

Collischon, Matthias; Kühnle, Daniel; Oberfichtner, Michael

Working Paper

Cash-for-care, or caring for cash? The effects of a home care subsidy on maternal employment, childcare choices, and children s development

IAB-Discussion Paper, No. 25/2020

Provided in Cooperation with:

Institute for Employment Research (IAB)

Suggested Citation: Collischon, Matthias; Kühnle, Daniel; Oberfichtner, Michael (2020) : Cash-for-care, or caring for cash? The effects of a home care subsidy on maternal employment, childcare choices, and children s development, IAB-Discussion Paper, No. 25/2020, Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung (IAB), Nürnberg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/234283>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.


Online Appendix B: Results for East Germany

We also conduct analyses for East Germany without the federal state of Thuringa (because the state already had a home care subsidy in place). As can be seen in Figure B.1, the take-up of the subsidy is far smaller compared to the main sample. Thus, we would expect smaller effects compared to the main analysis.

Table B.1 shows that there are no employment effects of the subsidy and that this finding is robust to changes in the specification (column 2 corresponds to the baseline DiD model with control variables, whereas column 1 shows the DiD without controls and column 3 shows the results from the DiDisc estimation). Furthermore, Table B.2 also shows the effect of the subsidy on the take-up of publicly subsidised childcare. Again, we find no effect.

Unfortunately, we have no data on child development for East Germany. Given the low take up, no effects on maternal employment and subsidised childcare attendance, we would not expect to find any effects on child development.

Figure B.1: Take-up rate of home care subsidy in East Germany



Notes: This figure shows the take-up rate by birth month for children born in 2012 using cross-sectional survey weights.
Source: Own calculations based on KiBS.

Table B.1: Main Results for employment outcomes for East Germany

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Ever worked within 36 months</i> | | | |
| 2012 X Autumn | 0.004 (0.004) | 0.004 (0.004) | 0.004 (0.008) |
| <i>Mean 2012 Spring</i> | 0.937 | 0.937 | 0.937 |
| <i>Cumulated employment days within 36 months</i> | | | |
| 2012 X Autumn | 2.913 (3.914) | 2.692 (3.824) | 4.629 (8.687) |
| <i>Mean 2012 Spring</i> | 570 | 570 | 570 |
| <i>Cumulated labour income within 36 months</i> | | | |
| 2012 X Autumn | 549.517 (427.208) | 493.823 (343.883) | 809.884 (777.781) |
| <i>Mean 2012 Spring</i> | 39120 | 39120 | 39120 |
| <i>Specification</i> | | | |
| Did | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| + X_i | | ✓ | ✓ |
| + running var | | | ✓ |

Source: Own calculations based on BeH data for for children born between March 2008 and December 2013, East Germany only.

Notes: N=109854; East Germany without Thuringa. Controls in X_i are district fixed effects, age at birth dummies (<25,25-30,30-35,30-40,>40), wage prior to birth dummies(<20, 20-40, 40-60, 60-80, 80-100, 100-120, >120), tertiary education (dummy), dummies for missing values in either. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Significance levels: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table B.2: Effect on subsidised childcare for East Germany

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <i>Care by a subsidised provider</i> | | | |
| 2012 X Autumn | 0.020 (0.032) | 0.004 (0.032) | 0.006 (0.059) |
| Mean 2012 Spring | 0.832 | 0.832 | 0.832 |
| <i>Specification</i> | | | |
| Did | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| + X_i | | ✓ | ✓ |
| + running var | | | ✓ |

Source: Own calculations based on KIBS for children born between August 2012 and December 2013, East Germany only.

Notes: Controls are maternal age at birth dummies (<25, 25-30, 30-35, 35-40, >40), survey year dummies, federal state fixed effects, maternal tertiary education (dummy), children's age in month dummies (12-18,18-24,24-30,30-36). Dummies for missing values in any control variable are included as well. Cluster robust (on mother's level) standard errors in parentheses.

Significance levels: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Online Appendix C: Information on outcomes in school entrance examinations data

Schleswig-Holstein uses a standardised test to assess the skills of children before they are admitted to elementary school, the SOPESS (? , *Sozialpädiatrisches Entwicklungsscreening für Schuleingangsuntersuchungen*). The measures correlate reasonably well with medical screening results (?). We use several items of this test to measure the development of children and to investigate the effects of the home care subsidy on it.

Cognition difficulties

Problems with cognition refer to deficiencies in the capacities of a child to understand visual and auditive information. It measures the ability to solve problems and to understand complex relations as well as the ability to classify.

Hand-eye coordination difficulties

Difficulties in hand-eye coordination or visuomotoric measure problems with motoric skills. Tasks to survey this item include for example drawing geometric forms.

Attention difficulties

This item measures problems in the ability to focus on a specific task and to ignore distractions. Children with attention difficulties have problems with understanding and internalizing learning content. It is surveyed with the performance in the task to strike out specific numbers on a sheet full of figures and then counting the errors.

Counting difficulties

Measures problems in counting quantities.

Quantitative difficulties

Measures problems in the ability to assess the number of an unstructured quantity without counting as well as the ability to compare small quantities.