



**NHES:2007  
Request for  
IMT/OMB Review**

**August 30, 2006**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>PART A: JUSTIFICATION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Request for Clearance.....	1
Introduction.....	1
A.1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information.....	10
A.2. Purposes and Uses of the Data.....	14
A.3. Use of Improved Information Technology.....	15
A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication.....	16
A.5. Collection of Data from Small Businesses.....	25
A.6. Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection.....	25
A.7. Special Circumstances.....	26
A.8. Public Comment and Consultations Outside the Agency.....	26
A.9. Payments to Respondents.....	34
A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality.....	35
A.11. Sensitive Questions.....	38
A.12. Estimated Response Burden.....	39
A.13. Annualized Cost to Respondents.....	41
A.14. Annualized Cost to the Federal Government.....	41
A.15. Reasons for Program Changes.....	41
A.16. Publication Plans and Project Schedule.....	41
A.17. Approval for Not Displaying the Expiration Date for OMB Approval.....	51
A.18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement.....	51
<b>PART B. DESCRIPTION OF STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>53</b>
B.1. Statistical Design and Estimation.....	53
B.2. Survey Procedures.....	88
B.3. Methods for Maximizing Response Rates.....	95
B.4. Tests of Procedures and Methods.....	97
B.5. Individuals Responsible for Study Design and Performance.....	109
<b>PART C: JUSTIFICATION OF NHES:2007 QUESTIONNAIRES.....</b>	<b>111</b>
C.1. Screener.....	111
C.2. School Readiness and Parent and Family Involvement in Education Interview.....	118
C.3. Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Interview.....	138
C.4. PFI Reinterview.....	149
References.....	151

Appendix A: Screener, School Readiness and Parent and Family Involvement in Education Interview, Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Interview, and PFI Reinterview.....	A-1
Appendix B: Respondent Materials.....	B-1
Appendix C: Details About Sample Size Requirement.....	C-1

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
Table 1.	Estimated response burden for NHES:2007.....	40
Table 2.	Race/ethnicity distribution of completed interviews in NHES:2003: Actual counts and percentages compared to counts and percentages expected without oversampling in the high minority stratum: 2003.....	62
Table 3.	Screener response rates and ever refusal rates, by incentive group: 2003.....	65
Table 4.	Expected numbers of sampled telephone numbers and completed Screeners, and expected residency and Screener unit response rates, by stratum: 2007.....	73
Table 5.	Percentage of telephone households with eligible children, by age/grade group: CPS 2003.....	80
Table 6.	Expected number of screened households in NHES:2007, by household composition: CPS 2003.....	81
Table 7.	Expected number of adults sampled for AEWI interviews, by number of adults and presence of eligible children in household: 2007.....	82
Table 8.	Expected numbers sampled and expected numbers of completed interviews in the telephone sample for NHES:2007.....	83
Table 9.	Comparison of expected number of persons sampled for extended interview in NHES:2007 to the numbers sampled in previous survey administrations.....	85
Table 10.	Comparison of expected numbers of completed interviews in NHES:2007 to the numbers completed in previous survey administrations.....	86

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Page</b>
Exhibit 1.	Topics addressed in surveys conducted under the National Household Education Surveys Program and years administered.....	2
Exhibit 2.	NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure.....	36
Exhibit 3.	Westat Confidentiality Pledge.....	37
Exhibit 4.	NHES 2007 schedule of major activities.....	51
Exhibit 5.	NXXType codes.....	58
Exhibit 6.	Key design features of the NHES:2007 nonresponse bias evaluation.....	68
Exhibit 7.	Overview of the sampling scheme for selecting adults based on household composition.....	79

**LIST OF EXHIBITS-Continued**

<b>Exhibit</b>		<b>Page</b>
Exhibit C-1.	Item-by-item description of the NHES:2007 Screener.....	116
Exhibit C-2.	Item-by-item description of NHES:2007 School Readiness Interview and Parent and Family Involvement in Education Interview.....	127
Exhibit C-3.	Item-by-item description of NHES-2007 Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Interview.....	143

*This page is intentionally blank.*

## **PART A: JUSTIFICATION**

### **Request for Clearance**

This request is for clearance to conduct the 2007 National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES:2007), including household screening, three topical surveys, and a reinterview for one topical survey. NHES:2007 includes a nonresponse bias study that involves in-person followup with households that do not respond to the survey by telephone. In addition, NHES:2007 will include a small supplemental sample of likely homeschooling families in order to examine whether such families respond to the survey at different rates than the population as a whole. The request for clearance reflects previous discussions with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) about the use of respondent incentives and a study of potential nonresponse bias in the NHES data.

NHES:2007 data collection will involve the screening of approximately 67,997 households and conducting interviews for three topical surveys. The total screening number includes a national random-digit-dial sample (62,000 Screeners), an address sample in 30 primary sampling units (PSUs) nationwide (5,235 Screeners), and a supplemental sample of known homeschooling families (762 Screeners). The topical surveys for NHES:2007 are the School Readiness Survey (SR), the Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey (PFI), and the Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Survey (AEWR). Because of the overlap in content areas and populations for the SR and PFI surveys, they have been incorporated in a single instrument (see page 9 for further information). The reinterview will incorporate a limited number of items from the PFI survey, addressing important policy questions and testing new items including school choice, the identification of children's schools using a school look-up function, tutoring, television viewing, and factors affecting parent participation. A total of 1,250 cases will be sampled for the reinterview at about two week intervals, beginning about three weeks after the start of data collection, with a target of 1,000 completed reinterviews.

Clearance is requested by November 15, 2006, so that the training of data collection staff may begin in mid-December and data collection may begin in early January 2007.

### **Introduction**

The National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES) was developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to collect information on important educational issues through random digit dial (RDD) telephone surveys of households in the United States.

NHES was developed by NCES to complement its institutional surveys. This program is the principal mechanism for addressing topics that cannot be addressed in institutional data collections. By

collecting data directly from households, NHES enables NCES to gather data on a wide range of issues, such as early childhood care and education, children’s readiness for school, parent perceptions of school safety and discipline, before- and after-school activities of school-age children, participation in adult and continuing education, parent involvement in education, and civic involvement. NHES uses RDD and computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI) and has been conducted by Westat, a social science research organization, in the winter and spring of 1991, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005. As shown in exhibit 1, each administration has included more than one topical survey.

**Exhibit 1. Topics addressed in surveys conducted under the National Household Education Surveys Program and years administered**

Survey topics	NHES survey administration							
	1991	1993	1995	1996	1999 <sup>1</sup>	2001	2003	2005
Early childhood education/program participation.....	√		√		√	√		√
Adult education.....	√		√		√	√	√	√
School readiness.....		√			√			
School safety and discipline.....		√						
Parent and family involvement in education.				√	√		√	
Civic involvement.....				√	√			
After-school programs and activities.....			√ <sup>2</sup>		√	√ <sup>3</sup>		√
Household and library use.....				√				

<sup>1</sup>NHES:1999 was a special end-of-decade administration that measured key indicators from the surveys fielded during the 1990s. See text below for further explanation.

<sup>2</sup>These items were only asked about children in kindergarten through grade 3.

<sup>3</sup>The NHES:2001 survey about after-school programs and activities (ASPA) also included before-school programs.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES), 1991, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2001 and 2003.

The first test of the NHES design was a large field test conducted in the fall of 1989. This effort, which included the screening of about 15,000 households, included surveys on the following two topics: school dropouts (interviews were conducted with adult household respondents and 14- to 21-year-old youths) and early childhood education (interviews were conducted with parents/guardians<sup>1</sup> of 3- to 5-year-olds). The design of the field test and the results of the field test data collection activities are described in an *Overview of the NHES Field Test* (Brick et al. 1992).

The following sections provide more detailed information on the topical areas addressed in the full-scale NHES administrations and the survey populations associated with each topic.

<sup>1</sup> Respondents need not have been parents or legal guardians. The household member most knowledgeable about the child’s care and education was identified by the Screener respondent and selected to respond to the survey. The respondent was usually, but not always, a parent. For ease of presentation, “parent” will be used in place of parent, guardian, or other most knowledgeable respondent.

## **Early Childhood Education/Program Participation**

The nonparental care and education of preschool children has been an important recurring topic for NHES and was the subject of the 1991 Early Childhood Education Survey (ECE-NHES:1991) and the Early Childhood Program Participation Surveys of 1995, 2001, and 2005 (ECPP-NHES:1995, ECPP-NHES:2001, and ECPP-NHES:2005). In addition, selected items about nonparental care were included in the 1999 Parent Survey (Parent-NHES:1999). The ECPP surveys have provided cross-sectional, national estimates of participation in early care and education programs for children in varying age groups, depending on the specific research questions addressed in a given survey. Estimates can be computed for White, Black, and Hispanic children and for subgroups composed of 2- to 3-year age groups or two to three grades in school, depending on the survey year.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the surveys were designed to support the analysis of change in early childhood care and education over time.

In ECE-NHES:1991, 13,298 parents of children ages 3 through 8 and 9-year-olds in first or second grade completed interviews about their children's early childhood education, including participation in nonparental care by relatives, nonrelatives, or in center-based programs (including Head Start). They also answered questions about early school experiences, including delayed kindergarten entry and grade retention, and activities children engaged in with parents and other family members inside and outside the home. For ECPP-NHES:1995, the population was expanded to include children newborn through third grade. Parents of 14,064 children from birth through third grade were asked detailed questions about their children's participation in nonparental care and education programs. Other items captured information about early school experiences of school-age children and home and out-of-home family activities with children. ECPP-NHES:2001 focused on children from birth through age 6 who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten; interviews were completed with parents of 6,749 children. In addition to obtaining the same in-depth information on relative care, nonrelative care, center-based program participation, and participation in Early Head Start and Head Start, questions designed to capture continuity of care, parents' perceptions of the quality of care, and reasons for choosing parental over nonparental care were included. ECPP-NHES:2005 was the fifth collection for this topic. Interviews were conducted with parents of 7,209 children from birth through age 6 and not yet enrolled in kindergarten. Like previous NHES surveys on this topic, in-depth information was collected about relative care, nonrelative care, center-based program participation, and participation in Early Head Start and Head Start, as well as family activities and emerging literacy and numeracy.

---

<sup>2</sup> While the NHES data can be used to produce estimates of other subgroups as well, those discussed in this section reflect population subgroups specifically taken into account in the sample designs for the surveys.



Information on early childhood care and program participation for preschool children was also gathered in Parent-NHES:1999, which collected data on key indicators that had been measured in previous NHES collections in order to provide the U.S. Department of Education (ED) with end-of-decade estimates for important education issues. Parent-NHES:1999 was administered to parents of 24,600 children from birth through grade 12, including parents of 6,939 infants, toddlers, and preschoolers for whom information was collected on nonparental care by relatives, nonrelatives, and in center-based programs. Detailed information about children's health and disability status and parent and family characteristics has also been obtained in all NHES ECPP surveys, as well as in Parent-NHES:1999.

### **Adult Education**

Adult educational activities capture the interest of educational researchers and policymakers interested in the phenomenon of learning over the lifetime. Adult Education Surveys were conducted in 1991, 1995, 1999, and 2005 (AE-NHES:1991, AE-NHES:1995, AE-NHES:1999, AE-NHES:2005); the Adult Education and Lifelong Learning Survey was administered in 2001 (AELL-NHES:2001); and the Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Survey was conducted in 2003 (AEWR-NHES:2003). Each of the surveys provided cross-sectional, national estimates of educational participation for noninstitutionalized persons 16 years and older who were not enrolled in grade 12 or below and not on active duty in the U.S. armed forces, as well as estimates for White, Black, and Hispanic adults. The 1995 and 2001 surveys provided estimates for adults who did not have a high school diploma or its equivalent. The surveys were also designed to permit the analysis of change over time in educational participation.

In the 1991, 1995, 1999, 2001, and 2005 administrations, respondents were asked about their participation in basic skills courses, English as a second language (ESL) courses, postsecondary credential (degree or diploma) programs, apprenticeships, work-related courses, courses taken for personal development or personal interest. In addition, AELL-NHES:2001 obtained information about informal learning at work, and AE-NHES:2005 obtained information about informal learning for personal interest. Sample sizes for these surveys ranged from 6,697 to 19,722 depending on the survey year and the specific analytical goals for each collection. Adults participating in programs or courses provided details about those programs or courses, such as subject matter, duration, cost, location and sponsorship, and employer support. In AE-NHES:1991 and AE-NHES:1995, adults who had not participated in selected types of adult education were asked about their interest in educational activities and the barriers

to participation in educational activities that they perceived. A battery of personal background, employment, and household questions was also asked in each adult education survey.

AEWR-NHES:2003 was the first administration of an NHES survey focusing specifically on work-related education and training. Information was collected from 12,725 adults on participation in four types of formal educational activities in the previous 12 months: college and university degree or certificate programs for work-related reasons; vocational/technical school diploma or degree programs for work-related reasons; apprenticeships; and formal work-related courses. In addition, adults were asked about participation in less formal learning activities related to a job or career. The interview included questions about reasons for participation and the outcomes of participation. Employer support for educational activities was also a key area of interest in this survey. A new series of items developed for this survey addressed factors associated with participation or nonparticipation in work-related adult education activities.

AEWR-NHES:2007 will collect current information on participation in adult education for work-related reasons. In addition to providing cross-sectional, national estimates, AEWR-NHES:2007 will provide the ability to measure change in participation over time.

### **School Readiness**

The School Readiness Survey was conducted in 1993 (SR-NHES:1993); a subset of key items was also included in Parent-NHES:1999. Adopting a broad approach to assessing children's readiness for entering school, the survey encompassed a range of items related to learning. Parents of 10,888 3- to 7-year-olds who were in second grade or below and children age 8 and 9 who were still in first or second grade completed interviews about their children's developmental accomplishments and difficulties, including emerging literacy and numeracy, center-based program participation, educational activities with family members, and health and nutrition status. Parents of children in elementary school were also asked about school adjustment, early school experiences, and feedback from teachers on children's school adjustment. Information about family stability and other risk factors was collected along with parent and household characteristics. SR-NHES:1993 provided cross-sectional, national estimates for the population of interest, for White, Black, and Hispanic subgroups, and for preschoolers (children ages 3 to 5 and not yet in kindergarten) and students in early elementary grades (K-2).

School Readiness items addressing emerging literacy and numeracy were also administered to parents of 3,631 preschoolers in Parent-NHES:1999, parents of 3,150 preschoolers in ECPP-NHES:2001, and parents of 7,209 preschoolers in ECPP-NHES:2005.

While some items from the SR survey have been included in subsequent NHES collections, SR-NHES:2007 will be the second NHES survey focusing specifically on School Readiness. The survey will provide current cross-sectional estimates as well as providing the ability to measure change over time.

### **School Safety and Discipline**

In 1993, NHES included the School Safety and Discipline Survey (SSD-NHES:1993). Interviews were conducted with parents of 12,680 students in grades 3 through 12 and with 6,504 youth in grades 6 through 12. Parents and youth were asked about the school learning environment, discipline policy, safety at school, victimization, availability and use of alcohol and drugs, and alcohol and drug education. Youth were also asked about peer norms for achievement and behavior in school and substance use. The survey addressed parents' contributions to their children's learning environment through questions about parental expectations for academic achievement and good behavior at school, parental efforts to educate and protect their children, and parental involvement in the school. Parent and family characteristics were also collected. SSD-NHES:1993 provided national estimates of the topics above for the full population of interest, for White, Black, and Hispanic children, and for children in grades 3 through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12.

### **Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement**

The Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement Survey was conducted in 1996 (PFI/CI-NHES:1996). Key family involvement items were incorporated in Parent-NHES:1999 as well, and NHES:2003 included a survey focusing specifically on parent and family involvement (PFI-NHES:2003). PFI/CI-NHES:1996 focused on parents' participation in educational activities at home as well as participation in various capacities at the programs or schools their children attended. The population of interest was children age 3 through 12th grade; interviews were conducted with parents of 20,792 sampled children. Questions for 19,581 children who attended school or a center-based program addressed specific ways the family was involved in the school/program, communication with teachers and other school practices to involve families, and parent involvement with children's

homework. Parents of all children responded to questions about parent and family involvement with their children in educational activities outside of school. Children's contact with nonresidential parents and the involvement of those parents with school was also captured. An additional topic for parents of preschoolers was support and training received for parenting.

The civic involvement of parents of students in grades 6 through 12 and that of the students themselves, as well as a separate random sample of adults, was addressed in PFI/CI-NHES:1996 and in two other 1996 surveys, the Youth Civic Involvement Survey (YCI-NHES:1996) and the Adult Civic Involvement Survey (ACI-NHES:1996). The topic of community service was expanded for inclusion in the end-of-decade 1999 Youth Survey (Youth-NHES:1999). Questions related to the diverse ways that parents and other adults may socialize children for informed civic participation. The surveys were intended to provide an assessment of the opportunities that youth have to develop the personal responsibility and skills that would facilitate their taking an active role in civic life, such as through exposure to information about politics or national issues, through discussion of politics and national issues, and by the example of adults who participate in community or civic life. Questions about attitudes that relate to democratic values and knowledge about government were also included. In Youth-NHES:1999, special emphasis was placed on the opportunities youth had for participation in community service and the extent of school efforts to support youth community involvement.

PFI/CI-NHES:1996 and Parent-NHES:1999 provided cross-sectional, national estimates of the topics described above for all children in the population of interest, for White, Black, and Hispanic children, for preschoolers, and for 3-grade groupings. YCI-NHES:1996 (8,043 interviews) and Youth-NHES:1999 (7,913 interviews) provided national estimates for 6th through 8th graders and 9th through 12th graders. ACI-NHES:1996 (2,250 interviews) provided estimates that could be used to compare adults in households without children age 3 through 12th grade to adults in households with children in this age/grade range.

PFI-NHES:2003 focused on children and youth in kindergarten through 12th grade and addressed school experiences, family participation in schools, school practices to involve and support families, family involvement in schoolwork, and family involvement outside of school. Homeschooling parents were asked about their reasons for choosing and resources for implementing homeschooling. The involvement of nonresidential parents was also addressed, when applicable. In addition, information was collected on the child's or youth's health and disability status, and child and parent demographic characteristics. A total of 12,426 interviews were completed with parents of eligible children and youth. PFI-NHES:2003 provided current national, cross-sectional estimates for the population of interest and provided the ability to examine change over time.

PFI-NHES:2007 will repeat the collection of information on parent and family involvement in their children's education, and will provide both cross-sectional estimates and the opportunity to measure change over time.

### **After-School Programs and Activities**

The ways that parents arrange for supervision and enrichment during the out-of-school hours for children who are enrolled in kindergarten through introduced as a topic in Parent-NHES:1999. (ECPP-NHES:1995 included questions about whether care arrangements and programs occurred before school, after school, or both, but that survey did not collect information about after-school activities). In 1999, parents of 12,396 children in kindergarten through eighth grade reported on their children's participation in care by relatives, nonrelatives, and in center-based programs, as well as their participation in after-school activities arranged to provide adult supervision. The 2001 Before- and After-School Programs and Activities Survey (ASPA-NHES:2001), collected detailed information from parents of 9,583 children in kindergarten through eighth grade about the before- and after-school arrangements in which their children participated, including care by relatives or nonrelatives in private homes, before- or after-school programs in centers and in schools, activities that might provide adult supervision in the out-of-school hours, and children's self-care. Items also addressed continuity of care arrangements, parental perceptions of quality, reasons for choosing parental care, and obstacles to participation in nonparental arrangements. The child's health and disability status and characteristics of the parents and household were also collected. Both Parent-NHES:1999 and ASPA-NHES:2001 provided cross-sectional, national estimates of participation in various types of arrangements for children in the population of interest as well as for White, Black, and Hispanic children, and for those in kindergarten through fifth grade and sixth through eighth grade. In addition, these data can be used to examine change in participation over time.

NHES:2005 addressed after-school programs and activities for children in kindergarten through eighth grade; because there was little variance observed in before-school activities in ASPA-NHES:2001, it was decided to focus on after-school activities in NHES:2005. Interviews were conducted with parents of 11,684 children in these grades. Information was obtained on participation in relative care, nonrelative care, center- or school-based programs, self care, and after-school activities. In addition, information on the child's health and disability status and characteristics of the parents and household was also collected.

## **Household and Library Use**

The Household and Library Use Survey of 1996 (HHL-NHES:1996) examined public library use by household members. This brief survey was administered to every household screened in 1996. The items tapped the ways that household members used public libraries (e.g., borrowing books, attending lectures, attending story hours) and the purposes for using public libraries (e.g., for school assignments, enjoyment, work-related projects). In addition, demographic and educational information was collected about each household member. HHL-NHES:1996 provided cross-sectional, national estimates of household characteristics and library use for all households in the United States as well as estimates by state.

## **NHES:2007 Surveys**

As noted above, NHES:2007 includes three surveys: The School Readiness Survey (SR), the Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey (PFI), and the Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Survey (AEWR). These three surveys are repeated administrations of topics described above, and thus will provide current cross-sectional, national estimates as well as provide for the measurement of change over time. In addition, a brief PFI reinterview will be used to test a number of new items. The instruments are described in detail in Part C of this document and appear in appendix A.

Experts in the field of school readiness are interested in the experiences of children in the early school years as well as the experiences of preschoolers, and the substantive interests include parent and family involvement as well as measures of children's experiences and developmental status. Likewise, experts in parent and family involvement in education are interested in preschoolers as well as school-aged children. Due to the overlap in the populations of interest and the measures of interest, the SR and PFI surveys share a single instrument, with specific paths and items designated for children of various ages.

### **A.1. Circumstances Necessitating Collection of Information**

NCES has as its legislative mission the collection and publication of data on the condition of education in the Nation (the National Education Statistics Act of 1994, P.L. 103-382, October 20, 1994 (20 USC 9001)):

The duties of the Center are to collect, analyze, and disseminate statistics and other information related to education in the United States and in other nations.

NHES is specifically designed to support this mission by providing a means to investigate educational issues that cannot be adequately studied through the Center's traditional, institution-based data collection efforts. For example, young children are cared for in many types of informal or formal settings and some children are cared for only in their own homes. As a result, no institutional sample frame is available to assess the school readiness of young children. Similarly, adults participate in educational activities through a wide variety of settings including traditional schools, businesses, community organizations, and religious organizations. Again, no institutional sample frame is suitable for studying the wide range of adult education. The NHES surveys conducted from 1991 through the present afford the opportunity to track change over time in several important educational domains that are of interest to policymakers and researchers. For example, information about children's emerging literacy and numeracy collected in NHES surveys is germane to the No Child Left Behind Act.

Many issues that are central to assessing the condition of education in the United States can be measured adequately only by a household-based survey conducted at regular intervals. Other studies dealing with similar topics differ in crucial ways from NHES (see section A.4 for details about those studies). In particular, none of them measure the topics of interest at specific, planned intervals, so changes over time cannot be studied effectively.

### **School Readiness**

School readiness is a major concern of developmental and educational researchers and has been a focus in several federally funded large-scale studies, such as the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) and the Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES). It was also studied in other major large-scale studies like the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Early Child Care Network (2004), and was the focus of a number of smaller scale studies of at-risk populations (e.g., Fantuzzo and McWayne 2002; Fantuzzo, Sekino, and Cohen 2004). According to U.S. Department of Education estimates, as many as one-third of children entering kindergarten have difficulties adapting to school (West, Denton, & Germino-Hausken 2000), and, according to some reports, as many as one-half of kindergartners have problems that interfere with learning and/or classroom functioning, a chief concern being children's aggressive behaviors and inability to regulate behavior (Rimm-Kaufman, Pianta, and Cox 2000).

Children's lack of readiness for entry into formal schooling leads to difficulty adjusting to school, poorer achievement in school and eventually increased probability of school dropout, all of which are costly to the child and to society (Fox, Dunlap, and Cushing 2002; La Paro and Pianta 2000). Nevertheless, compensatory early childhood programs, such as Head Start, have demonstrated that it is feasible to intervene and facilitate the transition to formal schooling and maintain gains for the duration of the program (Administration on Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF 2003). Hence, over the past few decades the need has arisen to understand the components of school readiness, to understand how different emerging competencies are related to each other and to school adjustment, to identify children who would benefit from early intervention efforts, and to measure the effects of those interventions (Wesley and Buysse 2003).

Typically, school readiness is thought to include the following dimensions: (1) physical well-being and motor development; (2) social and emotional development; (3) approaches to learning; (4) language development; and (5) cognition and general knowledge. In a recent integrative review of the neurodevelopmental, socio-emotional and school readiness literatures, Blair (2002) has added that children's emotionality and emotion-related functioning influence neurophysiological maturation and the interconnections among the neuronal structures that underlie emotion and higher order cognition.

Of the above dimensions, there is abundant literature supporting the role of children's cognitive abilities in school readiness (for a review see Bickham et al. 2001), in particular executive functions (e.g., Zelazo, Carter, Reznick and Frye 1997) and preliteracy (e.g., Hart and Risley 1999; Whitehurst and Lonigan 1998; Jordan, Snow and Porche 2000). In the last two decades, however, it has become more apparent that as important as these aspects are for school readiness and early success in school, other areas of development are equally important (NICHD Early Child Care Network 2004; Zill and West 2001) and that children's school readiness is multifaceted and has its origins in the child, the child's environment, and the child-environment interaction.

A host of environmental factors have been identified as contributors to school readiness, including socioeconomic status, parental marital status, parental education, and exposure to violence (Goodman and Gotlib 1999; Harden et al. 2000; Schwartz and Proctor 2000). The SR-NHES:1993 results indicated that risk factors such as low maternal education, single-parent family status, and non-English maternal language were associated with fewer reported developmental accomplishments and more developmental difficulties, and center-based program participation (in daycare centers and preschools) was associated with higher levels of cognitive developmental accomplishments (Zill et al., 1995).



SR-NHES:2007 takes a broad approach to collecting information on the school readiness and early school experiences of young children, focusing on the measures suitable for collection in a survey of parents. Data on parent reports of children's developmental status, center-based program participation and preschool enrollment, family-child learning activities, measures of health and disability, and child and family characteristics will provide a rich source of data for multi-faceted analysis.

### **Parent and Family Involvement in Education**

Much of the research on parental involvement in children's education supports the supposition that involvement promotes academic success (e.g., Barnard 2004; Epstein and Sheldon 2002; Sheldon 2002). Parent involvement has been largely conceptualized as occurring on two fronts: at home and at school. At home, parents' involvement includes participating in educational activities such as helping with homework or engaging in educational activities; some scholars conceptualize certain restrictions, such as monitoring television viewing and internet access as forms of parent-school involvement (Dauber and Epstein 1993; Muller 1995). At school, researchers often regard a broad spectrum of parent behaviors as parental-school involvement such as participation in activities within the classroom, becoming actively involved in policy making, attending sporting events and so on (Dunst 2002; Epstein and Sheldon 2002; Lewis and Forman 2002)

Research findings indicate that statistically significant differences exist in the relationships between parent involvement and student achievement according to the students' race/ethnicity and family income, as well as according to how achievement was measured, type of involvement, and whether it was reported by the student or parent (Desimone 1999; Zellman and Waterman 1998).<sup>3</sup> Nord (1998a) reported that students with involved fathers had higher grades, enjoyed school more, and were less likely to repeat a grade or to be suspended or expelled.

A number of demographic and family characteristics have been found to be associated with parent and family involvement in children's education. Among these findings are lower levels of participation among those in families with nontraditional family structure (Lee 1993), maternal full-time employment (Muller 1993), and lower parent education (Stewart 1999). School characteristics are also associated with family involvement, with greater levels of participation among families of children in private versus public schools and small versus large schools (Vaden-Kiernan and Chandler 1996).

---

<sup>3</sup> Information was collected directly from students in grades 6 through 12 in PFI/CI-NHES:1996 and Parent-NHES:1999. However, because response rates for youth declined over time, student interviews ended after 1999.

PFI-NHES:2007 addresses many of the issues above, including parent and family involvement in their children's schools, homework, and education and activities at home. Nationally representative estimates will permit cross-sectional analysis and the examination of change over time.

### **Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons**

Participation in work-related adult education has become increasingly important in our nation's economy and the lives of individuals in the workforce. Several factors have led to an increased demand for work-related adult education, including the shift in the labor market from a manufacturing economy to a service- and information-based economy, the growth of technology, and a general increase in job-skills requirements (Creighton and Hudson 2002). The confluence of an aging workforce, declining job stability, and continuing industry demands for a more flexible workforce have resulted in considerable emphasis on the importance of the training of workers already in the labor force (Dougherty 2003). Many economists studying the labor market believe that new technology has had a very significant effect on the demand for highly educated workers (Bassi 1999). Out of necessity, workers are adapting their skills and knowledge to meet the needs of today's changing workplace. The growth of knowledge and technology has meant that much of what adults learned five years ago is now obsolete or at least modified in content or meaning (McDonald 2001). These workers require training and education to achieve and maintain success in their career fields. Consequently, adult education for work-related reasons (AEWR) is the fastest growing area of practice in the field of adult education. Continuing education has been recognized as having at least as much importance as initial professional preparation in producing a reflective, problem-solving, well-rounded jobholder (McDonald 2001). Examination of work-related learning has recently become an important component of several educational studies and increasingly the focus of important public policy (Lengermann 1996 and Imel 1998).

AEWR-NHES:2007 will be the seventh time that national data have been collected about the participation of adults in various types of educational activities through the NHES survey system, and the second time that NHES has focused specifically on work-related education and training. Taking a broad approach, the survey will obtain information on a wide range of educational activities taken for work-related reasons, including college and university degree and certificate programs; vocational diploma, degree, or certificate programs; apprenticeships; formal work-related courses from a variety of sources; and informal learning related to a job or career. As in the past, information about instructional providers, intensity of participation, reasons for participating, outcomes of participation, and forms of employer support will be collected. Also, information will be gathered on distance learning through various technologies.

AEWR-NHES:2007 will provide current estimates of interest to researchers examining the role of employers in supporting or providing college degree programs, vocational or technical training, and professional development. The survey will address an important area in which adult education is evolving, the use of distance education for adult learning and the types of technology employed. Finally, the collection of information about informal learning will fill a gap in existing adult education research.

AEWR-NHES:2007 will allow for detailed analysis of the population in 2007, as well as enable analysts to examine differences between NHES:2003 and NHES:2007 estimates. Like the SR and PFI data, the AEWR data will be available for public use in 2008.

## **A.2. Purposes and Uses of the Data**

The data collected in NHES:2007 will fill gaps in existing data collection systems and provide NCES with the capability to monitor trends in educational activities and experiences. These data will be used by NCES to prepare and publish descriptive reports on parent and family involvement in education, school readiness, and adult education for work-related reasons. These reports are described in section A.16.2.

The data from NHES:2007 will be made available for public use following the removal of all identifying information, such as telephone numbers or names. Data files will be prepared in accordance with NCES standards for protecting the confidentiality of survey participants. The NHES:2007 data will be a rich and current resource for educational researchers and policymakers.

## **A.3. Use of Improved Information Technology**

The NHES interviews will be conducted using Westat's computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) system. The most important features of the CATI system for NHES are the following:

- **Sampling:** The CATI will be programmed to identify eligible household members and sample respondents for interviews. The use of online sampling eliminates the need for separate screening and interviewing calls, reducing survey cost and respondent burden.

- **Scheduling:** The CATI scheduler will be used to route telephone numbers to interviewers, maintain a schedule of callback appointments, and reschedule unsuccessful contact attempts to an appropriate day and time.
- **Skip Patterns:** The CATI system will automatically guide interviewers through the complex skip patterns in the questionnaire, reducing the potential for interviewer error and shortening the questionnaire administration time.
- **Avoiding Redundancy:** The CATI system will be programmed to avoid redundancy across intra-household interviews where possible. For example, when two children with the same parents are sampled in a household, the parent characteristics series and household information items will be asked only once.
- **Receipt Control:** The CATI system will provide for automatic receipt control in a flexible manner that will be used to produce status reports that allow ongoing monitoring of the survey's progress.

CATI is very efficient when more than one topic is covered in a survey system, and when on-telephone sampling of household members is required, as it is with NHES:2007. The use of CATI for NHES:2007 is also critical because of the difficult skip patterns that are created with complex survey instruments. Each interview collects specific sets of information depending on characteristics of the subject that are not known prior to data collection. Without CATI, these would be difficult instruments to administer, especially by telephone.

The NHES:2007 instruments have been programmed in Blaise, a computer-assisted interview processing tool for the Windows operating system. A key advantage of using Blaise is that this “out of the box” system will support surveys across different modes, including CATI, Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI), and Computer-Assisted Data Entry (CADE). This multimode feature is important to the future of NHES because it will facilitate future efforts to increase response rates through alternative methods of data collection.

#### **A.4. Efforts to Identify Duplication**

During the design of NHES:2007, extant research studies in the topical areas of interest were examined in an effort to avoid duplication. Consultations with government agencies and experts in the field, electronic searches, and literature reviews were used to identify existing studies in these areas. The following sections describe extant surveys on the topics covered by the NHES:2007 and highlight where NHES and the extant surveys overlap and where they differ.

#### A.4.1. Studies on Topics Included in the SR Interview

SR-NHES:2007 will provide important estimates of a broad range of topics related to school readiness such as child development, home activities, child health and disabilities, and community networks. While each of the studies presented below includes overlapping issues, none address all of the topics included in SR for a nationally representative sample of preschool children, and many are older studies that are not scheduled for repetition.

- **The Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers Study (1993-1997)** examined the influence of typical center-based child care on children's development during the preschool years and as they moved into elementary school.
- **Current Population Survey (CPS), October School Enrollment Supplement (annually since 1967)** provides basic data on school enrollment and some specific information on educational topics that change from year to year. Questions on disabilities, grade retention, and tuition have been included.
- **Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) (2000-2007)** provides detailed information on the early years of children, including topics such as health care, child care, and education. Specifically, the study is interested in gaining insight into how children's neighborhoods, families, health care, and early childhood program participation influence variations in developmental outcomes.
- **Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K) (2000-2004)** provides descriptive data on a national basis of children's developmental status at school entry, their transition into school, and their progression through fifth grade. This data set enables researchers to study how a wide range of family, school, community and individual variables affect early success in school.
- **The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (1998)** provides descriptive data on a birth cohort of mostly unwed parents and their children over a 5-year period. Data on child health and development and in-home assessments of child wellbeing were collected. The study also addresses welfare reform, the role of fathers and the effects of policies on family formation.
- **Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES) (1997-2006)** is conducted in order to gain data on (1) the cognitive, social, emotional and physical development of Head Start children; (2) the characteristics, well-being, and accomplishments of families; (3) the observed quality of Head Start classrooms, and (4) the characteristics and opinions of Head Start teachers and other program staff.
- **The National Household Education Surveys Program, School Readiness Survey (1993)** focused on the development, enrollment, school adjustment, and family activities of children from age 3 through second grade. In 1993, 10,888 interviews were conducted with parents of children from age 3 through second grade.
- **National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Study of Early Child Care (1991-2005)** investigates how variations in child care relate to children's development. The study also seeks to determine how children's

experiences in child care and family environment affect their cognitive, emotional, and social development.

- **The National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) (1994, 1996, 1998, continuing at two-year intervals)** is a long-term study conducted to monitor the social, emotional and behavioral development and well being of Canada's children as they grow from infancy to adulthood. The survey provides data for use in research on children's development and their adjustment to school in Canada.
- **National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) (1997, 1999, 2002)** provided a comprehensive look at the overall well-being of adults and children in the United States. The study focused on differences between low- and high-income families and children, and examined variables such as health, children's education, child care, nonresidential parent/father, employment and earnings, welfare participation, and demographic information.
- **National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) (1987-1988, 1992-1994; 2001-2002)** was conducted in three waves. Wave I contained questions on children's school experiences and child care arrangements. Wave II included items on children's behavior problems, educational expectations, activities with children, involvement with the child's school, preschool participation, and school readiness. Wave III followed up on children from the households included in the previous waves. Children of parents originally surveyed were adolescents or young adults in this wave.
- **Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID) (1968-2003) Child Development Supplement (1997, 2002-2003)** gathered data on aspects of economic and demographic behavior and social issues. The Child Development Supplement collected data from a variety of sources including parents, teachers, and children in order to evaluate the impacts of factors such as maternal employment patterns, family structure changes, and poverty on children's cognitive/academic, emotional/mental, social and physical development.
- **Survey of Income and Program Participation (1984-2005)** is a multipanel longitudinal survey of adults, measuring their economic and demographic characteristics over a period of 2½ to 4 years. The SIPP focuses on income, labor force information, and participation in federal, state, and local programs; however, topical modules are added to collect data on a wider variety of issues. The topical module on child care contains basic information on child care arrangements for children during the time respondents are at work or school. Questions concern the main type of arrangement used, type and location of second major arrangement, and changes in arrangement in the last 12 months. Data are gathered on each child under age 15 living in the sampled household.

Taken together, there are many important differences, both substantive and methodological, between these studies and SR-NHES:2005. While these surveys examine issues of interest in SR, none of them collects data on the full range of issues for a nationally representative population of children from age 3 through second grade.

In some cases, much of the content of interest is included in an extant study, but the desired population coverage is lacking. For example, ECLS-B collects comprehensive information, but is limited

to children born in 2001. As a result, it does not address the entire population of interest. Similarly, the Cost, Quality, and Child Outcomes in Child Care Centers Study; NICHD Study of Early Child Care, ECLS-B, and ECLS-K examine cohorts over a period of years, and therefore do not cover the entire population of interest. In other cases, the substantive content of the studies is limited relative to SR goals. For example, the Current Population Study addresses issues such as preschool enrollment and has collected data on disability and home activities in the past, but does not collect the detailed information sought in SR-NHES:2007.

Finally, some of these studies are dated (e.g., the Cost, Quality, and Outcomes Survey, 1993-1997; NSAF, 1997, 1999, 2002) and are not scheduled to be conducted again. As a result, they cannot provide current cross-sectional estimates or repeated measurements of key indicators of children's educational experiences during different time periods. SR is uniquely suited to this purpose.

In summary, none of the current and planned surveys meet all of the goals for SR-NHES:2007. That is, no single study satisfies the following requirements for content and methodological procedures:

- Collects information about preschoolers and children in kindergarten through second grade;
- Defines the population of interest as all children in the nation in the age range of interest;
- Selects a sample of sufficient size to generalize to the population;
- Selects a sample with sufficient representation of racial/ethnic minorities to permit analysts to produce reliable estimates for these groups;
- Provides current, national, cross-sectional estimates; and
- Collects data on the population and measures of interest at different points in time.

#### **A.4.2. Studies on Topics in the PFI Interview**

PFI-NHES:2007 is composed of items measuring children's experiences in and out of school, the activities they engage in, and parents' involvement in their education and after-school. These include questions on school characteristics, student experiences, and family involvement in and out of school including school decision-making. The studies listed below cover several of the topics addressed in the PFI-NHES:2007 survey. However, they are not as comprehensive in terms of addressing all of the

topics in the PFI for a nationally representative sample of the population of interest, i.e. children enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade.

- **National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (1997)** began as an offshoot of the **National Survey of Youth, Cohort 1979 (NLSY79)** and is made up of all children born to NLSY79 female respondents. The Children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth makes assessments of each child and obtains other demographic and developmental information. These data includes information on child-parent interaction, attitudes towards schooling, and health and substance use.
- **Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort (ECLS-K) (2000-2004)** provides descriptive data on a national basis of children's developmental status at school entry, their transition into school, and their progression through fifth grade. This data set enables researchers to study how a wide range of family, school, community and individual variables affect early success in school.
- **Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002** monitors the transition of a national sample of tenth graders as they move through high school and on to postsecondary education or enter the work force. This study focused on identifying school attributes that determine achievement, parent and community involvement in student achievement and factors influencing students to drop out of school.
- **Family Involvement in Education: A National Portrait (1998)** examined how schools, parents, and employers work together to improve education. The study focused on how parents feel about their opportunities to be involved in their children's schooling, how and what schools communicate to parents about students' learning, additional educational resources parents value, before- and after-school arrangements, and parents' views on program quality and desirable program features.
- **Hand in Hand National Parent Survey (1995)** was part of a larger initiative called "Hand in Hand: Parents, Schools, Communities United for Kids," a national campaign to build and strengthen partnerships to improve the education of all children. The study included items about parents' opinions about the importance of their involvement at home, at school, and with their children's homework. Questions were also asked about school meeting attendance, the frequency with which parents spoke to teachers, involvement in homework, and barriers to involvement.
- **National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988 (1990, 1992, 1994, 2000)** provides information about transition periods between middle school and high school and from high school into postsecondary education or into the work force. Students were asked questions about their experiences at home, in school and at work. Topics also included the process of dropping out of secondary school, how schools helped disadvantaged students, and the academic performance of minority students.
- **The National Household Education Surveys Program, Parent and Family Involvement in Education and Civic Involvement Survey (1996), Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey (2003)** addressed multiple aspects of parent and family involvement, including family experiences with schools, schoolwork outside of school, and non-school family activities. Parents and guardians answered questions about their children from age 3 through 12th grade in 1996 and about children in kindergarten through 12th grade in 2003. Information was also collected on children's school or center-based early childhood programs.



- **The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (1994, 1996, 2001)** is a school-based study of health-related behaviors of adolescents in grades 7-12. It was designed to explore the causes of those behaviors, with an emphasis on the influence of social context.
- **The National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (NLSCY) (1994, 1996, 1998, continuing at two-year intervals)** is a long-term study conducted to monitor the social, emotional and behavioral development and well being of Canada's children as they grow from infancy to adulthood. The survey provides data for use in research on children's development and their adjustment to school in Canada.
- **National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 Cohort (1997-2003)** collects information on the processes of moving from school to work among youth in the U.S. and to identify strengths and weaknesses in these processes. A particular goal is to identify the causes of difficulties some youths have in making the school-to-work transition.
- **National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) (1997, 1999, 2002)** obtained social and economic information about children in low-income households (with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level). Also the survey obtained similar data on children in higher-income households, as well as adults under age 65 (with and without children).
- **The National Survey of Parents of Public School Students (1998)** collected information on the opinions of parents of public school children regarding the importance of parental and federal involvement in education. The survey also collected information about parents who may qualify for Title 1 services.
- **Panel Survey of Income Dynamics (PSID) (1968-2003) Child Development Supplement (1997, 2002-2003)** gathered data on aspects of economic and demographic behavior and social issues. The Child Development Supplement collected data from a variety of sources including parents, teachers, and children in order to evaluate the impacts of factors such as maternal employment patterns, family structure changes, and poverty on children's cognitive/academic, emotional/mental, social and physical development.
- **Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity (1991-1996)** was initiated in 1988 under Congressional mandate as an assessment of Chapter I (formerly Title I) programs. This nationally representative longitudinal study was designed to assess the impacts of Chapter I programs on school performance and compare students with "significant participation" in Chapter I programs to comparable children who were not receiving services.
- **Survey of Family and School Partnerships in Public Schools, K-8 (1996)** provided information on the ways that schools are engaging parents in their children's education and the extent to which parents are responding to the opportunities for involvement that schools provide. The survey addressed the following issues: the kinds of communication schools establish to provide parents with information, the kinds of activities schools sponsor that are designed to inform parents about their children's school performance, volunteer activities schools make available to parents, and the extent to which parents are included in decision making regarding school issues.
- **Survey of Adults and Youth (1998, 2001, 2004)** monitored youth access to parent and community resources and focused on parent/child relationships,

supervised after-school activities, conflicts between work and family commitments and educational expectations and achievement in school. The first wave sample for Round 1 consisted of 15,571 adults and 7,778 youth.

There are many important differences, both substantive and methodological, between these extant studies and the PFI-NHES:2007. All the extant surveys included some items on children's educational experiences and development. However, unlike the PFI, many of the studies focused on the educational experiences of a limited grade range of children (National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Hand in Hand National Parent Survey, Family Involvement in Education: A National Portrait, ECLS-K, and NLSY97). Also, many studies were not nationally representative of children in grades K through 12 in the United States, either because they were non-US studies (National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth-Canadian) or because they included only children in public schools (National Survey of Parents of Public School Students, Survey of Family and School Partnership in Public Schools, K-8 and Prospects). Some surveys, while focused on education, were not designed to examine parent and family involvement in education in detail (PSID, CDS, and NSAF).

The PFI-NHES:2007 will gather data about approximately 14,150 children enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade. The inclusion of a wide age range of children will extend the parent involvement literature by providing data on parent and family involvement and school practices from early childhood through late adolescence. The PFI-NHES:2007 will examine parent and family involvement in the school, involvement in schoolwork at home, other features of the home environment that may support learning and success in school (family activities and rules), and home schooling. Finally, an important purpose of the PFI-NHES:2007 is to monitor the progress and change in family involvement and compare the results over time.

Finally, many of the studies noted above took place over 7 years ago (e.g., Hand in Hand National Parent Survey 1995, National Survey of Parents of Public School Students 1998, Prospects 1991-1996, Survey of Family and School Partnerships in Public Schools, K-8 1996) and are not scheduled to be repeated. As a result, they provide neither current cross-sectional estimates nor the ability to measure change over time, as does NHES.

None of the extant surveys fulfills the same objectives as the PFI-NHES:2007, which are:

- To provide data on a nationally representative sample of children;
- To include children from kindergarten through 12th grade;
- To include children in both public and private schools and children who are home-schooled;

- To cover a range of parent and family involvement items both in schools and homes;
- To provide current, national, cross-sectional estimates; and
- To measure parent and family involvement at regular intervals in order to monitor changes.

#### A.4.3. Studies of Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons

The AEW-RNHES:2007 interview is primarily composed of items related to adult educational activities. This includes topics such as college or university degree or certificate programs; vocational or technical diploma, degree, or certificate programs; apprenticeship programs; work-related courses; and informal learning for work-related reasons. Employer support and distance education are important aspects of participation addressed in AEW-R. Several other national surveys have incorporated questions on topics similar to those proposed for the AEW-R interview; however none fulfills the same objectives and some are outdated.

- **Adult Education and Training Survey (AETS) (1984, 1985, 1986, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1998, and 2003)** is intended to provide information on the education and training experiences of adult Canadians.
- **American Society for Training and Development: National HRD Executive Survey (1998)** collects information from a variety of organizations on the nature of their human resources development expenditures, practices, and outcomes. It is designed to build an extensive database of comparative information from large and small, as well as public and private, companies.
- **American Society for Training and Development (ASTD): Tools for Benchmarking and Continuous Improvement Survey (1999)** gathers data from a variety of organizations on the nature of their employer-provided training expenditures, practices, and outcomes. The survey is designed to build an extensive database of comparative information from large and small, as well as public and private, companies.
- **American Time Use Survey (ATUS) (2003, 2004)** collects information on how people living in the United States spend their time, including participation in educational activities. Estimates for how people spend weekdays and weekends will be developed. The kinds of activities and the time spent on them will be available by race, ethnicity, sex, age, educational attainment, labor force status, occupation, industry, household composition, and other characteristics.
- **Current Population Survey (CPS), October School Enrollment Supplement (annually since 1967)** contains items on various educational topics that change from year to year. Recent topics having to do with adult education include characteristics associated with participation in adult education, tuition and major/degrees sought, disabilities, proficiency in English, home ownership, and use of computers.

- **Educational Quality of the Workforce (EQW) National Employer Survey (1994, 1997, and 2000)** examined education and workforce issues from the employer's perspective. The survey explored the interaction of employer practices, organizational structure, and workforce proficiency. Specific areas addressed include the benefits of workplace education programs and employer participation in education and training. The survey also related the educational level of a workforce with establishment productivity.
- **Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) (annually since 1986)** was designed to provide basic institutional data for the universe of nonprofit colleges and universities (public and private) and for a sample of for-profit postsecondary institutions. The survey includes some items on work-related educational activities.
- **International Survey of Adults (ISA)/Adult Literacy and Lifeskills Study (ALL) (1999, 2001, 2002)** is a large-scale, international comparative assessment designed to identify and measure a range of skills, such as literacy, numeracy, and reasoning competency, that are linked to the social and economic characteristics of individuals across (or within) nations. In addition, the background questionnaire includes measures of the maintenance or enhancement of skills. ISA provides policy-makers with information about the distribution of these skills in their societies in order to help develop skill enhancement policies and programs. ISA also allows countries to compare the performance of their adult populations with those in similar countries.
- **Involving Employers in Training: Best Practices (1996)** was created as part of an U.S. Department of Labor effort to disseminate information about effective strategies and practices for companies who are involved in training employees.
- **National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL) (1985, 1992, 2003)** was originally conducted in 1985 and 1992 as the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS). NAAL is designed to measure the nature and extent of literacy skills among U.S. adults aged 16 and older and to provide policymakers, researchers, and educators with a variety of statistics on the condition of adult literacy in the United States.
- **National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy (NCSALL), Longitudinal Study of Adult Learning (1998 through 2005)** will create a database consisting of longitudinal information on program participation and nonparticipation of potential adult literacy learners. The study looks at the literacy growth of adult learners in adult basic education, English as a Second Language (ESL), and secondary programs.
- **National Compensation Survey (NCS), formerly the Employee Benefits Survey (EBS) (1979-2005)** collects data on the incidence of selected benefits provided by employers to their employees, including employer support for training/education. The survey is designed to aid in formulating and assessing public policy and provides information to corporations and labor organizations for use in collective bargaining.
- **Survey of Employer-Provided Training (1995)** collected information from establishments and employees on the amount of formal and informal training provided by employers as well as the amount of money employers spent on selected training expenditures.

- **The National Household Education Surveys Program, Adult Education Surveys (1991, 1995, 1999, 2001, 2005).** The NHES adult education surveys have focused on participation in a broad range of educational activities, including basic skills, English as a Second Language, postsecondary programs in colleges and vocational schools, apprenticeships, work-related courses, personal interest courses, and informal learning.
- **The National Household Education Surveys Program, Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Survey (2003)** asked persons 16 years of age and older about their participation in postsecondary degree, diploma, or certificate programs; apprenticeships; and work-related courses. Adults participating in programs or courses provided information about those programs or courses, including the subject matter, duration, cost, location and sponsorship, and employer support. In addition, NHES:2003 collected information on informal learning activities.
- **The 1998 Employee Survey (1998, 1999, 2000)** provided information on the level of job satisfaction held by federal agency employees, and the extent to which reinvention and custom orientation have taken hold within their organizations.
- **Training Magazine Annual Industry Report (annually)** is conducted to assess various characteristics of employer-sponsored training in the United States. The survey is self-administered and covers skills learned in training, methods used in training, and the amount of money invested in training.

No single adult education survey evaluates participation rates and participant characteristics as comprehensively as do the NHES surveys. The most prevalent substantive limitation of the above surveys is failure to examine participation in a broad range of adult educational activities. For example, the majority of surveys on adult educational activities have looked at only a few types of activities such as postsecondary education, employment-related training, or GED or literacy education (CPS, NALS/NAAL, EQW, ASTD, SEPT95). Also, many of the surveys are not nationally representative, but instead examine adult educational activities among only a specialized population (ASTD, AETS, NCSALL, SEPT95).

Some extant surveys collected information only from employers (SEPT95, ASTD) or institutions (IPEDS). Several of the studies were one-time investigations that are now several years old (EWQ, 1998; Involving Employers in Training, 1996; Survey of Employer-Provided Training, 1995) and are not scheduled to be repeated. As a result, they do not provide current information or the ability to track change over time, as does NHES.

AEWR-NHES:2007 has a proposed sample size yielding completed interviews with approximately 15,000 adults and will represent participants in a broad range of adult educational activities, as well as nonparticipants. Also, NHES oversamples minorities to provide reliable estimates for analysis. Data collected on current rates of participation, types of activities, and reasons for

participation and outcomes of participation in adult educational activities will provide trend information when analyzed in conjunction with adult education estimates from previous NHES collections.

The limitations of the extant data sources on adult educational activities render them inadequate to meet the goals of the AEW-NHES:2007, which are:

- To provide data on a nationally representative sample of adults including both participants and nonparticipants in adult education;
- To collect data about a range of adult education activities taken from a variety of instructional providers;
- To have sufficient numbers of racial/ethnic minorities to produce reliable estimates for those groups; and
- To produce estimates of participation in adult educational activities that can be used to track change over time.

**A.5. Collection of Data from Small Businesses**

Not applicable.

**A.6. Consequences of Less Frequent Data Collection**

This request is for clearance of NHES:2007 only. Separate requests will be submitted for future NHES collections. Topics covered in this NHES collection have been addressed in previous NHES administrations; repeating the surveys allows for analysis of trends over time. Less frequent collection would result in incomplete tracking of these trends.

**A.7. Special Circumstances**

None of the special circumstances listed in the instructions for completing the supporting statement apply to NHES:2007.

## **A.8. Public Comment and Consultations Outside the Agency**

The NHES:2007 surveys repeat, to a great extent, designs developed for previous NHES administrations. As a result, they reflect the cumulative input of many experts in the field and past NHES Technical Review Panels. In order to ensure that the NHES:2007 surveys address important topics in the topical areas of interest and incorporate important emerging issues, the design phase of the study included consultations with experts in the substantive areas addressed in the surveys. These experts included persons in government agencies, academe, and research organizations.

### **SR Experts**

Dr. Clancy Blair  
Department of Human Development and Family Studies  
Pennsylvania State University  
S110 Henderson Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
Tel: (814) 865 1447  
Email: cbb11@psu.edu

Dr. Sharon L. Kagan  
Columbia University  
Teachers College  
525 West 120th St.  
New York, NY 10027  
Tel: 212 678 8255  
Email: Sharon.kagan@columbia.edu

Dr. Richard G. Lambert  
Department of Educational Services  
UNC Charlotte  
Charlotte, NC 28223  
Tel: (704) 687 3493  
Email: rglamber@email.uncc.edu

Dr. Michael L. Lopez  
Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation  
Administration for Children & Families  
Department of Health & Human Services  
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW  
7th Floor West  
Washington, DC 20447  
Tel: 202-205-8212  
Email: milopez@acf.hhs.gov

Dr. Patricia Skelton  
First 5 California  
501 J St. suite 530  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Tel: (916) 324 7084  
Email: pskelton@ccfc.ca.gov

Dr. Deborah Stipek  
Stanford University  
School of Education  
485 Lasuen Mall  
Stanford, CA 94305-3096  
Tel: 650 725 9090  
Email: stipek@stanford.edu

Dr. Jerry West  
Mathematica Policy Research  
Suite 550  
600 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20024-2512  
Tel: 202-484-4516  
Email: JWEST@Mathematica-MPR.com

Dr. Don Yarosz  
National Institute for Early Education Research  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
120 Albany Street, Suite 500  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901  
Tel: (732) 932 4350  
Email: dyarosz@nieer.org

Dr. Nicholas Zill  
Child and Family Study Area  
Westat  
1650 Research Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20850  
Tel: (301) 294 4448  
Email: Nicholaszill@westat.com



## **PFI Experts**

Dr. Nancy Feyl Chavkin, Co-Director  
Texas State University Center for Children & Families  
601 University Drive  
San Marcos, TX 78666  
Tel: (512) 245 2593  
Email: [Nc02@txstate.edu](mailto:Nc02@txstate.edu)

Dr. Robert Crosnoe  
Department of Sociology and Population Research Center  
University of Texas at Austin  
1 University Station A1700  
Austin, TX 78712-1088  
Tel: (512) 232 6340  
Email: [crosnoe@mail.la.utexas.edu](mailto:crosnoe@mail.la.utexas.edu)

Dr. Laura Desimone  
Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations at Vanderbilt University  
Peabody # 514  
230 Appleton Place  
Nashville, TN 37203-5721  
Tel: (615) 322 5521  
Email: [l.desimone@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:l.desimone@vanderbilt.edu)

Dr. Kathleen Mullan Harris  
Gillian T. Cell Distinguished Professor of Sociology  
Director, National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
CB# 8120, University Square  
123 W. Franklin Street Chapel Hill, NC 27516  
Tel: Sociology Department, (919) 962 1388  
Carolina Population Center, (919) 966 5560  
Email: [kathie\\_harris@unc.edu](mailto:kathie_harris@unc.edu)

Dr. Diana Hiatt-Michael  
18403 Wakecrest Dr.  
Malibu, CA 90265  
Tel: (310) 454 7030  
Email: [dmicheal@pepperdine.edu](mailto:dmicheal@pepperdine.edu)

Anne T. Henderson  
Institute for Education and Social Policy  
1640 Roxanna Rd., NW  
Washington, DC 20012  
Tel: 202-882-1582  
Email: [HENDERAM@aol.com](mailto:HENDERAM@aol.com)

Dr. Annette Lareau  
Department of Sociology  
Temple University  
756 Gladfelter Hall  
Philadelphia, PA 19122  
Tel: (215) 204 5594  
Email: [lareau@temple.edu](mailto:lareau@temple.edu)

Dr. Oliver Moles  
6904 Stonewood Ct.  
Rockville MD 20852  
Tel: (301) 770 2325  
Email: [omoles@erols.com](mailto:omoles@erols.com)

Dr. Christine Nord  
Child and Family Study Area  
Westat  
1650 Research Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20850-3195  
Tel: (301) 294 4463  
Email: [christinenord@westat.com](mailto:christinenord@westat.com)

Dr. Steven Sheldon  
National Network of Partnership Schools  
Johns Hopkins University  
3003 N. Charles Street, Suite 200  
Baltimore, MD 21218  
Tel: (410) 516 5489  
Email: [ssheldon@csos.jhu.edu](mailto:ssheldon@csos.jhu.edu)

Dr. Jerry West  
Mathematica Policy Research  
Suite 550  
600 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20024-2512  
Tel: 202-484-4516  
Email: [JWEST@Mathematica-MPR.com](mailto:JWEST@Mathematica-MPR.com)

### **AEWR Experts**

Dr. David B. Bills  
University of Iowa  
Education Policy and Leadership Studies  
44 Edgewood Circle  
N446 LC  
Iowa City, IA 52245-3970  
Tel: (319) 339 0455  
Email: [david-bills@uiowa.edu](mailto:david-bills@uiowa.edu)

Dr. John Bishop  
Cornell University  
Department of Human Resource Studies  
New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations  
390 Ives Hall  
Ithaca, NY 14853  
Tel: (607) 255 2742  
Email: jhb5@cornell.edu

Dr. Kevin M. Hollenbeck  
W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 South Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, MI 49007-4686  
Tel: (269) 343 5541  
Email: hollenbeck@upjohninstitute.org

Cheryl Keenan  
U.S. Department of Education  
Office of Vocational and Adult Education  
Division of Adult Education and Literacy  
550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Potomac Center Plaza, Room 11046  
Washington, DC 20065  
Tel: (202) 245 7810  
Email: cheryl.keenan@ed.gov

Dr. Lennox L. McLendon  
National Adult Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc.  
444 N. Capitol Street  
Suite 422  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel: (202) 624 5250  
Email: lmclendon@naepdc.org

Dr. Charles Pierret  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Bureau of Labor Statistics  
National Longitudinal Survey Program  
Employment Research and Program Development  
2 Massachusetts Avenue, NE  
Suite 4945  
Washington, DC 20212-0001  
Tel: (202) 691 7519  
Email: pierret\_c@bls.gov

Dr. Stephen Reder  
Portland State University  
National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy  
P.O. Box 751  
Portland, OR 97207-0751  
Tel: (503) 725 3999  
Email: reders@pdx.edu

Dr. Sandra Wall Williams  
North Carolina Community College System  
200 W. Jones Street  
5006 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-5006  
Tel: (919) 807 6976  
Email: swilliams@ncccs.cc.nc.us

Michael E. Wonacott  
The Ohio State University  
Center for Education and Training for Employment  
College of Education  
1900 Kenny Road  
1078 Kenny, 1900  
Columbus, OH 43210  
Tel: (614) 688 3356  
Email: wonacott.2@osu.edu

In addition to consulting with the experts above, Technical Review Panels (TRPs) were established for the SR and PFI surveys. A TRP was not convened for AEWR because experts recommended relatively few changes from the 2003 AEWR survey. The panel members were asked to review the study research questions and survey content outlines. Following completion of the draft instruments, a 2-day meeting was held in May 2005 for the purpose of reviewing the instruments. This meeting included joint discussions involving both panels for those items shared by the two surveys, and separate discussions for items particular to either SR or PFI. NHES staff also conferred with the TRP members when decisions were made about reducing the length of the SR and PFI interviews.

### **SR Technical Review Panel**

Dr. Robert Bradley  
Center for Applied Studies in Education  
University of Arkansas at Little Rock  
2801 S. University Avenue  
Little Rock, AR 72204  
Tel: (501) 569-8177  
Email: rhbradley@ualr.edu

Dr. Catherine Snow  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
Larsen 313  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Tel: (617) 495 3563  
Email: catherine\_snow@harvard.edu

Dr. Frederick Morrison  
Department of Psychology  
University of Michigan  
2030 East Hall  
525 East University  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109  
Tel: (734) 763 2214  
Email: fjmorris@umich.edu

Dr. David Dickinson  
Lynch School of Education  
Boston College  
Campion Hall 127  
140 Commonwealth Avenue  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02467  
Tel: (617) 552 4180  
Email: david.dickinson@bc.edu

Dr. Steven Barnett  
National Institute for Early Education Research  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
120 Albany Street, Suite 500  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901  
Tel: (732) 932 4350  
Email: sbarnett@nieer.org

Dr. Kyle Snow  
NICHD  
6100 Executive Blvd. Room 4B05 MSC 7510  
Bethesda, MD. 20892-7510  
Tel: (301) 435 2307  
Email: snowk@mail.nih.gov

Dr. Ivelisse Martinez-Beck  
Administration for Children and Families  
330 C Street SW  
Washington, DC 20447  
Tel: (202) 690 7885  
Email: IMartinezBeck@acf.hhs.gov

Dr. Rachel Cohen  
OPRE  
370 L'Enfant Promenade  
Washington, DC 20447  
Tel: (202) 205 8810  
Email: Rachel.cohen@acf.hhs.gov

Dr. Linda Mellgren  
ASPE  
200 Independence Ave.  
Washington, DC 20201  
Tel: (202) 690 6806  
Email: Linda.Mellgren@HHS.GOV

**PFI Technical Review Panel**

Dr. Nancy Feyl Chavkin, Co-Director  
Texas State University Center for Children & Families  
601 University Drive  
San Marcos, TX 78666  
Tel: (512) 245 2593  
Email: Nc02@txstate.edu

Dr. Laura Desimone  
Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations at Vanderbilt University  
Peabody # 514  
230 Appleton Place  
Nashville, TN 37203-5721  
Tel: (615) 322 5521  
Email: l.desimone@vanderbilt.edu

Anne T. Henderson  
Institute for Education and Social Policy  
1640 Roxanna Rd., NW  
Washington, DC 20012  
Tel: (202) 882 1582  
Email: HENDERAM@aol.com

Dr. Annette Lareau  
Professor  
Department of Sociology  
Temple University  
756 Gladfelter Hall  
Philadelphia, PA 19122  
Tel: (215) 204 5594  
Email: lareau@temple.edu

Dr. Oliver Moles  
6904 Stonewood Ct.  
Rockville MD 20852  
Tel: (301) 770 2325  
Email: omoles@erols.com

Dr. Steven Sheldon  
National Network of Partnership Schools  
Johns Hopkins University  
3003 N. Charles Street, Suite 200  
Baltimore, MD 21218  
Tel: (410) 516 5489  
Email: ssheldon@csos.jhu.edu

Dr. Jason Fields  
US Census Bureau  
Population Division- Rm 2348 - FOB3  
4700 Silver Hill Road  
Washington DC 20233  
Tel: (301) 763 2465  
Email: jason.m.fields@census.gov

Dr. V. Jeffery Evans  
Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch  
Executive Building, Room 8B07  
6100 Executive Boulevard, MSC 7510  
Bethesda, MD 20892-7510  
Tel: (301) 496 1174  
Email: jeff\_evans@nih.gov

#### **A.9. Payments to Respondents**

NHES:2003 included an extensive experiment in the use of small cash incentives to improve unit response. These efforts focused primarily on the screening level, at which most nonresponse in RDD surveys occurs. The experiment included 10 combinations of mailing conditions (first class and Priority Mail) and incentive conditions (none, \$2, and \$5) at the initial mailing stage and the refusal conversion stage. A draft report of the experimental findings was been provided to OMB at that time. The experiment demonstrated that gains in respondent cooperation could be realized with relatively modest cash incentives.

Based upon the results of the NHES:2003 efforts and subsequent discussions with OMB, NHES:2007 will include an incentive program to maximize screening response. Specifically, an advance cash incentive of \$2 will be sent to sample members for whom an address is available, and an additional

incentive of \$2 will be included with refusal conversion letters. The mailing and refusal conversion strategies are discussed further in section B.3.

A cash incentive is also planned for the in-person followup for the nonresponse bias study. Because many of the fielded cases will be those that could not be completed by telephone (i.e., nonrespondents), an incentive will be used to encourage response. Field interviewers will offer respondents \$20 for their participation. The \$20 incentive is considered to be essential to obtaining as high a response rate as possible for this effort. In our initial feasibility study, we examined the use of a smaller incentive (\$5) and found that this incentive did not significantly increase response rates above offering no incentive. This experience suggests that in order to boost response rates a substantially greater incentive needs to be offered. In proposing this, we are not suggesting that an incentive of this level is essential for an ordinary interview of this type, but for converting refusal and maximum call cases and where a high response rate is essential to evaluating nonresponse bias, a \$20 incentive is justified. A detailed discussion of the bias study is given in section B.1.1.4.

#### **A.10. Assurance of Confidentiality**

All information identifying the individual respondents will be kept confidential, in compliance with Public Law 100-297, which states that:

- (4)(A) “Except as provided in this section, no person may -
  - (i) use any individually identifiable information furnished under the provisions of this section for any purpose other than statistical purposes for which it is supplied;
  - (ii) make any publication whereby the data furnished by any particular person under this section can be identified; or
  - (iii) permit anyone other than the individuals authorized by the Commissioner to examine the individual reports . . .”

All Westat staff members working on NHES and having access to the data (including monitoring of interviews) are required to sign the NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure (exhibit 2) and a similar Westat confidentiality pledge (exhibit 3). In addition, staff members with access to the data are also required to submit the necessary forms and fingerprints for a federal background investigation.



**Exhibit 2. NCES Affidavit of Nondisclosure**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Job Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Date of Assignment to NCES Project)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Organizations, State or local agency or instrumentality)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(NCES Data Base or File Containing Individually Identifiable Information)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Address)

I, \_\_\_\_\_, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that when given access to the subject NCES data base or file, I will not

- (i) use or reveal any individually identifiable information furnished, acquired, retrieved or assembled by me or others, under the provisions of Section 406 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1) for any purpose other than statistical purposes specified in the NCES survey, project or contract;
- (ii) make any disclosure or publication whereby a sample unit or survey respondent could be identified or the data furnished by or related to any particular person under this section can be identified; or
- (iii) permit anyone other than the individuals authorized by the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics to examine the individual reports.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

(The penalty for unlawful disclosure is a fine of not more than \$250,000 (under 18 U.S.C. 3559 and 3571) or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. The word "swear" should be stricken out wherever it appears when a person elects to affirm the affidavit rather than to swear to it.)

State of Maryland  
County of \_\_\_\_\_

Sworn and subscribed to me before a Notary Public in and for the aforementioned County and State this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Notary Public)

**Exhibit 3. Westat Confidentiality Pledge**  
**WESTAT**

**EMPLOYEE OR CONTRACTOR'S ASSURANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF SURVEY DATA**

**Statement of Policy**

Westat is firmly committed to the principle that the confidentiality of individual data obtained through Westat surveys must be protected. This principle holds whether or not any specific guarantee of confidentiality was given at time of interview (or self-response), or whether or not there are specific contractual obligations to the client. When guarantees have been given or contractual obligations regarding confidentiality have been entered into, they may impose additional requirements which are to be adhered to strictly.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality**

1. All Westat employees and field workers shall sign this assurance of confidentiality. This assurance may be superseded by another assurance for a particular project.
2. Field workers shall keep completely confidential the names of respondents, all information or opinions collected in the course of interviews, and any information about respondents learned incidentally during field work. Field workers shall exercise reasonable caution to prevent access by others to survey data in their possession.
3. Unless specifically instructed otherwise for a particular project, an employee or field worker, upon encountering a respondent or information pertaining to a respondent that s/he knows personally, shall immediately terminate the activity and contact her/his supervisor for instructions.
4. Survey data containing personal identifiers in Westat offices shall be kept in a locked container or a locked room when not being used each working day in routine survey activities. Reasonable caution shall be exercised in limiting access to survey data to only those persons who are working on the specific project and who have been instructed in the applicable confidentiality requirements for that project.  
Where survey data have been determined to be particularly sensitive by the Corporate Officer in charge of the project or the President of Westat, such survey data shall be kept in locked containers or in a locked room except when actually being used and attended by a staff member who has signed this pledge.
5. Ordinarily, serial numbers shall be assigned to respondents prior to creating a machine-processible record and identifiers such as name, address, and Social Security number shall not, ordinarily, be a part of the machine record. When identifiers are part of the machine data record, Westat's Manager of Data Processing shall be responsible for determining adequate confidentiality measures in consultation with the project director. When a separate file is set up containing identifiers or linkage information which could be used to identify data records, this separate file shall be kept locked up when not actually being used each day in routine survey activities.
6. When records with identifiers are to be transmitted to another party, such as for keypunching or key taping, the other party shall be informed of these procedures and shall sign an Assurance of Confidentiality form.
7. Each project director shall be responsible for ensuring that all personnel and contractors involved in handling survey data on a project are instructed in these procedures throughout the period of survey performance. When there are specific contractual obligations to the client regarding confidentiality, the project director shall develop additional procedures to comply with these obligations and shall instruct field staff, clerical staff, consultants, and any other persons who work on the project in these additional procedures. At the end of the period of survey performance, the project director shall arrange for proper storage or disposition of survey data including any particular contractual requirements for storage or disposition. When required to turn over survey data to our clients, we must provide proper safeguards to ensure confidentiality up to the time of delivery.
8. Project directors shall ensure that survey practices adhere to the provisions of the U.S. Privacy Act of 1974 with regard to surveys of individuals for the Federal Government. Project directors must ensure that procedures are established in each survey to inform each respondent of the authority for the survey, the purpose and use of the survey, the voluntary nature of the survey (where applicable) and the effects on the respondents, if any, of not responding.

PLEDGE

I hereby certify that I have carefully read and will cooperate fully with the above procedures. I will keep completely confidential all information arising from surveys concerning individual respondents to which I gain access. I will not discuss, disclose, disseminate, or provide access to survey data and identifiers except as authorized by Westat. In addition, I will comply with any additional procedures established by Westat for a particular contract. I will devote my best efforts to ensure that there is compliance with the required procedures by personnel whom I supervise. I understand that violation of this pledge is sufficient grounds for disciplinary action, including dismissal. I also understand that violation of the privacy rights of individuals through such unauthorized discussion, disclosure, dissemination, or access may make me subject to criminal or civil penalties. I give my personal pledge that I shall abide by this assurance of confidentiality.

---

Signature

## **A.11. Sensitive Questions**

NHES is a voluntary survey, and no persons are required to respond to the interviews. In addition, respondents may decline to answer any question in the survey. This voluntary aspect of the survey is clearly stated in the introduction and is stressed in interviewer training.

**School Readiness and Parent and Family Involvement (SR-PFI) Interview.** Child development specialists consider economic disadvantage and children's disabilities to be important factors in children's preschool and school experiences and family involvement in their education (Huston 2002, Parcel and Menaghan 1997). As a result, the SR-PFI Interview contains measures of characteristics that may be considered sensitive. These include

- Household income;
- Receipt of public assistance in the form of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), food stamps, and the Women, Infants, and Children program (WIC);
- Children's school performance and difficulties, including school grades, suspensions and expulsions;
- Identification of children's schools; and
- Children's disabilities.

Items concerning school performance and difficulty are important to the SR and PFI surveys as indicators of school readiness for young children, and as correlates of parent and family involvement for children of all ages and grades. Measures of household income and government assistance are important because both the school readiness of children at risk and the educational involvement of families of different socioeconomic backgrounds are of interest to researchers in the field. These items have been administered successfully in previous NHES studies.

Another element of the PFI survey that was considered to potentially be sensitive is the identification of children's schools using a school lookup file. This approach will allow analysts to link NHES data to other NCES datasets containing additional data about schools, greatly enhancing the ability to examine the relationships between students' and families' experiences and the characteristics of schools. The NHES:2007 field test conducted in the spring and early summer of 2006 indicated that the

great majority of parents were willing to identify their children's schools either with little reservation or with assurance that the information was strictly for research purposes.

The cognitive research conducted for this instrument (discussed under section B.4, Tests of Procedures and Methods) indicated a high degree of respondent interest and a strong motivation to participate.

**Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons (AEWR) Interview.** AEWR-NHES:2007 contains items on the following topics that may be considered sensitive:

- High school completion;
- Employer information (profession, duties, employer name, and industry);  
and
- Personal earnings and household income.

Educational attainment has been found to be a correlate of participation in adult education (Kim et al. 2004). As a result, questions concerning high school completion are analytically important for the AEWR survey. Items gathering information on employers are needed because of the relationship of occupation and industry to adults' participation in educational activities; the survey items will be used to code industry and occupation, but the specific responses to these questions will not be made available for public use. Questions on income are asked to provide a description of the economic circumstances of adults and their households, which is related to participation in adult education (Kim et al. 2004). These same questions were asked of adults in previous survey administrations.

#### **A.12. Estimated Response Burden**

The response burden per instrument and the total response burden for NHES:2007 are shown in table 1. The Screener administration time is drawn from actual experience in the NHES:2003 and NHES:2005 administrations. The estimates for SR/PFI and AEWR are based on the actual interview times from phase two of the NHES:2007 field test, with a minor downward adjustment made for PFI, because some additional items were deleted following the field test.

The cost to respondents for the total hour burden is estimated to be \$292,893, that is, \$17.75 per hour for 16,501 burden hours. The hourly rate is based on the National Compensation Survey

(Bureau of Labor Statistics 2004.) There are no other costs to respondents. There are also no recordkeeping requirements associated with NHES:2007.

**Table 1. Estimated response burden for NHES:2007**

Interview forms	Estimated time (minutes)	Number of respondents	Number of interviews	Total time (hours)
Screener.....	3.5	62,000	62,000	3,617
SR interviews.....	20	3,790	3,790	1,263
PFI interviews.....	26	14,150	14,150	6,132
AEWB interviews.....	17	15,000	15,000	4,250
PFI reinterview.....	5	1,000	1,000	83
Bias study Screener.....	5	5,235	5,235	436
SR interviews in field.....	20	344	344	115
PFI interviews in field.....	26	400	400	173
AEWB interviews in field.....	17	400	400	113
Homeschooling families Screener.....	3.5	762	762	44
PFI interviews.....	26	633	633	274
<b>Study Total.....</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>103,714</b>	<b>103,714</b>	<b>16,500</b>

NOTE: Details may not sum to totals due to rounding of partial hours.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2007 National Household Education Surveys Program.

**A.13. Annualized Cost to Respondents**

There are no costs beyond those presented in section A.12.

**A.14. Annualized Cost to the Federal Government**

The total cost of NHES:2007 to the government is approximately \$7.0 million over a period of 36 months. This includes all direct and indirect costs of the design, data collection, analysis, and reporting phases of the study, as well as the preparation of analytical data sets.

C-54

**A.15. Reasons for Program Changes**

There is an increase from 483 hours to 16,501 hours because we are moving from a field test to the full scale NHES:2007.

**A.16. Publication Plans and Project Schedule**

NHES:2007 will lead to descriptive analyses of the educational topics that are addressed in the SR, PFI, and AEWR surveys. A First Look report (the report format used by NCES to release new data) will be prepared for each survey, presenting estimates for a variety of measures in each survey. It is planned that tables of estimates related to the school readiness of young children, the participation of parents and families in education, and participation in adult education activities will be presented in these reports, showing differences between subgroups defined by demographic characteristics (e.g., age, sex, marital status), educational characteristics (e.g., grade in school and school type) and socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., educational attainment and income). The specific topics and tables for NHES:2007 reports will be developed during the winter of 2007.

### **A.16.1. Preliminary Analytical Tasks**

#### **Imputation**

Experience with previous NHES data collections indicates that respondents generally answer all items in the interview. However, some respondents either cannot or do not wish to answer some items, resulting in item nonresponse. For past NHES data sets, item nonresponse was addressed by developing and implementing hot-deck imputation methods for every item in the interviews. Data users have indicated their appreciation of the ease of use associated with a fully imputed data set.

The imputation strategy used for past NHES surveys involved choosing a random donor from the pool of respondents with similar characteristics who answered the item and replacing the missing value with this imputed value. Hot-deck imputation for item nonresponse will be conducted for NHES:2007 in much the same manner as for previous NHES data sets. The imputation will respect the skip patterns of the interviews and will select donors who are similar on key characteristics to the respondents with missing data. The imputed data will be subjected to the same data editing procedures as used in the original data collection.

The imputation will be done early in the post-data collection period; therefore, fully imputed data sets will be available even for the earliest analyses. All imputed values will be flagged, so analysts can either ignore the imputations or do their own imputations depending on their specific purposes.



## Derived Variables

As has been done for past NHES data sets, derived variables will be created for use by analysts and will appear on the data files. The construction of most derived variables involves combining one or more questionnaire variables to create a single measure of a characteristic or a counter, such as numbers of household members or courses. Other variables will be derived from the 2000 Census of Population and will be linked to NHES data using respondent ZIP Codes. The methods for creating NHES:2007 derived variables will be consistent with those used for previous NHES data sets, in order to facilitate analyses over time using similar derived variables. For the most part, the derived variables will be demographic characteristics of children, adults, or families that will be used in descriptive reports and are likely to be of value to a wide range of data users. Some examples from previous NHES collections follow:

C-54

- **Race-ethnicity.** By combining race and Hispanic origin, a derived variable can be created with standard categories that are commonly used by analysts: white, non-Hispanic; black, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; and other race.
- **Parents' highest education.** This socioeconomic measure combines the educational attainment measures for the child's mother and father and reflects the highest level of education completed by either parent or by the only parent in a single-parent household.
- **Child's grade/grade equivalent.** This variable combines three items to create a single variable reflecting both enrollment status and grade in school. The variables are enrollment status, current grade, and grade equivalent for those children in ungraded schools or who are homeschooled.
- **Linked ZIP Code variables.** These variables provide information on the characteristics of the ZIP Code area in which the child's household is located, using data from the 2000 Census of Population Summary Tape File SF3. Linked ZIP Code variables include a variable that categorizes the percentage of families in the subject's ZIP Code who have children under age 18 and had incomes in 1999 below the poverty line, a variable that categorizes the percentage of persons in the subject's ZIP Code who are Black or Hispanic, and a variable that categorizes the subject's ZIP Code as urban or rural.
- **Household counter-derived variables.** These are created by counting the number of persons enumerated in the household with specific characteristics. For example, household counter-derived variables include a counter-derived variable that indicates the number of household members age 18 and older, and a counter-derived variable that indicates the total number of household members.

### A.16.2. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive tabulations will be produced for the purposes of developing the NHES:2007 First Look reports. The tabulations will include weighted estimates as described in section B.1.7 of this clearance request. Generally, the tabulations will include questionnaire items cross-tabulated by a standard set of individual, family, and household characteristics, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, adult or parent education level, and household income.

Three First Look reports will be prepared for NHES:2007, one using SR data, one using PFI data, and one using AEWB data. Each report will be published by NCES. The contents of the First Look reports will be guided by the research questions presented below.

## School Readiness Research Questions

1. What is the home literacy and learning environment of preschoolers and kindergarteners?
  - a. What is the home reading environment like for preschoolers and kindergartners, including the presence of books and the reading habits of children and parents/families?
  - b. What pre-literacy/emerging literacy behaviors do preschoolers and kindergartners exhibit?
  - c. What television programs and videos do preschoolers and kindergartners watch, and how much?
  - d. To what extent do children engage in mutual parent-child activities that promote language development, motor development, math and science learning, and general learning?
  - e. To what extent are fathers involved in home learning and literacy activities with preschoolers and kindergartners?
  - f. How many preschoolers and kindergartners have access to computer and the Internet?
  - g. What television networks do children watch and are there any rules at the home for television viewing?
2. What are the developmental characteristics of preschoolers?
  - a. To what extent do preschoolers exhibit cognitive skills such as counting, letter recognition, color recognition, and phonological awareness?
  - b. What social skills and problem behaviors do preschoolers and kindergartners exhibit?
  - c. What are the domains in which children tend to have more accomplishments or more difficulties (cognitive skills, socioemotional development, language development, and motor development)?
  - d. What are the associations between accomplishments and difficulties and children's ages, preschool experience, and sociodemographic risk factors?
3. To what extent do children remain in preschool for an additional year, enter a developmental or transitional kindergarten program, experience delayed kindergarten entry, or repeat kindergarten?
  - a. How many children remain in preschool for an additional year or enter a developmental/transitional kindergarten rather than enter kindergarten?
  - b. How many children repeat kindergarten or spend two years in kindergarten or an associated grade (e.g., transitional kindergarten)?
  - c. What is the extent of delayed entry into kindergarten?

4. What are the characteristics of children's attendance in preschool/kindergarten?
  - a. What are the characteristics of children who attend preschool programs or daycare centers?
  - b. What is the association between parent involvement in children's daycare center/preschool program and children's developmental characteristics?
  - c. What are the differences in characteristics of children who participate in center-based programs and those who do not?
5. What is the association between the health and disability status of preschool children and readiness for school?
  - a. What is children's health status at birth and currently?
  - b. What is the proportion of children that are covered by health insurance?
  - c. How many children are not attending preschool or school or delayed school entry due to a health or emotional problem?
  - d. What is the proportion of children who have disabilities that affect their ability to learn?
6. What kind of beliefs and perceptions do parents have about school readiness?
  - a. What do parents see as their roles in preparing children for kindergarten?

### **Parent and Family Involvement in Education Research Questions**

1. In what ways and to what extent are parents and families involved in their children's schooling?
  - a. To what extent do parents delay young children's entry into kindergarten or first grade?
  - b. To what extent are parents and families involved in choosing their children's schools?
  - c. What are the reasons for parents' school choices and what types of information do parents obtain to make these choices?
  - d. In what ways are parents and families involved directly with their children's schools (e.g., meetings, volunteering, etc.)?
  - e. Do parents report receiving information from schools to plan for children's education and work after high school?
  - f. What is the relationship between parenting style and the extent of parents' and families' involvement in school choice and children's schooling?
  - g. What is the relationship between parent and family involvement in school and student experiences and performance (e.g., grades, retention).

- h. For older children, how does parents' willingness to pay for college relate to family involvement and student experiences and performance?
2. What are the roles of social networks and community in parent and family involvement in school?
    - a. What is the extent of parents' contact with parents of other children?
  3. What are parents' perceptions of communication by teachers or other school personnel with parents or families?
    - a. What is the type and purpose of school communication reported by parents including school contact to discuss both problems and how well the child is doing in school?
    - b. What frequency and modes of school contact with families do parents report?
    - c. How are parent perceptions of school/family communication related to their involvement with the school, in homework, and in learning activities outside of school?
  4. What types of school practices to involve and support families are reported by parents?
    - a. What are the school practices that parents report?
    - b. What is the relationship between school practices and different types and levels of involvement with the school, in homework, and in learning activities outside of school?
    - c. What are the differences in reports of school practices based on school characteristics?
    - d. What is the relationship of parent-reported school practices to levels of involvement by socioeconomic status?
    - e. What is the relationship between family involvement with the school and parent assessments of the school environment concerning parent and family involvement?
  5. What are the barriers to school involvement by families?
    - a. What are the language barriers that language minority families face and how do they relate to the type and extent of their involvement with the school?
    - b. Do parent perceptions of the efficacy of their involvement relate to the type and extent of family involvement?
    - c. What structural or logistical barriers to school involvement (e.g., work schedules, childcare needs) do parents report?
  6. In what ways and to what extent are parents and other household members involved in their children's homework?
    - a. How does the involvement of household members in homework relate to student experiences and performance?

- b. How often do household members and other adults outside the household (e.g. tutor) help children with homework?
  - c. How does the environment that families create for homework completion relate to student experiences and performance?
  - d. What rules do parents follow regarding their children's homework?
7. In what ways are parents and family members involved in non-school activities with children at home?
- a. What is the type and extent of family involvement in daily activities and other learning activities of children and how does this relate to student experiences and performance?
8. How is children's health/disability status related to family involvement and student behavior, experiences and performance?
- a. How is children's health related to the level of parent and family involvement in their education?
  - b. What is the extent of parent reporting of children's disabilities?
  - c. How are children's health and disabilities related to the extent of parent and family involvement, school practices, and student experiences and performance?
  - d. To what extent do children receive services for disabilities and from what sources?
  - e. What is the extent of children's participation in Individualized Educational Programs or Plans (IEPs) or enrollment in special education classes?
  - f. What is the extent of parents' and families' involvement with the school to develop their children's IEPs?
  - g. Are parents satisfied with their children's IEPs or special education classes or services, including the school's communication with the family, the special needs teacher or therapist, and the school's ability to accommodate the child's special needs?
9. What is the extent of homeschooling of children during their school years?
- a. To what extent do homeschooled students also attend schools to receive some of their instruction?
  - b. To what extent do parents use homeschool communities or resources such as distance learning/internet use to obtain materials or develop curricula?
  - c. Of the total school-going years, how many years are children homeschooled?
  - d. What are the reasons for homeschooling by parents?
  - e. What is the role of the Internet and the use of other technology or media for homeschooling instruction and curriculum development?



## Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons Questions

1. To what extent do adults participate in educational activities related to a job or career?
  - a. To what extent do adults participate in college degree programs or post-degree certificate programs for work-related reasons?
  - b. To what extent do adults participate in postsecondary vocational or technical diploma or certificate programs for work-related reasons?
  - c. To what extent do adults participate in apprenticeships to attain journeyman status in a trade or craft?
  - d. To what extent do adults participate in work-related courses that are not part of a degree, diploma, or certificate program?
  - e. To what extent do adults participate in informal learning activities related to work (e.g., on-the-job demonstrations, brown-bags, self-study)?
  - f. How is participation in AEWL activities related to characteristics of adults?
2. What is the employment status of adults during and after participation in adult education for work-related reasons?
  - a. Are employed adults more likely to participate in educational activities related to a job or career?
  - b. To what extent do adults participate in adult education for work-related reasons in order to change their job or career field?
  - c. To what extent does a change in employment status or occupation follow participation in adult education for work-related reasons?
  - d. What types of educational activities are associated with changes in employment status or occupation?
3. How is adults' educational attainment related to their occupation and intent to pursue additional educational credentials?
  - a. What is the relationship between the field of an adult's postsecondary degree or diploma (if any), his or her occupation, and the field in which he/she participates in educational activities?
  - b. To what extent do adults with bachelor's degrees or more education return to school to participate in vocational programs to enter an occupation?
4. For what specific work-related reasons do adults participate in adult education for work-related reasons, and how does this vary by type of activity?



5. What are the specific work-related outcomes of participation in adult education for work-related reasons, by type of activity?
  - a. What are the perceived benefits of educational activities taken?
  - b. How useful do adults find the courses, classes, or trainings taken for work-related reasons?
6. What is the intensity of participation in adult education for work-related reasons, by type of activity?
  - a. In how many credit hours or hours of classroom instruction do adults participate?
  - b. How is the intensity of participation associated with employment?
7. To what extent do adults report that they have completed educational activities or that they have stopped attending activities without completing them, by type of activity (particularly for apprenticeships)?
8. What are the costs and financial supports for participation in adult education for work-related reasons, by types of activities?
  - a. How much of their own resources do adults spend to participate in adult education for work-related reasons?
  - b. What additional sources of financial support are used to pay for participation in adult education for work-related reasons?
9. From what types of schools, organizations, or persons do adults receive instruction and where do they receive this instruction?
10. What types of employer support do adults receive for their participation in educational activities for work-related reasons?
  - a. To what extent do adults receive employer support in the form of payment or reimbursement of tuition and fees or books and materials?
  - b. To what extent do adults receive employer support in the form of work-site classes or trainings?
  - c. To what extent do adults take courses during their regular work hours (with or without pay)?
  - d. To what extent are adults paid for time spent taking educational activities?
11. To what extent are adults required by their employers to participate in educational activities?
  - a. To what extent is adults' participation suggested by their employers?
  - b. How does the extent of employer requirement/suggestion vary by type of educational activity?

12. To what extent do adults report occupational or legal requirements for continuing education?
13. How many adults report the use of distance education in their adult education activities for work-related reasons?
  - a. What types of technologies do adults report using?
  - b. How do the use of technology and the type of technology vary by type of adult education activity?
14. What are the factors associated with participation or nonparticipation in adult education?
  - a. To what extent are adults interested in taking work-related adult education?
  - b. To what extent do adults believe that they need or could benefit from additional training for their jobs or careers?
  - c. To what extent do adults report that their employers do or do not provide financial support, time off from work, etc., for educational activities?
15. To what extent do adults engage in work-related reading outside of their jobs?

### **A.16.3. Comparative Analysis**

An additional analysis task will be the development of comparative analyses. These analyses will compare estimates from the NHES:2007 surveys with estimates from extant databases addressing similar topics. The final selection of data sources and variables will depend on the availability of data during the summer of 2007. At a minimum, the analysis will include comparisons to the Current Population Survey and previous NHES administrations.

### **A.16.4. Project Schedule**

Exhibit 4 presents a schedule of major project activities.

**Exhibit 4. NHES:2007 schedule of major activities**

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Date of Scheduled Conduct/Completion</u>
Final interviewer training materials	November 15, 2006
Final CATI system	November 15, 2006
Interviewer training	December 18, 2006-January 10, 2007
Data collection	January 2, 2007—June 15, 2007
Preliminary data files	July 20, 2007
Draft data file users' manual	July 20, 2007
First analysis reports delivered to NCES	September 21, 2007
Final data files and users' manual	March 28, 2008
Final methodology report	March 28, 2008
Publication of reports	March 28, 2008

C-54

**A.17. Approval for Not Displaying the Expiration Date for OMB Approval**

Not applicable. We are not seeking this approval.

**A.18. Exceptions to the Certification Statement**

Not applicable. There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

*This page is intentionally blank.*