

**Non-Parent Caretakers of
Child-Only Families First Cases:
Evidence from Tennessee and Davidson County**

A Report to the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County

Metropolitan Social Services

Prepared by the

Center for Business and Economic Research

The University of Tennessee

May 2006

This project is funded under an agreement with the Metropolitan Social Services Office of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, with non-financial support from the Tennessee Department of Human Services. The views encompassed in this research do not necessarily reflect the views of Metropolitan Social Services or the Tennessee Department of Human Services.

Executive Summary

While U.S. welfare programs have traditionally targeted single-parent households, the “child-only” caseload is large and growing. The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County’s Office of Metropolitan Social Services contracted with the University of Tennessee’s Center for Business and Economic Research to conduct a study of this important but often-overlooked segment of the welfare caseload. MSS desires to learn more about child-only cases with non-parent caretakers in Davidson County, such that a menu of enhanced services can be developed for the broader population of kinship caregivers. Non-parental child-only cases involve situations in which children reside with family members other than their own parents or non-related legal guardians, most often grandparents, great-grandparents, aunts, or uncles. These cases, which comprise about 60 percent of Tennessee’s child-only caseload, are likely to have different needs than typical Families First assistance groups.

Our study presents the first detailed statistical portrait of the current non-parent child-only caseload in Davidson County. We supplement administrative data from monthly Families First records with a detailed survey of non-parent caretakers of child-only cases in Davidson County. Of the 10,277 child-only cases with non-parent caretakers in the state of Tennessee, 1,285 resided in Davidson County and 617 were surveyed for this report.

We find that non-parent caretakers of child-only cases in Davidson County are quite different from statewide averages in several important ways. They are less likely to be married and less likely to be grandparents of the eligible children. They are younger, more likely to be Black, and less likely to be disabled or to receive SSI than state averages. They received slightly more in Food Stamps and other unearned income. They are less likely to own a vehicle and more likely to rent than own their current housing. They also face higher monthly payments for mortgages, property taxes, and utility bills. Results indicate that non-parent caretakers of child-only cases are generally better off than caretakers of non-child-only cases. That said, a significant percentage of our Davidson County survey sample report having one or more difficulties. The areas for the most immediate and cost-effective impact appear to be information and referral, case management, education, and training.

A number of CBER researchers made significant contributions to this report. Angela Thacker compiled the administrative data file for the statistical analysis, which was conducted by Bryan Shone. Laura Ullrich reviewed prior studies and provided statistical support. We are grateful to Gerri Robinson, Edwina Chappell, and their colleagues at MSS for insightful comments, and to Glenda Shearon, Kerry Mullins, and their colleagues at TDHS for additional comments and for their cooperation regarding the administrative data used for this study.



Donald Bruce
Associate Professor and Project Director

Introduction

While U.S. welfare programs have traditionally been targeted at single-parent households, benefits are also available for children who are in the care of otherwise-ineligible adults. So-called “child-only” welfare cases are growing in number and as a share of the total welfare caseload throughout the state of Tennessee.

The proportion of assistance groups that are classified as child-only has been growing steadily since large-scale welfare reforms were passed in 1996.¹ Nationally, the percentage of child-only families on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) nearly tripled from only 11.6 percent in 1990 to 34.5 percent in 2000 (Charlesworth, et al., 2004). Of course, this trend could reflect the general decline in non-child-only cases alongside steady or more slowly-declining growth in child-only cases.

Child-only cases can be classified into two groups: those with parental caretakers and those with non-parental caretakers. Parental child-only cases are ones in which the parent is ineligible for Families First benefits, most typically due to their receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) as a result of a disability. Other possible reasons include parents who have reached time limits or have received sanctions, and parents with illegal immigrant status.

A Non-parental child-only case involves a situation in which the child resides with a family member other than their parent or non-related legal guardian. The non-parental caretakers are most often the child’s grandparent, great-grandparent, aunt, or uncle. These cases, which comprise about 60 percent of Tennessee’s child-only caseload, are likely to have different needs than typical Families First assistance groups. Table 1 shows non-parent cases as a percentage of the total TANF caseload for Tennessee and surrounding states as of September 2005.

Table 1: Child-Only Caseloads in Tennessee and Surrounding States, September 2005

State	Total Families	Families with No Parent Present	
	N	N	%
Alabama	20,376	8,930	43.8%
Arkansas	8,487	4,393	51.8%
Georgia	37,748	24,839	65.8%
Kentucky	34,082	16,992	49.9%
Mississippi	14,828	7,310	49.3%
Missouri	39,271	11,239	28.6%
North Carolina	31,724	19,548	61.6%
Tennessee	69,769	17,962	25.7%
U.S. Total	1,887,855	834,426	44.2%

Source: Authors’ calculations from data at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov>.

Data from Virginia were not available.

¹ For additional details on the nature of the 1996 reforms and their implementation in Tennessee, see *Welfare Reform in Tennessee: A Summary of Families First Policy*, Center for Business and Economic Research, The University of Tennessee, 2000 (available at <http://bus.utk.edu/cber/welfare.htm>).

The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County's Office of Metropolitan Social Services contracted with the University of Tennessee's Center for Business and Economic Research to conduct a study of this important but often-overlooked segment of the welfare caseload. MSS desires to learn more about child-only cases with non-parent caretakers in Davidson County, such that a menu of enhanced services can be developed for the broader population of kinship caregivers.

Our study presents the first detailed statistical portrait of the current non-parent child-only caseload in Davidson County. We supplement detailed administrative data from the Admiral database of monthly Families First records, housed in CBER under an agreement with the Tennessee Department of Human Services, with a detailed survey of non-parent caretakers of child-only cases in Davidson County.² Comparisons are drawn between Davidson County data and statewide data where possible and appropriate.

Evidence from Earlier Studies of the Child-Only Caseload

Studies done across the country have found similar demographic characteristics among non-parent caretakers of child-only cases, namely that they are more likely to be older, married, and higher-income than either parental caretakers of child-only cases or caretakers of non-child-only cases. A recent Maryland study showed the median age of non-parental caretakers to be 53 years of age, with 90.3 percent being over age 35 (Hetling et. al, 2005). The Maryland study also found that non-parental caretakers are more likely to be married and have higher incomes than both parental child-only caretakers and traditional TANF caretakers. A similar study in South Carolina reported that 62 percent of all non-parental caretakers were over 50 years of age (Edelhoch, 2004). The South Carolina study also found that these caretakers had longer welfare histories, higher incomes, and were more likely to be married. Yet another study from New Jersey echoed the latter result, showing that 31 percent of non-parental caretakers are married compared to only 6 percent of traditional TANF caretakers (Wood and Strong, 2002). Reflecting a general theme, the New Jersey study also found that the mean age of non-parental caretakers is 51.6 compared to only 31.9 for traditional TANF caretakers.

One might argue that children living with caretakers who are (a) more likely to be married and (b) have higher incomes would be a positive thing. However, these children also face many difficulties within their living arrangements. For one, many of these children still have contact with a parent who is not raising them. This is especially important in cases where a family member is the non-parental caretaker. The Maryland study discussed above finds that children in non-parental caseloads are more likely to have prior involvement with Child Protective Services. In Maryland, 49.9 percent of children in non-parental child-only assistance groups have a past incident of child abuse, compared to 30.9 percent of children in parental child-only assistance groups. The New Jersey study points out that many children in these child-only cases have experienced extreme hardship prior to moving in with their current caretaker. After all, something must have happened to cause them to no longer live with their parent.

² CBER and MSS jointly thank the Tennessee Department of Human Services for their permission to use administrative data for this project. This report could not have been written without their cooperation.

Common reasons include abandonment, incarcerated parents and child abuse. These hardships can lead to continued problems at home and in school.

A good deal of attention has been paid nationwide to the needs of both the children and caretakers in non-parental child-only assistance groups. A recent study prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (Gibbs, et al., 2004) analyzed how states respond to these needs. Their analysis of five states (Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, Washington, and Wisconsin) indicates that children who live in non-parental assistance groups may receive other income maintenance supports in addition to TANF. These include food stamps, medical coverage, and child care. The percentage of assistance groups receiving these additional income supports varies greatly. In Louisiana more than 80 percent of relative non-parental assistance groups receive food stamps compared to only 15 percent in Wisconsin. Because non-parental caretakers tend to have relatively higher incomes, they may be ineligible for many of these programs. Therefore, states must investigate whether these caretakers should receive benefits and/or services outside of the typical programs available for low income families.

Many states have struggled recently with the determination of non-parental child-only benefit levels. Children in non-parental child-only cases are at high risk of entering the state foster care system. States have obvious incentives to keep these children living with family and out of foster care. The issue is complicated by the fact that in most states, foster care benefits are substantially higher than child-only TANF benefits. This has led many states to increase the payments given to *relative* non-parental caretakers compared to *non-relative* caretakers. This is done to encourage a relative to maintain custody of the child so that they do not end up living in a non-relative situation or in the state foster care system. Some states, including Oklahoma and Wisconsin, have increased benefits to levels equal to foster care benefits. In addition, these states provide full support for each child rather than the incremental increases provided by child-only TANF (Gibbs, et al., 2004). For example, a one-child assistance group in Oklahoma receives a \$300 monthly benefit and an assistance group with two children receives \$600.

As the percentage of TANF cases classified as child-only increases, it will undoubtedly become increasingly important to evaluate the well-being and ongoing needs of this segment of the population. We now turn to a detailed analysis of administrative data on non-parental caretakers of child-only cases in Tennessee, with particular emphasis on the many ways in which Davidson County data differ from statewide averages.

Characteristics of Non-Parent Caretakers from Tennessee Administrative Data

Our primary data source is an extract from the Admiral database of administrative Families First records from October 2005. We identified 10,277 child-only cases with non-parent caretakers in the state of Tennessee, of which 1,285 resided in Davidson County. This subset of Davidson County data served as the starting point for our survey of non-parent caretakers in Davidson County as described in the next section. In the tables that follow in this section, we provide a wealth of information on the caseload in question for Tennessee as a whole and for Davidson County in particular. Prior research has identified important differences in caseload needs by both the marital status and the relationship of the caretaker, so all tables show overall breakdowns in addition to cross-tabulations by marital status and relationship. We begin with a look at the distribution of these characteristics in our data.

Table A1 reveals that about one-third of Tennessee NPCO caretakers and about one-fifth of Davidson County NPCO caretakers are married. These are both well above the 8.8 percent of non-child-only caretakers who were reported as married in the 2003 *Families First Case Characteristics Study (CCS)*.³ We combine all other marital statuses into one “Non-Married” category for most of the remainder of our report. In terms of relationship categories in Table A2, most non-parent caretakers are grandparents of the children in their care (about 64 percent in Tennessee and 56 percent in Davidson County). Interestingly, non-parent caretakers in Davidson County are significantly less likely to be grandparents and more likely to be aunts, uncles, or “other” than in the statewide data. We retain this three-category structure throughout the report.⁴

Table A1: Marital Status

Tennessee			Davidson County		
Marital Status	Frequency	Percent	Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Married	3328	32.38	Married	260	20.23
Single	2676	26.04	Single	568	44.20
Divorced	1867	18.17	Divorced	171	13.31
Separated	1531	14.90	Separated	195	15.18
Widowed	875	8.51	Widowed	91	7.08
Total	10277	100.00	Total	1285	100.00

Table A2: Relationship Codes

Tennessee			Davidson County		
Relationship To Caretaker	Frequency	Percent	Relationship To Caretaker	Frequency	Percent
Grandparent	6622	64.43	Grandparent	715	55.64
Aunt/Uncle	2342	22.79	Aunt/Uncle	354	27.55
Other	1314	12.78	Other	216	16.81
Total	10277	100.00	Total	1285	100.00

³ The *Families First Case Characteristics Study* is a regular report of the University of Tennessee Center for Business and Economic Research. It and other useful references may be found at <http://cber.bus.utk.edu/welfare.htm>.

⁴ Great-grandparents are included in the “Other” category. Also, to be more precise, since over 95 percent of non-parent caretakers in our data are female, most are grandmothers and aunts.

Table A3: Relationship Codes by Marital Status

Tennessee

		Relationship To Caretaker			
	MARITAL STATUS	Overall	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Married	Married	32.38	33.34	33.13	26.20
Non-Married	Single	26.04	18.35	37.45	44.48
	Divorced	18.17	22.56	10.55	9.60
	Separated	14.90	15.40	15.76	10.81
	Widowed	8.51	10.34	3.12	8.91
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County

		Relationship To Caretaker			
	MARITAL STATUS	Overall	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Married	Married	20.23	21.12	22.60	13.43
Non-Married	Single	44.20	33.57	53.67	63.89
	Divorced	13.31	18.74	7.34	5.09
	Separated	15.18	16.92	14.69	10.19
	Widowed	7.08	9.65	1.69	7.41
	Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

Non-parent caretakers of child-only cases are slightly younger in Davidson County than for the state as a whole, as shown in Table A4. Average ages reflect the findings from other states as described above. These caretakers are also decidedly older on average than the typical Families First caretaker, as the 2003 CCS reports an overall average age of 33.1. For both Tennessee and Davidson County, married caretakers and grandparents are older than non-married caretakers and those in other relationship categories.

Table A4: Average Age

Tennessee

		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE AGE	50.2	51.1	49.8	54.9	41.2	42.8
Frequency	10277	3328	6949	6622	2342	1313

Davidson County

		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE AGE	48.6	50.3	48.1	55.3	40.4	39.6
Frequency	1285	260	1025	715	354	216

The racial distribution of non-parent caretakers is strikingly different in Davidson County than for Tennessee as a whole (Table A5). While about 54 percent are Black in Tennessee, nearly 75 percent are Black in Davidson County. These statistics, when compared to similar numbers from the 2003 CCS, do not suggest dramatic differences between the racial distribution of non-parent child-only caretakers and the overall Families First caseload.

Table A5: Race

Tennessee

RACE	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Black	53.86	30.29	65.15	49.06	61.74	63.98
White	45.35	68.78	34.13	50.38	37.11	34.73
Hispanic	0.53	0.57	0.50	0.35	0.77	0.99
Asian	0.14	0.24	0.09	0.14	0.17	0.08
Indian	0.09	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.13	0.23
Other	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.09	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County

RACE	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Black	74.63	54.62	79.71	69.93	79.66	81.94
White	23.35	42.31	18.54	28.53	17.80	15.28
Hispanic	1.48	1.92	1.37	0.84	1.98	2.78
Asian	0.16	0.38	0.10	0.28	0.00	0.00
Indian	0.08	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.00	0.00
Other	0.31	0.77	0.20	0.28	0.56	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

Table A6 shows that about 35 percent of Tennessee caretakers and 27 percent of Davidson County caretakers are disabled (as defined by Families First records). Only about 19 and 15 percent, respectively, receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) as shown in Table A7. Interestingly, non-married caretakers and grandparents were more likely to be disabled and to receive SSI.

Table A6: Disability as defined by Families First

Tennessee

DISABLED	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	34.73	27.04	38.41	42.24	17.08	28.33
No	65.27	72.96	61.59	57.76	82.92	71.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County

DISABLED	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	26.85	14.23	30.05	36.78	11.58	18.98
No	73.15	85.77	69.95	63.22	88.42	81.02
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

Table A7: Supplemental Security Income Receipt

Tennessee

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	19.20	10.22	23.50	23.42	10.16	14.01
No	80.80	89.78	76.50	76.58	89.84	85.99
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	14.63	5.38	16.98	20.28	6.50	9.26
No	85.37	94.62	83.02	79.72	93.50	90.74
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

Tables A8 through A12 provide some interesting detail on the sources and amounts of income received by non-parent caretakers of child-only cases. Families First benefit amounts do not seem to vary among the various sub-groups in Table A8, but caretakers in Davidson County are slightly more likely to receive Food Stamps (62 percent versus 58 percent for Tennessee) and received slightly larger amounts on average (Table A9).⁵ These findings suggest that Food Stamp use among non-parent caretakers of child-only cases is toward the upper end of the distribution found in prior studies as noted above. Table A10 shows that Davidson County caretakers also have slightly more unearned income per month, which includes virtually any source of income other than Families First and Food Stamp benefits and work-related (i.e., earned) income. A smaller share of Davidson County caretakers receive pass-through child support, but those who do receive it get larger dollar amounts each month on average (Tables A11 and A12).

Table A8: Average Families First benefit (dollars per month)

		Tennessee					
		Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
		Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE FAMILY FIRST BENEFITS		161.92	162.35	161.70	165.13	156.31	155.59
Frequency		10072	3267	6805	6500	2303	1269

		Davidson County					
		Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
		Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE FAMILY FIRST BENEFITS		160.47	161.66	160.17	164.33	156.14	154.59
Frequency		1257	256	1001	703	349	205

Table A9: Average amount received in food stamps among those who receive food stamps (dollars per month)

		Tennessee					
		Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
		Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE FOOD STAMP AMOUNT		281.41	276.86	282.48	251.37	344.32	320.36
Frequency		5981	1142	4839	3830	1305	846

		Davidson County					
		Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
		Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
AVERAGE FOOD STAMP AMOUNT		301.07	325.96	297.61	249.54	377.95	340.25
Frequency		794	97	697	431	212	151

⁵ Families First benefit amounts vary directly with the number of children in the child-only assistance group. It should also be noted that, in contrast to Families First, the Food Stamp eligibility process considers the caretaker's income and resources and also considers everyone in the household.

Table A10: Average amount received in unearned income (dollars per month)

Tennessee						
AVERAGE MONTHLY UNEARNED INCOME AMOUNT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	276.12	261.32	283.81	274.11	271.97	293.90
Frequency	1808	618	1190	1189	393	226

Davidson County						
AVERAGE MONTHLY UNEARNED INCOME AMOUNT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	311.14	289.07	315.93	305.40	316.08	322.11
Frequency	168	30	138	93	48	27

Table A11: Percent receiving pass-through child support

Tennessee						
PASS THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	30.47	31.73	29.86	32.92	26.86	24.52
No	69.53	68.27	70.14	67.08	73.14	75.48
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County:						
PASS THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	22.96	17.69	24.29	22.94	24.01	21.30
No	77.04	82.31	75.71	77.06	75.99	78.70
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

Table A12: Average amount received from pass-through child support among those who receive pass-through child support (dollars per month)

Tennessee						
AVERAGE MONTHLY PASS THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT AMOUNT FOR THOSE RECEIVING P.T.C.S.	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	181.35	196.97	173.39	181.67	182.77	176.34
Frequency	3131	1056	2075	2180	629	322

Davidson County						
AVERAGE MONTHLY PASS THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT AMOUNT FOR THOSE RECEIVING P.T.C.S.	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	193.59	204.34	191.60	189.58	188.64	217.03
Frequency	295	46	249	164	85	46

As shown in Table A13, slightly more than half of Tennessee’s non-parent caretakers own a vehicle, while only about 42 percent of Davidson County’s caretakers own a vehicle. This difference likely reflects the greater availability of public transit options, and thus the lower need for owning a vehicle, in Davidson County.

Table A13: Ownership of a vehicle

Tennessee

VEHICLE	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	51.06	52.22	50.50	52.34	48.98	48.29
No	48.94	47.78	49.50	47.66	51.02	51.71
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,277]

Davidson County

VEHICLE	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Yes	42.02	45.00	41.27	40.00	45.76	42.59
No	57.98	55.00	58.73	60.00	54.24	57.41
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,285]

The next few tables from administrative data pertain to monthly expenses on housing or housing-related costs such as insurance, property taxes, and utilities. Perhaps unsurprisingly, our data contain more renters than owner-occupants. About 47 percent of Tennessee’s caretakers report paying rent, while another 22 percent report making a monthly mortgage payment. In Davidson County, these figures are 58 percent and 17 percent, respectively. While average rent payments in Davidson County are similar to the statewide average (Table A14), monthly mortgage payments are more than \$140 higher in Davidson County among those paying a mortgage (Table A15).

Less than 10 percent of non-parent caretaker records include a monthly home insurance payment, and the average monthly payment in Davidson County is very similar to the statewide average (Table A16). A slightly larger percentage has non-missing property tax information, with monthly amounts nearly twice as high in Davidson County as in the statewide data (Table A17). This may reflect differences in ownership rates and house values among these caretakers as well as differences in statutory property tax rates. Monthly utility bills are also significantly higher in Davidson County among the roughly 60 percent of caretakers with non-missing data (Table A18). The statewide average monthly utility bill is about \$273, compared to an average in Davidson County of about \$450.

Table A14: Average amount spent on rent among those who rent (dollars per month)

Tennessee						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY RENT AMOUNT AMONG RENTERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	359.78	381.27	355.72	345.02	394.64	364.17
Frequency	4804	764	4040	2980	1181	643

Davidson County						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY RENT AMOUNT AMONG RENTERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	356.29	463.11	343.93	352.81	366.54	348.33
Frequency	742	77	665	400	226	116

Table A15: Average amount spent on a mortgage among homeowners (dollars per month)

Tennessee						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY MORTGAGE AMOUNT AMONG HOMEOWNERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	493.78	514.13	484.08	465.64	557.30	543.63
Frequency	2299	742	1557	1557	499	243

Davidson County						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY MORTGAGE AMOUNT AMONG HOMEOWNERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	635.34	702.66	609.18	577.23	722.57	751.42
Frequency	218	61	157	136	56	26

Table A16: Average amount spent on home insurance among those who have home insurance (dollars per month)

Tennessee						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY HOME INSURANCE AMOUNT AMONG HOME OWNERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	52.19	45.27	55.92	50.66	44.71	71.48
Frequency	828	290	538	609	123	96

Davidson County						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
AVERAGE MONTHLY HOME INSURANCE AMOUNT AMONG HOME OWNERS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	59.11	50.89	62.11	48.98	51.04	118.81
Frequency	56	15	41	44	4	8

Table A17: Average amount spent on property taxes among homeowners (dollars per month)

Tennessee

AVERAGE MONTHLY PROPERTY TAX AMOUNT AMONG HOME OWNERS	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	46.43	38.76	50.54	44.55	57.62	44.89
Frequency	1103	385	718	819	155	129

Davidson County

AVERAGE MONTHLY PROPERTY TAX AMOUNT AMONG HOME OWNERS	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	89.60	82.27	92.90	92.86	63.38	82.39
Frequency	71	22	49	58	5	8

Table A18: Average amount spent on utilities such as coal and wood, electricity, fuel and oil, gas, telephone, trash removal, water and sewer, or other utilities (dollars per month)

Tennessee

AVERAGE MONTHLY UTILITIES AMOUNT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	272.66	304.53	264.48	270.07	307.55	226.20
Frequency	6088	1243	4845	3913	1367	808

Davidson County

AVERAGE MONTHLY UTILITIES AMOUNT	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
	450.04	242.05	485.66	628.33	204.67	212.89
Frequency	814	119	695	469	219	126

The Admiral database permits us to explore the history of program usage among active cases. The data reveal that child-only cases with non-parent caretakers have experienced an average of 1.3 spells since the program began in September 1996, with the average only slightly lower for the Davidson County data (Table A19). As shown in Table A20, the vast majority—about 81 percent—have only one spell, while most of the rest have only two spells in the data. Very few have more than two spells.

Table A19: Total Number of Spells on Families First

Tennessee						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
NUMBER OF SPELLS	1.2667	1.1785	1.2667	1.2651	1.1973	1.1741
Frequency	10243	3322	6921	6608	2337	1298

Davidson County						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
NUMBER OF SPELLS	1.2242	1.1385	1.2461	1.2619	1.1836	1.1651
Frequency	1280	260	1020	714	354	212

Table A20: Distribution of Spell Counts

Tennessee						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
NUMBER OF SPELLS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
1	81.13	85.37	79.09	79.13	84.04	86.06
2	14.93	11.83	16.41	16.39	13.05	10.86
3	3.15	2.41	3.51	3.57	2.18	2.77
4	0.62	0.36	0.75	0.71	0.60	0.23
5	0.13	0.03	0.17	0.14	0.13	0.08
6	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.00
Frequency	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 10,243]

Davidson County						
		Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
NUMBER OF SPELLS	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
1	81.02	87.69	79.31	78.29	83.33	86.32
2	16.09	10.77	17.45	18.21	14.97	10.85
3	2.50	1.54	2.75	2.80	1.69	2.83
4	0.31	0.00	0.39	0.56	0.00	0.00
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6	0.08	0.00	0.10	0.14	0.00	0.00
Frequency	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[n = 1,280]

As would be expected with child-only cases (where time limits and work requirements might not be present), our data indicate that cumulative program usage and current spell lengths are quite long. Table A21 shows that child-only cases with non-parent caretakers have been on Families First for an average of 44 months (46 months in Davidson County) since the program began. Current spells average 39 to 40 months in length (Table A22). Compared to data for the entire Families First caseload from the 2003 CCS, these results indicate that child-only cases with non-parent caretakers have fewer yet longer spells of assistance.⁶

Table A21: Total Number of Months on Families First

Tennessee						
	Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHS ON	43.86	41.87	44.82	46.14	41.68	36.22
Frequency	10243	3322	6921	6608	2337	1298

Davidson County						
	Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHS ON	45.68	45.52	45.72	48.80	44.24	37.54
Frequency	1280	260	1020	714	354	212

Table A22: Length of Most Recent Spell (Months)

Tennessee						
	Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
NUMBER OF MONTHS ON LAST SPELL	39.01	38.32	39.34	40.80	37.36	32.87
Frequency	10243	3322	6921	6608	2337	1298

Davidson County						
	Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
NUMBER OF MONTHS ON LAST SPELL	40.37	41.37	40.11	43.03	39.19	33.37
Frequency	1280	260	1020	714	354	212

To summarize our analysis of administrative records for non-parent caretakers of child-only Families First cases, we find that caretakers in Davidson County are quite different from statewide averages in several important ways. They are less likely to be married and less likely to be grandparents of the eligible children. They are younger, more likely to be Black, and less likely to be disabled or to receive SSI than state averages. They received slightly more in Food Stamps and other unearned income. They are less likely to own a vehicle and more likely to rent than own their current housing. They also face higher monthly payments for mortgages, property taxes, and utility bills.

⁶ To be sure, it would be better to compare our child-only data with more recent information on the overall Families First caseload. Unfortunately, the latest *Families First Case Characteristics Study* (2005) was undergoing final revisions by the Center for Business and Economic Research as this report was going to press.

Survey Design and Methods

It is well-known that administrative records, which are designed to track eligibility and determine benefit amounts, provide precious little detail on caretaker well being. While they provide important information on the composition of the caseload, those data must be supplemented with more detailed survey data. To this end, CBER contracted with the University of Tennessee's Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to conduct a telephone survey of non-parent caretakers of child-only Families First cases in Davidson County. A total of 1,285 non-parent caretakers were identified in the Admiral database as of October 2005, as described above. We were able to achieve a better than 3.0 percent margin of error by obtaining 617 completed interviews in this survey effort. The survey was conducted in November and December of 2005.⁷ What follows is a series of detailed tabulations of the survey data. We emphasize that the tables in this section are based on a survey sample of 617 non-parent caretakers of child-only cases in Davidson County. Table entries are column percentages unless otherwise noted.

While only 20 percent of the Davidson County caretakers are reported as married in the administrative data (Table A1 above), Table S1 shows that nearly 36 percent of our survey respondents reported being married.⁸ Also, according to the responses in Table S2, slightly more than half reported that at least one other adult lives in their home. Nearly 48 percent of the non-parent caretakers in our survey were the only adult in the home. About 59 percent of these caretakers are receiving Families First benefits for only one child (Table S3). Another 25 percent are receiving benefits for two children, with the remaining 15 percent receiving benefits for more than two children.

Table S1: Are you currently married?

Response	Overall	Relationship To Caretaker		
		Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	64.05	65.15	58.90	69.74
yes	35.78	34.58	41.10	30.26
refusal	0.16	0.27	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S2: How many other adults live in the home?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
0	47.39	9.46	59.48	47.45	47.85	46.05
1	39.54	68.24	30.39	40.21	36.20	43.42
2	8.82	14.86	6.90	9.12	9.82	5.26
3	2.12	5.41	1.08	1.34	3.68	2.63
4	0.33	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.61	1.32
5	0.16	0.68	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00
don't know	1.63	0.00	2.16	1.61	1.84	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

⁷ The entire survey instrument can be found in the Appendix.

⁸ Tables in this section that provide data by marital status are based on marital status as determined from administrative data rather than survey data.

Table S3: How many children are you receiving Families First benefits for?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
1	59.31	61.49	58.62	59.52	60.12	56.58
2	25.16	25.00	25.22	24.93	25.77	25.00
3	9.48	9.46	9.48	9.12	9.82	10.53
4	4.25	3.38	4.53	4.83	1.84	6.58
5	0.65	0.00	0.86	0.54	1.23	0.00
6	0.33	0.68	0.22	0.27	0.61	0.00
7	0.65	0.00	0.86	0.80	0.61	0.00
don't know	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.00	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Our survey included several questions about the circumstances surrounding the non-parental care of the children in the household. Table S4 reveals that about 35 percent are involved as a result of a court order or Department of Children’s Services (DCS) involvement. Slightly more than 12 percent reported that the child’s parents were incarcerated, while another 9 percent reported that the child’s parents were deceased. While about 69 percent of the respondents reported that the children have some involvement with their biological parents (Table S5), about 79 percent reported that they viewed their caretaker status as permanent, not temporary (Table S6).

Table S4: Why are you caring for these children?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
court order or dcs involvement	35.13	40.54	33.41	33.24	37.42	39.47
child's parents are temporarily unable	29.74	27.03	30.60	31.10	31.29	19.74
other	12.91	14.86	12.28	12.06	12.27	18.42
child's parents are incarcerated	12.25	8.11	13.58	12.87	8.59	17.11
child's parents are deceased	9.48	9.46	9.48	10.19	9.82	5.26
don't know	0.33	0.00	0.43	0.27	0.61	0.00
refusal	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.27	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S5: Do these children have any involvement with their biological parents?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
yes	68.77	64.18	70.24	72.54	65.31	58.33
no	30.69	35.07	29.29	26.87	34.69	40.28
don't know	0.54	0.75	0.48	0.60	0.00	1.39
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S6: Do you consider the fact that you are caring for these children to be a permanent or temporary arrangement?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
permanent	78.92	81.08	78.23	79.09	80.37	75.00
temporary	14.71	13.51	15.09	14.21	15.34	15.79
refusal	6.37	5.41	6.68	6.70	4.29	9.21
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

The primary intent of our survey was to assess the needs of non-parent caretakers in Davidson County, such that additional services might be designed and provided by MSS officials. The next tables in this section address the following potential areas of need:

- transportation
- health care
- child care
- education and skill level
- housing, economic, and food security
- counseling, and
- income sources and adequacy.

Beginning with transportation, our survey results indicate that nearly 68 percent of Davidson County caretakers have access to a car, truck or vehicle. Recall from the administrative data in Table A13 above that 42 percent were coded as owning a vehicle themselves. The survey data suggest that car access is more extensive among this population than is car ownership, with about 68 percent reporting that someone living in the house owns a car, truck, or other vehicle (Table S7). Access is indeed extensive, as over 87 percent of those with a vehicle in the household have access to it “all of the time” as indicated in Table S8. Only about 5 percent report never having access to the vehicle. Table S9 provides detail on several other forms of transportation used by survey respondents, with riding with friends or family being most common (40 percent). About 27 percent report riding the bus or other mass transit and 11 percent report using taxis that they themselves pay for. Only about 8 percent use state-sponsored van or taxi service.

Table S7: Do you, or does anybody else living in your house, own a car, truck or other vehicle?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
yes	67.81	92.57	59.91	65.95	70.55	71.05
no	32.03	7.43	39.87	34.05	28.83	28.95
refusal	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.61	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S8: How often do you have access to this vehicle for going to work, school, training, or running errands?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
all of the time	87.23	84.67	88.49	85.77	93.04	81.48
most of the time	5.06	3.65	5.76	6.10	3.48	3.70
some of the time	2.41	5.11	1.08	2.85	0.87	3.70
never	5.06	6.57	4.32	5.28	2.61	9.26
refusal	0.24	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.00	1.85
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S9: Do you use any of these other forms of transportation?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
ride with friend or family	39.71	26.35	43.97	41.29	36.20	39.47
none of the above	39.05	50.68	35.34	37.00	46.63	32.89
bus or other mass transit that you pay for	26.80	14.86	30.60	28.15	24.54	25.00
taxi that you pay for	10.62	5.41	12.28	9.92	9.82	15.79
free van or taxi paid for by tennicare or other non-dhs agency	7.84	6.08	8.41	9.38	3.68	9.21
other	2.45	1.35	2.80	2.68	1.84	2.63
don't know	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.27	0.00	0.00
refusal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Turning to the issue of health care, Tables S10 and S11 reveal that about 44 percent of the caretakers and nearly all of the children in their care are covered by TennCare, Medicaid, or Medicare.⁹ Importantly, nearly 18 percent of the caretakers report having no health insurance coverage. Caretakers report in Table S12 that about 26 percent of the children in their care have some form of condition that limits the caretaker's ability to work, go to school, or do other activities. Respondents have rather poor self-reported health status, with about 44 percent claiming to be in fair or poor health (Table S13). Grandparents report poorer health status on average than other non-parental caretakers.

Table S10: Are you, yourself, covered by any of the following types of health insurance?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
tenncare, medicaid, or medicare	43.79	27.03	49.14	45.31	36.81	51.32
employer or union	32.35	50.68	26.51	31.10	38.04	26.32
no insurance coverage	17.97	14.86	18.97	18.77	19.63	10.53
other	7.19	7.43	7.11	6.70	6.75	10.53
champus, va, or other military plan	0.98	2.70	0.43	1.07	0.61	1.32

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S11: Are any of the children in your care covered by any of the following types of health insurance?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
tenncare, medicaid, or medicare	97.06	94.59	97.84	96.78	96.93	98.68
employer or union	3.10	7.43	1.72	2.68	4.91	1.32
other	0.82	0.00	1.08	1.07	0.61	0.00
no: none of the children are covered	0.65	2.03	0.22	0.27	1.23	1.32
I pay privately	0.33	0.68	0.22	0.00	0.00	2.63
their father or mother covers them	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.27	0.00	0.00
champus, va, or other military plan	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

⁹ All children in Families First cases are automatically covered by TennCare, so other reported coverage in Table S11 is likely to represent supplemental (and possibly superior) additional coverage.

Table S12: Do any of the children in your care have a physical, learning, behavioral, or mental health condition that makes it difficult for you to work, go to school, or do any other regular activities?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	73.32	74.32	73.00	73.12	74.85	71.05
yes	25.86	24.32	26.35	26.34	23.31	28.95
don't know	0.82	1.35	0.65	0.54	1.84	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S13: How would you rate your health?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
excellent	9.15	8.78	9.27	4.56	17.79	13.16
very good	12.58	12.16	12.72	8.31	17.18	23.68
good	32.68	37.84	31.03	34.32	30.67	28.95
fair	28.76	20.95	31.25	31.90	27.61	15.79
poor	15.52	18.92	14.44	19.30	6.13	17.11
don't know/missing	1.31	1.35	1.29	1.61	0.61	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

A significant number of responding caretakers reported at least one area of difficulty among a long list of standard activities of daily living (ADLs) in Table S14. The most common difficulty is with walking, reported by over 26 percent. More than 10 percent reported having difficulty getting in or out of bed or a chair, doing office tasks, or taking a bath or shower. Perhaps unsurprisingly, grandparents were much more likely than other caretakers to report difficulty with each of the items on the list. Table S14b provides additional information regarding health status and health insurance coverage among those reporting difficulty with each of the ADLs. While most of those reporting difficulty had health insurance, most were also in fair or poor health (listed as “Unhealthy” in the table).

Table S14: I am going to read you a list of daily activities. Do you have difficulty with any of the following because of a physical or mental health condition?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
walking	26.14	25.00	26.51	35.39	7.36	21.05
getting in or out of a bed or chair	17.81	21.62	16.59	21.72	7.98	19.74
doing light housework	15.36	14.19	15.73	20.11	4.91	14.47
going outside the home (shopping, doctor's office, etc.)	13.89	16.22	13.15	18.23	7.36	6.58
taking a bath or shower	12.42	11.49	12.72	16.09	4.91	10.53
driving an automobile	10.62	13.51	9.70	13.40	4.29	10.53
keeping track of money or bills	8.50	8.78	8.41	7.51	7.36	15.79
taking the right amount of medicine at the right time	7.35	7.43	7.33	7.77	4.91	10.53
preparing meals	7.03	8.78	6.47	7.77	6.75	3.95
using or getting to the toilet	6.54	7.43	6.25	8.04	1.84	9.21
dressing	5.88	7.43	5.39	8.04	1.84	3.95
eating	3.92	4.05	3.88	4.56	1.23	6.58
using the telephone	3.27	3.38	3.23	3.49	1.84	5.26
none of the above	53.27	55.41	52.59	46.92	69.33	50.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S14b: ADL Difficulty by Health Status and Health Insurance Coverage

Response	Healthy	Unhealthy	Insured	Uninsured
none of the above	72.48	27.52	77.37	22.63
walking	16.67	83.33	86.42	13.58
getting in or out of a bed or chair	17.43	82.57	82.57	17.43
doing light housework such as washing dishes or sweeping a floor	12.77	87.23	85.11	14.89
going outside the home, for example to shop or visit a doctor's office	18.60	81.40	93.02	6.98
taking a bath or shower	15.79	84.21	80.26	19.74
driving an automobile	22.73	77.27	87.88	12.12
keeping track of money or bills	18.87	81.13	86.79	13.21
taking the right amount of prescribed medicine at the right time	15.22	84.78	91.30	8.70
preparing meals	6.98	93.02	90.70	9.30
using or getting to the toilet	7.50	92.50	75.00	25.00
dressing	11.11	88.89	88.89	11.11
eating	8.33	91.67	95.83	4.17
using the telephone	30.00	70.00	80.00	20.00

Note: Entries are row percentages for those who report difficulty with each ADL. "Healthy" includes those who self-report their health status as Excellent, Very Good, or Good, while "Unhealthy" includes those who self-report as Fair or Poor. "Insured" includes those with any form of health insurance.

Respondents reported making an average of six trips to see a doctor or dentist in the last 12 months (Table S15), but many could not afford needed care (Table S16) or could not find a provider who accepted their health insurance coverage (Table S17).

Table S15: How many times have you been to the dentist or doctor in the last 12 months?

	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Average Response	6.00	5.49	6.16	6.85	4.65	4.64
Frequency	489	118	371	300	130	59

Table S16: In the last 12 months, was there a time you or the children in your care needed to see a doctor or needed a prescription filled, but you could not afford to pay for it?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	62.58	64.19	62.07	60.32	68.10	61.84
yes	37.25	35.81	37.72	39.41	31.90	38.16
don't know	0.16	0.00	0.22	0.27	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S17: In the last 12 months, was there a time when you or your children needed to see a doctor or dentist and you could not find one who would accept your health coverage?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	87.54	89.04	87.07	87.94	89.51	81.33
yes	12.20	10.96	12.50	11.53	10.49	18.67
don't know	0.33	0.00	0.43	0.54	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

A common concern with non-parent caretakers is how they manage child care responsibilities. Table S18 shows that less than half (47 percent) report not needing child care, while 32 percent have some form of child care arrangement and the remaining 21 percent do not have child care (but possibly need it). More employed respondents were likely to have or need child care than unemployed respondents, as shown in Table S18b.¹⁰ Among caretakers with child care arrangements, the children in their care are watched by someone else an average of 19 hours per week (Table S19).

Table S18: Do you currently have somebody to watch the children while you are working, looking for a job, in school or training, or doing other activities?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no - does not need child care	47.22	52.03	45.69	50.13	41.10	46.05
no - does not have child care	21.08	15.54	22.84	19.03	23.93	25.00
yes	31.70	32.43	31.47	30.83	34.97	28.95
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S18b: Child Care Arrangements by Employment Status

Response	Overall	Employed	Unemployed
no - does not need child care	47.40	34.85	56.82
no - does not have child care	21.10	15.53	25.28
yes	31.49	49.62	17.90

Table S19: During a typical week, how many hours are they watched by someone else?

	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Average Response	18.96	20.93	18.33	19.58	17.92	18.26
Frequency	178	43	135	107	52	19

¹⁰ Additional employment information is provided later in this report.

The next two tables reveal that the child care provider is most commonly some other relative (45 percent), although child care centers (22 percent) and friends (14 percent) are frequently used. A comparison with the 2003 CCS shows that the use of formal child care (e.g., centers) is much lower among child-only cases relative to the overall caseload. Perhaps unsurprisingly, employed caretakers were more likely to use child care centers and less likely to use friends and relatives than unemployed caretakers (Table S20b). Only about 21 percent receive subsidized child care from DHS (Table S21).

Table S20: Who usually watches them?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
other relative	44.85	39.58	46.58	46.09	40.35	50.00
child care center (includes family and group day care homes)	22.16	27.08	20.55	21.74	22.81	22.73
friend	13.92	8.33	15.75	10.43	22.81	9.09
older brother or sister	8.25	0.00	10.96	8.70	7.02	9.09
child's grandmother	7.73	8.33	7.53	3.48	14.04	13.64
child's grandfather	6.19	18.75	2.05	9.57	1.75	0.00
after-school program	6.19	8.33	5.48	8.70	1.75	4.55
biological mother	2.58	2.08	2.74	3.48	1.75	0.00
baby sitter in your home	2.58	0.00	3.42	2.61	1.75	4.55
biological father	1.55	0.00	2.05	0.87	3.51	0.00
refusal	1.03	0.00	1.37	0.87	1.75	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S20b: Child Care Type by Employment Status

Response	Overall	Employed	Unemployed
other relative	44.85	27.84	17.01
child care center (includes family and group day care homes)	22.16	18.56	3.61
friend	13.92	7.22	6.70
older brother or sister	8.25	5.15	3.09
child's grandmother	7.73	5.15	2.58
child's grandfather	6.19	4.12	2.06
after-school program	6.19	5.15	1.03
biological mother	2.58	0.52	2.06
baby sitter in your home	2.58	1.03	1.55
biological father	1.55	1.03	0.52
refusal	1.03	0.52	0.52

Table S21: Do any of the following help pay for your child care expenses?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
I pay it all	31.96	29.17	32.88	31.30	33.33	31.82
there is no cost for the child care I use	31.44	33.33	30.82	33.04	28.07	31.82
families first/dhs	20.62	18.75	21.23	20.87	19.30	22.73
other	6.70	10.42	5.48	5.22	12.28	0.00
one of the child's parents	1.55	2.08	1.37	1.74	1.75	0.00
refusal	0.52	0.00	0.68	0.00	1.75	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S22 reveals that about 40 percent have less than a high school education. Another 29 percent have a high school diploma or equivalent, with the remaining 31 percent having more than a high school education. About 6 percent have difficulty reading (Table S23). As shown in Table S24, more than half report one or more problems that limit their ability to work or go to school, and grandparents were more likely than others to report at least one limitation. Illness or injury is the most frequently-cited barrier (30 percent), followed by physical handicaps (15 percent).

Table S22: What is the highest grade or level of education you have ever completed?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
8th grade or less	8.54	8.84	8.44	8.63	6.17	13.16
9th grade to 11th grade	27.91	21.09	30.09	30.46	22.84	26.32
12th grade, but no diploma	3.45	2.04	3.90	2.96	4.32	3.95
certificate of completion	3.61	3.40	3.68	3.23	4.94	2.63
ged	6.24	8.16	5.63	6.47	6.17	5.26
high school diploma	18.72	12.93	20.56	19.41	17.90	17.11
some vocational/technical school	3.28	3.40	3.25	2.96	4.94	1.32
vocational certificate	2.96	3.40	2.81	2.70	3.70	2.63
some college	13.96	17.01	12.99	12.40	17.90	13.16
associates degree	5.42	8.84	4.33	6.74	3.09	3.95
bachelor degree	4.27	6.80	3.46	2.70	6.79	6.58
some graduate school	0.33	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.62	1.32
graduate or professional degree	1.15	3.40	0.43	1.35	0.62	1.32
don't know	0.16	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S23: How well can you read?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
very well, I can read anything I want to	66.39	66.89	66.23	64.52	69.14	69.74
fairly well, I can read most things	18.85	14.86	20.13	19.09	17.28	21.05
well enough, I can read what I have to	9.02	10.81	8.44	10.22	8.64	3.95
not very well, I have a lot of trouble	4.26	4.73	4.11	4.84	3.09	3.95
I can't read	1.48	2.70	1.08	1.34	1.85	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S24: Do you have any of the following problems that might make it difficult for you in work or school?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
none	42.48	45.27	41.59	37.53	51.53	47.37
an illness or injury that has lasted a long time	30.39	35.14	28.88	36.46	20.25	22.37
physical handicap	15.03	12.16	15.95	20.91	5.52	6.58
childcare, etc.	14.71	6.76	17.24	14.48	12.88	19.74
emotional problems	14.22	8.78	15.95	16.89	9.82	10.53
learning disability	6.54	6.76	6.47	5.36	8.59	7.89
an experience with violence or abuse	5.56	3.38	6.25	6.17	4.91	3.95
speech problems or disability	3.43	2.03	3.88	3.75	3.07	2.63
anything else I have not listed	3.27	4.73	2.80	3.75	3.68	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Turning to issues of housing adequacy, we find that while most respondents live in a house (Table S25) and most have lived in their current place of residence for two years or more (Table S26), the majority rent rather than own their current housing (Table S27). Married caretakers were far more likely to own rather than rent, however. These trends echo those from our administrative data analysis above. About 23 percent receive subsidized housing from MDHA or a similar organization (Table S28). The average monthly payment for housing (rent or mortgage), as shown in Table S29, is about \$527.

Table S25: Where do you live?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
house	72.22	85.81	67.89	75.60	68.71	63.16
apartment	25.98	9.46	31.25	22.79	28.22	36.84
mobile home	1.47	3.38	0.86	1.61	1.84	0.00
emergency shelter	0.16	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.00
other	0.16	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.61	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S26: How long have you lived there?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
1-2 months	1.96	1.35	2.16	1.61	1.84	3.95
3-6 months	7.35	4.05	8.41	7.51	6.75	7.89
7-11 months	6.21	7.43	5.82	5.36	6.75	9.21
12-18 months	7.03	5.41	7.54	7.24	7.98	3.95
19-23 months	3.59	2.70	3.88	3.75	1.84	6.58
2 years or more	73.86	79.05	72.20	74.53	74.85	68.42
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S27: Do you rent or own?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
rent a home or apartment	53.27	28.38	61.21	52.28	53.37	57.89
own your home	42.81	68.92	34.48	44.24	41.10	39.47
pay money to a friend or relative to live with them	1.80	0.00	2.37	1.88	1.84	1.32
live rent-free with friend, relative, or in a shelter	1.47	1.35	1.51	1.07	2.45	1.32
other	0.65	1.35	0.43	0.54	1.23	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S28: Is a public housing authority, sometimes called MDHA, or some similar agency helping you pay the cost for the place you live in right now? This may include section 8, subsidized or public housing.

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	76.41	93.10	71.12	76.69	76.73	74.32
yes	23.42	6.90	28.67	23.31	22.64	25.68
don't know	0.17	0.00	0.22	0.00	0.63	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S29: How much did you pay for rent or mortgage last month (not counting what you get in housing assistance)?

	Marital Status			Relationship To Caretaker		
	Overall	Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Average Response	526.60	665.95	487.34	518.68	540.08	532.69
Frequency	505	111	394	296	145	64

Turning to the general issue of economic security, we find that roughly one-quarter of our survey respondents report having had phone or electric service shut off in the last 12 months due to an inability to pay a bill (Table S30). A slightly smaller percentage cut the size of meals or skipped meals during the previous month, as shown in Table S31. Food security appears to be an important issue to non-parent caretakers, 58 percent of whom report receiving Food Stamps (Table S32) and just over 20 percent of whom report visiting a food pantry/bank (Table S33) in the past 12 months. Food security appears to be better among married caretakers.

Table S30: Has your phone, cell phone, or electricity been shut off in the last 12 months because you were unable to pay the bill?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	75.46	80.14	73.96	78.32	69.18	74.67
yes	24.38	19.86	25.82	21.41	30.82	25.33
don't know	0.17	0.00	0.22	0.27	0.00	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S31: Over the last month, how often did you cut the size of your meals or skip meals because you couldn't afford enough food?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
never	79.18	85.71	77.11	80.43	76.07	79.73
once or twice a week	7.54	3.40	8.86	6.97	6.75	12.16
less than once a week	7.05	5.44	7.56	6.43	9.82	4.05
more than twice a week	5.41	4.76	5.62	5.09	6.75	4.05
don't know	0.82	0.68	0.86	1.07	0.61	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S32: In the last 12 months, did you get food stamps?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
yes	58.17	34.46	65.73	58.71	56.44	59.21
no	41.83	65.54	34.27	41.29	43.56	40.79
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S33: In the last 12 months, have you been to a food pantry or food bank to get food because you could not afford groceries?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	79.58	84.46	78.02	76.41	88.96	75.00
yes	20.42	15.54	21.98	23.59	11.04	25.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

About 43 percent of responding caretakers reported working at a job or business for pay at the time of the survey (Table S34), and those who worked reported working an average of 37 hours per week (Table S35). During the prior 12 months, about one-fourth received SSI (Table S36), and 37 percent received Social Security (Table S37). Table S38 provides the distribution of total monthly family income, with less than 20 percent reporting more than \$2,000 per month. Married caretakers tend to report higher incomes than non-married caretakers.

Table S34: Are you currently employed at a job or business for pay?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	56.86	51.35	58.62	64.34	42.94	50.00
yes	43.14	48.65	41.38	35.66	57.06	50.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S35: How many hours per week do you usually work? Include overtime hours if you usually work overtime.

	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
Average Response	36.76	38.07	36.27	37.67	36.01	35.42
Frequency	264	72	192	133	93	38

Table S36: In the last 12 months, did (any of) you get SSI (supplemental security income)?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	75.17	82.31	72.87	74.25	79.38	70.67
yes	24.67	17.01	27.13	25.75	20.00	29.33
don't know	0.17	0.68	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S37: In the last 12 months, did (any of) you get social security payments from the U.S. government?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	63.02	63.27	62.94	54.89	83.13	60.00
yes	36.65	36.05	36.84	44.84	16.88	38.67
don't know	0.33	0.68	0.22	0.27	0.00	1.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S38: What would you say your family income was last month when you count all sources except food stamps?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
< \$500	12.79	4.65	15.21	10.59	18.12	12.16
\$501 - \$1000	30.37	19.38	33.64	34.41	21.48	29.73
\$1001 - \$1500	19.36	17.05	20.05	16.76	22.15	25.68
\$1501 - \$2000	14.92	17.05	14.29	16.76	14.77	6.76
\$2001 - \$2500	8.17	16.28	5.76	7.06	8.72	12.16
\$2501 - \$3000	3.73	6.98	2.76	3.53	4.70	2.70
\$3001 - \$3500	2.13	3.88	1.61	2.35	2.01	1.35
\$3501 - \$4000	1.24	1.55	1.15	0.88	1.34	2.70
> \$4000	2.84	6.20	1.84	2.35	2.68	5.41
don't know	4.44	6.98	3.69	5.29	4.03	1.35
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Financial security is an important issue for these caretakers, with only about 30 percent reporting that they have enough money coming in to make ends meet without having to borrow (Table S39). Just over 26 percent said that they did *not* have enough money coming in to make ends meet, while the remaining 44 percent did not know or refused to answer. Interestingly, 52 percent of our respondents (and a larger share of non-married caretakers) reported receiving AFDC or Families First when they were raising their own children (Table S40).¹¹

Table S39: As a family, do you have enough money coming in to make ends meet without having to borrow?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
don't know	43.09	29.25	47.51	44.05	42.33	40.00
yes	29.61	40.14	26.25	31.08	25.15	32.00
no	26.48	29.93	25.38	23.78	31.90	28.00
refusal	0.82	0.68	0.87	1.08	0.61	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S40: Did you ever receive AFDC or Families First cash assistance (known as welfare) when you were raising your own children?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
yes	51.56	36.30	56.37	51.62	55.21	43.42
no	47.62	63.70	42.55	47.84	42.94	56.58
don't know	0.82	0.00	1.08	0.54	1.84	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

¹¹ To be sure, some of the non-parent caretakers in our survey could have been *simultaneously* receiving Families First benefits for their own children in addition to their nieces, nephews, or grandchildren.

Respondents were asked whether they were currently receiving counseling for various reasons shown in Table S41, and 92 out of our 617 responding caretakers gave at least one affirmative response. The most common reasons for counseling were mental or emotional health and children’s health or behavior. Nearly 8 percent of the survey respondents needed certain counseling services that had not been offered or were unavailable (most of whom were not currently receiving counseling), as shown in Table S42. Specific counseling needs identified by those individuals are listed in Table S43.

Table S41: Could you tell me if you are currently getting counseling for any of the following reasons?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
mental or emotional health	9.31	6.08	10.34	11.26	5.52	7.89
children's health or behavior	5.39	6.08	5.17	7.24	2.45	2.63
grief or loss of loved one	3.43	2.03	3.88	4.29	1.23	3.95
any other reason I haven't listed	2.29	2.03	2.37	2.95	0.61	2.63
learning disabilities	2.12	2.70	1.94	1.34	4.29	1.32
alcohol or drug abuse	0.82	0.68	0.86	0.80	1.23	0.00
domestic violence	0.33	0.00	0.43	0.00	1.23	0.00
don't know	0.49	0.68	0.43	0.80	0.00	0.00
refusal	0.98	0.68	1.08	1.34	0.61	0.00

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S42: Are there counseling services that you need to get, but they have not been offered to you or are simply not available?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	88.83	89.86	88.50	90.86	86.42	84.00
yes	7.72	6.08	8.24	5.91	9.26	13.33
don't know	3.45	4.05	3.25	3.23	4.32	2.67
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S43: Would you like to get counseling services for any of the following?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
mental or emotional health	38.30	33.33	39.47	27.27	53.33	40.00
learning disabilities	27.66	11.11	31.58	18.18	40.00	30.00
grief or loss of loved one	25.53	22.22	26.32	22.73	26.67	30.00
children's health or behavior	25.53	22.22	26.32	22.73	26.67	30.00
other	23.40	33.33	21.05	18.18	33.33	20.00
alcohol or drug abuse	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
domestic violence	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
don't know	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
refusal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Responses were only provided by those who answered “yes” in Table S42 above. Those respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

To get directly to the underlying purpose of this report, Table S44 provides a detailed listing of possible new services that could be provided by MSS, along with the percentage of respondents who said they would use the services if they were available. In general, virtually any new service would have a ready constituency in Davidson County. However, the most popular service areas were basic information and referral, case management (through a telephone hotline or assistance in obtaining services), education, and training. While service needs as measured by rank orderings appear to be independent of marital status and relationship classifications, we do find that married caretakers and grandparents were generally less likely to report that they would use most of the additional services. Table S44b provides additional information on the health status and health insurance coverage among those reporting that they would use each of the additional services, and does not reveal any significant relationships.

Table S44: Metropolitan Social Services is considering some new services in your area. Would you use any of the following services if they were available?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
telephone hotline for information about available services	68.95	62.16	71.12	68.10	71.78	67.11
additional financial support	67.48	63.51	68.75	66.49	69.33	68.42
funds to purchase specific items such as clothing, furniture, or supplies	67.48	64.86	68.32	64.61	70.55	75.00
assistance in actually obtaining services and benefits	66.50	59.46	68.75	64.08	69.33	72.37
training on helping children succeed in school	64.22	60.14	65.52	60.59	68.71	72.37
tutoring/homework assistance	62.25	58.78	63.36	56.57	71.17	71.05
funds for urgent expenses such as housing or transportation	59.80	49.32	63.15	56.03	66.87	63.16
training on how to build good character in children	57.03	54.73	57.76	53.08	62.58	64.47
general assistance from a caseworker	56.70	51.35	58.41	53.08	64.42	57.89
children's therapeutic activity groups to help deal with grief or loss	48.53	47.97	48.71	43.43	55.21	59.21
caregiver support groups	47.71	43.24	49.14	42.67	43.24	56.58
independent living skills training for teenagers	46.24	43.92	46.98	39.95	55.83	56.58
training to update general parenting skills	46.08	41.89	47.41	41.82	52.15	53.95
training about how to keep children healthy	45.42	40.54	46.98	38.34	56.44	56.58
legal assistance with matters of custody, visitation, and the like	43.79	45.27	43.32	39.41	49.08	53.95
telephone hotline to answer questions about raising children	43.46	39.86	44.61	42.09	46.01	44.74
child care assistance	42.81	43.24	42.67	38.34	53.37	42.11
respite care (temporary relief for caretakers of adults or children)	36.11	32.43	37.28	30.29	44.79	46.05
other	4.25	4.05	4.31	4.02	5.52	2.63

**Respondents might have given more than one response to this question.

Table S44b: Service Needs by Health Status and Health Insurance Coverage

Response	Healthy	Unhealthy	Insured	Uninsured
telephone hotline for information about available services	53.29	46.71	81.46	18.54
additional financial support	52.28	47.72	81.06	18.94
funds to purchase specific items such as clothing, furniture, or supplies	50.72	49.28	82.45	17.55
assistance in actually obtaining services and benefits	52.44	47.56	81.95	18.05
training on helping children succeed in school	53.03	46.97	80.56	19.44
tutoring/homework assistance	54.55	45.45	84.16	15.84
funds for urgent expenses such as housing or transportation	51.08	48.92	82.16	17.84
training on how to build good character in children	51.84	48.16	81.87	18.13
general assistance from a caseworker	50.71	49.29	80.91	19.09
children's therapeutic activity groups to help deal with grief or loss	56.52	43.48	81.94	18.06
caregiver support groups	52.54	47.46	80.34	19.66
independent living skills training for teenagers	54.39	45.61	84.21	15.79
training to update general parenting skills	52.98	47.02	81.05	18.95
training about how to keep children healthy	52.13	47.87	82.98	17.02
legal assistance with matters of custody, visitation, and the like	57.04	42.96	82.22	17.78
telephone hotline to answer questions about raising children	52.24	47.76	83.58	16.42
child care assistance	57.74	42.26	82.26	17.74
respite care (temporary relief for caretakers of adults or children)	56.95	43.05	82.96	17.04
other	57.69	42.31	84.62	15.38

Following on the general theme of a need for greater awareness of available services, our final survey questions show that a significant portion of respondents are unaware of the services available to them. More than one-third characterized their general awareness level as “rarely” or “never” knowing where to go when assistance is needed (Table S45). Only 32 percent had heard of the DCS relative caretaker program (Table S46) or the ARCO program administered by DHS (Table S48), and only 17 and 3 percent had participated in these programs, respectively (Tables S47 and S49).¹²

Table S45: How would you describe your awareness of the services available in your area?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
all of the time	25.90	27.70	25.32	26.34	28.22	18.67
most of the time	35.90	35.81	35.93	35.75	37.42	33.33
rarely	20.00	13.51	22.08	19.89	19.63	21.33
never	14.10	15.54	13.64	13.44	10.43	25.33
don't know	4.10	7.43	3.03	4.57	4.29	1.33
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S46: Are you aware of the relative caretaker program administered by DCS?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	67.05	66.22	67.32	66.04	69.33	67.11
yes	32.13	33.11	31.82	33.42	30.06	30.26
don't know	0.82	0.68	0.87	0.54	0.61	2.63
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S47: Have you ever participated in the DCS relative caretaker program?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	81.83	83.78	81.21	80.65	85.28	80.26
yes	16.86	14.86	17.49	17.74	13.50	19.74
don't know	1.31	1.35	1.30	1.61	1.23	0.00
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table S48: Have you ever heard of ARCO?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	85.25	85.81	85.06	84.64	85.28	88.16
yes	13.77	12.84	14.07	14.29	14.11	10.53
don't know	0.98	1.35	0.87	1.08	0.61	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

¹² ARCO is Tennessee’s “At-Risk Child-Only” program, which provides short-term child care assistance to caretakers who meet certain education and/or work activity requirements.

Table S49: Have you ever participated in ARCO?

Response	Overall	Marital Status		Relationship To Caretaker		
		Married	Non-Married	Grandparent	Aunt/Uncle	Other
no	96.73	99.32	95.90	97.04	96.93	94.74
yes	2.62	0.68	3.24	2.42	2.45	3.95
don't know	0.65	0.00	0.86	0.54	0.61	1.32
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

To summarize the findings from our survey of non-parent caretakers of child-only cases in Davidson County, results echo administrative data in that these caretakers are generally better off than caretakers of non-child-only cases. That said, a significant percentage report having one or more difficulties. The survey data suggest that the areas for the most immediate impact would be information and referral, case management services (to include awareness of available services), education, and training.

Conclusions

Non-parent caretakers of child-only cases are different from caretakers of other cases (child-only or otherwise) and have different needs. Additionally, this report shows that Davidson County caretakers are quite different from statewide averages. They are younger, less likely to be married, less likely to be grandparents of the eligible children, more likely to be Black, and less likely to be disabled or to receive SSI. They received slightly more in Food Stamps and other unearned income, they are less likely to own a vehicle, more likely to rent than own their current housing, and face higher monthly payments for mortgages, property taxes, and utility bills.

Administrative and survey data both indicate that non-parent caretakers of child-only cases are generally better off than caretakers of non-child-only cases. That said, a significant percentage of our Davidson County survey sample report having one or more difficulties. The areas for the most immediate and cost-effective impact appear to be information and referral, case management, education and training. Our sense is that other areas of need, such as financial assistance, transportation, child care, and food assistance, are likely to be met by existing programs at the local, state, or federal level (e.g., Families First, Metro's existing transportation assistance program, the TDHS ARCO program, and the Food Stamps program). That said, MSS staff could play a key role in directing eligible households to these and other existing services.

References

- Charlesworth, Leanne, Hercik, Jeanette, and Kakuska, Courtney. "TANF Child-Only Cases Trends and Issues." Welfare Peer Technical Assistance Network. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2004.
- Edelhoch, M., Liu, Q., and Martin, L. "Unsung Heroes: Relative Caretakers in Child-Only Cases." *Policy and Practice*. 2002. pg. 26-30.
- Gibbs, Deborah, Katsten, Jennifer, Bir, Anupa, and Hoover, Sonja. "Children in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Child-Only Cases with Relative Caretakers." Report Prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Research Triangle Institute Project Number 07147.018. June 2004.
- Hetling, Andrea, Saunders, Correne, and Born, Catherine E. "Maryland's Child-Only Caseload: A Comparison of Parental and Non-Parental Cases." Family Welfare Research and Training Group. University of Maryland School of Social Work. April 2005.
- Kaplan, April and Copeland, Ivory. "Addressing the Well-Being of Children in Child-Only Cases." Welfare Information Network Issue Notes. April 2001, Vol. 5, No. 6.
- Wood, Robert G. and Strong, Debra A. "The Status of Child-Only TANF Families: Evidence from New Jersey." Mathematica Issue Brief. June 2002, Number 3.
- Wood, Robert G. and Strong, Debra A. "The Status of Families on Child-Only TANF Cases." *Work First New Jersey Evaluation*. May 2002.

APPENDIX A – ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS BY DCS/COURT ORDER INVOLVEMENT

Table D1: How would you describe your awareness of the services available in your area?

Response	Court Order/DCS Involved	Other
most of the time	37.28	35.25
all of the time	27.57	25.25
rarely	15.42	22.25
never	15.42	13.25
don't know	4.21	4.00

Table D2: Are you aware of the relative caretaker program administered by DCS?

Response	Court Order/DCS Involved	Other
no	65.58	68.17
yes	32.56	31.58
don't know	1.86	0.25

Table D3: Have you ever participated in the DCS relative caretaker program?

Response	Court Order/DCS Involved	Other
no	80.93	82.50
yes	17.67	16.25
don't know	1.40	1.25

Table D4: Selected Characteristics by Court Order/DCS Involvement Status

	Court Order/DCS Involved	Other	Total
Average Number of Other Adults in Home	1.97	2.14	2.08
Average Number of Children Receiving Family First Benefits	1.71	1.85	1.80
Percent with Health Insurance for Themselves	81.86	81.55	81.66
Percent in Good Health	58.60	52.37	54.55
Percent that could not afford a needed doctor visit or filled prescription (last 12 months)	35.35	38.15	37.18
Percent with health insurance that was unaccepted when in need of a doctor or dentist visit (last 12 months)	14.49	11.00	12.21
Percent with more than a Highschool/GED Equivalent	30.70	31.17	31.01
Percent Renting	52.09	54.36	53.57
Average Number of daily activities with difficulty (last 12 months)	1.42	1.37	1.39
Percent with utilities shut off due to inability to pay bills (last 12 months)	21.70	26.08	24.55
Percent that ever had to skip or cut size of meals due to inability to afford food (last 12 months)	18.60	20.95	20.13
Percent that received food stamps (last 12 months)	56.74	59.35	58.44
Percent that attended a food pantry or food bank due to inability to afford groceries (last 12 months)	23.33	19.45	20.45
Percent Employed	43.72	42.39	42.86
Percent with enough money to make ends meet without having to borrow	35.21	26.32	29.41

Table D5: Service Needs by Court Order/DCS Involvement Status

Response	CO/DCS	Other
telephone hotline for information about available services	36.38	63.62
additional financial support	34.53	65.47
funds to purchase specific items such as clothing, furniture, or supplies	35.82	64.18
assistance in actually obtaining services and benefits	35.61	64.39
training on helping children succeed in school	35.35	64.65
tutoring/homework assistance	35.84	64.16
funds for urgent expenses such as housing or transportation	35.68	64.32
training on how to build good character in children	35.69	64.31
general assistance from a caseworker	36.18	63.82
children's therapeutic activity groups to help deal with grief or loss	36.12	63.88
caregiver support groups	38.31	61.69
independent living skills training for teenagers	35.79	64.21
training to update general parenting skills	34.74	65.26
training about how to keep children healthy	31.56	68.44
legal assistance with matters of custody, visitation, and the like	38.89	61.11
telephone hotline to answer questions about raising children	35.45	64.55
child care assistance	37.74	62.26
respite care (temporary relief for caretakers of adults or children)	39.46	60.54
other	38.46	61.54

APPENDIX B – ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS BY ZIP CODE

Table Z1: Comparison of Counts for Administrative Data and Survey Data

Zip Code	Administrative Data	Survey Data
	Frequency	Frequency
28071	1	0
37011	5	0
37013	63	31
37015	1	1
37027	2	0
37070	2	1
37072	25	10
37075	1	0
37076	31	12
37080	5	2
37115	86	39
37116	3	1
37138	21	11
37189	8	6
37201	2	1
37202	2	1
37203	46	20
37204	18	8
37205	2	0
37206	165	83
37207	240	128
37208	113	46
37209	80	34
37210	83	37
37211	82	39
37212	18	8
37214	19	11
37215	2	2
37216	47	21
37217	26	10
37218	60	40
37219	3	1
37220	1	1
37221	17	9
37222	3	2
37224	2	0
37228	10	0
38116	1	0
Total	1296	616

Table Z2: Selected Administrative Data by Zip Code

Zip Code	Frequency	Percent	% Married	% Grandparents	% Aunt/Uncle	Average Age	% Black
28071	1	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	63.00	0.00
37011	5	0.39	0.00	20.00	40.00	33.60	100.00
37013	63	4.86	34.92	52.38	38.10	46.03	60.32
37015	1	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	68.00	0.00
37027	2	0.15	0.00	0.00	50.00	28.50	50.00
37070	2	0.15	100.00	100.00	0.00	53.50	50.00
37072	25	1.93	28.00	52.00	32.00	46.52	44.00
37075	1	0.08	0.00	100.00	0.00	47.00	100.00
37076	31	2.39	13.33	70.00	16.67	49.40	36.67
37080	5	0.39	0.00	60.00	20.00	49.60	40.00
37115	86	6.64	24.42	48.84	38.37	46.38	53.49
37116	3	0.23	0.00	50.00	0.00	36.50	50.00
37138	21	1.62	23.81	66.67	28.57	50.14	23.81
37189	8	0.62	37.50	37.50	50.00	51.25	62.50
37201	2	0.15	0.00	50.00	50.00	61.00	50.00
37202	2	0.15	0.00	50.00	50.00	62.50	50.00
37203	46	3.55	21.74	54.35	26.09	47.59	89.13
37204	18	1.39	16.67	55.56	27.78	44.67	94.44
37205	2	0.15	50.00	100.00	0.00	49.00	0.00
37206	165	12.73	20.12	58.54	25.61	49.13	81.10
37207	240	18.52	18.22	56.36	28.81	49.32	88.14
37208	113	8.72	12.50	61.61	20.54	51.78	98.21
37209	80	6.17	16.67	56.41	25.64	48.00	69.23
37210	83	6.40	4.82	49.40	30.12	47.61	91.57
37211	82	6.33	28.40	58.02	24.69	48.23	53.09
37212	18	1.39	17.65	47.06	35.29	52.94	94.12
37214	19	1.47	36.84	68.42	21.05	52.63	47.37
37215	2	0.15	0.00	100.00	0.00	56.00	50.00
37216	47	3.63	29.79	53.19	29.79	49.66	70.21
37217	26	2.01	19.23	46.15	26.92	44.88	42.31
37218	60	4.63	23.73	52.54	25.42	48.93	91.53
37219	3	0.23	0.00	50.00	50.00	51.00	100.00
37220	1	0.08	100.00	100.00	0.00	61.00	0.00
37221	17	1.31	41.18	58.82	23.53	44.94	47.06
37222	3	0.23	33.33	100.00	0.00	53.67	0.00
37224	2	0.15	0.00	100.00	0.00	49.50	50.00
37228	10	0.77	0.00	40.00	10.00	51.90	100.00
38116	1	0.08	0.00	0.00	100.00	32.00	100.00
Total	1296	100.00	20.68	55.77	27.61	48.68	74.65

Table Z3: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Household Characteristics

Zip Code	Average Number of Other Adults in home	Average Number of Children Receiving Family First Benefits	Percent with Court Order or DCS Involvement
37115	0.77	1.51	30.77
37203	0.55	1.55	35.00
37206	0.54	1.73	36.14
37207	0.72	1.82	29.69
37208	0.52	1.76	45.65
37209	0.50	1.71	26.47
37210	0.54	1.64	27.03
37216	0.67	1.38	38.10
37218	0.65	1.60	25.00
Other	0.77	1.56	41.67
Total	0.66	1.66	34.90

Table Z4: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Health Status and Insurance

Zip Code	Percent in Good Health	Percent with Health Insurance for Themselves
37115	69.23	84.62
37203	60.00	85.00
37206	44.58	78.31
37207	51.56	78.91
37208	45.65	78.26
37209	52.94	85.29
37210	45.95	81.08
37216	52.38	80.95
37218	45.00	80.00
Other	64.88	85.12
Total	54.55	81.66

Table Z5: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Health Care Usage

Zip Code	Percent that could not afford a needed doctor visit or filled prescription (last 12 months)	Percent with health insurance that was unaccepted when in need of a doctor or dentist visit (last 12 months)
37115	30.77	5.13
37203	10.00	15.00
37206	46.99	13.25
37207	39.84	9.45
37208	36.96	13.04
37209	32.35	14.71
37210	45.95	21.62
37216	38.10	9.52
37218	40.00	22.50
Other	33.33	10.18
Total	37.18	12.21

Table Z6: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Education, Employment, Housing, and Activities

Zip Code	Percent with more than a Highschool/GED Equivalent	Percent Employed	Percent Renting	Average Number of daily activities with difficulty (last 12 months)
37115	38.46	53.85	53.85	1.05
37203	20.00	50.00	65.00	0.80
37206	19.28	34.94	71.08	1.93
37207	29.69	35.94	50.00	1.66
37208	26.09	34.78	63.04	2.07
37209	20.59	50.00	61.76	1.59
37210	21.62	32.43	64.86	1.41
37216	42.86	42.86	33.33	1.43
37218	42.50	40.00	35.00	1.35
Other	38.69	52.38	46.43	0.83
Total	31.01	42.86	53.57	1.39

Table Z7: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Economic and Food Security I

Zip Code	Percent with utilities shut off due to inability to pay bills (last 12 months)	Percent that ever had to skip or cut size of meals due to inability to afford food (last 12 months)
37115	23.68	17.95
37203	10.00	15.00
37206	24.10	12.05
37207	33.86	28.91
37208	26.67	21.74
37209	12.12	20.59
37210	35.14	27.03
37216	28.57	19.05
37218	18.42	17.50
Other	20.00	17.26
Total	24.55	20.13

Table Z8: Selected Survey Data by Zip Code – Economic and Food Security II

Zip Code	Percent that received food stamps (last 12 months)	Percent that attended a food pantry or food bank due to inability to afford groceries (last 12 months)	Percent with enough money to make ends meet without having to borrow
37115	46.15	5.13	43.59
37203	55.00	20.00	35.00
37206	68.67	21.69	28.05
37207	64.06	22.66	21.88
37208	60.87	34.78	25.00
37209	55.88	14.71	35.29
37210	78.38	35.14	21.62
37216	52.38	14.29	25.00
37218	45.00	17.50	22.50
Other	51.79	17.26	35.71
Total	41.56	20.45	29.41

**APPENDIX C – NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY
NON-PARENT CARETAKERS OF CHILD-ONLY FAMILIES FIRST CASES**

**University of Tennessee
Center for Business and Economic Research**

INTERVIEWER: READ THE FOLLOWING – “Hello! My name is {YOUR FIRST NAME} and I am a staff member at the University of Tennessee. May I please speak with {RESPONDENT’S NAME}?”

- 1. RESPONDENT NOT AVAILABLE **[PROBE: “When would be a good time to call back to talk with {RESPONDENT’S NAME}?” [RECORD CALL BACK TIME]**

- 2. RESPONDENT AVAILABLE

“I am part of a research team at the University of Tennessee. We are doing a short survey of non-parent caretakers of children on Tennessee’s Families First program. We are trying to determine your most pressing needs, in order to recommend additional services to program officials. Do you have a few minutes?”

- 1. YES

- 2. NO **[PROBE: “Is there a time when it would be convenient to call back?”]**
 - 1. YES **[RECORD CALL BACK TIME]**
 - 2. NO
 - 3. REFUSAL

HOUSEHOLD ROSTER

A

A1 “Great! Your individual responses will be kept confidential. Please answer as many of my questions as possible, but feel free to let me know if you would rather not answer any particular question. You can end this interview at any time.

Our records indicate that you are receiving Families First benefits for at least one child who is not your own, and that you do **not** receive Families First benefits for yourself. Is this correct?”

- 1. YES
- 2. NO **[Thank the respondent for their time and end the call.]**

A4 “How many children are you receiving Families First benefits for?”

_____ NUMBER OF CHILDREN

-88: DON’T KNOW
-99: REFUSAL

A5 “Why are you caring for these children?” **[READ CHOICES IF NECESSARY AND CHECK MOST APPROPRIATE.]**

- 1. CHILD’S PARENTS ARE DECEASED **[SKIP TO A7]**
- 2. CHILD’S PARENTS ARE INCARCERATED
- 3. COURT ORDER OR DCS INVOLVEMENT
- 4. CHILD’S PARENTS ARE TEMPORARILY UNABLE TO CARE FOR THE CHILDREN
- 5. OTHER **[SPECIFY: _____]**

- A6 “Do these children have any involvement with their biological parents?”
1. YES
 2. NO
 3. DON’T KNOW
 4. REFUSAL
- A7 “Do you consider the fact that you are caring for these children to be a permanent or temporary arrangement?”
1. PERMANENT
 2. TEMPORARY
 3. DON’T KNOW
 4. REFUSAL
- A7 “Are you currently married?”
1. YES
 2. NO
 3. DON’T KNOW
 4. REFUSAL
- A12 “How many other adults live in the home?”
- _____
- 88: DON’T KNOW
-99: REFUSAL

TRANSPORTATION

C

- C1 “Do you, or does anybody else living in your house, own a car, truck or other vehicle?”
1. YES
 2. NO **[SKIP TO C9]**
 3. DON’T KNOW **[SKIP TO C9]**
 4. REFUSAL **[SKIP TO C9]**
- C1a “How often do you have access to this vehicle for going to work, school, training, or running errands?” **[READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES]**
1. NEVER **[SKIP TO QUESTION C8]**
 2. SOME OF THE TIME
 3. MOST OF THE TIME
 4. ALL OF THE TIME
 5. DON’T KNOW
 6. REFUSAL
- C9 “Do you use any of these other forms of transportation?” **[READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES AND CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**
1. BUS OR OTHER MASS TRANSIT THAT YOU PAY FOR
 2. TAXI THAT YOU PAY FOR
 3. FREE VAN OR TAXI PAID FOR BY TENNCARE OR OTHER NON-DHS AGENCY
 4. RIDE WITH FRIEND OR FAMILY

5. OTHER _____
6. NONE OF THE ABOVE
7. DON'T KNOW [DO NOT READ]
8. REFUSAL [DO NOT READ]

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE

E

E1 “Are you, yourself, covered by any of the following types of health insurance?” **[READ OPTIONS AND CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

INTERVIEWER: SOME PEOPLE MAY BE CONFUSED IF THEY PAY A PORTION OF THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE TO THEIR EMPLOYER; THIS WOULD STILL COUNT AS EMPLOYER PAYS.

1. TENNCARE OR MEDICAID OR MEDICARE
2. EMPLOYER OR UNION
3. CHAMPUS, VA, OR OTHER MILITARY PLAN
4. OTHER _____
5. NO INSURANCE COVERAGE
6. NO OTHER CHOICES

E3 “Are any of the children in your care covered by any of the following types of health insurance?” **[READ AND CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

1. TENNCARE/MEDICAID/MEDICARE
2. EMPLOYER/UNION
3. CHAMPUS, VA, OR OTHER MILITARY PLAN
4. I PAY PRIVATELY
5. THEIR FATHER/MOTHER COVERS THEM
6. NO: NONE OF THE CHILDREN ARE COVERED
7. OTHER _____
8. NO OTHER CHOICES

HEALTH CARE USE AND ACCESS

F

F1 “Do any of the children in your care have a physical, learning, behavioral, or mental health condition that makes it difficult for YOU to work, go to school, or do any other regular activities?”

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

F4 “How would you rate your health? Would you say it is:” **[READ RESPONSES]**

1. POOR
2. FAIR
3. GOOD
4. VERY GOOD
5. EXCELLENT
6. DON'T KNOW/MISSING [DO NOT READ]

7. SOME VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL/BUSINESS SCHOOL AFTER HIGH SCHOOL
8. VOC./TECH/BUSINESS CERTIFICATE OR DIPLOMA AFTER HIGH SCHOOL
9. SOME COLLEGE
10. ASSOCIATE’S DEGREE (AA OR AS)
11. BACHELOR’S DEGREE (BA OR BS)
12. SOME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL
13. GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE
14. DON’T KNOW [DO NOT READ]
15. REFUSAL [DO NOT READ]

J53 “Do you have any of the following problems that might make it difficult for you in work or school?” **[READ RESPONSES; CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

1. LEARNING DISABILITY
2. SPEECH PROBLEMS OR DISABILITY
3. PHYSICAL HANDICAP
4. AN ILLNESS OR INJURY THAT HAS LASTED A LONG TIME
5. AN EXPERIENCE WITH VIOLENCE OR ABUSE
6. EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS
7. PROBLEMS WITH CHILDREN (I.E. DISABILITY, BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS, LACK OF CHILD CARE, ETC.)
8. ANY THING ELSE I HAVE NOT LISTED? _____
9. NONE [NONE]
10. NO MORE CHOICES

M3 “How well can you read? Please choose the best option that best describes your reading level.” **[READ RESPONSE CATEGORIES]**

1. VERY WELL, I CAN READ ANYTHING I WANT TO
2. FAIRLY WELL, I CAN READ MOST THINGS WITHOUT TOO MUCH DIFFICULTY
3. WELL ENOUGH, I CAN READ WHAT I HAVE TO
4. NOT VERY WELL, I HAVE A LOT OF TROUBLE READING
5. I CAN’T READ
6. DON’T KNOW
7. REFUSAL

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC HARDSHIP

K

K1 “Do you live in a:” **[READ RESPONSES]**

1. HOUSE (INCLUDES CONDO, TOWNHOUSE OR DUPLEX)
2. APARTMENT
3. MOBILE HOME OR TRAILER
4. EMERGENCY SHELTER
5. OTHER _____
6. HOMELESS [DO NOT READ] **[SKIP TO K14]**
7. DON’T KNOW [DO NOT READ]
8. REFUSAL [DO NOT READ]

K3 “How long have you lived there?”

1. 1 – 2 MONTHS
2. 3 – 6 MONTHS

K16 “In the last 12 months, did you get Food Stamps?”

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

K18 “In the last 12 months, have you been to a food pantry or food bank to get food because you could not afford groceries?”

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

N13 “Could you tell me if you are currently getting counseling for any of the following reasons?” **[READ RESPONSES; CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

1. CHILDREN'S HEALTH OR BEHAVIOR
 2. LEARNING DISABILITIES
 3. MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL HEALTH
 4. ALCOHOL OR DRUG ABUSE
 5. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
 6. GRIEF OR LOSS OF LOVED ONE
 7. ANY OTHER REASON I HAVEN'T LISTED? *[SPECIFY]*
-
8. DON'T KNOW *[DO NOT READ]*
 9. REFUSAL *[DO NOT READ]*
 10. NO MORE CHOICES

N14 “Are there counseling services that you need to get, but they have not been offered to you or are simply not available?”

1. YES
2. NO **[SKIP TO QUESTION X1]**
3. DON'T KNOW **[SKIP TO QUESTION X1]**
4. REFUSAL **[SKIP TO QUESTION X1]**

N15 “Would you like to get counseling services for any of the following?” **[READ AND CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

1. CHILDREN'S HEALTH OR BEHAVIOR
 2. LEARNING DISABILITIES
 3. MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL HEALTH
 4. ALCOHOL OR DRUG ABUSE
 5. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
 6. GRIEF OR LOSS OF LOVED ONE
 7. OTHER *[SPECIFY]*
-
8. DON'T KNOW *[DO NOT READ]*
 9. REFUSAL *[DO NOT READ]*

2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

I15 “For the purposes of our study, we need to have a rough idea of your family’s TOTAL MONTHLY income. What would you say your family income was last month when you count all sources EXCEPT food stamps?”

INTERVIEWER: INCLUDE ALL MONEY FROM JOBS, CHILD SUPPORT, AND ALL OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME. READ CHOICES IN ORDER UNTIL THE CORRECT ONE IS CHOSEN.

1. Less than \$500
2. Between \$501 and \$1,000
3. Between \$1,001 and \$1,500
4. Between \$1,500 and \$2,000
5. Between \$2,001 and \$2,500
6. Between \$2,501 and \$3,000
7. Between \$3,001 and \$3,500
8. Between \$3,501 and \$4,000
9. Above \$4,000
10. DON'T KNOW
11. REFUSAL

I16 “As a family, do you have enough money coming in to make ends meet without having to borrow?”

1. YES, ALL THE TIME **[SKIP TO J1]**
2. YES, SOMETIMES
3. NO
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSAL

I17 “Did you ever receive AFDC or Families First cash assistance (known as welfare) when you were raising your own children?”

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

CLOSING SECTION

X

X1 “Metropolitan Social Services is considering some new services in your area. Would you use any of the following services if they were available?” **[READ ALL AND CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.]**

1. Telephone hotline for information about available services
2. Telephone hotline to answer questions about raising children
3. Assistance in actually obtaining services and benefits
4. Child care assistance
5. Caregiver support groups
6. General assistance from a caseworker
7. Respite care (temporary relief for caretakers of adults or children)

8. Legal assistance with matters of custody, visitation, and the like
9. Children's therapeutic activity groups to help deal with grief or loss
10. Independent living skills training for teenagers
11. Tutoring/homework assistance
12. Funds to purchase specific items such as clothing, furniture, or supplies
13. Funds for urgent expenses such as housing or transportation
14. Additional financial support
15. Training about how to keep children healthy
16. Training on helping children succeed in school
17. Training to update general parenting skills
18. Training on how to build good character in children
19. Other [*SPECIFY*] _____

X2 "How would you describe your awareness of the services available in your area? Do you know where to go when you need assistance?"

1. ALL OF THE TIME
2. MOST OF THE TIME
3. RARELY
4. NEVER
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSE

X3 "Are you aware of the Relative Caregiver Program administered by DCS, which provides respite care and other assistance to non-parent caretakers?"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

X4 "Have you ever participated in the DCS Relative Caregiver Program?"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

X5 "Have you ever heard of ARCO, a Families First program which provides child care subsidies to non-parent caretakers who are working full-time and who meet income eligibility requirements?"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

X6 "Have you ever participated in ARCO?"

1. YES
2. NO
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSAL

END "OK. That completes the interview. Thank you for your time!"