child care needs, use patterns and preferences from an ecological perspective -- to understand how parameters of work, family life, characteristics of children, community resources, and social, economic, and geographic factors interact to affect child care needs, use patterns, and preferences; and to determine what factors add to, and reduce the tension parents may experience when juggling work, family, and child care responsibilities.
5. To examine the perceived effects of different child care use patterns and experiences on children and parents individually, and in relation to each other.
6. To examine the effects of provincial differences in programs and policies on parents' perceptions of the services available to them and their child care choices.

A partial list of the specific questions that were addressed in this study includes the following:

## Objective 1:

## Objective 2:

## Understanding Child Care Needs

1. How many families require care (for purposes related to parental employment or continuing education) for infants, for preschool children, and for school-age children for periods totalling:
$\leq 10 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk} \quad 11-19 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk} \quad 20-29 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk} \quad \geq 30 \mathrm{hrs} / \mathrm{wk} ?$
2. How many families require care for these purposes:

- in the evenings?
- on weekends?
- to accommodate variable or rotating shifts or other changes in work and study schedules?
- in the summer time?


## Understanding Child Care Use Patterns

1. What proportion of families with infants, preschoolers, and school-age children ( $6-12$ years old) use each of the major types of child care?
2. What proportion of families use a combination of arrangements on a regular basis? Which combinations are most common? Why are they used?
3. What special arrangements or changes in child care occur during the summer months?

## Objective 3:

Objective 4:

## Objective 5:

## Examining Parents' Preferences, Concerns and Opinions

1. What employment or homemaking option do parents perceive to be best suited to their own needs and the needs of their family?
2. What types (or combinations) of child care arrangements do parents prefer for infants? Preschoolers? School-age children?
3. What, if anything, prevents parents from using the methods of supplementary care they would most prefer? What is the demand for, and what are the primary barriers to the use of licensed care arrangements?
4. What changes in work schedules and parental benefits do parents most desire in order to reduce work-family interference?

## Factors Affecting Child Care

1. In what ways are child care needs, use patterns, and parental preferences similar and different across urban and rural locations?
2. Are there differences in child care preferences and/or in barriers to the use of preferred care among low, middle, and upper income families? Immigrant families?
3. Are the child care needs and use patterns of one-parent families noticeably different from those of two-parent families, and if so, how are they different?

## Effects of Child Care Experiences on Children and Families

1. What do parents perceive to be the positive and negative effects of particular child care arrangements on their children?
2. With what types of care are parents most and least satisfied? With what facets of their children's care are parents most satisfied? What aspects concern them the most?
3. Which factors contribute to, and which ones reduce the amount of tension parents experience when working outside the home? Are certain kinds or patterns of child care more likely to result in absenteeism or work interruptions?
4. What is a typical year like in the life of families and children today with respect to child care arrangements?

- How many changes do children experience?
- What are the major reasons for changes?
- Who is most vulnerable to unstable care arrangements?


## Objective 6: <br> Effects of Provincial Differences on Parents and Children

1. Do parents perceive the availability, affordability or quality of specific types of child care differently in different provinces?
2. To what extent are use patterns for similar types of families affected by provincial variations in programs and funding arrangements?
3. Are there differences in the economic and social characteristics of families using licensed child care services among the provinces? If so, what may account for the variation?

Results from the Canadian National Child Care Study are expected to be particularly helpful for policy development related to child care and to the issue of how parents may be helped to better balance work and family responsibilities. In addition, our results should contribute to further research in these areas by providing reliable contextual information that can be used to help interpret research on the effects of different types of child care on children's development.


## Chapter 4

# A DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO COMPONENTS THAT COMPRISE THE CANADIAN NATIONAL CHILD CARE STUDY 


#### Abstract

As stated previously, the Canadian National Child Care Study actually consists of two linked, but separate projects. One is the comprehensive national household survey of over 24,000 families, which was designed by the principal investigators in collaboration with Statistics Canada, and is referred to independently as the 1988 National Child Care Survey (or NCCS). The other project involved the collection and synthesis of information on each province's and territory's child care programs and policies, as well as demographic and economic characteristics. This second project was undertaken by the principal investigators and a team of individuals in each province and territory, and was coordinated by Dr. Alan Pence and CNCCS staff at the University of Victoria. Information collected through the provincial and territorial policy and programs review enabled the researchers to develop an accurate understanding of the similarities and differences among the provinces and territories. The relative availability of specific child care programs and services, funding mechanisms, and other policies that are under provincial or territorial jurisdiction are sociopolitical factors that are likely to contribute to observed inter-provincial differences in child care use patterns. Each of the two CNCCS components is described in more detail below.


4.1<br>The National Child Care Survey

The 1988 National Child Care Survey is one of the largest, most comprehensive social surveys ever conducted in Canada. It provides the basis for most of the analyses presented in the major research reports. As discussed in Chapter 2 of this report, the NCCS has a long history, and was truly a collaborative undertaking by the four principal investigators and Statistics Canada.

The survey was conducted in September and October of 1988, as a special supplement to the monthly Canadian Labour Force Survey. One parent in each selected family was interviewed either over the telephone or in person by trained Statistics Canada interviewers. Questions focused on parents' employment and child care arrangements during the reference week (the week preceding the interview) for each child in the family younger than 13 years of age. Additional information was collected concerning the care arrangement(s) used for one of the children in the family (the target child) while the interviewed parent was working or studying, including how parents found care for this child, which factors influenced their decision making, and how satisfied parents were with the care arrangements they were using. Parents were also asked about child care arrangements used in the preceding year for the target child, and about specific problems they may have experienced locating and maintaining good quality care throughout the year.

The interviewed parent (IP) was the parent who described herself or himself as being most responsible for making the child care arrangements for the

## 4.2

Provincial and Territorial Policy and Programs Reviews
children in the family. In most cases, the IP was the mother. In families in which both parents made child care arrangements jointly and equally, the female parent was interviewed. Child care, as defined in this study, consisted of any care provided by a relative or non-relative, or in a group care setting. Also included in our definition of child care was time spent in the care of the interviewed parent's spouse/partner, care by an older sibling, and self care while the IP was working or studying during the reference week. Not included in this definition is time spent in recreational activities or hobbies (e.g., girl guides, band practice, little league games); time spent in transit to and from school; or time spent at a doctor's or dentist's office.

Further information about the survey instruments and methodology are included in Chapters 5 and 6 of this report.


#### Abstract

A unique component of the Canadian National Child Care Study is the development of a set of reports focusing on each of the provinces and territories individually. The need for separate, representative samples of families in each province had always been anticipated, and was present in the earliest research proposal submitted to Health and Welfare Canada. A sufficiently large sample that could provide reliable and detailed information for each province was deemed essential for making accurate inter-provincial comparisons, and for policy analysis and planning at the provincial level. Initially, the development of a separate series of reports focused on the provinces and territories did not figure prominently in the CNCCS proposals. The principal investigators' growing awareness of (1) the significant differences between the provinces and territories in their demographic and economic characteristics, as well as in their child care and education systems, and (2) the importance of documenting those differences as the ecological and policy contexts in which child care patterns are embedded, led to the decision to develop a separate set of provincial and territorial reports. These reports were developed in cooperation with a team of knowledgeable child care specialists in each of the provinces and territories.


In November and December of 1988, letters were sent to child care experts representing, at a minimum, four facets of child care in each province: government, advocacy, academia, and the field and professional associations. In each province and territory, four to seven persons were invited to serve as members of the provincial and territorial writing teams which developed the individual provincial and territorial reports. Dr. Alan Pence and CNCCS staff at the University of Victoria assumed major responsibility for coordination, and provided information, advice, and support to each team. Over 65 individuals from the 12 provinces and territories served on these teams, donating their time and sharing their expertise on behalf of the Canadian National Child Care Study. A complete list of the participants is included in Appendix E.

At the same time that provincial and territorial writing teams were being identified, a questionnaire was sent to the director of day care (the person most directly responsible for child care programs and policies) in each province and territory. Information from that questionnaire (see Appendix B) focused on provincial regulations and policies, funding mechanisms, and child care spaces and enrolments. The information supplied by the day care directors was then used by the writing teams as the basis for one of the sections in their individual provincial or territorial reports. The result of this collaboration between the CNCCS researchers and the teams of experts from each province and territory is a unique set of reports which provides the social, historical, and regulatory context for the evolution of child care within each jurisdiction. The set of CNCCS provincial and territorial reports provide the necessary ecological context for a
much clearer understanding of the "natural experiment" that child care in Canada represents, i.e., the experiment of twelve jurisdictions approaching a similar task in a multitude of ways. From such a naturally occurring experiment, much can be learned regarding the interaction of regulatory, sociodemographic, and historical forces on the provision and utilization of child care services.

The provincial and territorial reports represent not only an innovative extension of the basic ecological model, but also a commendable example of professional, inter-provincial cooperation in Canadian policy research. Each of the individual reports will contain information about the economic and demographic characteristics of the province or territory; the historical development of child day care in that locale; child care regulations, funding, and service delivery within the province or territory; data from the national household survey regarding children and their care arrangements, families, and parental employment patterns; and bibliographic references on child care studies that are specific to the province or territory. (Note: survey data are not available for the Yukon and Northwest Territories.)

A more detailed description of the CNCCS provincial and territorial reports is included in Chapter 7 of this report.


## Chapter 5

## METHODOLOGY OF THE NATIONAL CHILD CARE SURVEY

## 5.1 <br> Survey Design and Coverage

Two target populations were identified for the National Child Care Survey:

- all Canadian children under the age of 13 , and
- all economic families in Canada with at least one child under the age of 13.

These populations are sometimes referred to as NCCS children and NCCS families, respectively.

The National Child Care Survey was administered as a supplement to the September, 1988 monthly Labour Force Survey (LFS). ${ }^{3}$ Consequently, the sample design and population coverage of the National Child Care Survey is closely tied to that of the LFS and does not include:

- children and families living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories,
- children permanently residing in institutions,
- children and families living on Indian reserves, and
- Canadian children and families who were living outside of Canada in

September 1988.
Together, these exclusions represent approximately $2 \%$ of all Canadian children under the age of 13. The following table shows a breakdown of Canadian children younger than 13 years of age, and estimates of the number of children excluded from the sample for the reasons cited above.

## Table 1

Distribution of Canadian Children Younger Than 13 Years of Age

| Canadian Children | Totall | $\%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | $4,658,500$ | 97.9 |  |
|  | Children living in the Yukon or Northwest Territories | 20,300 | 0.4 |
|  | Inmates of institutions | 2,500 | 0.1 |
|  | Children living on Indian reserves | 72,900 | 1.5 |
|  | Children living outside of Canada | 6,000 | 0.1 |
| All Canadian Children | $\mathbf{4 , 7 6 0 , 1 0 0}$ | 100.0 |  |

[^0]The Canadian Labour Force Survey conducted by Statistics Canada employs a panel design in which the entire monthly sample consists of six panels, or rotation groups, each containing approximately 9,000 dwellings. Each panel itself, is representative of the population of Canada with the exception of the exclusions referred to previously. ${ }^{4}$ One panel rotates out of the active sample each month and is replaced with a new panel. The sample size of the LFS is determined by the statistical requirements for various estimates of labour force characteristics at the national, provincial and sub-provincial levels. The September 1988 LFS sample consisted of 54,000 dwellings; approximately 48,000 were occupied and contained persons considered eligible for the LFS.

Data collection for the National Child Care Survey utilized a three-step process. The first step consisted of the procedures used to select dwellings for inclusion in the Labour Force sample, which utilizes a stratified, multi-stage cluster sampling technique. The National Child Care Survey employed five of the six "active" rotation groups in the September LFS sample. Because only about $30 \%$ of Canadian households have children under the age of 13 , however, the sample that would have been obtained under normal circumstances would not have been large enough to meet the specific data requirements of the study. Eight additional rotation groups composed of respondents who had previously participated in the LFS sample, but who had "rotated out" were contacted and invited to participate. As a result, the final sample used for preliminary screening consisted of roughly 122,000 dwellings drawn from a total of 13 rotation groups. Five were considered "active" rotation groups for the purpose of the September, 1988 LFS survey and eight more rotation groups were included that had left the Labour Force sample between October of 1987 and May of 1988.

The second stage in data collection involved making contact with a household member in each selected dwelling. Demographic information was collected for each household in order to identify those which met the criterion of including an economic family in which at least one child was younger than 13 years of age.

Table 2 presents the number of dwellings included in the NCCS sample within each province, the number of households (i.e., occupied dwellings), the number of households for which basic demographic information was obtained, and the corresponding household response rate (i.e., the proportion of selected households for which basic demographic information was obtained).

## Table 2

## Household Response Distribution

| Province | Number of Dwellings | Number of Households | Responding Households | Household Response Rate (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newfoundland | 6,885 | 5,873 | 5,709 | 97.2 |
| Prince Edward Island | 3,801 | 3,302 | 3,217 | 97.4 |
| Nova Scotia | 8,947 | 7,822 | 7,537 | 96.4 |
| New Brunswick | 9,048 | 8,024 | 7,718 | 96.2 |
| Quebec | 18,592 | 16,090 | 15,295 | 95.1 |
| Ontario | 23,100 | 21,170 | 20,687 | 97.7 |
| Manitoba | 9,264 | 8,252 | 7,746 | 93.9 |
| Saskatchewan | 12,224 | 10,702 | 9,696 | 90.6 |
| Alberta | 17,528 | 15,768 | 14,613 | 92.7 |
| British Columbia | 12,659 | 11,282 | 10,674 | 94.6 |
| CANADA | 122,048 | 108,285 | 102,892 | 95.0 |

Across Canada, the household response rate was $95.0 \%$ ( $97.8 \%$ for the five "active" LFS rotation groups and $93.3 \%$ for the eight "rotated out" groups). There are several reasons why non-response occurred at the household level. The reasons for non-response and the associated non-response rates are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Reasons For Non-Response at the Household Level

|  | Reason for Non-Response | Number of <br> Non-Respondents | Associated Non- <br> Response Rate (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No one at home <br> Refused to participate | 450 | 0.4 |  |
| Household members temporarily absent <br> Interview prevented by death, <br> sickness, or language problem | 1,159 | 1.1 |  |
|  | Other reason for non-response | 2,885 | 0.2 |
|  | 704 | 2.7 |  |

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

The third step in data collection involved administration of the NCCS child care interview in each eligible family, (i.e., an economic family living in the selected dwelling including at least one child younger than 13 years of age). A child care interview was to be completed in each family with the parent who identified her/himself as most responsible for making child care arrangements in that family. In total, 28,660 economic families were identified and a child care interview (Form 06) was completed for 24,679 or $86.1 \%$ of them. At the end of the interview, respondents were asked if they would agree to share their answers with the universities associated with the National Day Care Research Network, Employment and Immigration Canada, and various provincial governments. Only 524 families ( $2.1 \%$ of the completed interviews) did not agree to share their responses, resulting in a final sample size of 24,155 families. This represents a response rate of $84.3 \%$ at the final stage of data collection, which will be referred to as the child care response rate. The following results were obtained for each province and for Canada as a whole.

Table $4 \quad$ Final (Child Care) Response Distribution

| Province | Economic Families Sampled | Completed Child Care Interviews | NonSharers |  | Total Response | Final Child Care Response Rate (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number | (\%) |  |  |
| Newfoundland | 2,335 | 2,138 | 36 | (1.7) | 2,102 | 90.0 |
| Prince Edward Island | 931 | 791 | 11 | (1.4) | 780 | 83.8 |
| Nova Scotia | 2,036 | 1,794 | 48 | (2.7) | 1,746 | 85.8 |
| New Brunswick | 2,359 | 2,024 | 56 | (2.8) | 1,968 | 83.4 |
| Quebec | 4,310 | 3,875 | 82 | (2.1) | 3,793 | 88.0 |
| Ontario | 5,376 | 4,649 | 58 | (1.2) | 4,591 | 85.4 |
| Manitoba | 1,925 | 1,630 | 51 | (3.1) | 1,579 | 82.0 |
| Saskatchewan | 2,641 | 2,257 | 44 | (1.9) | 2,213 | 83.8 |
| Alberta | 4,095 | 3,204 | 96 | (3.0) | 3,108 | 75.9 |
| British Columbia | 2,652 | 2,317 | 42 | (1.8) | 2,275 | 85.8 |
| CANADA | 28,660 | 24,679 | 524 | (2.1) | 24,155 | 84.3 |

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure 1
Final (Child Care) Response Rates, Canada and the Provinces


Unfortunately, little information is available for the purpose of estimating possible response biases in this study, other than geographic location and rotation group status. As Table 4 indicates, child care response rates ranged from $75.9 \%$ in Alberta to $90.0 \%$ in Newfoundland. Of the 28,660 economic families included in the original sample, $32 \%$ were from Census Metropolitan Areas (CMAs) and $68 \%$ were from non-CMAs. The child care response rates for CMA and non-CMA areas were $82.5 \%$ and $85.1 \%$, respectively. The child care response rate for families in the five "active" LFS rotation groups was $84.9 \%$; it was $83.8 \%$ among those who had "rotated-out" of the LFS sample between October, 1987 and May, 1988.

Weighting factors developed for this survey compensated for non-response at each stage of sampling (households and families with children younger than 13 years of age), in order to yield population estimates that would be as accurate as possible for each province and for Canada as a whole.

A total of 42,131 children under the age of 13 were included in the 24,155 economic families who participated in the National Child Care Survey. A wide range of information was collected for each of these children. In order to reduce the response burden for families with two or more children, one "target child" was randomly selected, about whom additional information was obtained. In selecting the target child, children under the age of six were given a probability of selection four times greater than children six years of age and older in families with children both younger and older than six years of age. This procedure was used primarily so that more detailed estimates could be developed regarding the kinds of child care utilized for children younger than school-age than would have been possible otherwise. The number of children and target children included in the final sample is presented by age in Table 5. Children under six years of age comprised $45.6 \%$ of all children in the NCCS sample and $52.1 \%$ of the target children.

Table 5

## Age Distribution of NCCS Children and Selected Target Children

| Age of Child (In Years) ${ }^{1}$ | All Children in Economic Families | Selected Target Children |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00 | 2,989 | 2,017 |
| 01 | 3,078 | 2,131 |
| 02 | 3,291 | 2,128 |
| 03 | 3,271 | 2,071 |
| 04 | 3,325 | 2,158 |
| 05 | 3,268 | 2,078 |
| 06 | 3,330 | 1,372 |
| 07 | 3,320 | 1,318 |
| 08 | 3,436 | 1,487 |
| 09 | 3,226 | 1,603 |
| 10 | 3,289 | 1,839 |
| 11 | 3,292 | 2,054 |
| 12 | 3,016 | 1,899 |
| Total | 42,131 | 24,155 |
| Age of child Numbers | birthday. rding. |  |

## 5.3 <br> Description of <br> National Child Care Survey Instruments and Administrative Procedures

A small number of the sampled households contained two economic families, both with at least one child younger than 13 years of age. In the 13 cases in which this occurred, a child care interview was completed with a parent in each family.

[^1]The Household Record Docket (Form 03)

The Labour Force Questionnaire (Form 05)

## The National

 Child Care Survey Questionnaire (Form 06)The Household Record Docket (Form 03) was used to update information previously collected by Statistics Canada on the characteristics of household members whose usual place of residence was the selected dwelling. Basic demographic information included the sex, marital status, educational attainment, age, and relationship to head of the economic family of each household member. This form was also used to collect the actual month and year of birth of all children under the age of 13. This allowed interviewers to exclude households in which the youngest child had passed his/her 13th birthday since the time when demographic information was first collected, and also enabled the creation of analytical categories based on months of age for children who remained in the sample (e.g., 0-17 months). Form 03 identified a "Designated Adult" (DA) in each economic family who served as the primary source of information. To aid interpretation, the term "interviewed parent" (IP) will be used in this and all other NCCS reports in lieu of the term "designated adult" or "DA".

The standard LFS Labour Force Questionnaire (Form 05) was used to collect information on the current or most recent labour market activity of all household members 15 years of age or older in eligible families. The Labour Force Questionnaire includes questions on hours of work, job tenure, type of work, reason for hours lost or absent, job search undertaken, availability for work, and school attendance.

A National Child Care Survey Questionnaire (Form 06) was administered to the parent in each economic family who described her/himself as most responsible for child care arrangements. Some parts of the interview focused on the interviewed parent, or her/his spouse/partner. Other parts focused on child care used in the reference week for each child in the family younger than 13 years of age, or on child care arrangements selected for the randomly selected target child. The following overview outlines how the Form 06 is organized:

## Section A: Interviewed Parent's Work and Study

Provides detail about the interviewed parent's work and study schedule not available from the LFS Form 05. Included are questions on maternity/ paternity leave (sources of income, plans to return to work, and preferred care option upon return to work); the schedule of hours worked in the reference week; variability and predictability of hours worked; distance from home to work; employer flexibility and support; and the parent's involvement in educational activities.

## Section B: Spouse's Work and Study

This section provides similar information pertaining to the interviewed parent's spouse or partner.

## Section C: Disability or Special Needs

Identifies the presence of any long-term condition or health problem among any of the children younger than 13 in the family, and effects if any, on the IP's labour force participation and use of child care arrangements.

## Section D: Unusual Circumstances

Identifies events, if any, which made the care arrangements in the reference week atypical. These data will allow users to assess the impact of restricting the primary reference period to one reference week.

## Section E: School Attendance

Provides detail about school attendance for all children under the age of 13. While the NCCS is mainly concerned with child care provided by persons other than the IP, school attendance is considered as a substitute for other types of care, reducing the number of hours of care which would be required otherwise.

## Section F: Kindergarten or Nursery School

Section G: Care in a Before or After School Program

## Section H: Care in a Day Care Centre

Section I: Care by a Relative and/or Non-Relative in the Parental Home or Another Home

Sections: F, G, H, and I
Yield detailed information on seven different types of care which may have been used in the reference week. Data were obtained for each child younger than 13 years of age. The types of care are defined in terms of location (a kindergarten or nursery school, a before or after school program, a day care centre, care in the IP's own home, or in some other private home); and, where appropriate, by the relationship of the caregiver to the children (a relative or non-relative). Individual items pertaining to each type of care include the days on which care was provided during the reference week, total hours in care, cost of the arrangement for parents, whether the cost of care is subsidized, whether receipts are given, the main activity of the IP while care was being provided, and whether the IP had any concerns about the quality or suitability of the care arrangement. As many as four separate arrangements were permitted in Section I and all relevant questions were repeated for each separate arrangement that was utilized.

## Section J: Care by Interviewed Parent At Work

## Section K: Care by Spouse At Work

## Section L: Care by Spouse (When the Spouse is Not Working)

## Section M: Care by an Older Brother or Sister

## Section N: Child in Own Care

Sections: J, K, L, M, and N
Yield detailed information on five additional types of care used in the reference week for all children. These sections were restricted to times when care was provided while the IP was working at a job or business, studying full-time, or studying part-time to improve job opportunities.

## Section 0: Preferred Child Care Arrangements

This section provides information on the type(s) of child care arrangement most preferred for each child in the family, given the parent's current work schedule and family income. Factors preventing use of preferred arrangements, if applicable, were also obtained.

## Section P: Work-Family-Child Care Tension Issues

Provides detail on the level of tension subjectively experienced in juggling work, family, and child care responsibilities by IPs who worked or studied in the reference week. This section also identifies which factors parents feel contribute to and help to reduce tension, as well as which work options are preferred for the IP and spouse.

## Section Q: Main Method Evaluation

The main method of care was identified by the IP as the method of care used in the reference week for the target child (other than school) that allowed the IP to work or study. This section includes questions about the main method, questions about other methods that were considered, reasons for not considering or not using other child care alternatives, information sources used when searching for child care, difficulties encountered in finding care, factors considered most important, and parental satisfaction with the main method that was chosen.

## Section R: Tension Issues for Non-Working Parents At Home

This section, (which parallels Section P) was designed for IPs who did not work for pay in the reference week. It includes questions that identify which factors contribute to and/or reduce tension experienced by at-home parents.

## Section S: 12-Month Work and Study History

Section S includes questions on the IP's and spouse's work history during the previous year. Parental work and study history information can be matched against information on child care-related absences and changes in child care arrangements during the reference year.

## Section T: 12-Month Care Arrangements History

Section T captures information about the types of care used for one month or longer during the preceding year for the target child. Items include the duration of each arrangement, reasons for changing care arrangements, and the main activity of the IP and spouse during the period of time each care arrangement was used.

## Section U: Evaluation of Past Year's Child Care Arrangements

In section U parents were asked to enumerate which problems, if any, they experienced during the previous year in finding and maintaining good quality care for the target child. This section also contains questions about the impact, if any, of child care problems on each parent's labour force status and productivity during the year.

## Section V: Child Care Support and Neighbourhood Resources

This section includes questions about the extent of personal child care support available to the IP for help with back-up or unexpected care needs. It also includes questions about neighbourhood resources for children and parents.

## Section W: Demographics

The final section of the NCCS questionnaire obtained demographic information not available from the Household Record Docket (Form 03), such as parental income sources and amounts in the previous year, and each parent's country of origin and mother tongue.

The length of the interviews varied some what depending upon whether the interviewed parent worked at a job or business in the reference week, whether a spouse or partner was living in the household and his/her work status, the number and ages of children in the family under the age of 13 , and the complexity of child care use patterns. The average interview length was 46 minutes - 45 minutes for telephone interviews and 49 minutes for in-person interviews. As shown in Table 6, interview length was most affected by the interviewed parent's employment status.

Table 6 Average Interview Length For Specific Groups ${ }^{1}$

| Respondent Groups | Time in Minutes |
| :---: | :---: |
| IP2 with spouse/partner | 46 |
| IP2 with no spouse/partner | 44 |
| IP ${ }^{2}$ works full-time | 52 |
| IP2 works part-time | 50 |
| IP2 unemployed | 41 |
| IP $^{2}$ not in the labour force | 37 |
| IP $^{2}$ with 1 child $<13$ years of age | 44 |
| IP $^{2}$ with 2 children $<13$ years of age | 47 |
| IP ${ }^{2}$ with 3 children $<13$ years of age | 48 |
| IP ${ }^{2}$ with 4 or more children < 13 years of age | 46 |
| All Interviews | 46 |
| Time to administer NCCS Child Care Labour Force Docket and Labour Force | inistration of |
| IP refers to the interviewed parent. See |  |

## 5.4 <br> Edit and <br> Imputation

The NCCS child care interview had many questions involving detailed information regarding dates, work schedules, and cost and hours of care. In addition, the flow patterns inherent in the questionnaire design required that interviewers check and enter information from other items on the child care questionnaire and from the forms used to collect demographic and employment information. As expected, there were some errors.

To ensure as much accuracy and consistency as possible, all survey records were subjected to an exhaustive computer edit to identify and correctany inconsistent information on the questionnaires. Whenever possible, records with missing or incorrect information were corrected from other information in the respondent's questionnaire. When this was not possible and the record still had missing data, one of two actions was taken. In some cases, a non-response or "not stated" code was assigned to the item. In other cases, an attempt was made to estimate the correct or appropriate response by imputing the item. For the most part, two procedures were used for imputing information. If the number of records requiring imputation was not large, manual examination of the record was conducted to determine a response. In other cases, a computer search was made for another record that was "similar" to the record with a missing item and values were assigned from this "donor" record.

The major areas of the NCCS interview in which imputation was carried out and the number and percent of records that were involved are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Major Variables For Which Values Were Imputed

| Item (Question Number or Section) | Number of Records Imputed | Percent of Records Imputed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work schedule of the IP ${ }^{1}$ (A-11) | 391 | 1.6\% of IPs ${ }^{1}$ |
| Work schedule of Spouse (B-2) | 814 | 3.9\% of spouses |
| Days missing for at least one care arrangement in the matrix ${ }^{2}$ (E-N) | 522 | 1.2\% of children |
| Hours missing for at least one care arrangement in the matrix ${ }^{2}$ (E-N) | 488 | 1.2\% of children |
| Cost missing for at least one care arrangement in the matrix ${ }^{2}$ (E-N) | 941 | 2.2\% of children |
| Number of weeks worked by the IP1 in reference year (S-2) | 311 | 1.3\% of IPs ${ }^{1}$ |
| Number of weeks worked by the spouse in reference year (S-7) | 415 | 2.0\% of spouses |
| Work days missed or late by the IP1 in reference year related to target child (S-13) | 615 | 2.5\% of target children |
| Missing dates (Section T) | 696 | 2.9\% of target children |
| At least one component of income missing for the IP ${ }^{1}$ or the Spouse (W-2 \& W-9) | 8,335 | 34.5\% of families |

1 IP refers to the interviewed parent. See Appendix C for glossary of terms.
2 The child care matrix consists of Sections $E-N$ of the NCCS questionnaire. See Appendix A.

There were a few other cases in which information was imputed for children.

1. If the interviewed parent (IP) worked during the reference week, and there was no care arrangement reported for a child, an arrangement was imputed. This occurred for 614 children ( $1.5 \%$ ).
2. If the IP worked during the reference week, a comparison was made between the number of hours worked and the number of hours of care reported for each child in the family. If the number of hours of work exceeded the number of hours of care accounted for in the reference week by more than 10 hours, additional hours of care were imputed. This happened for 1,030 children ( $2.4 \%$ ).

## 5.5 Coding of OpenEnded Questions

3. A comparison was made between the days worked by the IP and the days each child was reported to be in some form of care. For Monday to Friday, very few problems were detected (i.e., if it was reported that the IP worked on any one of these days, in almost all cases care was reported for each child in the family for those days). Cases in which care was not reported at all for a weekday were not modified. However, a significant number of cases of no care reported at all were found on Saturday and Sunday. For these two days, a care arrangement was imputed if it was reported that the IP worked on these days and no care arrangement had been reported for a child. It is expected that more informal types of care are used on the weekend (e.g. care by the spouse), and that respondents did not consider this as care when answering the questions in the matrix. For Sunday a care arrangement was imputed for 1,142 children ( $2.7 \%$ ). For Saturday a care arrangement was imputed for 1,766 children ( $4.2 \%$ of the sample).


#### Abstract

A total of 61 partially or completely open-ended questions were included in the National Child Care Survey. They were asked in order to obtain as much information as possible about: parents' desired workplace benefits; children's health problems; unusual circumstances affecting child care in the reference week; reservations about child care arrangements; barriers to the use of preferred care methods; factors that contributed to or reduced tension in juggling multiple roles; reasons for using and for not using various child care alternatives; perceived positive and negative effects of child care arrangements; and reasons for changing child care arrangements in the previous 12 -month period. Most open-ended questions were answered only by a subset of parents for whom the question was applicable.

The development of coding schemes, coding, and the entry of codes onto a tape that was eventually merged with the full data tape were the responsibility of the principal investigators. CNCCS staff at the University of Guelph were most directly involved, with assistance from co-investigators and research assistants at the University of Manitoba and the University of British Columbia. All codes were double checked for reliability, and data entry was carefully monitored. Inter-coder reliability across the 61 questions ranged from $80.2 \%-100 \%$. Disagreements were resolved through discussion and occasional amendments to the coding schemes.


## 5.6

Sampling Error

The National Child Care Survey produces population estimates based on information collected from and about a sample of families and children. The estimates may have been slightly different if, instead, a census (complete population survey) had been conducted using the same questionnaires, interviewers, supervisors, quality assurance procedures, processing methods, and tabulation routines. The difference between a population estimate derived from a sample survey and the result obtained from a census taken under similar conditions is known as sampling error. One measure of sampling error is called the standard error of the estimate.

If repeated samples of the same type were used to produce NCCS estimates, then it would be expected that in about 68 of 100 samples, the difference between a sample estimate and its corresponding census (population) figure would be less than one standard error. In about 95 out of 100 samples, the difference would be less than two standard errors, and in about 99 out of 100 samples the difference would be less than 2.5 standard errors.

A wide range of estimates related to economic families with children younger than 13 years of age, the children in these families, and the types of care used for these children can be produced from the National Child Care Survey. Since sampling error is not the same for all estimates, the standard error of the estimate is usually expressed relative to the estimate to which it pertains. The resulting measure, known as the coefficient of variation (cv), is obtained by dividing the standard error by the estimate itself, and is expressed as a percentage of the estimate.

Generating actual estimates of sampling variability is a very costly procedure, so the coefficients of variation for estimates used in this and all other NCCS publications have been obtained from a set of generalized tables computed for the National Child Care Survey. These general tables take into account the size of the estimate, the sample size or number of records used to produce that estimate, and a factor that accounts for the stratified, multi-stage design of the LFS, on which the National Child Care Survey sample is based. This last factor is taken into consideration by the incorporation of what is known as a design effect, which, in essence, is the penalty paid for using a clustered sample as opposed to a simple random sample. Coefficient of variation (cv) tables have been produced for estimates based on families, IPs, spouses, children, and target children. ${ }^{5}$

Statistics Canada's release guidelines allow for the unrestricted release of any estimate that has a cv equal to or less than $16.5 \%$. Estimates with a cv between $16.5 \%$ and $25.0 \%$ are released accompanied with a warning about the high sampling variability. Estimates with a cv greater than $25.0 \%$ are not released. In this and other publications, estimates with a cv in the range of 16.5\% to $25.0 \%$ will be accompanied by the letter " q ". The " q " will serve as a warning to users that these estimates should be used with caution. Estimates that are not releasable will be replaced with "...".
5.7
Non-sampling
Error

Errors which are not related to sampling may occur at almost any phase of a survey operation. Interviewers may misunderstand instructions, respondents may make errors answering questions, the answers may be incorrectly entered on the questionnaire, and errors may occur in the coding, processing and tabulation of the data. These are all examples of non-sampling errors. Over a large number of observations, randomly occurring errors will have little effect on estimates derived from the survey; systematically occurring errors, however, will introduce biases in the survey estimates. Considerable time and effort has been invested to reduce non-sampling errors in the National Child Care Survey through careful design of the questionnaire, proper training and supervision of interviewers, and meticulous control of and attention to coding, data entry, and data preparation. Procedures to ensure that data capture errors were minimized included coding and edit quality checks to verify processing logic. Despite these efforts, non-sampling error is bound to have some impact on NCCS estimates. In general, items in the National Child Care Survey interview that required more detail (e.g., total income from various sources in the previous calendar year) were more susceptible to errors.

Another potential source of non-sampling error is the effect of non-response on the survey results. The magnitude of the bias introduced by non-response depends both on the extent of non-response, and the degree to which responders and non-responders differ from each other. The extent of non-response will vary from partial non-response (failure to answer just one or some questions) to total non-response (which was discussed in Section 5.2). Total non-response was handled by adjusting the weights of households and economic families that responded to the survey to compensate for those that did not respond.

## 5.8 <br> Estimation

In most cases, partial non-response to the National Child Care Survey occurred when the respondent misinterpreted a question, could not recall the requested information, or in some cases when a mistake was made in question sequences involving a skip pattern.

The National Child Care Survey was administered to a sample of Canadian economic families with children under the age of 13 . The starting point was the household. Approximately one in every 90 Canadian households was included in the NCCS sample. Data collected from families in selected households were used to represent similar households not in the sample. In practice, different areas of the country were sampled at different rates, in part based on the size of the population for which estimates were desired (e.g., a province, Canada as a whole, etc.).

The number of families or children that each family or child represents is called its weight. Assuming for the moment that there is no non-response, then the weight is equal to the inverse of the sampling rate. However, non-response occurs in most sample surveys and the NCCS was no exception. Non-response occurred at the household level and therefore the weights of responding households had to be increased to represent the non-responding households. Once economic families with children were identified for the purpose of conducting child care interviews, non-response occurred if the interview was not conducted. Weighting factors applied to the economic families with children that responded to the survey were increased to represent those that did not. In both cases, the weight adjustment was made by multiplying the original weight by a factor that compensates for non-response. The factor is computed by dividing the number of households (or families with children) by the number of households (or families with children) responding.

At this stage, the weight is comprised of two components: the inverse of the sampling rate and the non-response adjustment. A third component, the family weighting adjustment described below, was then added to improve accuracy even more.

Independent estimates are available monthly for various age and sex groups, by province. These estimates are based on Canadian Census data, records of births and deaths, and estimates of migration. A procedure was used to adjust weights to force agreement with these independent estimates, thus improving the accuracy and reliability of estimates that could be produced by the NCCS. In fact, estimates of children by single years of age by sex produced from the NCCS will agree exactly with estimates based on these external sources.

The weighting procedure that was used to make this final adjustment is referred to as the family weighting procedure. At the same time as ensuring consistency with external Census counts, the procedures ensure that every member of the economic family is assigned the same weight. This is important to ensure consistency of estimates and to produce accurate estimates at the economic family level.

The three factors that have been discussed -- namely, the inverse of the sampling rate, the non-response adjustment, and the family weighting adjustment -- are the main components used to produce the respondents' weights. The final weight that incorporates all these factors is the one used to produce estimates from the NCCS sample. The final weight inflates the sample of 24,155 economic families to $2,724,300$ families and the sample of 42,131 children to $4,658,500$ children. This represents a final average weight of approximately 110 for each interviewed family and child.

The NCCS involved one further stage of selection -- the selection of the target child in families with more than one child younger than 13 years of age. A weight adjustment had to be made taking the particular selection scheme that was utilized into consideration.

Adjustments were then made to ensure consistency by single years of age with the independent Census estimates. The average weight for target children is approximately 190. Any estimates produced from information based on questions referring to the target child use this target child weight. It should be noted that if the same tabulations are made based on all children in the sample $(42,131)$ and then based only on the target children $(24,155)$, slightly different results will occur because of sampling error. This is the case for all variables other than province, sex, and age, for which the weighting procedure has been used to ensure consistency.


## Chapter 6

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NATIONAL CHILD CARE SURVEY SAMPLE AND THE POPULATION IT REPRESENTS

As described in Chapter 5, sampling procedures for the National Child Care Survey were designed to ensure accurate population estimates of Canadian families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age (NCCS families), and of all Canadian children younger than 13 years of age (NCCS children). The obtained NCCS sample is representative of these two target populations nationally (with certain exceptions as described in Chapter 5), and each provincial sample is representative of the families and children in that province. The number of families interviewed in each province and the number of children younger than 13 years of age about whom child care information was collected are shown in Table 8. The full sample represents a total of 2,724,300 economic families and $4,658,500$ children younger than 13 years of age.

Table 8 Distribution of NCCS Samples and Populations

| Province | Sample Families | Sample Children | Population of Families Represented | Population of Children Represented |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newfoundland | 2,102 | 3,501 | 70,400 | 116,600 |
| Prince Edward Island | 780 | 1,404 | 14,000 | 25,500 |
| Nova Scotia | 1,746 | 2,978 | 93,000 | 157,500 |
| New Brunswick | 1,968 | 3,306 | 79,300 | 132,000 |
| Quebec | 3,793 | 6,252 | 707,700 | 1,157,800 |
| Ontario | 4,591 | 7,930 | 978,800 | 1,661,200 |
| Manitoba | 1,579 | 2,830 | 110,300 | 193,600 |
| Saskatchewan | 2,213 | 4,151 | 109,000 | 203,700 |
| Alberta | 3,108 | 5,679 | 268,800 | 492,500 |
| British Columbia | 2,275 | 4,100 | 293,000 | 518,000 |
| Yukon and Northwest Territories ${ }^{1}$ | - | -- | - | -- |
| CANADA | 24,155 | 42,131 | 2,724,300 | 4,658,500 |

1 No data were collected in the Yukon or Northwest Territories.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Family estimates from the National Child Care Survey are based on the concept of the "economic family", which is defined as including all persons living in the same dwelling related by blood, marriage, or adoption (see the NCCS Glossary, Appendix C to this report). Other studies may provide estimates of "census families" which are more narrowly defined, consisting only of parents and their never-married children. In general, most households contain only immediate family members; indeed, $93.9 \%$ of NCCS economic families are census

## 6.1 <br> Family and <br> Child Composition

families. This fact is particularly important when interpreting NCCS estimates of 1987 family income (which are based on combined parental income), and estimates of the proportion of parental income that was spent on child care in that year.

The number of families with one, two, or three or more children younger than 13 years of age is shown in Table 9 for Canada and each province. As other studies of fertility trends and family size have demonstrated, families are considerably smaller now than they were years ago. A downward trend in family size has been evident since the early part of this century, although it was interrupted and reversed temporarily during the 1950s and 1960s. Today, the majority of Canadian families have only one or two children (Ram, 1990). Table 9 indicates that in 1988, $46.3 \%$ of Canadian families $(1,261,000)$ had only one child younger than 13 years; another $39.8 \%(1,085,500)$ had two children. Families with three or more children younger than 13 years of age numbered 377,800 and accounted for $13.9 \%$ of all NCCS families. Not shown in Table 9 is the proportion of families with four or more children younger than 13 years of age. In total, they accounted for only $2.7 \%$ of the population of NCCS families ( 74,100 families).

The three provinces with the largest proportion of one-child families are Newfoundland, New Brunswick, and Quebec. Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island have the largest proportion of families with three or more children younger than 13; although even in those provinces, four out of five families have only one or two children younger than 13 years old.

Table 9 Families With 1,2,3 or More Children Younger Than 13 Years of Age, Canada and the Provinces, 1988

| Province | Economic Families |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Families |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { With } 1 \\ \text { Child }<13 \end{gathered}$ |  | With 2$\text { Children < } 13$ |  | With 3 or More Children < 13 |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Newfoundland | 70,400 | 100.0 | 35,000 | 49.7 | 26,700 | 37.9 | 8,700 | 12.4 |
| Prince Edward Island | 14,000 | 100.0 | 5,900 | 42.4 | 5,400 | 38.6 | 2,600 | 19.0 |
| Nova Scotia | 93,000 | 100.0 | 43,500 | 46.7 | 36,900 | 39.7 | 12,600 | 13.6 |
| New Brunswick | 79,300 | 100.0 | 39,100 | 49.3 | 29,600 | 37.3 | 10,600 | 13.3 |
| Quebec | 707,700 | 100.0 | 348,600 | 49.3 | 285,100 | 40.3 | 74,000 | 10.5 |
| Ontario | 978,800 | 100.0 | 462,300 | 47.2 | 382,300 | 39.1 | 134,100 | 13.7 |
| Manitoba | 110,300 | 100.0 | 48,700 | 44.1 | 43,800 | 39.7 | 17,800 | 16.2 |
| Saskatchewan | 109,000 | 100.0 | 42,600 | 39.1 | 44,500 | 40.8 | 21,900 | 20.1 |
| Alberta | 268,800 | 100.0 | 106,400 | 39.6 | 114,800 | 42.7 | 47,600 | 17.7 |
| British Columbia | 293,000 | 100.0 | 129,000 | 44.0 | 116,300 | 39.7 | 47,800 | 16.3 |
| CANADA | 2,724,300 | 100.0 | 1,261,000 | 46.3 | 1,085,500 | 39.8 | 377,800 | 13.9 |

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 10 provides information on the composition of children within NCCS families. It can be seen that 975,300 families ( $35.8 \%$ ) have one or more children younger than three years of age. Almost six out of ten NCCS families ( $1,586,700$ or $58.2 \%$ ) include at least one preschool-age child ( $0-5$ years old). Families with two or more children under six years of age, for whom full-time child care might
be particularly costly, number 512,500 and comprised $18.8 \%$ of all NCCS families.

Approximately $42 \%$ of all NCCS families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age ( $1,137,600$ families) contain only children six years of age or older. Slightly more than a sixth of NCCS families ( 464,600 families or $17.1 \%$ ) are comprised only of older children, 10-12 years of age.

Table 10
Families With Children in Selected Age Groups, Canada, 1988

| Child Composition within Families | Number of Families | Percent of Families |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Children Younger Than 3 Years of Age |  |  |
| Families with no children < 3 | 1,749,000 | 64.2 |
| Families with children <3 | 975,300 | 35.8 |
| with 1 child < 3 | 862,300 | 31.7 |
| with 2 or more children <3 | 112,900 | 4.1 |
| Children Younger Than 6 Years of Age |  |  |
| Families with no children <6 | 1,137,600 | 41.8 |
| Families with children <6 | 1,586,700 | 58.2 |
| with 1 child < 6 | 1,074,200 | 39.4 |
| with 2 or more children <6 | 512,500 | 18.8 |
| Children Younger Than 10 Years of Age |  |  |
| Families with no children < 10 | 464,600 | 17.1 |
| Families with children $<10$ | 2,259,700 | 82.9 |
| with 1 child $<10$ | 1,190,300 | 43.7 |
| with 2 children < 10 | 838,900 | 30.8 |
| with 3 or more children < 10 | 230,500 | 8.5 |
| Children Younger Than 13 Years of Age |  |  |
| Families with 1 child < 13 | 1,261,000 | 46.3 |
| Families with 2 children < 13 | 1,085,500 | 39.8 |
| Families with 3 or more children $<13$ | 377,800 | 13.9 |
| All Families | 2,724,300 | 100.0 |

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Children today live in a variety of types of families and circumstances, including one and two-parent families, blended families, extended families, families with common-law partners, and joint custody arrangements, some of which enable children to participate in more than one nuclear family and in a variety of relationships. This diversity provides some interesting challenges to researchers who would seek to accurately describe the parameters of children's family experiences. While the National Child Care Survey was not designed for that purpose, data on parents' marital or cohabitation status and characteristics of the parent or parent-figure who is most responsible for making child care arrangements in the family provide interesting information in that regard.

The number of one and two-parent families with at least one child under the age of 13 in Canada and each province is presented in Table 11. The definition of one-parent families that was employed in the Canadian National Child Care Study departs from one based solely on marital status, since the presence or absence of a spouse or partner (rather than one's legal status) is far more
pertinent to estimates of child care needs and analyses of child care use patterns. Thus, a one-parent family was defined in the CNCCS as a family including a child or children younger than 13 years of age in which the interviewed parent (IP) does not live with a spouse or partner (see the NCCS Glossary, Appendix C).

## Table 11 One and Two-Parent Families With Children Younger Than 13 Years of Age, Canada and the Provinces, 1988

| Province | All Families |  | Two-Parent Families ${ }^{1}$ |  | One-Parent <br> Families ${ }^{2}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Newfoundland | 70,400 | 100.0 | 61,400 | 87.2 | 9,000 | 12.8 |
| Prince Edward Island | 14,000 | 100.0 | 12,100 | 86.4 | 1,900 | 13.6 |
| Nova Scotia | 93,000 | 100.0 | 80,600 | 86.7 | 12,400 | 13.3 |
| New Brunswick | 79,300 | 100.0 | 68,000 | 85.7 | 11,300 | 14.3 |
| Quebec | 707,700 | 100.0 | 604,400 | 85.4 | 103,300 | 14.6 |
| Ontario | 978,800 | 100.0 | 842,200 | 86.1 | 136,500 | 13.9 |
| Manitoba | 110,300 | 100.0 | 90,900 | 82.4 | 19,400 | 17.6 |
| Saskatchewan | 109,000 | 100.0 | 93,200 | 85.5 | 15,900 | 14.5 |
| Alberta | 268,800 | 100.0 | 228,100 | 84.8 | 40,700 | 15.2 |
| British Columbia | 293,000 | 100.0 | 243,900 | 83.2 | 49,100 | 16.8 |
| CANADA | 2,724,300 | 100.0 | 2,324,800 | 85.3 | 399,500 | 14.7 |

1 Two-parent families consist of an IP and spouse or partner who live together with at least one child <13 years old.
2 One-parent families consist of an IP who does not live with a spouse or partner and at least one child <13 years old.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 11 indicates that $85.3 \%$ of Canadian families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age are two-parent families in which the IP described herself or himself as married or living common-law, with a spouse or partner living in the household. Approximately 399,500 NCCS families (14.7\%) are oneparent families. Although not shown in Table 11, almost $92 \%$ of the one-parent families $(367,000)$ are headed by women; about $32,600(8 \%)$ are male-headed. The proportion of all NCCS families that are female-headed, one-parent families was $13.5 \%$. Male-headed, one-parent families accounted for only $1.2 \%$ of all NCCS families.

The pattern evident in Table 11 indicates some variability in the percentage of one- and two-parent families across the provinces. The proportion of oneparent families ranged from a low of $12.8 \%$ in Newfoundland to $17.6 \%$ in Manitoba. These numbers take on added meaning when viewed from the perspective of children. Nationally, 586,900 children or $12.6 \%$ of all Canadian children younger than 13 years of age were estimated to be living in one-parent families, as defined in this study. These numbers are significant since the unavailability of a spouse (and potentially other family members) can result in increased difficulty in finding reliable, affordable child care and in coping with unexpected child care breakdowns and children's illnesses. A comprehensive analysis of one- and two-parent families' child care needs and use patterns is the subject of a separate National Child Care Study report.

In the vast majority of cases (94.9\%), the interviewed parent (IP) was the mother of at least one child in the family younger than 13 years of age, as shown
in Table 12. An appreciation of who the IP is in relation to the children provides some insight into family and gender roles. Practically, however, identification of who served as the IP in this study is important because child care arrangements were classified according to the IP's main activity while children were in care. As well, the IP is the parent who supplied information about the spouse's work hours, the spouse's workplace benefits, and the impact of child care problems on the spouse in two-parent families. The IP's degree of tension in juggling work, family, and child care responsibilities (or family life, personal goals and child care, in the case of IPs who were not employed) is examined in other NCCS research reports.

Table 12
Relationship of the Interviewed Parent (IP) ${ }^{1}$ to Children Younger Than 13 Years of Age in the Economic Family

| Relationship of IP ${ }^{1}$ | Number | Percent of Sample |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mother ${ }^{2}$ of 1 or more children in two parent family | 2,225,200 | 81.7 |
| Mother ${ }^{2}$ of 1 or more children in one-parent family | 360,600 | 13.2 |
| Father ${ }^{2}$ of 1 or more children in two-parent family | 90,300 | 3.3 |
| Father ${ }^{2}$ of 1 or more children in one-parent family | 32,200 | 1.2 |
| Other relative | 16,000 | 0.6 |
| All Interviewed Parents | 2,724,300 | 100.0 |
| The interviewed parent is referred to as the "designated adult" (DA) on the NCCS questionnaire and in the NCCS Microdata User's Guide. <br> Includes natural, foster, and step-parent. See Appendix C for glossary of terms. <br> Numbers may not add due to rounding. |  |  |

## 6.2 <br> Urban-Rural Distribution

The distribution of NCCS families across urban and rural areas, or locations varying in population density, is presented in Table 13. NCCS families and children live in all size cities, ranging from Canada's largest urban areas to remote and rural communities. Almost one fifth live in rural areas; while another $13.7 \%$ live in small towns and villages; $9 \%$ live in small cities with populations between 30,000 and 100,$000 ; 14.3 \%$ live in larger cities with populations greater than 100,000 , but less than 500,000 ; and $43.2 \%$ live in large urban centres with populations greater than 500,000 people.

As one might expect, the distribution of NCCS children and families across urban and rural areas reflects the distribution of the population within Canada's provinces. NCCS families are most heavily concentrated in urban areas of 100,000 or more in Manitoba, Alberta, Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia, where close to the majority of families live in large urban centres. In contrast, more than half of NCCS families live in communities of less than 15,000 in Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and New Brunswick; as do more than $40 \%$ of families in Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan.

Table 13 Distribution of NCCS Families Across Urban and Rural Areas, Canada and the Provinces, 1988


Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure 2
Percentage of NCCS Families in Urban and Rural Areas, Canada and the Provinces, 1988


## 6.3 <br> Income Distribution <br> The distribution of NCCS families across income groups is shown in Table 14.

Table 14
Distribution of NCCS Families Across Selected Income Ranges Based on 1987 Combined Parental Income, Canada and the Provinces, 1988

| Province |  |  | Combined 1987 Parental Income ${ }^{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All <br> Families |  | $\$ 20,000$ <br> or Less |  | \$20,001-30,000 |  | \$30,001-40,000 |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Newfoundland | 70,400 | 100.0 | 24,600 | 34.9 | 15,500 | 22.0 | 13,300 | 18.9 |
| Prince Edward Island | 14,000 | 100.0 | 4,500 | 32.2 | 3,400 | 24.7 | 3,100 | 21.9 |
| Nova Scotia | 93,000 | 100.0 | 21,200 | 22.8 | 19,400 | 20.9 | 19,200 | 20.6 |
| New Brunswick | 79,300 | 100.0 | 22,300 | 28.1 | 14,900 | 18.8 | 18,200 | 22.9 |
| Quebec | 707,700 | 100.0 | 157,500 | 22.3 | 119,700 | 16.9 | 154,200 | 21.8 |
| Ontario | 978,800 | 100.0 | 162,300 | 16.6 | 129,300 | 13.2 | 179,300 | 18.3 |
| Manitoba | 110,300 | 100.0 | 27,300 | 24.8 | 20,400 | 18.5 | 24,000 | 21.7 |
| Saskatchewan | 109,000 | 100.0 | 30,300 | 27.8 | 19,600 | 18.0 | 21,500 | 19.7 |
| Alberta | 268,800 | 100.0 | 57,300 | 21.3 | 39,700 | 14.8 | 51,500 | 19.2 |
| British Columbia | 293,000 | 100.0 | 62,800 | 21.4 | 44,000 | 15.0 | 59,800 | 20.4 |
| CANADA | 2,724,300 | 100.0 | 570,100 | 20.9 | 426,000 | 15.6 | 544,000 | 20.0 |


| Province | Combined 1987 Parental Income ${ }^{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$40,001-50,000 |  | \$50,001-60,000 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { More Than } \\ \$ 60,000 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Newfoundland | 7,900 | 11.2 | 4,800 | 6.7 | 4,400 | 6.2 |
| Prince Edward Island | 1,300 | 9.3 | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ |
| Nova Scotia | 15,600 | 16.7 | 7,300 | 7.8 | 10,300 | 11.1 |
| New Brunswick | 11,800 | 14.9 | 5,800 | 7.3 | 6,300 | 8.0 |
| Quebec | 108,200 | 15.3 | 75,100 | 10.6 | 93,100 | 13.2 |
| Ontario | 179,000 | 18.3 | 134,400 | 13.7 | 194,500 | 19.9 |
| Manitoba | 18,200 | 16.5 | 10,300 | 9.3 | 10,000 | 9.1 |
| Saskatchewan | 16,700 | 15.4 | 10,200 | 9.4 | 10,700 | 9.8 |
| Alberta | 46,800 | 17.4 | 32,400 | 12.1 | 41,100 | 15.3 |
| British Columbia | 49,800 | 17.0 | 32,500 | 11.1 | 44,100 | 15.1 |
| CANADA | 455,400 | 16.7 | 313,600 | 11.5 | 415,200 | 15.2 |

[^2]Numbers may not add due to rounding.


#### Abstract

Almost $21 \%$ of Canadian families with children younger than 13 years of age ( 570,100 families) had an annual parental income of $\$ 20,000$ or less in 1987, while $15.2 \%$ had parental incomes exceeding $\$ 60,000$ (see the Glossary, Appendix $\mathbf{C}$, for the definition of parental income used in this study). Separate analyses indicated that $19.7 \%$ of those NCCS families which qualified as both census and economic families (503,500 families) could be classified as falling below 1987 Statistics Canada low-income cut-off points, based on geographic area and family size. This number might be a slight over-estimate of the number of families with children younger than 13 who fall below low-income cut-off points, since income earned by children 15 years of age and over was not collected nor included in NCCS estimates of 1987 annual income. Nonetheless, the incidence of child and family poverty is significant in this population and is relevant to debates about child care policies and federal-provincial cost-sharing approaches, as well as to more general policies and programs oriented towards ensuring and maintaining the economic well-being of families with children.

Analyses of NCCS total parental income by province mirror statistics on family poverty produced by the National Council on Welfare. Table 14 indicates that the proportion of NCCS families with a total parental income of less than $\$ 20,000$ in 1987 was highest in Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, followed by New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. In all four of these provinces, more than a quarter of families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age (close to a third of such families in Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island) had a total 1987 parental income of less than $\$ 20,000$. Provinces in which at least one quarter of families with children younger than 13 had a 1987 total parental income exceeding $\$ 50,000$ were British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, while $23.8 \%$ of Quebec families fell into this upper income category. Other NCCS research reports will examine whether and how child care use patterns vary by family income, the proportion of low-income families who receive child care subsidies, and parents' concerns about the affordability of child care arrangements.


## 6.4 Parental Work and Study

Child care may be used for many purposes that can benefit children and their parents. The two purposes most often considered critical to family economic well-being are: (1) care that enables parents to work to support their families, and (2) care that allows parents to complete or continue their education so as to better support their families in the future.

Table 15 provides general information about parents' employment and educational status in families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age. Table 16 provides information on families as units, in which the interviewed parent's and spouse's employment and educational involvement are considered simultaneously.

Table $15 \begin{aligned} & \text { Employment and Student Status of the Interviewed Parent and } \\ & \text { Spouse/Partner in Families With at Least One Child Younger Than } 13 \\ & \text { Years of Age, Canada, } 1988\end{aligned}$

| Employment and Student Status | Interviewed Parent |  | Spouse/Partner |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Parent's Employment Status ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Employed full-time | 1,168,200 | 42.9 | 2,132,400 | 91.7 |
| Employed part-time | 466,000 | 17.1 | 30,200 | 1.3 |
| Unemployed | 164,200 | 6.0 | 73,300 | 3.2 |
| Not in the labour force | 926,000 | 34.0 | 88,900 | 3.8 |
| Parent's Student Status ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Enroled as a full-time student | 60,500 | 2.2 | 22,700 | 1.0 |
| Enroled as a part-time student | 112,200 | 4.1 | 49,800 | 2.1 |
| Not enroled as a student | 2,551,500 | 93.7 | 2,252,300 | 96.9 |
| Parent's Combined Work and Study Status ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Full-time work and full-time student | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Full-time work and part-time student | 51,200 | 1.9 | 47,200 | 2.0 |
| Part-time work and full-time student | $5,600 \mathrm{q}$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | ... |
| Part-time work and part-time student | 18,500 | 0.7 | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ |
| Full-time work and not a student | 1,115,100 | 40.9 | 2,081,700 | 89.5 |
| Part-time work and not a student | 441,900 | 16.2 | 25,900 | 1.1 |
| Not employed ${ }^{2}$ and full-time student | 53,100 | 1.9 | 15,600 | 0.7 |
| Not employed ${ }^{2}$ and part-time student | 42,600 | 1.6 | . ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\cdots$ |
| Not employed ${ }^{2}$ and not a student | 994,600 | 36.5 | 144,700 | 6.2 |
| TOTAL | 2,724,300 | 100.0 | 2,324,800 | 100.0 |

See Appendix C, glossary, for definitions of employment and study categories.
2 Includes parents who are unemployed and those not in the labour force.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 16

Parents' Work and Study Status in Families With at Least One Child
Younger Than 13 Years of Age, Canada, 1988

| Parents' Work/Study Status | Number of Families | Percent of Families |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Both parents are involved full-time in two-parent families; the IP is involved full-time in a one-parent family | 1,174,800 | 43.1 |
| One parent is involved full-time and one parent works or studies part-time in two-parent families; the IP works or studies part-time in a one-parent family | 483,700 | 17.8 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies full-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 822,100 | 30.2 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies part-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 22,800 | 0.8 |
| Both parents work or study on part-time basis | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| Two-parent families in which neither parent is employed nor a student; the IP in a one-parent family is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 218,100 | 8.0 |
| All Families | 2,724,300 | 100.0 |

1 Includes parents who are unemployed and those not in the labour force.
See Appendix C for glossary of terms.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

These data indicate that the most common pattern in Canadian families with at least one child under the age of 13 is for both parents in a two-parent family, or a single parent in a one-parent family to be involved on a full-time basis in work and/or study activities. This pattern of full-time parental involvement describes $1,174,800$ families or $43.1 \%$ of all Canadian families with a child younger than 13. An additional 17.8\% of NCCS families are composed of two-parent families in which one parent is involved in work or study activities on a full-time basis while their spouse/partner is involved part-time; and one-parent families in which the single parent is involved in work and/or study activities on a part-time basis. NCCS families in which at least one parent is at home (i.e., neither employed nor a student) numbered $1,063,000$ and accounted for $39 \%$ of all families with at least one child younger than 13 years of age.

Annual averages of labour force data published by Statistics Canada demonstrate that women's labour force participation varies as a function of the age of the youngest child in the family and the husband's employment status, if a husband is present. Table 17 illustrates the work and study status of parents considered together in families with younger and older children.

Table 17
Parents' Work and Study Status by Age of Youngest Child, Canada, 1988

| Parents' Work and Study Status | Age of Youngest Child in Age Groups |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | 0 to 2 Years |  |
|  | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Both parents are involved full-time in two-parent families; the IP is involved full-time in a one-parent family | 1,174,800 | 43.1 | 350,600 | 36.0 |
| One parent is involved full-time and one parent works or studies part-time in two-parent families; the IP works or studies part-time in a one-parent family | 483,700 | 17.8 | 164,400 | 16.9 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies full-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 822,100 | 30.2 | 369,400 | 37.9 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies part-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 22,800 | 0.8 | 9,400 q | 1.0 q |
| Both parents work or study on part-time basis | $\ldots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |
| Two-parent families in which neither parent is employed nor a student; the IP in a one-parent family is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 218,100 | 8.0 | 80,600 | 8.3 |
| All Families | 2,724,300 | 100.0 | $\mathbf{9 7 5 , 3 0 0}$ | 100.0 |

Age of Youngest Child in Age Groups

|  | 3 to 5 Years |  | 6 to 9 Years |  | 10 to 12 Years |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parents' Work and Study Status | Number | \% | Number | \% | Number | \% |
| Both parents are involved full-time in two-parent families; the IP is involved full-time in a one-parent family | 261,000 | 42.7 | 323,300 | 48.0 | 239,900 | 51.6 |
| One parent is involved full-time and one parent works or studies part-time in two-parent families; the IP works or studies part-time in a one-parent family | 109,900 | 18.0 | 130,500 | 19.4 | 78,900 | 17.0 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies full-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 182,900 | 29.9 | 162,700 | 24.2 | 107,100 | 23.1 |
| Two-parent families in which one parent works or studies part-time and one parent is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 4,900 q | 0.8q | 4,600 q | 0.7 q | $\ldots$ |  |
| Both parents work or study on part-time basis | $\cdots$ | $\ldots$ | ... | $\ldots$ | ... | ... |
| Two-parent families in which neither parent is employed nor a student; the IP in a one-parent family is neither employed nor a student ${ }^{1}$ | 52,100 | 8.5 | 50,900 | 7.6 | 34,500 | 7.4 |
| All Families | 611,500 | 100.0 | 673,000 | 100.0 | 464,600 | 100.0 |

Includes parents who are unemployed and those not in the labour force.
See Appendix C for glossary of terms.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

As expected, the proportion of families in which both parents in a twoparent family or a single parent in a one-parent family work and/or study on a full-time basis increases as the age of the youngest child in the family increases. A pattern of full-time work and/or study is most common in families in which the youngest child is at least 10 years old. In contrast, the likelihood that at least one parent is home full-time (i.e., neither employed nor enroled as a student) is highest in families with very young children. In families with a child younger than three years of age, a pattern of full-time parental involvement in work or study was observed in 350,600 families, or $36 \%$ of the families in that category; both parents or a single parent are involved at least part-time in work and/or study in another $16.9 \%$; and families in which at least one parent is neither employed nor a student number 459,400 , or $47.2 \%$ of all families with a child younger than three years old.

While the age of the youngest child is certainly a factor that influences parents' work and study activities, the number of children in the family is another consideration. Separate analyses, not shown in table form, indicate that the prevalence of a full-time pattern of work and study for both parents in a twoparent family or for a single parentin a one-parent family declines from $49.3 \%$ in families with only one child younger than 13 , to $41.0 \%$ in families with two children, and to $28.6 \%$ in families with three or more children younger than 13 years of age. Conversely, the proportion of families with a stay-at-home parent increases with the presence of more children in the home. In families with only one child, the proportion is $35.1 \%$; with two children younger than 13 , the proportion is $39.5 \%$; and in families with three or more children younger than 13 at home, almost half the families ( $49.9 \%$ ) include at least one parent who is neither employed nor a student.

6.5<br>Estimating Child Care Needs

While estimates of the degree to which parents are involved in work and study activities are important, and provide some indication of the nature and diversity of family patterns, they tell only a part of the story. Projections of child care needs are most commonly derived from estimates that indicate how many children, in various age groups, have parents who, by virtue of their involvement in employment and educational activities, are likely to require supplemental (i.e., non-parental) care. Child estimates of this sort are provided each year by Health and Welfare Canada in their Status of Day Care reports. These reports, prepared by the National Child Care Information Centre, are based on labour force data collected during March of each year using a much smaller sample of families with children than the National Child Care Survey. Estimates of the number of children who may need care are then matched against available information on the number of full-time centre and family day care spaces in each province.

The authors of the annual Status of Day Care reports have recognized the problems associated with having only general data on parents' labour force participation. As a result, four separate estimates are provided for children in each of four age categories. The estimates are based on: (1) the number of children with mothers in the labour force; (2) the number of children with fulltime working parents; (3) the number of children with parents who either work or study on a full-time basis; and (4) the number of children of full-time working parents plus students, plus parents working 20-29 hours a week. The use of these four categories results in a smorgasbord of estimates of the number of children in Canada who may need full-time child care and the percentage who are served by licensed day care centres and family day care homes. In general, estimates based on mothers in the labour force (which include mothers who are employed and work for any number of hours per week, as well as those who are unemployed and looking for work) yield the highest numbers, and estimates
based on full-time working parents yield the lowest numbers. While having the four different estimates for each age group is interesting, there is little basis for choosing one over another. Instead, the estimates provide a range of alternatives or "ballpark" parameters.

For example, the 1988 Status of Day Care report (which is based on March, 1988 data) estimated that anywhere from 154,319-303,954 infants age 0-17 months may need child care. The range of estimates for children 18-35 months of age varied from 174,131 to 320,761; and for children 3-6 years old, the estimates ranged from 344,258 to 652,922 . Estimates for children age 6-13 ranged from 932,782 to $1,634,010.6$ Clearly, such wide-ranging estimates leave much to be desired for the purpose of policy development.

Table 18 and Figure 3 provide similar estimates based on National Child Care Survey data. School-age children have been divided into two groups (6-9 and 10-12 years) for more meaningful estimates. The number of children served in licensed settings is not yet available, however, the percentage of all children in a particular age group whose parents fit the aforementioned categories is provided. The data indicate that even when the most conservative criterion for estimation is used (i.e., full-time working parents), approximately one third of Canadian children in each age category, including infants, need some form of child care. The most liberal criterion (mothers in the labour force) suggests that $55-68 \%$ of children in each age group may need child care to supplement the care provided by their parents.

## Table 18

## Children by Age Group and Parents' Usual Hours of Work and Study, Canada, 1988

|  | Number of <br> Children |  | Percent |  | Number of <br> Children |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Parents' Work/Study |  |  |  |  |  |

Children 10 to 12 Years of Age

| All children 10-12 years of age | $1,056,900$ | 100.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Mothers in the labour force | 721,800 | 68.3 |
| IPs in the labour force | 737,900 | 69.8 |
| Full-time working parents ${ }^{1}$ | 442,800 | 41.9 |
| Full-time working parents <br> plus full-time students |  |  |
| Parents working and/or studying <br> at least 20 hours a week |  |  |

Two-parent families in which both parents usually work 30 or more hours per week and oneparent families in which the IP usually works 30 or more hours per week.
2 Two-parent families in which both parents usually work and/or study 30 or more hours per week and one-parent families in which the IP usually works andlor studies 30 or more hours per week.
3 Two-parent families in which both parents usually work and/or study 20 or more hours per week and one-parent families in which the IP usually works andlor studies 20 or more hours per week.

See Appendix C for glossary of terms.
Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure $3 \quad$ Percentage of Children in Age Groups by Parents' Usual Hours of Work and Study, Canada, 1988


These preliminary findings beg for further clarification. Parents may be employed full- or part-time; some parents work at home or only during school hours; and couples may have overlapping or off-shifted work schedules. Hence, Tables 16 and 17 provide only a "first cut" at describing the proportion of families who may be involved in arranging and maintaining suitable child care on a regular basis, and Table 18 provides only a "first cut" estimation of the number and percentage of children who may need supplemental child care. A more complete and accurate estimate of the number of children who need supplemental child care and a better appreciation of the relationship between work, family, and child care variables require a more sophisticated approach. Such data are analyzed in detail in a separate report in this series entitled Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs.

In addition, future reports will differentiate between child care used while parents are working or studying and child care used for other purposes. As such, CNCCS research reports will provide a broader perspective on child care, including its functions as a vehicle for providing stimulation and recreation for children and social support to parents, in addition to the role child care has as an increasingly necessary resource to enable parents to provide for their family's immediate and long-term economic well-being.

# ANTICIPATED REPORTS BASED ON THE CANADIAN NATIONAL CHILD CARE STUDY 

As indicated in Chapter 2, CNCCS research reports will be released in three stages. Following this Introductory Report, six major descriptive reports will be published, each focusing on a different major facet of the study from a national perspective. Secondly, a full set of 12 provincial and territorial reports will be produced, which will provide information about each province's or territory's child care services and policies, along with demographic information. A summary of the child care use patterns in each province obtained from analysis of the National Child Care Survey data is included. Later reports focus on specific thematic issues and present more in-depth, multivariate analyses on such topics as infant care, low-income families and their child care arrangements, effects of child care on parents' labour force participation and productivity, immigrant families, inter-provincial comparisons, and the affordability and availability of child care alternatives.

Each of the major national reports and the provincial and territorial set is described in more detail in the remainder of this chapter. To assist readers, reports that share a common focus pertaining to one of the major themes of the Canadian National Child Care Study are described together and are referred to as components of a "set" of CNCCS reports.

## 7.1

## Set A: Where Are The Children? Child Care Arrangements in Canada

As described previously, the Canadian National Child Care Study was designed to provide information on current child care use patterns in Canada. Researchers, policy analysts, provincial and federal task forces, and committees had found existing data bases sorely lacking in accuracy and detail. The reports in this first series address some of the primary objectives of the Canadian National Child Care Study: to obtain accurate estimates of the number of children in each type of care; to provide detailed information about the child care methods being used across Canada; and to determine parents' preferences among different child care options.

The first two reports, entitled "An Overview of Child Care Arrangements in Canada" and "An Analysis of Child Care Arrangements Used While Parents Work or Study" provide complementary analyses that yield accurate and detailed information about the care arrangements used for children of different ages for a variety of purposes. Readers will be able to focus on children of a specific age, and will also be able to compare and contrast child care use patterns across different age groups. The data are presented in a number of different but helpful ways which, taken together, provide a detailed snapshot of child care use patterns.

The first report in this series begins by presenting data on children who are in child care for all reasons: care used while the interviewed parent's main activity was working, studying, or other activities, such as caring for other family members, homemaking, volunteer work, and personal and social activities. One
focus of this report is the number of different child care arrangements children of different ages participated in during the reference week. A second focus is the number of hours children spent in child care settings during the reference week.

The second report focuses on the main method of child care used for one selected child in each family while the Interviewed Parent was working or studying in the reference week. Detailed analyses, broken down by the age of the children and the types of care in which they participated, provide a fine-grained picture of:
A. child characteristics (the children in each type of care -- their age, gender, and birth order);
B. child care characteristics (e.g., cost, licensing status, relationship of caregivers to the children);
C. family characteristics (e.g., one- or two-parent family, number of children in the family);
D. how parents searched for child care, and the factors which influenced their selection among current child care options; and
E. parents' satisfaction with, and evaluation of the main method of care they used during the reference week.

Both reports include a statement of how the research findings help fill some of the gaps in our understanding of child care use in Canada, and explore some of the policy implications of the findings.

Set B: Canadian Families and Their Child Care Arrangements
Families vary widely in their composition, number of children, place of residence, socioeconomic status, and corresponding child care needs and preferences. Existing research on child care has rarely adopted a "family as the unit of analysis" approach to this topic. The various reports that follow the theme of families and their child care arrangements in the Canadian National Child Care Study provide an in-depth analysis of how differences between families relate to child care needs, parental preferences among child care alternatives, and typical child care use patterns. Each of the reports in this series focuses on a particular major type of family in Canada, often in comparison to others. The variety of topics that will be addressed in this series include: comparisons among one-and two-parent families; child care needs and use patterns in families with special needs children; a comparison of urban, rural and farm families; immigrant families and their child care arrangements; and families in which one parent stays at home with a child. (Definitions of different types of families are included in the Glossary. See Appendix C.)

Each "type of family" report addresses three aspects pertaining to families and their child care. First, each major family type is described demographically. Information is presented on such characteristics as: parental age and education, employment status, combined parental income during the previous year, and the number and age distribution of children in the family.

Secondly, family types are compared in terms of specific child care issues. These issues include:
A. parental work patterns in different types of families and corresponding differences in child care needs;
B. variance in parental preferences among child care alternatives;
C. the types of child care most often used;
D. parents' satisfaction with their chosen child care arrangements;
E. factors that contribute to and reduce child care related stress; and
F. patterns of formal and informal support available to, and used by parents.

Thirdly, each "type of family" report addresses issues that are unique to the particular family type(s) examined in that report. Examples include the following:

- the number of child care options that are perceived to be available, affordable, and accessible to families with a special needs child;
- the availability of fee subsidies for child care to parents in highly urban and less populated geographic regions; and
- the availability of kin and informal child care support for recent and longterm immigrant families.

Finally, each report in this series concludes with a summary of the major findings. Special attention is given to implications for current federal and provincial policies that affect child care for each of the respective family types.

The first two reports on Canadian families and their child care arrangements are entitled "Patterns of Child Care in One- and Two-Parent Families", and "Stay-At-Home Parents: An Option for Canadian Families". The reports in this series will add to our understanding of how family factors influence child care use patterns, and will provide valuable information for those concerned with developing a range of policies and programs that support the diversity of family types across Canada today.

## 7.3

## Set C: Work and Family Reports

Previous surveys of child care arrangements generally have not contained enough detail about parental work patterns and work schedules to help policy analysts and professionals develop more than a superficial understanding of the complexities of the work-family-child care nexus. In addition, no previous Canadian study has obtained detailed information about both mothers' and fathers' work schedules, an omission which has resulted in little or no understanding of how dual-earner couples' work involvements and work schedules relate to their child care needs and use patterns. Information about the extent of parents' use of, and preference for "off-shifting" their work hours and child care responsibilities is a significant factor that should be considered in estimates of the demand for child care services.

Other research indicates that parental work schedules are becoming increasingly more heterogeneous, involving weekends, evenings, and nonstandard or variable work shifts. The National Child Care Survey provides detailed information about parental work schedules, thereby allowing more accurate estimates of the nature of child care needs and a greater appreciation of the complexities of family life.

The National Child Care Survey also provides significant information about the degree of work-family-child care tension (or work-family interference) experienced by working parents. Factors that contribute to, and reduce work-family-child care tension are assessed, including the availability (or lack of) workplace benefits and practices that may help parents balance their work and family responsibilities.

The first report in this series, entitled "Parental Work Patterns and Child Care Needs" serves three major functions: it provides a complete description of parental employment patterns; it presents accurate estimates of child care needed to enable parents to work; and it suggests how patterns of child care are related to parental employment characteristics.

This report presents a descriptive overview of parents' work patterns individually, and jointly in the case of dual-earner couples, as reported in the reference week. A partial list of the variables examined include:
A. Parent's work involvement: the number of hours each parent worked in the reference week, and whether either parent worked overtime or worked at more than one job.
B. Parents' work schedules: the number of days worked in the reference week, the pattern of days worked, the extent of variability in work schedules from week to week or from day to day, and parents' usual start and stop times, e.g. early or late day shift, night shift, compressed or rotating shifts, etc.
C. The nature of parents' employment: their work classification (e.g. paid worker, self-employed, or unpaid family worker), industry, and occupational categories.

These variables are then used to estimate child care needs, using both families and children as separate units of analysis. Thus, for example, estimates will be calculated of the number of families with two children younger than six years of age in which either a single parent or both parents usually work 30 or more hours per week; or the number of families with school-age children in which one or both parents work at least one weekend day. Child estimates, such as the number of young school-age children (six to nine years of age) who live in families in which either a lone parent or both parents are at work most weekdays after school, will also be generated.

The second report in the Work and Family series, entitled "Workplace Benefits and Flexibility: A Perspective on Parents' Experiences" will provide information on the availability of workplace benefits and practices that can help parents balance work and family responsibilities. These benefits and practices include workplace child care, flexibility in work hours, paid family responsibility leave, options to work part-time or to job share, and maternity leave and benefit policies. Parents' preferences for changes in workplace benefits and policies will also be examined. This CNCCS report provides analyses based on a nationally representative sample of parents that complement recent studies by the Conference Board of Canada on employees with child or elder care

## 7.4 <br> Provincial and Territorial Reports

responsibilities, and efforts by Statistics Canada and various federal and provincial departments to assess the need for research and innovative policies in this area.


#### Abstract

As noted earlier, the NDCRN research team made a decision prior to the submission of the 1987 proposal to produce provincial and territorial reports as part of the Canadian National Child Care Study. In the fall of 1988 a decision was made to develop this into a series of twelve reports, each following a similar model. The set is titled "Canadian Child Care in Context: Perspectives From the Provinces and Territories". In order to develop the individual provincial and territorial reports, a 4-7 member CNCCS writing team was established in each province and territory. Team members researched and authored the report on their respective province or territory with assistance from CNCCS research staff at the University of Victoria, who coordinated this part of the project. Each provincial and territorial report in the series contains the following sections:


## Section 1: An Introduction to the Province or Territory

This section of each report provides a demographic and economic overview of each province or territory, and includes the following information:

- trends in basic population demographics,
- influential geographic aspects of the province,
- changes in the economic base over time,
- historical changes in labour force characteristics, and
- trends in the labour force participation of women and mothers.


## Section 2: Historical Development of Child Day Care in the Province or Territory and Current Issues

Section two presents a historical picture of the development of child day care policies and programs in each province and territory beginning most often with developments at the time of World War II, and ending in 1988 when CNCCS survey data were collected. The histories include:

- the chronological sequence of major events or periods in the province's or territory's child care history,
- key events and key players noted within each "period",
- current issues and their evolution (i.e., how and why did these particular issues emerge?), and
an update on recent or proposed program and policy changes.


## Section 3: Child Day Care Legislation, Regulations, Funding and Enrolments

This section is based on data obtained from the provincial and territorial questionnaire sent to each day care director. Information includes the number of children in care, regulations, funding, provincial associations, etc.

## Section 4: NCCS Survey Data for the Province

This section of each report will include a standard set of tables based on the NCCS survey data that summarize major findings on child care use patterns. These tables will be immediately useful, and may serve as the basis for interprovincial comparisons.

## Section 5: Provincial Bibliography and Resource List

This section provides a complete bibliography of provincially or territorially-based research studies and documents that will be of interest to many individuals and groups in the child care field and in other disciplines.

With the exception of Section 4, which is not available for the Northwest Territories or for the Yukon, all twelve reports in this series follow the same fivepart format noted above. The reports are not tightly standardized and considerable latitude for differences in statements and styles has been allowed. The result is a fascinating collection of documents that reflect the uniqueness of each of the twelve provincial and territorial jurisdictions of Canada.

The set of provincial and territorial reports add an important contextual feature to the overall Canadian National Child Care Study. In Canada, where regulatory and funding structures are a provincial and territorial responsibility, it is critical to understand child care at both the national and the provincial or territorial level. The provincial and territorial reports will help readers understand the critical factors that impact on the provision of care across Canada -- the historical, demographic, political, and economic background to caregiving in each of the provinces and territories. To create this background, acknowledged experts from government, academia, advocacy organizations, and professional associations have worked with the CNCCS project team to create a unique resource for those interested in child day care in Canada.

The development of the CNCCS provincial and territorial report series represents an important "first" in Canadian day care, as indeed do each of the reports based on the Canadian National Child Care Study. It is particularly satisfying to see the provincial and territorial series further extend the collaborative model of the CNCCS into each of the provinces and territories.
7.5

Additional Reports

Later CNCCS reports focus on specific thematic issues and include more indepth, multivariate analyses. The three main themes of analysis evident in the first CNCCS reports -- children and their care arrangements, families and family types, and work-family-child care relationships -- are continued. In addition, later reports address strategic child care policy issues, such as the affordability and availability of child care alternatives, the stability of care arrangements, and inter-provincial comparisons in child care use patterns.

At least ten reports are planned that will follow the six national reports and the provincial and territorial series. They will encompass the following areas: infant care; families with a special needs child; low-income families and their child care arrangements; comparisons among urban, rural, and farm families; immigrant families and their child care arrangements; effects of child care on parents' labour force participation and productivity; work-family-child care
tension; inter-provincial comparisons; the affordability and availability of child care alternatives, and an analysis of annual child care patterns. These reports will be developed by the principal investigators and published during 1992 and 1993.

## A FINAL NOTE

The development, execution, and analysis of the Canadian National Child Care Study has been an exciting and challenging activity for all concerned -- the principal researchers, CNCCS research staff, Statistics Canada, and the provincial and territorial writing teams. It represents, in many ways, one of the most unique research activities ever conducted in the social sciences. We are particularly pleased that it has developed into the collaborative project it has become today, capitalizing on the richness and diversity of knowledge and expertise contributed by so many individuals.


## NOTES

1. Statistics Canada (1989). Labour Force Annual Averages 1981-1988. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, Catalogue 71-529, Table 8.
2. Employment and Immigration Canada (1990). Canadian Occupational Projection System, unpublished data.
3. See Statistics Canada (1976). Methodology of the Canadian Labour Force Survey, Catalogue No. 71-526 for further information.
4. The LFS sample typically also excludes households in which all members of the household age 15 and over are full-time members of the Canadian Armed Forces.
5. Readers interested in additional information about sampling variability estimates for the National Child Care Survey are referred to the National Child Care Survey Microdata User's Guide, Statistics Canada, 1991.
6. National Child Care Information Centre (1989). Status of Day Care in Canada, 1988. Ottawa: Health and Welfare Canada, pp. 8-10.
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|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  <br> Donit know io |  | ${ }_{\text {or }}$ <br> Donil know $1 O$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  <br>  |  |
| Mipratamsion 0 | . 0 | masarasmion 0 | momomeas 0 |
| Oo ronex cimo | Oo o Nexx cluls |  | Oor ronex sccrow |


|  | benectina a chilo <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  whelicn nubler erionv - Inet do 'fuget O |
| :---: | :---: |


| -20 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Q2t. Wes the amounl you pald subaldised by the govern. meni? |
|  | Q22. Approximatity how much would 1 cosil you to send. - |
|  | 083. Whtlo ... was in thia program during freference wegk) was your main collvily... <br> - weiling ot a fob or buginess. <br> - sludying. <br> - cailing for your fomily's neads, <br> OR <br> - sombiting elsor |
|  | 024. Ovarail how do you teal abeut this cers ansangement for...f Would you sey you have . . . <br> - noreservallena <br> - miner roservallens <br> - some importani reservalions, <br> OR <br> - msjor tesarvallons about this arrangoment? |






\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline  \&  \&  \&  \\
\hline  \& 1- Itrue ; ina \({ }^{2} \mathrm{O}\) \& ITI \({ }^{\text {argow ense }} 0\) \& II \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{-27-} \\
\hline 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yes } 1 \mathrm{O} \\
\& \text { No } 2 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { Oo to nent Cnito }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yat } 1 \mathrm{O} \\
\& \text { No } 2 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { oo to neat crise }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { yes } 1 \mathrm{O} \\
\& \text { No }: \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { Go lo ment Child }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yos } \mathrm{O} \\
\& \mathrm{~N}_{0}: \mathrm{O}-\text { Go to noxt Section }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 401 G0 10113 \& Q Mot coto 113 \& \(\square 11016010113\) \& \(\square 11016010113\) \\
\hline \& \& . \& \\
\hline  \& \[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
\hline \& M \& y \& w \& r \& F \& 8 \\
\dot{O} \& 2 \& 1 \& 4 \& 5 \& \dot{O} \& 1 \\
O \& O \& O
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
8 \& M \& 1 \& w \& T \& F \& s \\
1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 1 \& s \& a \& 1 \\
O \& O \& O \& O \& O \& O \& O
\end{array}
\] \& \[
\begin{array}{lllllll}
s \& \mu \& r \& w \& r \& F \& s \\
\dot{O} \& \dot{O} \& \dot{O} \& \dot{O} \& \dot{O} \& \dot{O} \& \dot{O}
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline Hours \& Houls \& \(\square\) Hours \& \(\square\) Hours \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{lr} 
Yes \& 10 \\
No \& 10 \\
No othat chidaran \& 0
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{lr} 
Yos \& 1 O \\
No \& 3 O \\
No otren children \& O
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{lr} 
Yos \& 1 O \\
No \& 2 O \\
No other chiscren 30
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{lr} 
Yes \& 1 O \\
No \& 2 O \\
No other childion \& O
\end{tabular} \\
\hline  \&  \&  \&  \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
yos 10 \\
No 30
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Yos 10 \\
No \(\%\)
\end{tabular} \& \[
\begin{array}{ll}
Y_{43} \& 1 \mathrm{O} \\
\text { No } \& 0 \mathrm{O}
\end{array}
\] \&  \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yss } O \\
\& \text { No } x \mathrm{O} \rightarrow 0010120
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yos } \mathrm{O} \\
\& \text { No } 3 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { OO to } 120
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Yes } 1 \mathrm{O} \\
\& \mathrm{~N}_{0} 2 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { G0 } 10120
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { vas } \mathrm{O} \\
\& \mathrm{No}_{2} \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \mathrm{O} \text { to } 120
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{ll} 
Pauenuzlop-parent \& .0 \\
Oiandpewont \& .0 \\
Aunisuncio \& 0 \\
Other rolative \& .0
\end{tabular} \&  \&  \&  \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \mathrm{H}^{\cdot} 000^{\circ} \text { go } 10125
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\frac{8 \square \square}{\square 0^{*} 000^{\circ} 0010125}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\square=00 \\
N^{\cdot} 000^{\circ} 0010125
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\square 00 \\
11^{2} 000^{\circ} \text { go } 10125
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
4 Itom 118 a \\
al your horne Oolo 122 \\
Otherwise
\\
Go 10123
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
4 Hem \(118=\) \\
al yow home \\
Otherwiso \\
Go 10122 \\
Go to 123
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
A Rem \(110=\) \\
al your homs \\
Othorwise \\
Go 10122 \\
Go to 123
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
H Hem IIB: \\
al your home \\
Otherwise

<br>
Go to 122 <br>
Go 10 123
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline Yos 10 \& Yes 10 \& yot O \& Vis: 0 <br>
\hline \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}







|  | ¢́8 |  |  | 8 8 8 8 8 0 |  |  | 동 | - mefor roberratlone sboul this atrengement? |  |  | ( |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -35- |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Notrsenations $\quad \mathrm{O}$ <br> mnor tasavations ${ }^{1} \mathrm{O}$ $\substack{\text { Somo important } \\ \text { resanations }}$$\quad 0$ <br> Major reservetions 40 |  | No rotervaiona 10 <br> Mnot Itsurations $=0$ <br>  <br> Major is revations 4O |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| smiwtfs óỏóóóó | s m r wrfs óo̊ ỏ óóóó |  óỏó ó ó óó | smiwifs <br> óóóóóó |
| $\square]$ Hours | $\square$ Hows | $\square$ Hours | [] Hours |
| Yos 10 <br> No 10 <br> No other chideran 10  |  | Yos 10 <br> No 0 <br> No ontre chibicion O | Yos 10 <br> No 20 <br> No ovirer chideran 10  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { yos } 10 \\ & \text { No ro } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { yes } 10 \\ \text { No } 0 & 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yos } 10 \\ & \text { no } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ccc} \text { rot } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 10 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yos : } \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { No } \mathrm{O} \rightarrow 010185 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reo } 10 \\ & \text { No } 20 \rightarrow \text { Gotoltss } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vos } 1 \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { No } 2 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { Golo/64 } \end{aligned}$ | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Nos } 10}$ |




|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 37 - |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  | Pasenvitep-patent JO <br> Orandperont © <br> Auntrunclo SO <br> Other rotaive .0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \square \square \square 00 \\ (11 \cdot 000 \cdot 0010 \text { 159) } \end{gathered}$ | $\underbrace{\square 1}]_{0}$ | : $\square$ $\infty$ <br> (II *000'00 10 (180) |  |
| If tlem 160 n <br> al your hame 'O aoto 168 <br> Oinerwise OOO 10161 | al your home O Go to 185 <br> Ouharwise <br> 20 G0 10161 | $x$ trem $160=$ <br> at your home. O co to 166 | if liem $160=$ <br> al yous home 1 O Goto 165 <br> Otherwiso <br> 2 O Oolo 167 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes } \mathrm{O} \\ \text { No } \mathrm{O} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { ves } & 0 \\ \text { No } & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\text { yos } \mathrm{O}$ $\text { No } \mathrm{O}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { Yos } & 0 \\ N_{0} & 0 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ves } s 0 \\ & N_{0}: O \end{aligned}$ | res:O $\text { No } 0$ | $y_{a s}: O$ $\text { No } 0$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { res } \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { No } 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { you } 10 \\ & \text { No } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yes } 1 \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { No }: ~ O \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { res } 10 \\ N_{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| if tiem 182 - <br> Yes (ratalive) ${ }^{\text {O O Go } 10175}$ <br> Oinerwise <br> OGO 10170 | $11110 \mathrm{~m} 162=$ <br>  <br> Ontorwise <br> OGOto 10 | If Item $182=$ <br> Yes (relative) $1 O$ Go 10175 <br> Otherwis <br> 2 Ooto 170 | 4Item $862=$ <br> Yes (rolativa) ${ }^{(O G G o r o t r s}$ <br> Otharwise <br> $x$ Goto 170 |
| H 1 Iom $160=$ <br> A your hame OO O 174 <br> OOOItll | "1tem 160 = <br> st yout home $\mathfrak{O}$ Go 10174 | II trem 160 : <br> at your home OGo 10174 <br> Otherwise <br> OGotom | II Item 160 - <br> at youn home O Golo 174 <br> Otherwise <br> -OGolo (r) |
| $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { Yos } & s O \\ \text { No } & 0 \\ \substack{\text { Donil } \\ \text { hnow }} & O \end{array}\right\} \text { Goloint }$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { yes } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 10 \\ \text { Donnit } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { colo } 174$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { Yos } & s 0 \\ \text { No } & 0 \\ \text { doonit } & 0 \end{array}\right\} \text { colo } 174$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { ros } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 0 \\ \text { Doont } \\ \text { nom } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { Golol14 }$ |
|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { vas } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 0 \\ \text { Oonit } \\ \text { noow } & 0 \end{array}\right\} 0010175$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { ras } & 10 \\ \text { Mo } & 2 \\ \text { Donil } \\ \text { nnow } & 0 \end{array}\right\} \text { colo } 175$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { ras } & 1 O \\ \text { No } & 20 \\ \text { Donit } \\ \text { noom } & 0 \end{array}\right\} \text { Golo } 175$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Yas $O$ <br> No $O$ <br> Donil knom $O$ | Yas $O$ <br> No $O$ <br> Doni inom $O$ | Yos $O$ <br> No $O$ <br> Donil unow $O$ | Yo, $O$ <br> No 0 <br> Doni know 0 |


|  | 8ELECTINO A CHDD <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Num Tomern <br>  <br> ny raver mine |
| :---: | :---: |
| -38- |  |
|  |  |
|  | M6. How much did you pay tot thic thind care arrangement for ... dusting tio weok of Letgrence wegki? |
|  | Hes. INIERVIEWER CHECK TTEM: |
|  | 166. Doest thie coit include other servicest auch as light housakeopling otc. 7 |
|  | 161. Doas this thite casioglved provide recalpte? |
|  | 188. Do you er e mamber of your iamily Intend to claim thila coal for income tax purposes? |
|  | 169. INTEAVIEWER CHECK ITEM: |
|  | 10. inteaviewea check item: |
|  | 171. Is the person providing this care licenced by the gevernment or approved by elamily daycare agency? |
|  | 172. Wee the amount you pald tor thie cale pubbidized by the gevernmentl |
|  | 113. Approximetaty thow much mould this care arang* ment cost ter . . . per week if II wete not oubetdizedt |
|  | 174. Is this thid cate alrongement ababyaiting co opetative in which you are oxpected to provide care poti-t1mof |




|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -11. |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} {[\square \square 00} \\ (11)-000 \text { po ו1 991) } \end{gathered}$ |  | 8 $\square$ 0 <br> (11) $0000^{\circ} 0010181$ 1) |  |
| IIItem $182=$ <br> al your nome 1 O Oo to 188 <br> Otherwiso O Oolo 189 | $11110 \mathrm{~m} 182-$ <br> al your home 1 O Golo 189 <br> Ollhorwise $\quad \mathrm{OO} 010189$ | 4 fiem $182=$ <br> al rou home 'O 0010189 <br> Otherwise OOO10189 | H Hem 182 : <br> al your home 1O Go to 189 Othe:wiso OGotota9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yos } 10 \\ & \text { No } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rei } 0 \\ & \text { No o } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } & 0 \\ \text { no } & 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } 3 \\ \text { no } & 0 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yos so } \\ & \text { No © } \mathrm{O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { yos so } \\ & \text { No } 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} x_{0} & 5 \\ n_{0} & 0 \end{array}$ | $\text { Yos } s$ $\text { No } 0$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yos } י \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { no : } \mathrm{O} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { you } & 0 \\ \text { No } & 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} y_{0 s} & 0 \\ \text { No } & 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} y_{e s} & 10 \\ \text { No } & 0 \end{array}$ |
| thitam tor = <br> Yos (rolativa) ' O Ooto 197 <br> Othorwise <br> 2 OGe to 192 | If Item 184 : <br> Yes (ralative) 1 Go fo 197 <br> Olthermse :OGoror ${ }^{192}$ | Il Hem 194 <br> Yos f(t)lative) : OGeto t9r <br> Otherwise $\quad 2$ O Ge to 192 | If tiom t84 = <br> Yes (tolative) : OGo to 197 <br> Oinerwise 2 O Go to t92 |
| II Item 182 = <br> al yout home ${ }^{2}$ O Goto 198 <br> Gherwiso - OOO 10193 | If tiom 182 * <br> al your home 3 On to t98 <br> Othermise 4 OGototgu | If Itam 182 : <br> at you home 2 Ooto 196 <br> Otherwise - OQo 10193 | n Itom 182 . <br> at your nome, O Gator 195 <br> Otherwise - O Gotot93 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { Yos } & 10 \\ \text { Ne } & 0 \\ \text { Oonit } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { oolo } 198$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { Yes } & 30 \\ \text { No } & 10 \\ \begin{array}{l} \text { Donit } \\ \text { noom } \end{array} & 10 \end{array}\right\} 0010198$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { yes } & 30 \\ \text { No } & 10 \\ \text { Oonit } \\ \text { now } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { G010 } 198$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } & 30 \\ \text { No } & 10 \\ \text { Donit } \\ \text { innow } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { Go } 10196$ |
|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 20 \\ \text { OnNit } & 10 \end{array}\right\} \text { oilol97 }$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } & 10 \\ \text { no } & 20 \\ \text { oonit } \\ \text { thow } & 0 \end{array}\right\} 0_{0} 1019 r$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { yos } & 10 \\ \text { No } & 20 \\ \text { Ooni1 } \\ \text { know } & 0 \end{array}\right\} \text { Golo19r }$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Yas 1 <br> Mo 0 <br> Doni anom 1 | Yes 10 <br> No $X$ <br> Oonit know 0 | yos $O$ <br> No $O$ <br> Doni know 0 | Yos 0 <br> No 0 <br> Doni nnow 0 | 8-3(0)-2091









| $0$ |  |  | $0$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| \％．10 | ＂．＇0 | ＂．＇0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| obotobo | óóóóo | Obóóobó | ¢áàóo |
| 凹um | 凹w | 凹wo． | $\square^{\text {mom }}$ |
| $5:$ |  | $:$ | \％ |
| $=0$ | Nio | \％osme | $10.0$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| semer |  | mom oim |  |
| － |  | שim | － |
| －1\％ | －mד | （1） | －Tm｜m |
| － | － | （1mm |  |
| ¢ாா் | 凹 | （1\％ | －1\％ |
|  |  |  | ， |
| Somerao | Coroseremo | Oromesemo | coives sclain |

Soloction Ond Lebol Ooss More

0．5103．209．1





| Pom | $10$ | 茴mum | $P 0_{0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| （ili）${ }^{\text {anmow }}$ | $10^{10 \times 20}$ | 边 | ［1T10．mo |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | － | －0 |  |
|  |  | （1） | （100 |
| 边 |  | 䢒 | （ |
| （10） | \％ssmatuo |  | \％ |
| ＂＂${ }^{\circ}$ | \％ | \％ | \％ |
| \％ | \％ | 0 | － |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{ll} \infty \\ m & \infty \\ m & \infty \\ m \end{array}\right\|$ | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} \infty & \infty \\ i n & \infty \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \infty & \infty \\ \cdots & \infty \\ \cdots \end{array}$ | ［100 |
| － | Limmome | 边 |  |
| somentum | Oomater | － | \％omm |
| …＂0 | \％omeno | \％osme | omememos |
| － | $\ldots$ | \％ | \％ |
|  |  | \％ | \％ |
| 冬 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 50， 0 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 0 \times 0.0 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| （10 | \％ | Sixme |  |
| Oner | $\because$ | $\bigcirc$ | ame |
|  |  | Covramesume | ansumesta |
| yonemomo | monemose ${ }^{\circ}$ | nowmeme | namexasao－o |
|  | amsamen $1 \times$ | ${ }^{\text {Omamsens }}$ ， | TMTI |
| 1 | Tintor | － |  |
| crit | T | TITIT |  |
| Soionex cuo |  |  | ooronext sectron |



 $0.100-109.1$


$\dot{\mathfrak{o}}$
$\square$
 The totst number of houre you are working each
Your woik schedule ............................................








 Working out airengenents with your spouse or or
partine over whe will plek up and diop ofl your chltd partiner ovet whe will plak up and diop off your child
Not bating ebte to taik to your child or ceroglvit



 Foelling tred or overiteaded bec buba of your job...

[^3]
$\qquad$ No $\cdot \mathrm{O}$
 B. 5100 - 109.4

 a. MAIN METHOD EVALUATION a. MAIN METHOD EVALUATION




Ho rosson ................... ©


$\quad 000100 \longrightarrow \mathrm{O}^{200}$
$\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{Ot}} \mathrm{O} \longrightarrow 01000$
No O





 Curo in someone atso's home by Coto
 Cati in omn noma by spaus..... 0 O) Care in own home by apouse ..... Care by apousa white working ....
 Caro in own home by bother or Came by other chiter own care .... Child in tid not uso a care arcangen

 | JUNIOR KINDEROARTEN PROGAAMNNURSERY |
| :--- |
| SCHOOL PROGRAMDDAYCARE CENTRE |

 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4 \tan u$ | ven | O4. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM







|  |  |  |  |  |  | posn |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 manct |
| . 65. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 041. How eatitlad are you with yout main care asrangement tet . . In terms of the following aspects7 Would you say that you are vary gatisfled, somewhat aetistlod, somewhat dissatisted er very dissalistled with... 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The convonlence of the lecatien ................... |  |  | Very <br> Satished | Semowliat Satisfied | Sornewhat Dissatistiod | Vory Onssatisticed | N/A |
|  |  |  | $0 \cdot 0$ | 02 O | 0 O | 0.0 | $\cdots 0$ |
| The cest of the care............................ .. . . |  |  | $\infty 0$ | 00 | 080 | - 0 | 1 O |
| The avallabilly el care for the hours you naed it.. |  |  | 10 | 120 | 130 | 10 | $" 0$ |
| The transperatien betwesn the scheot and this pregram |  |  | 14 O | ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 130 | 14 | ${ }^{3 \prime} 0$ |
| The qually of foed aerved |  |  | ............................ | 210 | 20 | 330 | 210 | as 0 |
| Cleanllness and safely .................................. |  |  | 360 | $\because 0$ | 20 O | ${ }^{29} 0$ | ${ }^{\circ} 0$ |
| The number ot careglvars tor childion ............. |  |  | 30 | "O | 30 | $\cdots$ | 350 |
| The caregivera' educsition and tualning related te chlid caso$\qquad$ |  |  | 380 | 120 | 30 | 3 O | 100 |
| The careglvera' akills and oxpstience in working with chitdion$\qquad$ |  |  | $\because 0$ | 2 O | ${ }^{43} 0$ | "O | 45 |
| The carsgivera' senallivily to your child's neods. |  |  | 100 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 50 |
| The avallabllity of interosiling faating activilles for your chlld's age greup........ ..... .. ......... |  |  | 310 | ${ }^{32} \mathrm{O}$ | 330 | 30 | 350 |
| Communication betwoen you and the carsolvors |  |  | 56 | 310 | 300 | ${ }^{39} \mathrm{O}$ | $\cdots 0$ |
| The ameunt of furnever ameng stall ................. |  |  | $\cdots 0$ | 82 | ${ }^{6} \mathrm{O}$ | $0 \cdot 0$ | ss O |
| The amount of hifluence you have in decistons that altsec yeur chlid'e pregram |  |  | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{8 \prime} \mathrm{O}$ | 3 O | 59 | 100 |
| The alze and deston of indeor play space .......... |  |  | $\cdots$ | 170 | 13 | "O | 30 |
| The avallable Indoor toys and equipmant .......... |  |  | 180 | "O | 180 | 19 | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{O}$ |
| The outdoor play apaco, loys and equipment....... |  |  | $\cdots \mathrm{O}$ | 10 | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{O}$ | $: 0$ | 1* O |
| Q42. fit thote anything ofte you would the to tall me about that yeu are pirticulaty atistied wilh about this core strangement? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes $\mathrm{O} \rightarrow$ What is ll7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No 2 O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 043. Is there snything eise that you are particulariy dissalisitad with? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes $3 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow$ Whatis ill |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{No}{ }^{4} \mathrm{O}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


 $\frac{\mathrm{NoClO}}{0-3103-209.1}$ 0-3103-200.1



| 0 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 |  |
| 0 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 0 |  |
| 2 |  |




## 

Knowing whore to got informallion about evaliable child caret.....
Finding goed quailly carogivers?

 $\mathrm{No}, \mathrm{O}$
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| Poin | [T] man | T]7ain | TTDa! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 1]I]'umme | T1] | [1] ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |


| 093. Astiver hiont <br> (Ask if nal kivownt Are you paying for the maln care arrangement that you used tor. . . the woah of (catejanco wegh)? <br> ros 10 $\text { Ho } \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { Go ro Orir (p. 78) }$ | O99. When you mado this maln caso atrangement lor . did you conalder uating a daycaro cantrof Yos ' $\mathrm{O} \rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \text { Why did you decide nat to } \\ & \text { Use a day care centra? }\end{aligned}$以ाITI円 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| O95. Which of the lollowing catogories best describes by wow much it would have io incrasso bour (ob (or schopilig)? <br>  |  |
| Cane by melatives |  |
| O95. When did you mosi raconily begin to usa this as your matn caro arrangement for ... ? main caro arra <br> $\square$ | प1111111 $\square 11111111$ |
|  care arrangemant for ... <br> vos ${ }^{1} \mathrm{O}$ $\text { No } 2 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow \text { Gofo Olas }$ | Otot. In many pats of Canada, an oplion avalioblo to tho provinctal government or approvad by a daycare agoncy, to provide care in hismar homa. Ifave you hesid of ilcenced family home daycare? <br> Yos $1 \mathrm{O} \rightarrow$ Coto Ot03 <br> No $\quad \circ$ |
| OS8. INTERVIEWER CIIECK ITEM: <br> - It aga ol laiget chita is foss than 5 JO Ca fo Og9 - Olhorwiso ........................... ©O Goto O100 | you mado this last matn cario atrangament lor when $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { ros } & \mathrm{O} \\ \text { No } & \mathrm{o} \end{array}\right\} \mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{A} 10.0100}$ |




O110. INTERVIEWER CHECK HEM:



- Othorniso ......... .... ....... .. .......................... s O ooto all


| ancourucy | mientiodu) <br> ION | jurpiodus jequouis |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | $\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 & 8\end{array}$ 8 $\bigcirc$ $\stackrel{O}{2}$ $0 \quad 0$ $\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 112. What was youc epousa'o/partnat's msin activity whon (Misk onty one) |  |
|  |  |
|  | Ho |
| Stino | a womples miteod |
| Pastimo iluenl.1.1.1.x.a. |  |
|  |  |
| thola mak |  |
| tholom maik | . 0 |
|  |  |
| पП17111] | ¢ 1 |
| 113. Was the noxt main care arrangement you usad for ... tha same as the ono you used for himher durting the <br> 2 wesk of (teforence weok)? |  |
|  | $\xrightarrow{\square}$ |
| ${ }^{2} 2$ |  |
| $\mathrm{Ho}_{0} \mathrm{O} \longrightarrow$-010 ${ }^{\text {ris }}$ | 721. What was the matn reason you stoppod using itis as your matin cere(Mask onty one) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\mu_{0} \cdot 0$ |  |
|  |  |
|  | प11111] |
|  | पП1111 |
|  | T22. When . . was In this arrangoment what was your maln acifily? (Mark only one) |
| A pocectis wmmap pogram...........O | Waxtion nat atilicmo bo or busioss , O |
|  |  |
|  | Full inmo stuont |
|  | Pantilmo itsont.1. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | पITIIII] |
| पा111] | П11111 |
| पा1111] | 123. WIEEVYIEWER: |
| 16. Wos thls cate ofven in your own home, in someene els $\theta^{\circ}$ s heme, or tomewhata else allogothsi? |  |
| Inom | vos ${ }^{\circ}$ |
|  |  |
| Sanomatas atse O | $\mathrm{No}_{0} \mathrm{O} \longrightarrow$ Gotor 25 |


| $\square \square$ | 17] mom | T1] mon | W $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1]$ | $\square$ | 1 | $\square$ |
| पाIT | (1)1 ruminio |  | (1) |


| 12 month chlid cafe amanoements |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | When did you etap using this care strangoment for $\square$ $\square$ What was the msin reasen you sloppad using thit as your maln care arrangement for ... |
| 13. Since Octobsy 1987, which of the tellewing was the monith of longet? (Maik onty ono) $\square$ $\square$ | Carogivertpogram no tongot avaitablo * $O$ <br> Oissatislisd wilh catagiver/program .... a O <br> $0 n$ <br> Other (Specily oae resson) ............ 30 <br> पIITITID $\square$ T16. When . . . was in this arrangament whet was your maln a cllvily? <br> Working at a full-time job or business iO <br> Working al a patt-time job or businass: O <br> Fult-time sludsnt ................................ 1 O <br> Pattime student............................... $\cdot \mathrm{O}$ <br> Casing lor tamily's noeds.................... $5 \mathbf{O}$ <br> Withoul werk and looking for werk 0 <br> Dther (spacity) $\qquad$ 10 |
| 14. Was this cerc given in your own home, in semeena <br> In own home Someone else's horne $\quad 1 \mathrm{O}$ <br> Semawhero eiso $\quad 30$ altogsthar? | पा11111 |
| 15. Was this care given by a rolatitro? $\text { Yos } \mathrm{O}-0.10 \text { or }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{ves}_{3}: \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{Nr}_{0}: \mathrm{O} \longrightarrow 0010710 \end{aligned}$ |





 than untll fratorence wadty. that lo, with no brsoks o)
moite than a monitht
$\frac{\text { Ho } 0}{}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text {... for a month or longurt (Mark only onol } \\ \text { A daycate contio .................... } & 0\end{array}$

$$
\text { A belore or ailor school progam. ..... } 92 \mathrm{O}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A pre-kindergation. junios } \\
& \text { kindirgaton. or nuisary schoot }
\end{aligned}
$$ Cslogiverporogam no bongor avaitable 10 $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dissatistiod wilh cuagivatprogiam .... } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { Oiner (Specity one reason) ........... }\end{aligned}=0$ $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dissatistiod wilh cuagivatprogiam .... } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { OR } \\ & \text { Oiner (Specity one reason) ........... }\end{aligned}=0$

Fult-ime student ......
Patt:time student...........
Coling lor lamilys noods .......
Wuthout moik and looking lor noik
$\begin{array}{ll}0 & 0 \\ 0 \\ 0\end{array}$

$$
\text { A spocial summot progian............... } 010
$$oner (specint ....

 S. INIERVIEWER: Does Dosignatad Adull have
housebobi?
yes 10
$\mathrm{HBO}_{\mathrm{O}} \mathrm{O} \longrightarrow$ Goto 3 O

$$
0^{\infty}
$$

$$
0
$$

$$
0
$$


$\begin{array}{ll}\text { in own tome } & 10 \\ \text { somenens otso's home } & 20\end{array}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \because 0 \\
& \because 0
\end{aligned}
$$
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## APPENDIX B

## PROVINCIAL / TERRITORIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

| PROVNCIAUTERGHORUTCICITOCARE QURSTIONNAIRE <br>  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please review the questionnaire in full before responding. In some cases the definitions and terms used may not best describe the situation or services in your provinceferritiory. When this occurs, pleaso note the appropriate term(s) (with a definition) in part B (below). Please indicate if the definitions in part $A$ are relevant to your province or territory by checking the appropriate box in the right hand column. |  |  |  |
|  | L_derintions |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1. LICENSED CORE CARE TYPES (NCCS generic definitlons): |  |  |  |
| CENTRE-BASED GROUP CARE (CDC): group care provided for children in a faclity (other than a home). Oroup size may vary. |  |  |  |
| EAMIL Y DAX CARE (FDC): care for children in a private home other than their own home. |  |  |  |
| EAMILY GROURDAX CARE (FODC): group care provided for children in a family day care setting licensed to accomodate more children than an FDC seting with two or more caregivers. |  |  |  |
| Sub-categories of core care types: (if age categories are not accurate, please note appropriate age range in Section I-B, items 3, a-d) |  |  |  |
| INPANT CARE: care provided for children under the age of 18 months. |  |  |  |
| TODDLER CARE: care provided for chlldren 18 months to < 3 years of age. |  |  |  |
| PRESCHOOL AOB CARE: care provided for children age 3-5 years. |  |  |  |
| SCHOOLCAGB CARE: out of school caro provided for children age 6-12 years. |  |  |  |
| 2. | LICENSED SUPPLEMENTAL CARE TYPES: | Yes | No |
|  | CHILD-MINDING: Drop-in short term type care arrangements; |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| loddier |  |  |  |
| preschool-age |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| NURSERY SCHOOL: carly chididood education half day programs provided for children under the age of five. |  |  |  |





MATRIX 1 (for 1-A - 1)

| LICENSED CORE CARE TYPE NCCS DEFINED | Number of spaces |  | SPACES BYDISTRIBUTION |  | total spaces by ausplces |  |  |  |  |  | funding |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{2}{\mathbf{\circ}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { es of } \\ & \hline \frac{0}{6} \\ & \frac{0}{5} \\ & \frac{5}{2} \end{aligned}$ | --Pror |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LICENSED: CDC $\qquad$ <br> Todder <br> Proschool <br> School Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FDC <br> Intant Tosder Proschool Sctioal Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FGDC <br> Infart : <br> Toddiar <br> Proschool <br> School Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

- Please indicate population rumber in Dlank space providect to detine rural vs utban or atiach a copy of provincial map with regional distribution of spaces.
IL_MATRIXES
Enciosed with litis questionnaire is a series of matrix fonms numbered I lifrough 5.
Matrix 1: This matrix is to be used if the NCCS generic definitions are accurate for your province/
Matrix $1(\mathrm{a})$ : This matrix is to be used if you have provided your own provincial/territorial definitons with regard to CORE CABE TXPRS. (Those noted in 1-B-1.)
Matrix 2: This matrix is to be used if the NCCS definitions for SUPPLEMENTALCARE TYPES are àcurate for your province/tertitory. (Those noted in 1-A-2.)
Matrix 2(f): This matrix is to be used if you have provided your own definitions for SUPPLEMENTAL CARE TXPES. (Those noted in I-B-2.)
This matrix is to be used to describe UNLICENSED CARE TYPES in your
This matix is to be used to describe EXCLUDRD CARBTYPRS in your

matrixes. (Those noted in I-C)
Please indicate areas in which data would be difficulfimpossible for you to collect with an U/A, and note if the data Is available from another source (and what that other source is) for future NCCS follow-up. Please indicate areas that are not appticable with an N/A.

MATRIX 2 (for I-B - 2)


MATRIX 1a (for ; - B - 1)


MATRIX 3 (for 1-A - 3)


- Please indicate population ramber in blark spaca provided to define nural vs uttan or attach a ecpy of provincial map with regional distribution of spzces.

MATRIX 2a (for I-B - 2)


MATRIX 5 (for 1-C)

tease indicate poputation rumber in blank space provided to deline turai vs urtan or antach a copy of provincial map with regional distribution of spaces.

MATRIX 4 (for 1-A - 4)


U. SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF TUE PROYINCIALTEERRTCORIAL
SECSION_A. (Pleasc use an "Autachment" sheet should any of your responses require

1. Please identify the enabling legislation for child care services in your province (and ensure you have enclosed a copy for our reference).
 services and note (their) responsibilties.
Minisiry
Responsibilily
2. Are there any proposed changes or amendinents to the legisiation or regulations curremily under consideration? Please describe.
(b) Are there special grants or subsidies avallable to these programs and/or the parcuts who use
then? Please idenify grant/subsidy, funding source and note eligibility critcria.
3. (a) Please describe any muliculural chlld care services available in your province/territory.

(b) Are there grauls or subsidies available to these programs and/or the parents who use them?
Please idenify grant/subsidy, funding source and note eligibillty criteria.
Is there additional information you believe to be relevant to this special needs section?
If so, please comment.

## SLCCLION_I.

SPECIAL NEEDS_SERYICES

|  | \#of Programs | \#of Spaces | Auspices | Average Cos! <br> (per month) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Specialized <br> Segregated <br> Child Care <br> Seuings |  |  |  |  |
| Cornmunity <br> Integrated <br> Child care |  |  |  |  |
| Seutings |  |  |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |  |  |

(b) Are there grants or subsidies available to these programs and/or the parents who use them?
Please identify grant/subsidy, funding source, and note eligibility criteria.
2. (a) Please deseribe child care services available for native famllies.

|  | H of Brograms | \# of Spaces | Auspices | Average Cost <br> (per month) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ot Reserve: | - |  |  |  |
| Off Reserve: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

> 4. If start-up grants are available in your province/territory, please describe the funding body whicls
provides the grants, who Is cligible, and the eligibility criteria:
> 5. Please identify other grants, subsidies, or financial supports which are available in your province/
> 6. Is there additlonal Information you believe to be relevant to this secition? If so, picase comment.


|  | 匀 | $\qquad$ |  |  | 훔 <br> 훕 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## SECTION - 1.

SUPRORT SERYICES

| Program-lype | \#of Programs | Auspices | Eunding Source |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| information service |  |  |  |
| referal service |  |  |  |
| toy lending library |  |  |  |
| parent resource centre |  |  |  |
| respite care |  |  |  |
| OrHirR: <br> (please describe) |  |  |  |



3. Is there additional information you believe to be relevant to this section? If so, please comment.


[^4]Is there additional information you believe to be relevant to this section? If so, please comment.
$\square$
SECTION_G
commenis

## APPENDIX C

## CANADIAN NATIONAL CHILD CARE STUDY GLOSSARY

This glossary contains the definition of terms used in the Canadian National Child Care Study and in research reports.

## General Terms:

Interviewed Parent (IP): The adult in the economic family who is most responsible for making child care arrangements. If there are two parents and they make the child care arrangements jointly and equally, the female parent was the IP. NOTE: This term replaces that of Designated Adult (DA), which appears in the NCCS Questionnaire and in the National Child Care Survey Microdata User's Guide.

Parent: For the purposes of this survey, a parent is defined broadly and includes a natural, step, or foster parent, as well as a guardian or other relative who has assumed the role of a parent for a child younger than 13 years of age who is a member of their economic family.

Reference Week: The reference week is the full week (Sunday to Saturday) prior to the date of the interview with the interviewed parent (IP) for which detailed data about parents' employment and child care were collected. For this survey, the reference week could have been any of the following weeks: the weeks of September 11-17, September 18-24, September 25-October 1st, October 2-8, October 9-15, October 16-22, or October 23-29, 1988.

Reference Year: The reference year for the survey was the 12 -month period from October 1, 1987 to September 30, 1988.

## Children and Child Care:

Affordable: The degree to which an IP reported a given type of child care as reasonable or acceptable relative to family income, expenditures, and personal expectations.

Before and After School Program: A group program designed to provide care for children age 6 through 12 years during non-school hours including before school begins, after school ends, and in some instances, the noon hour and professional development days. These programs are generally offered by school boards, non-profit societies or agencies, community centers, and in family day
care homes. In several provinces, school-age programs are licensed as recreational programs. In the Yukon, child care legislation does not include out-of-school programs.

Care by a Non-relative: Care of a child provided by a person who is not related to the child in either the child's home or the caregiver's home. Care by a nonrelative in the caregiver's home may also be referred to as family day care or family home day care. See Family Day Care.

Care by a Relative: Care of a child provided by a relative of the child (grandparent, aunt, uncle or other relative) either in the child's home or the relative's home. NOTE: In this study, care by the IP's resident spouse and care by an older sibling are considered separately. Care by a non-custodial parent is considered care by a relative.

Care by Sibling: Child care provided by an older brother or sister living in the same dwelling.

Care by Spouse: Care of a child provided by the resident spouse or partner of the IP while the IP was working or studying.

Caregiver: A caregiver is a person other than the IP who provided child care during the reference week or reference year.

Care While Working: Care of a child by the IP or resident spouse while the respective parent was engaged in work for pay or profit or in unpaid family work. See Work.

Centre-Based Group Care: Group care provided for children in a facility other than a private home. In Newfoundland group care may be provided in a private dwelling. In some provinces part-time centred-based programs are referred to as preschool or nursery school.

Child Care: Child care is any form of care used by the IP for children under 13 years of age while the IP was engaged in paid or unpaid work, study, or other personal or social activities during the reference week. Care is classified by method of care (e.g., day care center, before and after school program, informal babysitter, etc.); by location (e.g., school, own home, other private home, elsewhere); and by relationship of the child to the caregiver (e.g., aunt, grandparent, or non-relative).

Also identified in the survey is time children spent in school, in their own care, or in the care of a sibling or IP's spouse while the IP was working or studying.

Child Care Arrangement: The term "child care arrangement" refers to care provided by a specific child care program (the Three Bears Nursery School) or caregiver (Mrs. Ames, a neighbour; or Betsy, John's oldest sister) for a child younger than 13 years of age.

Child Care Availability: The extent to which specific types of child care are perceived by an IP to be available and/or accessible for a specific child in the economic family for the hours needed.

Child Care Support: The IP's report of the availability of individuals (other than a spouse or partner) for assistance with unexpected child care for short periods of an hour or two, and longer periods of a day or two, including overnight.

Child in Own Care: Time spent by a child younger than 13 years of age when the child is not under the supervision of an adult or older sibling while the IP is working or studying. Not included is time spent in transit or relatively brief periods of time.

Child Minding: Generally drop-in, short term or occasional child care. In British Columbia, such care is provided in a group care facility; in Manitoba, in the child's own home; in Prince Edward Island, in occasional centres.

Children: Children are household members who, at the time of the survey reference week, were younger than 13 years of age.

Community Day Care Home: New Brunswick term. See Family Day Care.
Cost of Child Care: The amount of actual child care expenses paid by parents to an individual or centre for child care.

Day Care Centre: Day care centres provide care for children in group settings located in a variety of places including schools, community agencies, dedicated buildings, workplaces, and religious institutions under a variety of auspices including publicly-funded non-profit societies, private or commercial day care operators, and employers. Centres may provide full-day and part-day care.

Family Day Care: Child care offered in the home of a provider (caregiver) who may or may not be licensed or approved by a government or community agency to provide care for children. The age range of children varies from province to province. Also called Private Home Day Care in Ontario and Community Day Care Homes (New Brunswick). May also be referred to as Family Home Day Care.

Family Group Day Care Home: Family day care provided for a larger number of children in a private home by two or more caregivers. This type of care is available in Manitoba.

Infant: The term used by Health and Welfare Canada in their Status of Day Care Reports for a child under 18 months of age.

Infant Care: Care provided for children under 18 months in some provinces and under two years of age in other provinces, as defined by provincial legislation. In Newfoundland, group care for children under 2 years is prohibited.

Junior Kindergarten: An educational program offered by school boards for four-year-old children. Such programs are legislated in a limited number of provinces, and are provided on part-day and/or part-week schedules.

Kindergarten: An educational program offered for five-year-old children by school boards, universities, private schools, and non-profit societies or agencies on either a part- or full-day basis. New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Alberta do not legislate public kindergarten programs.

Licensed Child Care: Child care offered in a day care centre, nursery school, or family day care home which has been sanctioned by governmental authorities on the basis of meeting minimum standards of health, safety, and program quality.

Main Method: The single method of care other than school identified by the IP as the main method used for the target child during the reference week to allow the IP to work or study. Detailed information was collected about how parents searched for the main method, decision-making criteria, difficulties finding care, and satisfaction with the main method of care. Note: In most cases, but not all, the main method of care is synonymous with the primary child care arrangement used for the target child while the IP was working or studying. Differences reflect the fact that the main method of care excludes school as an alternative and was subjectively identified by the IP, while the primary care arrangement was mathematically derived.

Neighbourhood Support: The IP's report of the number of resources in her or his neighbourhood including activities for children, drop-in day care centres and play groups, toy lending libraries, parenting groups, and child care information and referral services.

Non-Parental Child Care: Child care provided in any group program, including school, or provided by a relative or non-relative during the reference week. Care by an older sibling and self care while the IP was working or studying are also considered types of non-parental care. Exclusive parental care may be provided by parent who is not employed, or may result when parents offshift work or study hours, and/or are able to provide care themselves while they are at work.

Nursery School: A group program offered on a part-time basis generally for children three and four years of age by community centers, parent cooperatives, churches, non-profit organizations, and sometimes by school boards. Age ranges vary between two and six years from province to province. Also called preschool programs.

Occasional Centre: A facility which primarily provides supervision of children who attend on an irregular or one-time only basis. See Child Minding.

Preferred Child Care: The type of care indicated by the IP as preferable for a specific child in the family, given family income and the current work schedule of the parent(s).

Preschooler: A child aged 36 months to 71 months.
Preschool Program: See Nursery School.
Primary Child Care Arrangement: The supplemental care arrangement used for the largest number of hours in the reference week for a particular child.
Primary care arrangements may be defined with respect to the IP's main activity while the child was in care, in which case, one can refer to the primary arrangement used for a particular child while the IP was working; or working or studying; or for any and all purposes during the reference week.

Private Home Day Care: Ontario term. See Family Day Care.
Relative: A relative is any person related to a child by blood, marriage, or adoption. If a child's parent does not live in the same household (i.e., is an exspouse or is separated from the IP), he/she is considered to be a relative of the child for the purpose of describing child care arrangements.

School: A graded or ungraded educational program for children under 13 years of age which includes both publicly funded and private schools. In this study, kindergarten is included in a separate category.

School-aged Child: A child aged six years to under 13 years.
Subsidized Care: Care provided to a child under 13 years of age for whom at least part of the child care fee is paid from government sources under the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan and provincial day care regulations.

Supplemental Child Care: Any form of child care used in the reference week to supplement care provided by the IP (other than care by the IP while working) as captured in the Child Care Interview, Sections E-N. Such forms of care include school, daycare centers, before and after school programs, nursery schools and kindergarten, and care by a relative or non-relative either in the child's home or in another home. Also included is care provided by a spouse or older sibling and self-care while the IP is working or studying. Not included as supplemental care is time spent in the care of a spouse or older sibling or self care at times other than while the IP was working or studying, and time spent in recreational activities, music lessons or other incidental activities.

Target Child: One child selected from each economic family for whom additional information was obtained. This information includes data on the main method of care used in the reference week while the IP was working or studying, and methods of care used and problems experienced throughout the reference year.

While target children were randomly selected within families, children under the age of six years were given four times the probability of selection in families in which there were both children 0-5 and 6-12 years of age. Estimation procedures, however ensure that the target child is representative of children of all ages so that estimates are not biased in favour of younger children.

Toddler: A child aged 18 to 35 months.
Toddler Care: Generally, care provided for children age 18 months to 35 months, however, minima and maxima vary from province to province. Some provinces do not specify programs for toddlers. Also called Under Age Three programs in British Columbia.

Type of Care: Type of care refers to a method of child care used for a child younger than 13 years of age. Types or methods include group care (nursery school, day care centre, before and after school program); care in the child's home; family home day care; care by the IP or spouse while at work; and care by self, spouse or an older sibling while the IP was working or studying. See also Child Care; Child Care Arrangement.

## Family and Family Types:

Census Family: Sometimes referred to as an "immediate family" or "nuclear family", a census family consists of either a husband and wife (with or without children who have never married) or a parent with one or more children who have never married, living together in the same dwelling. Never married children, regardless of their age, who live with their parent(s) are considered a part of the family; i.e., a census family includes adult children as long as they are not married, separated, divorced or widowed.

For purposes of the NCCS, adopted children, step-children, and guardianship children are counted as own children.

Dual-Earner Families: Two-parent families in which both the IP and spouse were employed, full- or part-time, during the reference week. Also referred to as two-earner families.

Economic Family: All household members related by blood, marriage or adoption are members of the same economic family. The family includes the IP, his/her spouse (including common-law partner), children (natural, adopted, step, or foster children), sons/daughters-in-law, grandchildren, parents, parents-inlaw, sisters, brothers, aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, and nephews.

The economic family does not include roomers, boarders, friends, and other people who usually reside in the dwelling but who are not related by blood, marriage (including common-law) or adoption to any other family member. These persons form separate family groups. A foster child of 18 years of age or older forms a separate family group.

Families With a Special Needs Child: Families in which at least one child under 13 years of age was reported by the IP to have a long-term disability, handicap, or health problem. Major categories of special needs include: respiratory ailments, cognitive impairments, sensory deficits, physical handicaps, chronic diseases and other long-term problems.

Family-Child Care Tension: The amount of tension, discomfort, or distress that IPs who are not in the labour force reported experiencing in juggling homemaking tasks, children's schedules, their own needs, and other aspects of family life on a general, everyday basis.

Farm Family: An economic family residing in a rural area in which either the IP or spouse identified him/herself as self-employed in the occupation of farming in the reference week.

First Generation Canadians: Families in which the mother or father of either the IP or spouse was born in a country other than Canada are considered first generation Canadians in this survey.

Household: A household is any person or group of persons living in a dwelling. A household may consist of one person living alone, a group of people who are not related but who share the same dwelling, or one or more families.

Household Member: A household member is a person who, during the survey reference week, regards the dwelling as his or her usual place of residence or is staying in the dwelling and has no usual place of residence elsewhere.

Immigrant Family: An immigrant family is an economic family in which either the IP or spouse has a country of origin other than Canada. For this study, immigrant families are classified relative to the length of time they have resided in Canada. Immigrant families are also classified relative to the first language spoken by either the IP or spouse. See Long-term Immigrant Families; Recent Immigrant Families.

Long-term Immigrant Families: Families in which either the IP or spouse took up permanent residence in Canada on or before December 31, 1972.

Low Income Families: In this study, a low income family is one in which the combined annual income of the IP and spouse in two-parent families or total income of the IP in one-parent families fell below the 1987 low income cut-off points established by Statistics Canada. These low income cut-off points are set at levels where, on average, $58.5 \%$ of census family income is spent on food, clothing and shelter. Low income cut-off points vary according to the size of the family and community of residence. The terms "low income cut-off" and "poverty line" are often used synonymously. No correction was made in this study for families in which 1987 incomes were affected by the death of a parent, the dissolution of a marriage, or similar circumstances. Low-income status could be assigned only to those economic families which could be classified as census families as well.

One-Earner Couples: Two-parent families in which only the IP or the spouse was employed in the reference week.

One-Parent Family: A family in which at least one child is under 13 years of age and the IP is not residing with a spouse. NOTE: Married or common-law married IPs who do not reside with their spouse are considered one-parent families in this study even though they are still legally married.

Recent Immigrant Families: Families in which either the IP or spouse took up permanent residence in Canada on or after January 1, 1973.

Rural Area: All territories lying outside urban areas with populations less than 15,000.
Readers should note that this definition of rural departs from the usual Statistics Canada definition which defines rural as areas with populations of less than 1,000 .

Spouse: The family member who is married to or living in common-law with the IP. A spouse or partner not usually residing in the household with the IP is not considered to be a spouse for the purposes of this survey. See One-Parent Family.
Stay-At-Home Parent: An IP in a one-parent or two-parent family who does not work for pay or profit or as an unpaid family worker. See Work.

Total 1987 Income of IP: Total income of the IP consists of all money income receipts received during the 1987 calendar year from the following sources: wages and salaries (before deductions for taxes, pensions, etc.); net income from self-employment (including net income from farming, independent professional practice and roomers and boarders); investment income (i.e., interest, dividends, rental income); government payments (such as Family allowances, refundable provincial tax credits, child tax credit, federal sales tax credit); pensions (such as retirement pensions, annuities and superannuation); and miscellaneous income (e.g., scholarships, alimony, etc.).

Total 1987 Income of IP's Spouse: Total income of IP's spouse or partner is defined in the same way as for the IP.

Total 1987 Parental Income: The total 1987 income reported by the IP for both her/himself and the spouse or partner. NOTE: Total 1987 parental income corresponds to 1987 census family income in those families in which only one or both of the parents were income earners. No correction was made in cases in which 1987 or 1988 incomes were affected by the death of a parent, the dissolution of a marriage, or similar circumstances.

Two-Parent Family: A two-parent family is one in which the economic family consists of an IP and spouse or partner and at least one child under 13 years of age.

Urban Area: A continuously built-up area with a population concentration of 1,000 or more and a population density of 400 or more per square kilometre based on the 1986 census. Two sizes of population areas are distinguished: (1) Large urban centres with populations of 100,000 or greater, and (2) Mid-sized Urban Centres with populations ranging from 15,000 to 99,999 .

## Work and Study:

After School Hours: Weekday afternoons between 3:00 pm and 6:00 pm.
Compressed Work Week: A weekly pattern of work in which 35 or more hours of work are normally scheduled in fewer than five days.

Employed: An employed person is one who, during the reference week, did any work at a job or business, or who had a job but was not at work due to illness or disability, personal or family responsibilities, bad weather, labour dispute, vacation, or other reasons (excluding lay-off or hired but waiting to commence a job). A woman on maternity leave who did not work in the reference week is considered employed. See Work.

Employed Full-time: A person who usually works 30 or more hours per week in all jobs, with the exception of employees in certain occupations who, by contract, are considered to be full-time workers but who are prohibited from working 30 or more hours (e.g., airline pilots).

Employed Part-time: A person who usually works fewer than 30 hours per week at all jobs.

Employer Support: This term refers to a variety of ways in which an employer or employment situation is supportive of the roles and responsibilities of working parents. Employer supports include benefits such as extended parental leave policies, workplace child care, options for part-time employment or job-sharing, and flexibility in scheduling.

Evening Hours: Weekday evenings between $6: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ and $10: 00 \mathrm{pm}$.
Extended Work Week: A weekly pattern in which 40 or more hours of work are normally scheduled across six or seven days.

Flexibility in Work Arrangements: Work arrangements in which the hours of work can be flexible or the place of work is the home.

Industry and Occupation: The Labour Force survey provides information about occupation and industry attachment of employed persons and unemployed persons, as well as those not in the labour force, but who have held a job in the past five years. Since 1984, these statistics have been based on the 1980 Standard Occupational Classification and the 1980 Standard Industrial Classification.

Not in the Labour Force: Persons who, during the reference week, were neither employed nor unemployed, i.e., persons who were unwilling or unable to participate in the labour force.

Off-Shifting: In dual-earner families, a work pattern in which there is little or no overlap in the work schedules of the couple.

Serious Student: A serious student is one who engages in full- or part-time study to improve job opportunities or career development, or to increase earnings.

Shift Pattern: In this study, five categories of work shifts are defined relative to the parent's usual stop time on days worked in the reference week.

- Early day shift (finishing between 10:00 am and 3:00 pm)
- Day shift (finishing between 3:00 pm and 6:00 pm)
- Late day shift (finishing between 6:00 pm and 10:00 pm)
- Night shift (finishing between 10:00 pm and 10:00 am )
- Split, irregular or changing shifts

Split Shift: A pattern of work in which there are breaks of two or more hours between blocks of work on any given day excluding overtime hours.

Standard Work Week: A work schedule consisting of 30-40 hours of work normally occurring between 8:00 am and 6:00 pm from Monday to Friday.

Study: Study means attendance at a school, college or university. Attendance refers to taking a course (including correspondence courses) or program of instruction that could be counted towards a degree, certificate, or diploma. School or college refers to all types of public and private educational establishments such as high schools, community colleges, secretarial schools and vocational schools.

Personal interest courses such as night courses in pottery or woodworking are not credit courses unless they are part of a program of instruction that grants a degree, certificate or diploma.

Unlike the concepts of full-time and part-time work, being enroled as a fulltime or part-time student is not necessarily related to the number of hours of schooling undertaken each week. The classification of full- or part-time student in this study reflects how schools classify their students. See Serious Student.

Unemployed: An unemployed person is one who, during the reference week:
a. was without work, had actively looked for work in the past four weeks (ending with the reference week), and was available for work.
b. had not actively looked for work in the past four weeks but had been on layoff and was available for work. (Persons are classified as being on lay-off only when they expect to return to the job from which they were laid off.)
c. had not actively looked for work in the past four weeks but had a new job to start in four weeks or less from the reference week, and was available for work.

Variable Work Pattern: A general term referring to a pattern of work that is variable either in the number and/or scheduling of days worked from week to week, or in the scheduling of hours worked from day to day within a week. See Variable Work Schedule; Variable Work Week.

Variable Work Schedule: A work schedule characterized by significant variation in the beginning and/or ending time of work days in the reference week. Variability in work scheduling was categorized as minor (variation of less than two hours), moderate (variation between three and four hours), or major (variation of five or more hours between the earliest and latest start time, earliest and latest stop time, or total number of hours worked per day).

Variable Work Week: A pattern of work that varies from week to week. Workers may know these changes in advance as with rotating shifts. Alternatively, work days and work hours may not be known in advance, as in work done on an on-call basis such as supply teaching, nursing, free-lance work, or other casual labour.

Work: Work includes any activities performed for pay or profit; that is, paid work in the context of an employer-employee relationship, or self-employment. It also includes unpaid family work, i.e., unpaid work which contributes directly to the operation of a farm, business or professional practice owned or operated by a related member of the household. Pay includes cash payments and payment in kind, whether or not payment was received in the week or year the duties were performed. Work includes any periods of paid leave such as sabbatical, paid sick leave, etc. NOTE: The use of the term "work" in this sense does notimply that unpaid labour at home is not work in a more generic sense or that such contributions are not valued.

Work/Family/Child Care Tension: The amount of tension or personal discomfort reported by IPs who worked in the reference week or the amount they experience on a general basis in juggling work, family, and child care responsibilities. This term is related to concepts of role conflict, role strain, workfamily interference, and work-family conflict.

Work Preference: The IP's preference to work full-time, part-time, or not to work at a job or business.
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## The Canadian National Child Care Study

is a collaborative research project among four members of the

National Day Care Research Network, Statistics Canada, and Health and Welfare Canada.

It was designed to provide comprehensive and reliable information about


Canadian families and their child care arrangements, parental work patterns, and factors that affect families as they strive to maintain their family's economic well-being and meet the needs of their children.

Major research reports based on the study can be ordered directly from Statistics Canada.

## Introductory Report

Where are the children? An overview of child care arrangements in Canada Where are the children? An analysis of child care arrangements used while parents

## work or study <br> Parental work patterns and child care needs

Work place benefits and flexibility: A perspective on parents' experiences
Patterns of child care in one-and two-parent families
Stay-at-home parents: An option for Canadian families
Canadian child care in context: Perspectives from the Provinces and Territories

Additional research reports are being planned that will address:

- Infant Care
- Care for School-Age Children
- Family Day Care Arrangements
- Urban and Rural Families
- Immigrant Families and Their Child Care Arrangements
- Children with Special Needs
- Work, Family and Child Care
- Affordability and Availability of Child Care Alternatives
- Perceived Effects of Child Care Experiences on Children and Their Parents
- Inter-Provincial Differences in Child Care Use Patterns

Researchers can obtain a copy of the public use microdata tape of the National Child Care Survey and a copy of the Microdata Users' Guide by contacting the Special Surveys Group, Household Surveys Division of Statistics Canada.


[^0]:    1 Numbers were supplied by Statistics Canada.
    Numbers may not add due to rounding.

[^1]:    Three separate instruments were used to collect the requisite information from respondents to the National Child Care Survey. NCCS interviews were administered either over the telephone or in person in the parent's official language of choice by trained Statistics Canada interviewers. Approximately $90 \%$ of the interviews were administered over the telephone, usually in one sitting. The remainder were in-person interviews. All instruments were available in English and French. Outlines of the content of each research instrument follows. Copies of the actual questionnaires are included as Appendix A.

[^2]:    1 Income received by the interviewed parent and spouse or partner in two-parent families in 1987 from gross income from wages and salaries, net income from self-employment, transfer payments (Family Allowance, UIC, Social Assistance, CPP/QPP or Old Age Security), and other income sources including investment income, scholarships, alimony, private pensions.
    2 No correction was made for instances of death or divorce occurring in 1987 or intervening between 1987 and September, 1988.

[^3]:    

[^4]:     govermment in provision of service (e.g. act as cerifying body

    Service

    Organization

