



Department
for Education

Childcare and Early Years Survey of Parents 2020

Technical Report
August 2022

Ipsos

Tom Huskinson, Fiona Tudor, and Kevin Pickering

Contents

1	Survey background and history.....	3
1.1	Aims of the study.....	3
1.2	Time series of the Childcare and early years survey of parents	3
2	Overview of the study design.....	4
2.1	The sample	4
2.2	The interviews	4
2.3	Defining childcare.....	6
2.4	Interpreting the data in the Official Statistics Tables.....	8
3	Questionnaire development	10
3.1	Changes to the questionnaire.....	10
3.2	Questionnaire content.....	14
4	Sampling	15
4.1	Survey population.....	15
4.2	Sample frames	15
5	Fieldwork.....	18
5.1	Briefings	18
5.2	Contact procedures	18
5.3	Interviewing.....	20
6	Response	20
6.1	Outcomes and response for CBR sample	20
6.2	Outcomes and response for FRS sample.....	21
6.3	Profile of the achieved sample	21
6.4	CAPI checks and coding	24
6.5	Analysis	24
6.6	Weighting.....	24
	Appendix: Socio-demographic profile	30

Table A.1	Control totals for the family calibration weights	26
Table A.2	Control totals for the child calibration weights	27
Table A.3	Effective sample size and weighting efficiency	28
Table A.4	Confidence intervals (95% level) for key estimates	29
Table B.1	Age of respondent, by family type	30
Table B.2	Marital status	30
Table B.3	Qualifications, by family type	31
Table B.4	Number of children in the household, by family type	31
Table B.5	Number of pre-school and school-age children in the family, by family type	32
Table B.6	Annual family income, by family type	32
Table B.7	Family work status	33
Table B.8	Tenure status, by family type	33
Table B.9	Age of selected child, by family type	34
Table B.10	Ethnicity of selected child, by family type	34
Table B.11	Special educational needs or disabilities of selected child, by family type	35
Table B.12	Type of special educational needs of selected child, by family type	35
Table B.13	Region	36
Table B.14	Area deprivation according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation	36
Table B.15	Rurality	37

1 Survey background and history

1.1 Aims of the study

This Technical Report describes the methodology of the 2020 survey in the Childcare and Early Years Survey of Parents (CEYSP) series.

The survey was funded by the Department for Education (DfE), and carried out by Ipsos. The study has two key objectives. The first is to provide salient, up-to-date information on parents' use of childcare and early years provision, and their views and experiences. The second is to continue the time series statistics – which have now been running for over ten years – on issues covered throughout the survey series. With respect to both of these objectives, the study aims to provide information to help monitor effectively the progress of policies in the area of childcare and early years education.

1.2 Time series of the Childcare and early years survey of parents

The current study is the 12th in the CEYSP series, which began in 2004. The time series in fact stretches back further than 2004, as the current series is the merger of two survey series that preceded it: i) the Survey of Parents of Three and Four Year Old Children and Their Use of Early Years Services, of which there were six waves between 1997 and 2004, and ii) the Parents' Demand For Childcare Survey, of which there were two waves, the first in 1999 and the second in 2001.

Previous waves of the CEYSP were conducted in 2004, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2014-15, 2017, 2018, and 2019.

For the 2020 wave, the target number of interviews was 6,000 with fieldwork planned to run between January and August 2020; however, fieldwork ended on 17 March 2020 after 1,384 interviews had been completed, due to restrictions on face-to-face fieldwork arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. This premature end to fieldwork meant that not all of the sample issued to field had been fully worked, and this may have introduced bias into some survey estimates. As such, direct comparisons with previous survey waves should be made with caution.

2 Overview of the study design

2.1 The sample

A total of 1,384 parents with children aged 0 to 14 in England were interviewed face-to-face between January and March 2020. The target number of interviews was 6,000, with fieldwork initially planned to run until August 2020; however, fieldwork ended on 17 March 2020 due to restrictions on face-to-face fieldwork arising from the COVID-19 pandemic.

A probability sample of children aged 0 to 14 in England was drawn from the Child Benefit Register (CBR) maintained by Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs (HMRC) which, given its high take-up, provides very high coverage of dependent children in England. Interviews were sought with parents of these children. If the sampled child was no longer living at the address, an interview was sought with the current occupiers if they had a child aged 0 to 14, otherwise the address was deemed ineligible¹.

A small additional sample of parents in England was drawn from respondents to the Family Resources Survey (FRS) commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions, who had consented to be re-contacted for future research².

In order to achieve sufficient interviews with parents of children attending early years provision to enable separate analysis of this group, the number of 0- to 4-year-olds sampled was boosted by increasing their probability of selection by a factor of 2.4. This design was intended to provide a roughly equal number of interviews with parents where the selected child was aged 0 to 4, and with parents where the selected child was aged 5 to 14.

2.2 The interviews

Interviews were conducted face-to-face in parents' homes and lasted a mean of 49 minutes, and a median of 45 minutes. The main respondent was a parent or guardian of

¹ Prior to the 2019 survey, the sampling unit was the child (rather than the address), and in cases where the sampled child had moved from the sampled address, the child was still considered eligible, and the interviewer attempted to trace the child to his or her new address to conduct an interview there. The sampling unit was changed from the child, to the address, due to the increasing proportion of children that were found to have moved address during fieldwork (from 13% in 2010, to 22% in 2018).

² This was necessary because the eligibility criteria for Child Benefit changed in 2013 so that higher-income households (those where one or both partners earn £60,000 or more per year) ceased to gain financially from Child Benefit, resulting in them becoming disproportionately likely to be missing from the CBR. To avoid bias to survey estimates, higher-income households missing from the CBR were sampled from the FRS. For further details see Department for Education (2017) *Childcare and early years survey of parents: Sampling frames investigation* <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childcare-and-early-years-survey-of-parents-sampling-frames>

the sampled child with main or shared responsibility for making childcare decisions, and in most cases (86%) was the child's mother.

In addition, in couple households an interview was sought with the respondent's partner, if he or she was at home. Partners were asked about their employment and other socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Where this was not possible, the main respondent was asked to provide this information by proxy. An interview was conducted with the respondent's partner at 21 per cent of couple households; the main respondent answered by proxy (on their partner's behalf) at 67 per cent of couple households; and at the remaining 12 per cent of couple households no detailed information was collected about the partner's circumstances (because the partner was unavailable or unwilling to be interviewed, and the main respondent refused to provide this information or was insufficiently knowledgeable to be able to answer on their partner's behalf).

The study used an inclusive definition of childcare and early years provision. The respondent was asked to include any time their child was not with them (or their current or ex-spouse or partner), or at school. Ex-husbands/wives/partners were counted as a type of informal provider prior to the 2019 survey, but following the surveys user consultation in 2018 have been excluded from the definition of childcare from the 2019 survey wave for consistency with other national and international surveys about childcare.

The definition of childcare covered both informal childcare (for instance grandparents, an older sibling, or a friend or neighbour) and formal childcare (for instance nursery schools and classes, childminders, and before- and after-school clubs). Further detail about this definition is provided in section 2.3.

In families with two or more children, broad questions were asked about the childcare arrangements of all children, before more detailed questions were asked about the randomly sampled child (henceforth referred to as 'the selected child').

Because childcare arrangements vary between school term-time and school holidays, most of the questions focused on the most recent term-time week (the 'reference week'). Separate questions were asked about the use of childcare during times of the year when school children are on holiday.

The interview covered the following topic areas:

- **For all families:**
 - use of childcare and early years provision in the reference term-time week, school holidays periods (if applicable) and last year;
 - payments made for childcare and early years provision (for providers used in the last week), the use of free hours of childcare, the use of Tax-Free Childcare, and the use of tax credits and subsidies;

- sources of information about, and attitudes towards, childcare and early years provision in the local area; and
- if applicable, reasons for not using childcare.
- **For one randomly selected child:**
 - a detailed record of child attendance in the reference week;
 - reasons for using and views of the main formal provider; and
 - the home learning environment.
- **Classification details:**
 - household composition;
 - parents' education and work details; and
 - provider details.

2.3 Defining childcare

The study uses an inclusive definition of childcare and early years provision. Parents were asked to include any time that the child was not with a resident parent or a resident parent's current or ex-partner, or at school³.

In order to remind parents to include all possible people or organisations that may have looked after their children, they were shown the following list:

Formal providers

- nursery school
- nursery class attached to a primary or infants' school
- reception class at a primary or infants' school
- special day school or nursery or unit for children with special educational needs
- day nursery
- playgroup or pre-school
- childminder

³ This definition deviated from that used prior to the 2019 survey wave by excluding ex-partners. Prior to the 2019 wave, the definition of childcare and early years provision was "any time that the child was not with a resident parent or a resident parent's current partner, or at school". This change brought the definition of childcare in line with other research about childcare.

- nanny or au pair
- baby-sitter who came to home
- breakfast club
- after-school clubs and activities
- holiday club/scheme

Informal providers⁴

- the child's grandparent(s)
- the child's older brother/sister
- another relative
- a friend or neighbour

Other

- other nursery education provider
- other childcare provider

Definitions of main formal providers for pre-school children

A short definition for each of the main formal providers for pre-school children is included below. The definitions were not provided to parents in the survey but these are included here to help the reader differentiate between the most common categories.

- nursery school – this is a school in its own right, with most children aged 3 to 5. Sessions normally run for 2 ½ to 3 hours in the morning and/or afternoon;
- nursery class attached to a primary or infants' school - often a separate unit within the school, with those in the nursery class aged 3 or 4. Sessions normally run for 2½ to 3 hours in the morning and/or afternoon;
- reception class at a primary or infants' school - this usually provides full-time education during normal school hours, and most children in the reception class are aged 4 or 5;
- special day school/nursery or unit for children with special educational needs - a nursery, school or unit for children with special educational needs;
- day nursery - this runs for the whole working day and may be closed for a few weeks in summer, if at all. This may be run by employers, private companies,

⁴ Prior to the 2019 wave, the list of informal providers included “my ex-husband/wife/partner/the child's other parent who does not live in this household”.

community/voluntary group or the Local Authority, and can take children who are a few months to 5-years-old; and

- playgroup or pre-school - the term 'pre-school' is commonly used to describe many types of nursery education. For the purposes of this survey, pre-school is used to describe a type of playgroup. This service is often run by a community/voluntary group, parents themselves, or privately. Sessions last up to 4 hours.

Providers were classified according to the service for which they were being used by parents, for example daycare or early years education. Thus, providers were classified and referred to in analysis according to terminology such as 'nursery schools' and 'day nurseries', rather than as forms of integrated provision such as Children's Centres. Reception classes were only included as childcare if it was not compulsory schooling, that is the child was aged under 5 (or had turned 5 during the current school term).

This inclusive definition of childcare means that parents will have included time when their child was visiting friends or family, at a sport or leisure activity, and so on. The term early years provision covers both 'care' for young children and 'early years education'.

Deciding on the correct classification of the 'type' of provider can be complicated for parents. The classifications given by parents were therefore checked with the providers themselves in a separate telephone survey, and edited where necessary. Detail about the provider edits can be found in section 0.

2.4 Interpreting the data in the Tables

The majority of findings in the Official Statistics Tables relate to one of two levels of analysis:

- the family level (e.g. proportions of families paying for childcare, parents' perceptions of childcare provision in their local areas); and
- the (selected) child level (e.g. parents' views on the provision received by the selected child from their main childcare provider).

However, for most of the analyses carried out for the data tables in Chapters 9 and 10 the data was restructured so that 'all children' in the household were the base of analysis. This was done to increase the sample size and enable the exploration of packages of childcare received by children in more detail. This approach is not used for other analyses because much more data was collected on the selected child compared with all children in the household.

Weights

A 'family-level' weight is applied to family-level analyses. This ensures the findings are representative of families in England with a child aged 0 to 14 in receipt of Child Benefit, and re-balances families with children aged 0 to 4 and children of other age groups to their proportion in the population.

A 'child-level' weight is applied to analyses carried out at the (selected) child-level. This weight combines the family-level weight with an adjustment for the probability of the child being randomly selected for the more detailed questions.

Bases

The data tables show the total number of cases that were analysed (e.g. different types of families, income groups). The total base figures include all the eligible cases (in other words all respondents, or all respondents who were asked the question where it was not asked of all) but, usually, exclude cases with missing data (codes for 'don't know' or 'not answered'). Thus, while the base description may be the same across several data tables, the base sizes may differ slightly due to the exclusion of cases with missing data.

Unweighted bases are presented throughout. This is the actual number of parents that responded to a given question for family-level questions, and the actual number of children about whom a response was provided by parents for child-level questions.

In some tables, the column or row bases do not add up to the total base size. This is because some categories might not be included in the table, either because the corresponding numbers are too small to be of interest or the categories are otherwise not useful for the purposes of analysis.

Where a base size contains fewer than 50 respondents, particular care must be taken, as confidence intervals around these estimates will be very wide, and hence the results should be treated with some caution. In tables with bases sizes below 50, these figures are denoted by squared brackets [].

Percentages

Due to rounding, percentage figures may not add up to 100 per cent. This also applies to questions where more than one answer can be given ('multi-coded' questions).

Continuous data

Some Official Statistics Tables summarise parents' responses to questions eliciting continuous data; for instance, the number of hours of childcare used per week (see Table 1.10 in the Official Statistics Tables) and the amount paid for childcare per week (see Table 4.5 in the Official Statistics Tables). For these data, both median and mean values are included in the data tables.

Symbols in tables

The symbols below have been used in the tables and they denote the following:

n/a this category does not apply (given the base of the table)

[] percentage based on fewer than 50 respondents (unweighted)

* percentage value of less than 0.5 but greater than zero⁵

0 percentage value of zero

3 Questionnaire development

3.1 Changes to the questionnaire

A number of changes were made to the 2020 Childcare and Early Years Survey of Parents (CEYSP) questionnaire (from the 2019 survey wave) to reflect changes in policy, and to improve the quality of data captured.

Many of the questionnaire changes reflected the fact that the survey population changed from children aged 0 to 4 in 2019, back to children aged 0 to 14 in 2020, consistent with survey waves prior to 2019.

Overall, 34 new questions were added, and 33 existing questions were deleted. The questionnaire changes are described in the bullet points that follow, in which question names are provided in brackets.

New questions

Questions about holiday childcare for school-age children

Questions about the use of holiday childcare by school-age children in the household were removed from the questionnaire in the 2019 wave and replaced with a section about holiday childcare for pre-school children, reflecting its focus on children aged 0 to 4. These questions were re-instated in the 2020 survey. These questions were added back into the questionnaire for the 2020 wave.

- (Carehol, HolWrk, WhHol, Holeas, HolPla, Noholcar, HolIntro, HolProv, HolNew, ProvHol, HolMore, HChld, HolPay, PayMore, HolMuch, HolWen, HolDays, HolHrs, Hol3, Hol4) These questions asked parents with a school-age child (or children) whether they used childcare in the school holiday

⁵ Where a cell in a table contains only an asterisk, this denotes a percentage value of less than 0.5 but greater than zero. Asterisks are also shown immediately to the left of certain figures in tables that present the results of logistic regression models. In these cases, asterisks denote the level of significance of the odds ratios in the table as follows: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

periods over the past year; whether the respondent only works during school holidays; in which school holiday periods did the family use childcare; how easy the parent finds it to arrange holiday childcare (and why they find it difficult); why the family didn't use any holiday childcare; which provider types were used during the most recent holiday period, and by which child(ren) in the household; whether the parent paid the holiday providers, and if so, whether they paid more, less, or the same as during term time; how many hours of childcare did the payment cover; whether parents have difficulties finding childcare they can afford during the school holidays, and whether they can find holiday care that fits in with their (and their partner's) working hours.

Questions about the government funded entitlement to early education (free hours)

- (F30ExAw, F30ExNaw) These questions were added to gauge parents' understanding of the 30 hours offer. They were last asked in the 2018 wave. They measured parents' awareness that providers can charge for certain extra services, such as meals, consumables, and special lessons or activities; and that parents can choose not to receive, or pay for, these extra services.

Questions about online payment providers

- (PayOnline, PayOnlineWh) These questions asked parents who paid a provider whether the payment had to be made using an online payment provider, and if so, which payment provider.

Question about non-usage of Tax-Free Childcare online payment providers

- (TaxFCSApNWh) This question asked parents why they had not used their Tax-Free Childcare account.

Questions about the use of Children's Centres, Family Centres, Sure Start Centre, or Family Hubs

- (HLCCen, HLCCenO) These questions asked parents whether anyone at home ever takes the selected child to a Children's Centre, a Family Centre, a Sure Start Centre, or a Family Hub, and if so, how often.

Questions about barriers to taking part in home learning activities

- (HLBarOpp, HLBarMotiv) These questions asked parents whether they often struggle to fit learning and play activities with the selected child into their daily routine, and whether the parent considers that it is the responsibility of schools and childcare providers, rather than parents, to help children aged 5 and under to learn to speak and hold conversations.

Questions about parents' perceptions of childcare provision for children with an illness, disability, or special educational need for which they receive support

- (DisSEnFind, DisSEnTrav, DisSEnHours, DisSEnStaff) These questions replaced the (DisFind, DisTrav, DisHours, DisStaff, DisPrep) series of

questions from 2019. The 2020 questions differed from the 2019 questions in that children with a special educational need for which they received support were also included, rather than only children with an illness or disability as was the case in 2019.

- The 2020 questions asked parents with a child with an illness, disability, or special educational need for which they receive support: the ease of find a childcare provider in their area that can cater for their child's needs; the ease of travelling to the nearest childcare provider who can accommodate their child's needs; whether the hours available at childcare providers that can cater for their child's needs fit in with their other daily commitments; and whether staff at the childcare providers they use for their child are trained in how to deal with the child's needs.

Deleted questions

Questions about Tax-Free Childcare

- (TaxFCSAdd, TaxFCSPay) These questions asked parents who had opened a Tax-Free Childcare account whether they had paid any money into their account, and if so, whether they had used their account to make a payment to a childcare provider.

Questions about the government funded entitlement to early education (free hours)

- (F30ApWy) This question asked parents why they had applied for the 30 hours offer.

Questions about holiday childcare for pre-school children

This section asked parents about the receipt of childcare by pre-school children during school holiday periods, to reflect the focus of the survey in 2019 on children aged 0 to 4.

- (HolPSOpen, HolPSWrk, HoIPSCare, HoIPSWHLst, HoIPSProv, HoIPSNNew, HoIPSNNewTyp, HoIPSMore, HoIPSPay, HoIPSPayMore, HoIPSMuch, HoIPSDays, HoIPSHrs, HoIPSWHyr). Parents whose child used a formal provider were asked whether the formal provider remained open during times of the year when school children are on holiday, including half terms, or whether it closed for the school holidays. Parents whose child's formal provider closed throughout the school holidays were asked: whether their job meant that they only worked during school term times, and whether their child received any childcare during the most recent school holiday period. Where the child did receive childcare, parents were asked: which was the most recent holiday period in which this childcare was received; which provider or providers provided this childcare; how much, if anything, they paid each provider and how many days and hours per day this payment covered; how their payments

compared to payments made in term-time; and whether the child had received any childcare in any other school holiday periods over the last year.

Questions about the use of digital technology in the home learning environment

- (HLDDev, HLDAct, HLDOften, HLDEver) These questions ascertained which digital electronic devices selected children aged 0 to 5 used at home; whether anyone at home used a digital electronic device to help the child learn, and if so, how often; and the main reasons the child used a digital electronic device at home.
- (HLDApps, HLDAppPay) These questions asked parents whose child used apps on a digital electronic device at home: how the parent (or partner) chose which apps the child should use; and whether they (or their partner) had ever paid any money for an app for the child, whether by paying to download an app, or making an 'in-app purchase' to buy extra features of an app already owned.

Question about parents' preferences for receiving information

- (LrnPref) This question ascertained from where parents would like to get information and ideas about learning and play activities they could do with their child aged 0 to 5.

Questions about males in the early years workforce

- (CCMales1, CCMales2) Males are significantly under-represented in the early years workforce, with evidence from the Survey of Childcare and Early Years Providers 2018⁶ showing that three per cent of the workforce are male. To help DfE understand parental attitudes towards men in the workforce, these questions asked parents the extent to which they supported or opposed male staff caring for children at formal childcare providers. Parents who did not oppose male staff caring for children were asked whether they thought that male staff should have the same duties and responsibilities as female staff, or only some of these duties and responsibilities.

Questions about parents' perceptions of childcare provision for children with an illness or disability

- (DisFind, DisTrav, DisHours, DisStaff, DisPrep) These questions were removed to make way for a new series of questions (DisSEnFind, DisSEnTrav, DisSEnHours, DisSEnStaff) in 2020. The 2020 questions differed from the 2019 questions in that children with a special educational need for which they received support were also included, rather than only children with an illness or disability as was the case in 2019.

⁶ www.gov.uk/government/publications/provider-finances-evidence-from-early-years-providers

- The deleted questions asked how easy parents found it to find a local childcare provider that could cater for their child's health condition or impairment; how easy it was to travel to the nearest childcare provider who could accommodate their child's health condition or impairment; whether the hours available at childcare providers that could cater for their child's health condition or impairment fitted in with their other daily commitments; whether staff at the childcare providers use for their child with a health condition or impairment were trained in how to deal with this condition; and whether their child's health condition or impairment had made it harder for the child's childcare providers to prepare the child for school.

3.2 Questionnaire content

The questionnaire was structured as follows:

- Household composition, and identification of the selected child.
- Household's use of childcare in the reference week, and the past year.
- Household's awareness and use of the 15 and 30 hours offers.
- Household's childcare costs, for providers used in the reference week.
- Household's receipt of Tax Credits, awareness of Universal Credit, and awareness and use of Tax-Free Childcare.
- The impact of support received on employment and family finances.
- Selected child's attendance record (the day-by-day 'diary' of childcare use in the reference week).
- Selected child's experiences at their main provider, reasons for choosing the main provider, and reasons for the patterns of provision used.
- Selected child's use of childcare during school holiday periods.
- Selected child's home learning environment.
- Respondent's attitudes towards childcare in the local area.
- Respondent's and child(ren)'s demographic characteristics.
- Respondent's employment history.
- Consent to data linkage; consent for follow-up research; contact details for pre-school providers.
- Partner's employment status and details (partner interviewed directly).

4 Sampling

4.1 Survey population

The survey population was children aged 0 to 14 living in private residential accommodation⁷ in England.

This survey population is consistent with survey waves prior to 2019. In 2019, the survey population was children aged 0 to 4 (rather than 0 to 14), to allow for a greater focus on pre-school children.

Although the sampling units were children, the interview for each selected child was conducted with an appropriate adult (defined as an adult within the child's household with 'main or shared responsibility for making decisions about the child's childcare').

4.2 Sample frames

Up until the 2014-15 wave of the Childcare and Early Years Survey of Parents, children were sampled exclusively from the Child Benefit Register (CBR). This was a highly efficient approach given the near universal take-up of Child Benefit among parents of children aged 0 to 14 in England, and hence the near total coverage of the sample population by the sample frame. In 2013 this coverage was damaged by the introduction of the High Income Child Benefit Charge (HICBC), the effect of which has been to decrease the likelihood that children born since 2013 to higher income parents (those where one or both partners earn £60,000 or more per year) are listed on the CBR.

DfE commissioned Ipsos to write a report investigating the potential impact of this change, and to explore potential solutions.⁸ The report found that persisting with the CBR as the sole sampling frame would introduce non-coverage bias that would reduce both the accuracy of survey estimates, and the ability to compare changes in estimates over time. The report recommended that a sample of children should be drawn from the CBR, as per previous survey waves, but should be supplemented with a sample of respondents to the Family Resources Survey (FRS) who had agreed to be recontacted for the purposes of future research. The FRS respondents were those with a child (or children) who had not made a claim for Child Benefit, or who had made a claim for Child Benefit but had subsequently opted-out of receiving Child Benefit due to having a high

⁷ Children living in communal establishments such as children's homes were excluded.

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/childcare-and-early-years-survey-of-parents-sampling-frames>

income. These families would have little or no chance of being selected in the CBR sample.

Since the 2017 wave, the survey has used a dual-frame approach, sampling from both the CBR and the FRS.

Selection of the CBR sample

The sample of children from the CBR was selected by HMRC from all children in England that would be aged 0 to 14 on the first day of fieldwork (15 January 2020) for whom a Child Benefit claim had been made.

A small number of children were excluded from the sampling frame before selection took place. The exclusions were made according to HMRC procedures and reasons included: death of a child, cases where the child has been taken into care or put up for adoption, cases where the child does not live at the same address as the claimant and cases where there has been any correspondence by the recipient with the Child Benefit Centre (because the reason for correspondence cannot be ascertained and may be sensitive).

The sample of children was selected in two stages: selection of Primary Sample Units (PSUs) and selection of individual children within each PSU. Ipsos randomly selected 470 PSUs, plus an additional 470 PSUs that could be used as a reserve sample if needed. The PSUs were based on postcode sectors. HMRC provided a full list of postcode sectors in England with counts for each of the number of children on Child Benefit records aged 0 to 14 rounded to the nearest five and the number of children aged 0 to 4 rounded to the nearest five. In order to reduce clustering, postcode sectors containing fewer than 250 children were grouped with neighbouring postcode sectors. The list of grouped postcode sectors was stratified by Region, population density, proportion of households in managerial professional and intermediate occupations, and, proportion of the population that were unemployed. A size measure was calculated for each PSU based on the population of children, and sample points were selected with probability proportionate to this size measure.

At the second stage, prior to the start of fieldwork 26 children per PSU were selected by HMRC from the selected PSUs (both the 470 main PSUs and 470 reserve PSUs). A list of all eligible children aged 0 to 14 in the PSU was created and was sorted by postcode and child benefit number to help to avoid children from the same household being selected. A weighted design was used to increase the number of children aged 0 to 4 in the sample. Each child aged 0 to 4 on the Child Benefit records on the first day of fieldwork was given a weighted chance value of 2.4 and all other children had a value of 1. This design was intended to provide a roughly equal number of interviews with parents where the selected child was aged 0 to 4, and with parents where the selected child was aged 5 to 14.

The mainstage sample was drawn from the August 2019 extract of Child Benefit data.

Each sampled child was the ‘selected child’ about whom detailed child-specific questions in the Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI) interview was asked. In certain instances, the CAPI programme re-selected this child, from among all children in the household, at the start of the interview. This occurred in the following instances:

- i. Where the selected child was no longer living at the sampled address (for instance, where the family had moved address without informing HMRC, meaning that their address listed on the CBR was out of date). In these instances, as long as there was a child aged 0 to 14 living at the address at the point that the interviewer made contact, the interviewer sought an interview with one of the parents of this child (or children), with the CAPI script randomly choosing one child aged 0 to 14 in the household to become the selected child (where there was more than one). This occurred at 52 households. Prior to the 2019 wave, the interviewer was instead required to attempt to trace the selected child to his or her new address, and conduct the interview there.
- ii. Where the selected child was living at the address, and a child had been born into the household between the date that the sample was drawn and the date of the interview. As there was approximately a gap of five months between the sample being drawn and the start of fieldwork, children that were born during this time were not represented in the sample of children drawn from Child Benefit records. To account for this, in households where a child had been born since the sample was drawn, the CAPI programme re-selected the child that was to be the focus of the child-specific questions from all children (including the newborn child) in the household. This re-selection occurred at 36 households.
- iii. Where the selected child was living at the address, and where the number of children in the household (excluding children born since the sample was drawn) was found to be greater than the number of children living in the household according to Child Benefit records, and where Child Benefit was received by some but not all children in the household. In these instances, there was a (non-newborn) child in the household that did not have a chance of selection at the sampling stage, as said child was not on the Child Benefit database. Such instances may reflect a child in the household for whom the parents had decided not to claim, an error on the Child Benefit database, or a family event such as adoption. In these households, the CAPI programme re-selected the child that was to be the focus of the child-specific questions from all children in the household. This re-selection occurred at 12 households.

Selection of the FRS sample

The sample of FRS respondents (n = 185) was selected by DWP from households who had taken part in the 2018/19 FRS survey, who had consented to be re-contacted for the purposes of further research at the time of their FRS interview, and who had a child (or children) born since 1 January 2013 (that is, since the HICBC was introduced) for whom they either:

- had not made a claim for Child Benefit, or
- had opted out of receiving Child Benefit payments due to having a high income.

Those opting out were included to ensure that all children in FRS households that could not be covered via the CBR were captured. Specifically, while families opting out of receiving Child Benefit remain listed on the CBR and are therefore available to be sampled, their contact details are more likely to be out of date as these families have little reason to inform HMRC of a change of address if they move, and as a result, they are likely to be under-represented in the CBR achieved sample. The FRS sample therefore boosts the sample of households that have opted-out of Child Benefit as they would otherwise be under-represented in a sample selected from the CBR alone.

5 Fieldwork

5.1 Briefings

Prior to the start of fieldwork, all interviewers who had not worked on the 2019 Childcare and Early Years Survey of Parents (CEYSP) attended a half day briefing led by the Ipsos research team.

The briefings covered an introduction to the study and its aims (including a section from DfE that explained the importance of the survey, along with examples of how the survey data has been used to develop and understand the impact of childcare and early years policies), an explanation of the samples and procedures for contacting respondents, full definitions of formal and informal childcare, and a section on securing participation. All briefing sessions covered discussion on conducting research with parents, issues of sensitivities and practical information, and gave interviewers the opportunity to ask any questions.

Ipsos interviewers who had worked on the 2019 CEYSP participated in a refresher telephone briefing, which lasted approximately one hour. This briefing served as a reminder of the key aspects of the survey, explained changes to survey procedures, and gave interviewers the opportunity to ask questions.

5.2 Contact procedures

Letters and leaflet

A letter introducing the survey was mailed prior to the start of fieldwork, in January 2020, addressed to (for the CBR sample) the named benefit recipient of the child sampled from the CBR, and (for the FRS sample) the adult who had taken part in the FRS survey and had consented to be recontacted for further research.

The letter provided details about how the household could opt-out of the survey, should they not wish to participate. Those households that did not opt-out were issued for interview.

Interviewers sent a separate 'advance letter' to each household in their assignment shortly prior to making their calls. Enclosed with the advance letter was a 'survey leaflet', which provided further details about the study.

Interviewer visits

For the CBR sample, interviewers were provided with the selected child's name, address, and the name of the person in the household listed as the recipient of Child Benefit for that child. An interview could be conducted with an adult with 'main or shared responsibility for making decisions about childcare for the selected child'. This adult did not have to be the Child Benefit recipient.

In cases where the selected child had moved from the sampled address, interviewers sought to determine whether a child aged 0 to 14 currently lived at the address. If so, the address was deemed to be eligible, and the interviewer introduced the survey to the current residents (who would not have received any advance communications about the survey), and sought to conduct an interview with a parent of the child (or children) aged 0 to 14 at the address. If the interviewer was unable to identify whether a child aged 0 to 14 lived at the address (for instance, where the current residents refused to provide this information), the address was deemed to be of unknown eligibility, and no interview was sought. If the interviewer determined that no child aged 0 to 14 lived at the address, the address was deemed to be ineligible, and no interview was sought.

These procedures are consistent with those followed in the 2019 survey wave, but differ from those followed prior to 2019. Prior to 2019, where the selected child had moved from the sampled address, the interviewer attempted to trace the child's new address and conduct an interview there. Due to the rising proportion of children found to have moved from the address listed on the CBR (from 13% of addresses issued to interviewers in the 2010 survey wave, to 22% in the 2018 survey wave), combined with the difficulties of tracing new addresses in the field, from the 2019 survey the sampling unit was the address, rather than the child.

For the FRS sample, interviewers were provided with the FRS respondent's name, address, telephone number (if available), and the name of a second adult in the household who carried out the FRS interview (if available). An interview could be conducted with an adult with 'main or shared responsibility for making decisions about childcare for the child or children aged 0 to 14 in the household'.

Interviewers were provided with an 'Impact Card' to use, at their discretion, to maximise co-operation across all issued addresses. This Impact Card laid out some of the ways in which the data from the survey series has been used to improve the services the Government provides to parents.

For both the CBR and FRS samples, an interview only took place where the responsible adult consented to be interviewed.

5.3 Interviewing

Interviews were conducted face-to-face using Computer Aided Personal Interviewing (CAPI). The CAPI script was programmed using SPSS Dimensions software. A set of showcards were provided as an aid to interviewing.

In situations where respondents could not speak English well enough to complete the interview, interviewers were able to use another household member to assist as an interpreter, or another interviewer in the area who was able to speak their language was asked to conduct the interview. If translation was not possible, the interview was not carried out.

The interviews lasted for a mean of 49 minutes, and a median of 45 minutes.

6 Response

6.1 Outcomes and response for CBR sample

12,220 children were sampled from the Child Benefit Register (CBR) – 26 for each of 470 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). Opt-out letters were sent to these addresses, leading 537 respondents to opt out. These addresses were removed from the sample, and a total of 11,683 addresses were issued to interviewers, who sent advance letters before starting their calls.

As fieldwork ended on 17 March 2020 after 1,384 interviews had been completed (1,380 of which were interviews with households sampled from the CBR), due to restrictions on face-to-face fieldwork arising from the COVID-19 pandemic, the issued sample was not fully worked, with many addresses having not receiving any interviewer visits at all. However, all addresses had the opportunity to opt out of the survey via the initial opt-out letter they were sent.

Because the sample was not fully worked, the overall survey response rate (e.g. see Table A.2 in the technical report of the 2019 wave⁹) has not been calculated. This response rate requires an estimate of sample eligibility, the calculation of which will be inaccurate without a fully worked sample. Instead, an unadjusted response rate can be calculated as: completed interviews / (addresses at which one or more interviewer visits

9

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/853542/CEYSP_2019_Technical_Report.pdf

were made + opt-outs). This unadjusted response rate is $1,380 / (4,129 + 537) = 30\%$. One can exclude opt-outs from the denominator to derive an alternative unadjusted response rate which more closely reflects parents' response to interviewers up until to the point at which the survey was cancelled. This unadjusted response rate is $1,380 / 4,129 = 34\%$.

6.2 Outcomes and response for FRS sample

184 valid addresses were sampled from the Family Resources Survey (FRS). Opt-out letters were sent to these addresses, leading one respondent to opt out. This address was removed from the sample, and a total of 183 addresses were issued to interviewers, who sent advance letters before starting their calls. Four interviews were achieved with households from the FRS sample.

As with the CBR sample, because the FRS sample was not fully worked, the overall survey response rate (e.g. see Table A.4 in the technical report of the 2019 wave¹⁰) has not been calculated. This response rate requires an estimate of sample eligibility, the calculation of which will be inaccurate without a fully worked sample. Instead, an unadjusted response rate can be calculated as: completed interviews / (addresses at which one or more interviewer visits were made + opt-outs). This unadjusted response rate is $4 / (26 + 1) = 15\%$. One can exclude opt-outs from the denominator to derive an alternative unadjusted response rate which more closely reflects parents' response to interviewers up until to the point at which the survey was cancelled. This unadjusted response rate is also 15% (i.e. $4 / 26$).

6.3 Profile of the achieved sample

Restrictions on face-to-face interviewing arising from the COVID-19 pandemic meant that the sample could not be fully worked in field, so there is a chance that the achieved sample will deviate from the survey population in a manner that will lead to non-response bias in the survey estimates. This risk would be especially acute if, for instance, the 1,384 interviews that were conducted up until the termination of fieldwork were concentrated in a particular region (or regions) of England, or took place in certain types of areas.

The survey design mitigated against this possibility, with all PSUs randomly allocated to one of three fieldwork 'tranches' intended to be issued to interviewers throughout the fieldwork period. These tranches allowed fieldwork resourcing to be evenly spread out across the fieldwork period, and the random allocation of PSUs to tranches ensured that

10

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/853542/9CEYSP_2019_Technical_Report.pdf

any given tranche was representative of all PSUs. Nevertheless, a comparison of the unweighted achieved sample profile to the available CBR population data – age of child, and region - is instructive. While the data are weighted to these population data to correct biases in the achieved sample profile, sufficiently large deviations cannot be corrected for via weighting.

Table 6.1 shows: the population profile (from Child Benefit Record data, supplied by HMRC) for the age of children in England, the unweighted sample profile for the 2020 survey based on the 1,384 achieved interviews, and the expected proportions of pre-school and school-age selected children after accounting for the boost of children aged 0 to 4. These data show that the expected proportions for pre-school and school-age selected children (50.0% each) match the achieved sample almost precisely (49.8% and 50.2% respectively).

Table 6.1 Population data and achieved sample profile for age of children

Age	Population		Achieved sample		Expected achieved sample (given boost)
	%		%	%	
0	2.5	27.6	6.1	49.8	50.0
1	5.7		11.0		
2	6.2		10.2		
3	6.5		12.3		
4	6.7		10.2		
5	6.7	72.4	4.9	50.2	50.0
6	6.9		5.1		
7	7.4		5.5		
8	7.5		5.9		
9	7.6		4.7		
10	7.5		4.3		
11	7.5		5.6		
12	7.3		4.5		
13	7.1		5.5		
14	6.9		4.3		

Table 6.2 shows the regional distribution of children aged 0 to 14, comparing the population profile (from CBR records, supplied by HMRC) to the unweighted achieved sample profile.

These data show that at the point at which interviewing was terminated, interviews had been conducted across all regions of England, and while there are some differences between the population and sample profiles (for instance, proportionately more interviews were conducted in the East of England, and proportionately fewer in the East Midlands) these differences were relatively modest in size.

Table 6.2 Population data and achieved sample profile for region in which children reside

	Population	Achieved sample
--	------------	-----------------

Region	%	%
Northeast	4.6	7.9
North West	13.4	10.5
Yorkshire and the Humber	10.0	13.4
East Midlands	8.6	5.0
West Midlands	10.9	8.6
East of England	11.2	17.0
London	16.2	14.0
South East	15.9	15.8
South West	9.3	7.7

One can also compare the unweighted achieved sample profile to certain geo-demographic data derived from the full sample frame provided by HMRC – that is, from the list of all addresses that would have been issued to field across all three tranches had fieldwork not been cancelled. This comparison is shown in Table 6.3 (for Area deprivation), and Table 6.4 (for rurality). These data show a very close match between the sample frame, and the achieved sample, for each.

Table 6.3 Population data and achieved sample profile for area deprivation

	Sample frame	Achieved sample
Area deprivation	%	%
1 st quintile – least deprived	16	15
2 nd quintile	16	19
3 rd quintile	21	20
4 th quintile	21	23
5 th quintile – most deprived	26	24

Table 6.4 Population data and achieved sample profile for rurality

	Sample frame	Achieved sample
Area deprivation	%	%
Rural	15	13
Urban	85	87
Urban - major conurbation	38	37
Urban - minor conurbation	4	5
Urban - city and town	43	45
Rural - town and fringe	8	7
Rural - town and fringe in a sparse setting	*	0
Rural - village and dispersed	7	6
Rural - village and dispersed in a sparse setting	*	0

All survey estimates are vulnerable to non-response bias, to a great or lesser extent. While we should expect the survey estimates to be more vulnerable to non-response bias than they would have been had fieldwork completed as initially envisaged, in the absence

of any restrictions to face-to-face interviewing, the analyses in this section show that the achieved sample is broadly in line with the population profile, and do not provide evidence of high levels of non-response bias.

Data processing

6.4 CAPI checks and coding

The CAPI script ensured that the correct routing was followed throughout the questionnaire and applied range checks, which prevented invalid values from being entered. It also included consistency checks, which prompted interviewers to check answers that were inconsistent with information provided earlier in the interview. These checks allowed interviewers to clarify and query any data discrepancies directly with the respondent and were used extensively throughout the questionnaire.

In previous waves the data collected during interviews was coded, to include verbatim responses provided at 'other-specify' question. Given the cancellation of the 2020 survey wave early in the fieldwork period, the data was not coded.

6.5 Analysis

Data tables showing survey results were created. These were generated in SPSS (version 24). The complex samples module in SPSS was used to take into account the impact of stratification, clustering and non-response on survey estimates where relevant.

Provider edits

In previous waves, checks have been carried out on respondents' classifications of the pre-school childcare providers they used in order to improve the accuracy of the classifications. These checks have entailed telephoning pre-school providers to ask them which services they provide, and combining this data with parents' answers to derive the correct classifications.

Given the cancellation of the 2020 survey wave early in the fieldwork period, provider edits were not carried out.

6.6 Weighting

Summary of the weighting

The sample was selected from two sources: the main component was sampled from the Child Benefit Register (CBR) as per previous years of the survey, with an additional sample from respondents to the Family Resources Survey (FRS) that were identified as

not receiving Child Benefit because of the introduction of the High Income Benefit Charge. These two components of the survey were weighted separately.

The sample is analysed at both the family and child-level, and hence there are two final weights; a family weight for family-level analyses, and a child weight for analyses of data collected about the selected child.

Child Benefit sample: Family weights

Family selection weight

The Child Benefit sample was designed to be representative of the population of children (aged 14 or younger) of parents receiving Child Benefit, rather than the population of parents or families themselves. This design feature means that larger families are over-represented in the sample¹¹. The first stage of the weighting for the family weights corrects for these design features by calculating the appropriate selection weights; these selection weights corrected for families for which the number of children on the sample frame differed from the number of children found in the family at interview.

The family selection weight is the inverse of the family's selection probability, so larger households are weighted down:

$W1 = 1/Pr(F)$; where

$Pr(F) = (\# \text{ children not aged 0 to 4}) + 2.4 \times (\# \text{ children aged 0 to 4})$

The counts of the children were based on the sampling frame information, but were adjusted up (or down) if more (or fewer) children were found in the family at interview – this adjustment was trimmed to reduce the variance of the final child weights.

Family calibration weight

The next stage of the weighting adjusted the sample using calibration weighting, so that the weighted distribution for region and the number of children in the household at the family level matched the family-level Child Benefit counts, and the weighted distribution for age groups at the child level matched child-level Child Benefit counts (Table A.1). HMRC provided Ipsos with a breakdown of the sampling frame (before exclusions) for different variables at family and child level (see Tables A.7 and A.8).

The family selection weights (W1) were used as the starting weights for the calibration weighting stage.

¹¹ This follows from children in England having an equal chance of selection, meaning that a family with two children has twice the chance of having a child selected as a family with one child, a family with four children has four times the chance of having a child selected as a family with one child, and so on.

Table A.1 Control totals for the family calibration weights

	Population	Population	Selection weight (W1)	Final weight (W2)
	N	%	%	%
Region (families)				
North East	257,588	4.6	7.8	4.8
North West	743,500	13.4	10.8	13.6
Yorkshire and the Humber	553,279	10.0	13.2	10.1
East Midlands	477,658	8.6	4.6	7.4
West Midlands	603,203	10.9	8.4	11.0
East of England	621,013	11.2	16.9	11.3
London	896,568	16.2	13.7	16.3
South East	882,121	15.9	16.5	16.1
South West	514,767	9.3	8.2	9.4
TOTAL	5,549,697			
Children's age (children)				
0-1	748,415	8.2	11.2	8.4
2-4	1,758,047	19.4	20.3	19.4
5-7	1,906,545	21.0	21.2	21.0
8-11	2,724,495	30.0	28.5	30.1
12-14	1,937,908	21.4	18.8	21.1
TOTAL	9,075,410			
Number of children aged 0 to 14 in household (families)				
1	2,897,122	52.2	43.0	51.7
2	1,985,991	35.8	43.4	36.2
3	510,391	9.2	10.0	9.2
4+	156,193	2.8	3.5	2.9
TOTAL	5,549,697			

The weights after the calibration stage were the Child Benefit family weights (W2).

Child Benefit sample: Child weights

Child selection weight

At each sampled address from the Child Benefit sample, a single child aged 0 to 14 was selected at random to be the focus of the detailed childcare section of the questionnaire. Children aged 0 to 4 were given a higher chance of selection (by a factor of 2.4) in order to boost the sample in that age range.

The child selection weight (W3) is the inverse of the child selection probabilities applied within each household:

$$W3 = 1/\text{Pr}(C); \text{ where}$$

$\text{Pr}(C) = 2.4 / [(\# \text{ children not aged 0 to 4}) + 2.4 \times (\# \text{ children aged 0 to 4})]$ if the child was not aged 0 to 4

Child calibration weight

The next stage was to produce calibration weights that adjusted the sample of selected children so that the weighted distributions for age/sex groups, region and number of children in the household matched child-level Child Benefit counts (Table A.2). The starting weights for the calibration stage (W4) were obtained by combining the family weight (W2) with the child selection weights (W3): $W4 = W2 \times W3$.

Table A.2 Control totals for the child calibration weights

	Population	Population	Pre-calibration weight (W4)	Final weight (W4)
	N	%	%	%
Region (children)				
North East	417,108	4.6	4.4	4.6
North West	1,227,229	13.5	13.5	13.5
Yorkshire and the Humber	917,849	10.1	9.8	10.1
East Midlands	779,209	8.6	8.4	8.6
West Midlands	1,015,583	11.2	10.8	11.2
East of England	1,006,912	11.1	11.6	11.1
London	1,451,611	16.0	17.8	16.0
South East	1,420,857	15.7	15.5	15.7
South West	839,052	9.2	8.3	9.2
TOTAL	9,075,410			
Selected child's gender / age (children)				
Males: 0-1	383,639	4.2	4.3	4.2
Males: 2-4	900,863	9.9	8.5	9.9
Males: 5-7	976,289	10.8	9.4	10.8
Males: 8-11	1,394,601	15.4	13.9	15.4
Males: 12-14	991,301	10.9	12.6	10.9
Females: 0-1	364,776	4.0	3.7	4.0
Females: 2-4	857,184	9.4	10.0	9.4
Females: 5-7	930,256	10.3	11.7	10.3
Females: 8-11	1,329,894	14.7	17.4	14.7
Females: 12-14	946,607	10.4	8.6	10.4
TOTAL	9,075,410			
Number of children in household (children)				
1	2,896,890	31.9	24.6	31.5
2	3,971,663	43.8	49.6	44.2
3	1,531,050	16.9	17.2	16.9
4+	675,808	7.4	8.6	7.5
TOTAL	9,075,411			

FRS Sample: Family and child weights

Because the number of interviews carried out with the sample selected from the Family Resources Survey was small (4), a complex weighting strategy was not appropriate. Instead, the child and family weights for the FRS sample were both set to be three times the corresponding mean value for the Child Benefit sample weights.

The weights for the two sample components were combined and re-scaled to have mean of 1, so the weights sum to the sample size.

Effective sample size

Disproportionate sampling and sample clustering usually result in a loss of precision for survey estimates. All else being equal, the more variable the weights, the greater the loss in precision.

The effect of the sample design on the precision of survey estimates is indicated by the effective sample size. The effective sample size measures the size of an (unweighted) simple random sample that would have provided the same precision as the design being implemented. The efficiency of a sample is given by the ratio of the effective sample size to the actual sample size.

The estimated 'average' effective sample size and sample efficiency were calculated for both weights (Table A.3). Note that this calculation includes only effects of the weighting; it does not include clustering effects, which will be question-specific. In addition, this is an 'average' effect for the weighting – the true effect will vary from question to question. These figures provide a guide to the average level of precision of child-level and family-level survey estimates.

Table A.3 Effective sample size and weighting efficiency

	All
<i>Base: All cases</i>	1,384
Child weight	
Effective sample size	942
Sample efficiency	68.1%
Family weight	
Effective sample size	780
Sample efficiency	56.4%

Confidence intervals

Confidence intervals (at the 95% level) for key estimates in the survey are shown in Table A.4. The confidence intervals have been generated using standard errors calculated using complex samples formulae.

Table A.4 Confidence intervals (95%) for key estimates

	Estimate	Standard error	Lower	Upper	Unweighted base
Use of any childcare by family	76.97%	0.02	73.48%	80.47%	1,384
Use of formal childcare by family	63.89%	0.02	60.22%	67.57%	1,384
Use of informal childcare by family	32.56%	0.02	28.97%	36.15%	1,384
Hours of childcare used (pre-school children) (mean)	25.56	0.99	23.60	27.52	463
Hours of childcare used (school-age children) (mean)	9.01	0.63	7.77	10.26	380
Weekly amount (£) paid for childcare (mean)	50.33	2.86	44.64	56.03	638
Use of holiday childcare (when main provider closed)	41.41%	0.02	36.67%	46.16%	1,081

Appendix: Socio-demographic profile

The data in this appendix show the socio-demographic profile of the achieved sample. The data are weighted by the final household weight, or child weight, as appropriate for the level of analysis. Details of the weighting is provided in Section 6.6.

Respondent characteristics

Gender

As in previous surveys in the series, the majority of parents who responded to the survey were female (86%).

Age

The mean age of respondents was 39. Table B.1 shows the age bands of respondents by family type. It shows that respondents in couple families tended to be slightly older than lone parent respondents.

Table B.1 Age of respondent, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Age of respondent	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,089	295	1,384
20 and under	*	*	*
21 to 30	12	19	14
31 to 40	42	36	41
41 to 50	39	35	38
51+	6	9	7
Mean	39.4	39.2	39.4

Marital status

The majority of respondents (70%) were married and living with their husband/wife. Just over one in five (22%) were single and never married (including persons who were cohabiting) (Table B.2).

Table B.2 Marital status

	All
Marital status	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,384
Married and living with husband/wife	70
Single (never married)	22
Divorced	4
Married and separated from husband/wife	3
Widowed	1

Qualifications

Respondents in lone parent families tended to have lower qualifications than respondents in couple families (Table B.3). Lone parents were less likely to hold Honours and Masters degrees as their highest qualification than were respondents in couple families, and were more likely not to hold any academic qualifications.

Table B.3 Highest qualification, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Qualifications	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,089</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>1,384</i>
GCSE grade D-G/CSE grade 2-5/SCE O Grades (D-E)/SCE	4	11	6
GCSE grade A-C/GCE O-level passes/CSE grade 1/SCE O	13	23	15
GCE A-level/SCE Higher Grades (A-C)	15	17	16
Certificate of Higher Education	9	9	9
Foundation degree	4	3	3
Honours degree (e.g. BSc, BA, BEd)	26	12	22
Masters degree (e.g. MA, PGDip)	12	6	11
Doctorate (e.g. PhD)	1	*	1
Other academic qualifications	7	4	7
None	9	14	10

Family characteristics

Size of the family

The median family size was four people. The smallest families comprised two people (i.e. one parent and one child), and the largest comprised 9 people.

Number of children aged 0 to 14 in the family

Around half (51%) of families had one child aged 0 to 14, 37 per cent had two children, and 12 per cent had three or more children (Table B.4). Lone parents tended to have fewer children than couple families.

Table B.4 Number of children in the family, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Number of children	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,089</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>1,384</i>
1	47	65	51
2	41	27	37
3+	13	9	12

One in five (20%) families had only pre-school children, 18 per cent had both pre-school and school-age children, and 62 per cent had only school-age children (Table B.5).

Table B.5 Number of pre-school and school-age children in the family, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Age of children in family	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,089	295	1,384
Only pre-school children (0 to 4 years)	21	16	20
Both pre-school and school-age children	19	18	18
Only school-age children (5 to 14 years)	60	67	62

Family annual income

Table B.6 shows the family annual income (before tax). Lone parents tended to have lower family annual incomes than couple families.

Table B.6 Annual family income, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Family annual income	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,011	277	1,288
Up to £9,999	2	23	7
£10,000 - £19,999	8	38	15
£20,000 - £29,999	16	25	18
£30,000 - £44,999	23	6	19
£45,000 - £64,999	24	5	19
£65,000 or more	28	2	22

Family type and work status

Table B.7 shows family type and work status. Over half of respondents were from couple families where both parents worked (54%), and a further 19 per cent were in couple families where one parent worked. In 13 per cent of families no-one was working (10% were non-working lone parent families and 3% were couple families where neither parent was in work).

Table B.7 Family work status

	All
Family work status	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,384</i>
Couple – both working	54
Couple – one working	19
Couple – neither working	3
Lone parent working	14
Lone parent not working	10

Tenure

The tenure of respondents' families is shown in Table B.8. Families were most likely to be renting the property (41%) or buying it with the help of a mortgage or loan (49%). Most couple families were in the process of buying their home with the help of a mortgage or loan (58%), while most lone parents were renting (70%).

Table B.8 Tenure status, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Tenure status	%	%	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,087</i>	<i>293</i>	<i>1,380</i>
Buying it with the help of a mortgage or loan	58	20	49
Rent it	32	70	41
Own it outright	8	8	8
Live rent-free (in relative's/friend's property)	1	1	1
Pay part rent and part mortgage (shared ownership)	1	1	1

Selected child characteristics

Gender

There was a roughly even split of selected boys (49%) and girls (51%).

Age

The age of the selected child was spread across all age categories (Table B.9).

Table B.9 Age of selected child, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Age of selected child	%	%	%
<i>Base: All child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,089</i>	<i>295</i>	<i>1,384</i>
0 to 2	16	12	15
3 to 4	13	13	13
5 to 7	20	24	21
8 to 11	30	31	30
12 to 14	21	20	21

Ethnic group

The majority of selected children in the survey were White British (69%) (Table B.10).

Table B.10 Ethnicity of selected child, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Ethnicity of selected child	%	%	%
<i>Base: All child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,088</i>	<i>294</i>	<i>1,382</i>
White			
White British	68	72	69
White Irish	*	0	*
Other White	9	5	8
Mixed			
White and Caribbean	1	3	1
White and Black African	1	1	1
White and Asian	2	2	2
Other mixed	1	1	1
Asian or Asian British			
Indian	3	1	2
Pakistani	5	2	4
Bangladeshi	2	2	2
Other Asian	2	2	2
Black or Black British			
Caribbean	*	1	*
African	4	5	4
Other Black	1	2	1
Chinese	1	*	*
Arab	1	1	1
Other	1	*	1

Special education needs and disabilities

Ten per cent of selected children had a special educational need¹², and nine per cent had a long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability (Table B.11).

Table B.11 Special educational needs or disabilities of selected child, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Special educational needs or disabilities of selected child	%	%	%
<i>Base: All child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,089	295	1,384
Child has SEN	8	16	10
Child has long-standing physical or mental impairment, illness or disability	8	13	9

Among children with a special educational need, 42 per cent had an Education, Health and Care plan or a Statement of special educational needs, and 26 per cent received SEN support (Table B.12). A further eight per cent received one of these (an Education, Health and Care plan/Statement of special educational needs, or SEN support) but the parent did not know which.

Table B.12 Support received by selected child with special educational needs, by family type

	Family type		
	Couples	Lone parents	All
Special educational needs	%	%	%
<i>Base: All child(ren) with a special educational need or other special needs</i>	64	39	103
Child has Education, Health and Care plan or Statement of special educational needs	41	[46]	42
Child receives SEN support	27	[24]	26
Child receives one of the above but parent does not know which	7	[10]	8
Child does not receive any of these	25	[20]	23

¹² The selected child was categorised as having a special educational need (or not) during the interview via the parent's response to the question "Does [child's name] have any special educational needs or other special needs? [yes/no/don't know/refused]"

Region, area deprivation and rurality

Table B.13 shows the geographical spread of the surveyed families according to region.

Table B.13 Region

	All
Region	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,384
North East	5
North West	13
Yorkshire and the Humber	10
East Midlands	7
West Midlands	11
East of England	12
London	16
South East	16
South West	9

Interviewed families lived in a broad range of areas in terms of deprivation levels, as defined by the Index of Multiple Deprivation in England (Table B.14).

Table B.14 Area deprivation according to the Index of Multiple Deprivation

	All
Area deprivation	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	1,384
1 st quintile – least deprived	16
2 nd quintile	20
3 rd quintile	20
4 th quintile	21
5 th quintile – most deprived	23

Table B.15 shows that 87 per cent of families lived in urban areas, with the remaining 13 per cent living in rural areas.

Table B.15 Rurality

	All
Rurality	%
<i>Base: All families with child(ren) aged 0 to 14</i>	<i>1,384</i>
Rural	87
Urban	13
Urban - major conurbation	40
Urban - minor conurbation	4
Urban - city and town	43
Rural - town and fringe	7
Rural - village and dispersed	6
Rural - village and dispersed in a sparse setting	0



Department
for Education

© Department for Education 2022

For any enquiries regarding this publication, contact us at
EY.ANALYSISANDRESEARCH@education.gov.uk or www.education.gov.uk/contactus

This document is available for download at www.gov.uk/government/publications