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BACKGROUND

Survey of pregnant women and parents of young children (Parent Survey)

• Conducted in 2011 as part of Oregon’s needs assessment required by the Affordable Care Act (ACA) Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Program

• To assess the service needs of at-risk families in Oregon and the ease or difficulties of getting services.
Study Questions

Are there differences between families who received home visiting services and those who did not in:

(a) the level of service needs?
(b) the level of difficulty getting services?

Are there any other notable demographic/family characteristics related to levels of service needs and difficulty getting services?
Parent Survey

Survey development

- Developed by a home visiting needs assessment workgroup
- Tested by parents in home visiting programs
- Survey languages:
  English, Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Korean

Survey methods

April – June 2011; a structured written questionnaire; anonymous; non-random sampling, targeted primarily at low-income groups

(a) Paper survey, distributed by WIC and home visiting programs and returned by mail
(b) Paper survey, outreach to metro and rural areas
(c) Online survey, via Internet social media
Parent Survey

Survey content

• List of 32 items of family services:
  – Did anyone in the household need the service in 2010 or 2011?
  – If yes, how easy or difficult was it to get the service?

• Home visiting services
  – Did the respondent receive home visiting services in 2010 or 2011?

• Household demographics
• Screening for children with special health needs
METHODS

Factor analysis; multiple regression analysis

• Factor analysis
  – To identify a small set of factors (types of services) to represent the 32 survey items used to measure families’ service needs and difficulty getting the services needed
  – Exploratory factor analysis (principal component analysis; oblique rotation)
• **Multiple regression analysis**
  – To assess whether levels of families’ service needs and difficulties getting services in the factors derived from factor analysis are different:
    (a) Between respondents who received home visiting services and those who did not;
    (b) Among respondents of other different demographic/family characteristics
RESULTS

Survey respondents

N = 4,628

51% (2,375) received home visiting services in 2010 or 2011;
42% (1,958) did not;
7% (295) did not answer or were not sure.
Demographic/family characteristics:
All respondents

- 94%, female
- 30 years old on average
- 54%, White alone; 34%, Hispanic/Latino of any race
- 79%, a household income at 185% of FPL or below
- 26%, education < high school or GED
- 53%, a child(ren) with special health needs in household
- 27%, single-parent household
- 14%, someone pregnant in household
- 31%, living in rural/frontier counties.
Demographic/family characteristics:
Respondents who received home visiting services (vs. those who did not)

• Greater proportion of:
  – Females
  – Hispanic or Latino (of any race)
  – Not employed
  – Single-parent home
  – Household income at 185% of FPL or below
  – English, not the primary language in home

• On average,
  – Younger
  – Less education
Comparison of respondents’ demographic/family characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received Home Visiting (n=2,375; 54.8%)</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Home Visiting (n=1,958; 45.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender: Female</strong></td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (mean)</strong></td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino, any race</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (mean)</strong></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12th grade (1)</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade or GED (2)</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college (3)</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree or more (4)</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working, looking for work</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working, not looking for work</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 Percentages and means in the table are based on: (a) the total excluding 'missing' responses. Chi-square or t tests, **p < .001; **p < .01 for differences between respondents who received home visiting services and those who did not.
Comparison of respondents’ demographic/family characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Received Home Visiting (n=2,375; 54.8%)</th>
<th>Did Not Receive Home Visiting (n=1,958; 45.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Poverty Level (FPL)(^2): 185% or below***</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent home***</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, not primary language in home***</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone pregnant in household***</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with a child with special health needs***</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with health insurances in household***</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Frontier (vs. Urban) Counties</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ¹ Percentages and means in the table are based on the total excluding 'missing' responses. ² Federal Poverty Levels (FPLs) were approximated by using respondents' household income categories and the number of household members. ³ Chi-square or t-tests, ***p < .001; **P < .01 for differences between respondents who received home visiting services and those who did not.
Results of Factor Analysis

10 factors derived from 32 survey items

F1. Parenting needs (6 items)
F2. Pregnancy/newborn needs (4)
F3. Services for special health needs (5)
F4. Language/transportation needs (2)
F5. Basic needs (4)
F6. Job needs (2)
F7. Mental health/substance abuse/domestic violence (4)
F8. Health care needs (5)
F9. Child care (1)
F10. Information about other resources/services (1)
Results of Factor Analysis

10 factors (types of services)

**Factor 1- Parenting needs**
1. Information and support about playing with, reading to, and teaching children new things
2. Information and support on parenting
3. Help with finding out if a child is growing and developing normally
4. Information about how to improve diet and nutrition for the family
5. Information about how to keep children safe and prevent injuries
6. Information and support about how to relate to a baby or young child
(Cronbach’s alpha= .88)

**Factor 2- Pregnancy/newborn needs**
1. Information and support about breastfeeding
2. Information and support about having a healthy pregnancy
3. Information and support about how to care for a newborn
4. Information and support about how to relate to a baby or young child
(Cronbach’s alpha= .90)
Results of Factor Analysis

**Factor 3- Services for special health needs**
1. Help getting services for a child with special health needs
2. Information on caring for a child with special health needs
3. Help with coordinating multiple services a child needs or is receiving
4. Health care from a specialist for a child
5. Mental health or behavioral health services for a child
   (Cronbach’s alpha= .79)

**Factor 4- Language/transportation needs**
1. Translation or interpretation services
2. Help with transportation
   (Cronbach’s alpha= .41)

**Factor 5- Basic needs**
1. Help with getting food for the family
2. Housing assistance (rent, power, heat, water, phone)
3. Help getting health insurance and medical care
4. Cash assistance, such as TANF
   (Cronbach’s alpha= .71)
Results of Factor Analysis

Factor 6- Job needs
1. Help with job search
2. Help with getting job training or education
(Cronbach’s alpha= .78)

Factor 7- Mental health/ substance abuse/domestic violence needs
1. Mental health or behavioral health services for a child
2. Help for alcohol or drug use or abuse
3. Help for domestic violence or sexual violence
4. Mental health or behavioral health services for an adult
(Cronbach’s alpha= .55)

Factor 8- Health care needs
1. General health care for an adult, such as a physical exam
2. Dental health care for an adult (including cleanings)
3. General health care for a child, such as a well-child exam or physical exam
4. Dental health care for a child (including cleanings)
5. Health care from a specialist for an adult
(Cronbach’s alpha= .66)

Factor 9
1. Child care (including specialized child care)

Factor 10
1. Information about other resources and services that your family may need
Level of Service Needs & Difficulties in 10 Factors

Measures

• Level of families’ service needs (0-100%)  
  \[ \text{Level} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of the service items needed in a factor}}{\text{Total number of the service items in the factor}} \right) \times 100 \]

• Level of families’ difficulty getting services (0-100%)  
  \[ \text{Level} = \left( \frac{\text{Number of the service items that a family had difficulty getting in a factor}}{\text{Number of the service items needed in the factor}} \right) \times 100 \]
Average level of families’ service needs

Note: ^The number of respondents is slightly different across the factors due to missing responses. T-tests, ***p < .001 for % differences between families who received home visiting and those who did not.
Average level of families’ difficulty getting services (among those who needed services)

T-tests, **p < .01 for % differences between families who received home visiting services and those who did not
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

To assess differences in levels of service needs and access difficulties, controlling for demographic/family characteristics

• **Independent variables**
  – Home visiting status
  – 10 demographic/family characteristics
    *(race/ethnicity, employment, poverty level, single-parent, pregnancy, children with special health needs, English at home, rural/urban county, education, household health insurance)*

• **Dependent variable**
  In each of 10 factors and the overall average:
  (a) Level of service needs
  (b) Level of difficulty getting the services needed

• 22 regression analyses
**Example-** Level of service needs in Parenting Factor: Results of multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Visiting &amp; Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Unstandardized B (Std. Error)</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive home visiting (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did receive home visiting</td>
<td>25.86 (1.28)</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other- 1 or more races</td>
<td>10.29 (3.54)</td>
<td>.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, full-time (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, part time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, looking for work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, not looking</td>
<td>3.18 (1.37)</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, primary at home (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, not primary at home</td>
<td>11.21 (1.44)</td>
<td>.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban counties (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Frontier counties</td>
<td>-3.78 (1.34)</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. (REF) indicates a reference group to which all other groups within each characteristic are compared.
2. Model statistics: $R^2 = .394$; $R^2 = .155$; $F(5, 3238) = 118.78, ***p < .001$; **p < .05; *p < .01; p < .05
3. Six demographic characteristics (education, income, single-parent, pregnancy, children with special needs, and household health insurance) were not related to the level of needs in Parenting Factor.
**Example**- Level of difficulty getting services in Parenting Factor:  
Results of multiple regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Visiting &amp; Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Unstandardized B (Std. Error)</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not receive home visiting (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did receive home visiting</td>
<td>-9.48 (1.52)</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>14.38 (3.60)</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other- 1 or more races</td>
<td>-7.16 (3.62)</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less educated (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More educated</td>
<td>1.53 (.71)</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, full-time (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, part time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, looking for work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, not looking</td>
<td>-4.00 (1.46)</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income, above 185% FPL (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income, 185% FPL or below</td>
<td>-6.21 (1.92)</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children with special health needs (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children with special health needs</td>
<td>8.76 (1.35)</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban counties (REF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Frontier counties</td>
<td>-4.19 (1.49)</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 1. (REF) indicates a reference group to which all other groups within each characteristic are compared.  
2. Model statistics: $R^2 = .282; R^2 = .080; F(8, 2282) = 24.73, ***p < .001; **p < .01; *p <.05$  
3. Four demographic characteristics (single-parent, pregnancy, English speaking at home, and household health insurance) were not related to the level of difficulty in Parenting Factor.
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Level of service needs

• Respondents who had received home visiting reported needing more services than those who had not in:
  – all of individual factors except health care
  – the overall average of 10 factors

• The status of receiving home visiting was the strongest predictor of greater service needs in:
  – 3 factors (parenting, pregnancy/newborn and information about other resources/services)
  – the overall average of 10 factors

➢ Home visiting programs served families with greater needs.
Results of Multiple Regression Analysis

Level of difficulty getting services

• Respondents who had received home visiting reported less difficulty getting the needed services than those who had not in:
  – all of 10 individual factors; the overall average of 10 factors

• Home visiting
  – the strongest predictor of having less difficulty in 4 factors (parenting, job, mental health/substance abuse/domestic v. and information about other resources/services)
  – 2\textsuperscript{nd} strongest predictor of less difficulty in the overall average of 10 factors

> Home visiting programs helped families get the services they needed.
2 other notable demographic/family characteristics

- **Families with a child with special health needs**
  - More service needs in all individual factors except parenting and pregnancy/newborn;
    - 2^{nd} strongest predictor of more needs in the overall average of 10 factors
  - More difficulty getting services in all individual factors except language/transportation;
    - the strongest predictor of more difficulty in the overall average
2 other notable demographic/family characteristics

- Families who live in urban counties
  - More service needs in:
    › all individual factors except health care and child care
    › the overall average of 10 factors
  - More difficulty getting services in:
    › 5 factors (parenting, pregnancy/newborn, basic needs, health care and information on other resources/services)
    › the overall average
CONCLUSIONS

Implications

• Home visiting programs in Oregon are successful in:
  – serving families with greater needs
  – helping families get the services they need.

• More outreach and services to population subgroups with greater needs and difficulties, e.g., families with a child with special health needs, urban counties

• Interventions tailored to ensure identifying and meeting families’ service needs.
  – Families with a child with special health needs, likely to need a wide range of services; have difficulty getting services.
  – Urban counties, likely to have difficulty getting 5 types of services (parenting, pregnancy/newborn, basic needs, health care and information on other resources/services)
Limitations

• **Parent Survey, not designed to measure causal relationships**
  – Asked respondents about needs for family services, access difficulties and receipt of home visiting for the same time period, 2010 or 2011.
  – Causality (corroborating evidence in the literature):
    “Respondents were in need of family services.
    → Families received home visiting.
    → Families had less difficulty getting family services.”

• **No control for extraneous factors**, e.g., receiving other program services

• **Response bias**: self-reported data
e.g., perceived needs and difficulty may be different, depending on income, race/ethnicity.
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