

## National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) Bibliography

Updated November 2022

This bibliography lists resources in the Research Connections collection related to the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) and is intended as a reference tool for researchers and policymakers.

These NSECE data-related publications can be found in the [Child Care and Early Education Research Connections](#) library. To find the most recent publications, users can also search Research Connection's resources by entering "National Survey of Early Care and Education" and sorting by publication date.

Publications and information about accessing the NSECE datasets can be found on the [Child and Family Data Archive](#) by searching for "NSECE."

The resource descriptions below are directly from the source material. Minor edits have been made to improve readability in this format.

### Document Navigation Links

- [Reports from Administration for Children and Families](#)
- [Studies Using NSECE Data](#)
- [Data Sets](#)
- [Instruments](#)
- [User Guides, Training Webinars, and Methodological Reports](#)

### Reports from Administration for Children and Families

**Datta, A. R., Gebhardt, Z., & Zapata-Gietl, C. (2021). *National Survey of Early Care and Education chartbook: Center-based early care and education providers in 2012 and 2019: Counts and characteristics* (OPRE Report No. 2021-222). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**  
<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/132721>

"This chartbook presents nationally representative estimates of center-based providers serving children ages 5 and under—not yet in kindergarten—using data from the 2012 and 2019 NSECE. The chartbook features the following: (1) counts of center-based providers, children served, and staff; (2) number of center-based providers, number of children served by age group, percentage changes in providers and children, and number of staff; (3) characteristics of center-based providers; (4) ages of children served, hours open, auspice and sponsorship, and public funding receipt."

**Datta, A. R., Milesi, C., Srivastava, S., & Zapata-Gietl, C. (2021).** *National Survey of Early Care and Education chartbook: Home-based early care and education providers in 2012 and 2019: Counts and characteristics* (OPRE Report No. 2021-85). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/127061>

“This chartbook presents nationally representative estimates of all home-based care to children under age 13, using data from the 2012 and 2019 NSECE. Home-based providers discussed in the report include both paid and unpaid providers of care. Three types of home-based providers are discussed: (1) listed, (2) unlisted paid, and (3) unlisted unpaid. Key definitions are found in the next section. The chartbook describes counts of home-based providers and children served, characteristics of care provided in home-based ECE, and characteristics of the individuals providing home-based ECE. The chartbook also identifies statistically significant changes between 2012 and 2019 for different types of home-based providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2013).** *Number and characteristics of early care and education (ECE) teachers and caregivers: Initial findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* (NSECE Research Brief, OPRE Report 38). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/26496>

“This resource includes findings from the NSECE—a study of the availability and utilization of early care and education in the United States—that examine workforce size, program sponsorship, educational attainment, wages, health insurance, and years of experience, based on questionnaires from more than 10,000 center- and home-based providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2014).** *Characteristics of center-based early care and education programs* (OPRE Report No. 2014-73b). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/28742>

“This fact sheet provides the first nationally representative portrait of center-based early care and education (ECE) in more than 20 years, using data from the newly available NSECE. We describe ECE programs that serve children age birth to 5 years, not yet in kindergarten. Key characteristics include enrollment size, ages of children served, revenue sources, auspice and hours of operation.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2014).** *Characteristics of center-based early care and education programs: Initial findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* (NSECE Technical Report, OPRE Report 2014-73a). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/28740>

“In this report, we use newly available data from the NSECE to construct the first nationally representative estimates of all center-based care to children birth through age 5, not yet in kindergarten. We describe center-based ECE programs by key characteristics, such as enrollment size, ages of children served, revenue sources, auspice and sponsorship, and hours of operation. We also provide national estimates of total children enrolled in these programs.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2014). *Household search for and perceptions of early care and education* (OPRE Report No. 2014-55b). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/28615>

“What do families think of different types of ECE, such as center-based programs or care by relatives? How do families search for ECE for their young children? This fact sheet reports preliminary findings from the newly available NSECE Household Survey to provide insight into how parents perceive the ECE arrangements available to them, how and why they search for care, and when searches result in a change in arrangement.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2014). *Household search for and perceptions of early care and education: Initial findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* (NSECE Research Brief, OPRE Report 55a). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/28613>

“This brief uses new, nationally representative data from the NSECE—funded by the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families—to describe critical elements in the decision-making process of parents and other caregivers regarding the nonparental care of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. The NSECE comprises four nationally representative surveys that were conducted in 2012. These coordinated surveys were designed to provide in-depth data on multiple dimensions of ECE in the United States, including the availability of ECE, preferences and needs for ECE and school-age care, the use of ECE and school-age care, and a description of the ECE workforce. One of the four surveys—the Household Survey—gathered data from households with young children, while the other three collected data from center- and home-based ECE providers. The NSECE oversampled from low-income areas because the experiences of families with low incomes are of critical public policy interest. This brief uses data from the Household Survey to provide insight into how parents perceive the ECE arrangements available to them, how and why they search for care, and when searches result in a change in arrangement.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Identifying Head Start and public pre-k participation in NSECE data on center-based ECE programs* (OPRE Report #2015-92b). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31212>

“The analyses we present in the technical report *Which Centers Participate in Head Start or Public Pre-Kindergarten* characterize centers that have at least one child whose enrollment is funded through Head Start or public prekindergarten funds. This supplement to the technical report provides interested readers with technical details of the analyses (including additional information about tabulations and definitions used, as well as discussion of features of the data that affect how additional analyses might be undertaken).”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Measuring predictors of quality in early care and education settings in the National Survey of Early Care and Education* (OPRE Report #2015-93). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30814>**

“This report, *Measuring Predictors of Quality in Early Care and Education Settings* in the NSECE, is intended as a methodological report on how selected predictors of quality can be measured using the NSECE data. It also provides descriptive data for each of the selected predictors of quality. Attributes of early care and education settings that contribute to quality are considered at the level of the individual teacher and caregiver, at the level of the classroom or home-based group, and at the level of the center- and home-based program at a single location.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Prices charged in early care and education: Initial findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* (OPRE Report 2015-45). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/29790>**

“This brief uses data from the NSECE to describe prices charged by center- and home-based providers of ECE, as well as amount of care that is free to all parents. These data come from both the NSECE Center-Based Provider Survey and the NSECE Home-Based Provider Survey; external data sources were used to classify the locations of the sampled providers. This brief describes the maximum price of full-time care, without any subsidies, that providers were charging families in 2012 (when NSECE interviews were carried out). This “market price” for care is the type of data commonly collected in market rate surveys required by the Child Care Development Fund. It is related to, but can be quite different from, the cost of care to parents and providers’ costs for providing care. The brief also reports the percentage of providers, such as Head Start and publicly funded prekindergarten programs, that provide care free to all the families they serve. In addition to providing national information, we examine how prices and availability of free care vary by community characteristics such as poverty and urbanicity. For center-based programs, we also examine variation by receipt of public funding. In the next section of the brief, we describe the NSECE and other data sources for this analysis. We then present estimates for the prevalence of care that is free to all parents, and—for those programs that do charge for care—the distribution of prices for center-based programs. Home-based estimates of these two items follow. We conclude the brief with discussion of the presented estimates and suggestions for further research.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Provision of early care and education during non-standard hours* (OPRE Report No. 2015-44). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/29737>**

“Affordability is one of the critical barriers to accessing ECE for many parents and guardians of young children. Another is finding ECE for the days and hours needed. This is particularly true for the many parents and guardians who do not work during “standard” work hours—in other words, 8 a.m.–6 p.m., Monday–Friday—but who work evenings, overnight shifts, on the weekends, or have varying work schedules that change from week to week or month to month. This fact sheet uses data from the newly available NSECE to describe the flexibility of available ECE in the United States. Specifically, we provide nationally representative estimates of the percentage of ECE providers serving young children (ages birth through 5 years) who offer services during nonstandard hours as well as those who permit parents flexibility in scheduling and in payment for

services. Estimates are presented separately for center-based providers as well as three types of homebased providers: “listed” providers who appear in official state and national lists of ECE services; “unlisted, paid” providers who are not on official lists but receive payment for caring for children; and “unlisted, unpaid” providers who are not on official lists and do not receive payment for the care they provide.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Which early care and education centers participate in Head Start or public pre-kindergarten?* (OPRE Report #2015- 92a). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31211>

“Newly released data from the NSECE provides a unique opportunity to understand Head Start and public prekindergarten offerings within the context of all center-based ECE to children ages 5 and under. These two prominent initiatives involve almost 40 percent of all ECE centers nationally. Most centers receiving any Head Start or public prekindergarten funding are also serving young children through other ECE services, such as parent-funded preschool. In fact, 25 percent of centers with Head Start (but no public prekindergarten) funding and 45 percent of centers with public prekindergarten (but no Head Start) funding are also supported with private funds. Fewer than one in five centers with Head Start or public prekindergarten funding are operated by a public school district. The NSECE data indicate that ECE centers nationally are a diverse group in terms of size, auspice, mix of public and private funding, and other characteristics; the same can be said for centers receiving any Head Start or public prekindergarten funds.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *Who is providing home-based early care and education?* (OPRE Report No. 2015-43). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/29738>

“This fact sheet provides the first nationally representative portrait of home-based providers of ECE using data from the newly available NSECE. We describe individuals who care for other people’s children, ages 5 and under, in home-based settings. Key characteristics we report include the numbers of such providers, numbers of children cared for, whether providers are paid or unpaid for care, and what, if any, prior personal relationships existed between providers and the children they care for.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2016). *Characteristics of home-based early care and education providers: Initial findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education* (OPRE Report No. 2016-13). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31515>

“About a million paid and an additional 2.7 million unpaid home-based providers are responsible for young children not their own for at least 5 hours each week. This technical report uses data from the newly available NSECE to provide a nationally representative estimate of all home-based care to children ages birth through 5 years and not yet in kindergarten.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2016). *Examining child care subsidy receipt: An analysis of matched NSECE and Illinois administrative data* (OPRE Report No. 2016-12). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31561>**

“The NSECE team undertook an innovative approach to calculate Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) program participation. Using probabilistic record linkage methods, the household records from the NSECE were matched to CCDF administrative data from the State of Illinois to form a combined database of survey and administrative data. That combined database allowed creation of CCDF program participation variables from NSECE households’ over-time records in the childcare subsidies program. The unified database created from this exercise resembles one from a cross-sectional survey that, by asking retrospective questions, identifies households’ recent participation in social programs (CCDF, in our case). But the unified database has the advantage of a more accurate participation variable from administrative data than would have been obtained from a survey self-report.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2016). *Households’ geographic access to center-based early care and education: Estimates and methodology from the National Survey of Early Care and Education* (OPRE Report No. 2016-08). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32106>**

“This document offers a national picture of selected segments of the ECE market by describing how important attributes of the supply of and the demand for center-based care relate to each other. The document also provides a methodological guide for using newly available data from the NSECE to study local-level interactions of the supply of and demand for center-based ECE in the United States.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2016). *How far are early care and education arrangements from children’s homes?* (OPRE Report No. 2016-10). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/33398>**

“Distance between a child’s home and the location of a provider of early care and education (ECE) is one of the critical factors parents consider in choosing providers (in addition to cost, schedule, quality, and availability). These distances can also inform child care subsidy policies and our understanding of households’ access to ECE. This fact sheet uses newly available mapping data from the NSECE to describe distances between young children’s homes and where they receive regular ECE. We provide nationally representative estimates of the distances between families’ homes and the regular (5 or more hours per week) nonparental care they use for children 5 years and under. We present estimates separately for infants and toddlers (birth to < 3 years old) and preschoolers (3 through 5 years old), as well as different levels of household income-to-poverty ratio, and selected types of ECE providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2017). *Parent work schedules in households with young children* (OPRE Report No. 2017-48). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34962>

“This research snapshot describes the work schedules of parents to young children during a reference week in 2012. We describe how work schedules differ for households of different income levels; between one-parent and two-parent families; and in households where neither, one, or both parents work. One group of particular focus is “fully-employed” households; these are households where all parents work—a one-parent/one-worker household or a two-parent/two-worker household.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2018). *Early care and education usage and households’ out-of-pocket costs: Tabulations from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* (OPRE Report No. 2016-09). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36519>

“The extensive tables in this document describe four main aspects of households’ use of nonparental care: types of care, combinations of types of care, hours of care, and parents’ out-of-pocket costs for care. These aspects are reported by child age, by household characteristics such as the household’s income-to-poverty ratio, and by two aspects of the community where the household is located (poverty density and urbanicity).”

## Studies Using NSECE Data

**Austin, L. J. E., Edwards, B., Chavez, R., & Whitebook, M. (2019). *Racial wage gaps in early education employment*. University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37491>

“This research snapshot analyzes national and selected state-level data sets from the NSECE and builds upon our analysis first included in the Early Childhood Workforce Index.”

**Austin, L. J. E., Whitebook, M., & Chavez, R. (2018). *Strengthening California’s early childhood education workforce*. In D. Stipek, *Early childhood education in California* (pp. 99–119). Policy Analysis for California Education.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37055>

“The quality of a state’s ECE system is an extension of the condition of its workforce. After providing an overview of California’s ECE workforce, this chapter identifies best practices for ensuring a strong ECE workforce, discusses how California fares in each best practice, and proposes the best way forward regarding the policy options or state-level data needed to support change in California. The chapter concludes with a summary of the essential reforms needed to transform California’s ECE workforce.”

**Austin, L. J. E., Edwards, B., & Whitebook, M. (2018).** *California's ECE workforce: What we know now and the data deficit that remains.* University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37002>

“This brief directs stakeholders to three more recent, though not comprehensive, sources of information about the California early childhood workforce: (1) local workforce data sources from three counties; (2) annual federal data collected by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; and (3) California-specific data drawn from the 2012 NSECE.”

**Banghart, P. (2022).** *Factors that influence families' search for child care and early education* (OPRE Report #2022-70). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138311>

“Key findings about factors that influence families' search for child care and early education (CCEE) are drawn from secondary analyses of the NSECE Household Survey and from a study about information states provide about CCEE on consumer education websites. Considerations for state CCEE leaders are presented.”

**Baumgartner, E. M., Holzman, B., & Sanchez, L. (2021).** *Methodological brief: An alternative approach to measuring student immigrant generation.* Kinder Institute for Urban Research. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142911>

“The goal of this methodological study is to evaluate the efficacy of an innovative approach to create a proxy indicator of immigrant generation for school districts to use when data on immigrant generation or parent birthplace are unavailable. While the use of child birthplace explains whether a child is United States–born or foreign-born (in other words, first generation or not), it does not tell us whether a United States–born child is the child of an immigrant, preventing differentiation between second and third (or higher) generations. The approach proposed by this study creates a proxy indicator of students' immigrant generation with information from the student enrollment forms. Specifically, items on the birthplace of a child and parental language preferences (in other words, parents' preferred language of contact by the school district, whether they need a translator when being contacted by the district) are used.”

**Borowsky, J., Brown, J. H., Davis, E. E., Gibbs, C., Herbst, C. M., Sojourner, A. J., Tekin, E., & Wiswall, M. (2022).** *An equilibrium model of the impact of increased public investment in early childhood education* (NBER Working Paper 30140). National Bureau of Economic Research.  
<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/137971>

“In this paper, we develop an equilibrium model of ECE subsidy policy, and we use this model to estimate the impact of three alternative systems. One system—a narrower expansion of subsidies—is based on the Child Care and Development Block Grant's current eligibility and copayment structure, and we analyze the impact of a fully funded version of the policy (in other words, one that serves all eligible children). The most relevant policy proposal to this system is the one by Murray-Kaine. The other two modeled policies involve a broader expansion of subsidies, reflecting the child care benefit structure proposed in the BBBA.”

**Borton, J., Datta, A. R., & Ventura, I. (2021). 2019 NSECE snapshot: Parent work schedules in households with young children (OPRE Report No. 2021-187). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/132736>

“This research snapshot describes characteristics of households with young children, including the work schedules of parents during a reference week in 2019. We also compare statistically significant differences in findings between parental work schedules in 2012 and 2019. We describe how work schedules differ for households of different income levels; between one-parent and two-parent families; and in households where neither, one, or both parents work. One group of particular focus is ‘fully-employed’ households; these are households where all parents work—a one-parent/one-working-parent household or a two-parent/two-working-parents household.”

**Brummet, Q., Coyle, P., & Sepulvado, B. (2021). Effects of differential privacy techniques: Considerations for end users. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 17(5), 930–941. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128256>**

“We study the effects of differentially private (DP) noise injection techniques in a survey data setting, using the release of cost of early care and education estimates from the NSECE as a motivating example. As an example of how DP noise injection affects statistical estimates, our analysis compares the relative performance of DP techniques in the context of releasing estimates of means, medians, and regression coefficients. The results show that for many statistics, basic DP techniques show good performance provided that the privacy budget does not need to be split over too many estimates. Throughout, we show that small decisions, such as the number of bins in a histogram or the scaling of a variable in a regression equation, can have sometimes dramatic effects on the end results. Because of this, it is important to develop DP techniques with an eye toward the most important aspects of the data for end users.”

**Caven, M., Khanani, N., Zhang, X., & Parker, C. E. (2021). Center- and program-level factors associated with turnover in the early childhood education workforce (REL 2021-069). Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/39300>

“Staff turnover is a pressing problem in ECE. High turnover can create organizational instability and distract from the care and education mandate of early childhood education centers. The Early Childhood Workforce Development Research Alliance of the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands wants to better understand the factors associated with turnover in the early childhood educator workforce. Using data from the 2012 NSECE, this study found that a low average turnover rate across early childhood education centers obscured systematic variation in turnover patterns across types of centers and programs, with high turnover rates in some types. Higher wages were associated with lower turnover rates across centers. Turnover rates were highest among private-pay centers serving children ages 0–5. Nonwage benefits such as health insurance and retirement benefits and paid time off for professional development were generally unrelated to turnover rates. Educators were also clustered into certain center types based on background characteristics; Black educators and educators with lower educational attainment more likely to work in centers with low wages and high turnover.”

**Chaparro, J., Sojourner, A. J., & Wiswall, M. (2020). *Early childhood care and cognitive development* (NBER Working Paper No. 26813). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38824>**

“This paper combines multiple sources of information on early childhood development in a unified model for analysis of a wide range of early childhood policy interventions. We develop a model of child care in which households decide both the quantities and qualities of maternal and nonmaternal care along with maternal labor supply. The model introduces a novel parenting-effort channel, whereby child care subsidies that permit less parenting may enable better parenting. To estimate the model, we combine observational data with experimental data from the Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP) which randomly assigned free child care when the child was 1 and 2 years old. We estimate a cognitive skill production function and household preferences, giving insight into mechanisms driving the ex post heterogeneous effects of the IHDP intervention, accounting for alternative care substitutes available to the control group and spillovers of the child care offer across the household’s decisions. We also estimate ex ante effects of counterfactual policies such as an offer of lower-quality care, requiring a co-pay for subsidized care, raising the maternal wage offer, or a cash transfer. Finally, we use the model to rationalize existing evidence from outside the United States on the effects of universal child care programs.”

**Coffey, M. (2022). *Still underpaid and unequal: Early childhood educators face low pay and a worsening wage gap*. Center for American Progress. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142956>**

“This issue brief contains a new CAP analysis of recently released 2019 early childhood workforce data, including demographics, credentials and qualifications, and compensation. The child care workforce survey includes teachers, lead teachers, or instructors (61.3 percent, referred to in this brief as teachers), and aides or assistant teachers (37.1 percent). A small proportion (0.4 percent) had a role classified as other or unknown and were dropped from the analysis.”

**Crosby, D. A., & Mendez, J. L. (2016). *Hispanic children’s participation in early care and education: Amount and timing of hours by household nativity status, race/ethnicity, and child age* (Publication No. 2016-58). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32877>**

“In this brief, we use publicly available data from the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) to describe the amount and timing of hours that young Hispanic children from low-income households spend in ECE settings, distinguishing care that takes place during standard weekday hours from care that occurs during nonstandard times (in other words, evening, nighttime, and weekend hours). We focus on low-income households because the challenges of coordinating parental employment and the care of young children are most acute for families with limited economic resources. Low-income families are therefore the primary target of policy efforts and public investments to improve ECE access, use, and quality. Hispanic families represent a growing policy-relevant population, with more than two thirds of young Hispanic children living in low-income households. Households’ ECE needs, preferences, and available options may vary by family members’ demographic characteristics or child age. We report separate estimates for Latino children in immigrant households and those living with U.S.–born adults only and provide comparison data for young non-Hispanic white and black children from low-income households. We also examine patterns of ECE schedule characteristics separately for infants and toddlers (younger than age 3), and preschoolers (3 to 5 years).”

**Crosby, D. A., & Mendez, J. L. (2017). *How common are nonstandard work schedules among low-income Hispanic parents of young children?* (Publication No. 2017-50). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35110>

“This brief draws on survey and retrospective calendar data from the 2012 NSECE to describe the work schedules of low-income Hispanic parents with young children from birth to age 5 (not yet in kindergarten) and provide comparison data for their non-Hispanic white and black counterparts. We calculate the percentages of low-income Hispanic children with parents working standard weekday, early morning, evening, overnight, and/or weekend hours. We also examine the percentage of children whose parents have short advance notice (one week or less) of their work hours, which has been shown to complicate parents’ efforts to arrange child care and maintain family routines. Importantly, we report estimates separately for children in single- and two-parent households, as families’ ECE needs, preferences, and options vary depending on the number of parents in the home. We additionally look at differences among Hispanic children by household nativity status.”

**Crosby, D. A., & Mendez, J. L. (2020). *Multiple factors predict higher child care costs for low-income Hispanic households* (Report 2020-01). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38061>

“In an earlier brief, we reported that although approximately 6 out of 10 low-income Hispanic households with children in care pay no out-of-pocket costs, fewer than 1 out of 10 pay affordable costs according to the federal benchmark of 7 percent or less of income—and more than 3 out of 10 pay costs that exceed this threshold. Moreover, we found that households in the latter category spend, on average, nearly one-third of their income on child care. In the current brief, we draw on data from the 2012 NSECE to extend this earlier work and explore how various characteristics of households, communities, and nonparental care arrangements predict different levels of child care spending for a national sample of low-income Hispanic households with young children (birth to age 5). Recognizing that such factors do not operate in isolation, we use a statistical method—multivariate ordinal regression—that allows us to consider multiple characteristics simultaneously while estimating the relative contribution of each one in predicting the percentage of income that Hispanic households spend to meet their child care needs.”

**Crosby, D. A., Mendez, J. L., & Barnes, A. C. (2019). *Child care affordability is out of reach for many low-income Hispanic households* (Report No. 2019-05). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37310>

“This brief examines child care costs and affordability for low-income Hispanic households with at least one child ages 0 to 5, the period in which families’ care needs tend to be most acute. Given that care is often needed for older children as well, to cover gaps between school and parents’ work schedules, our household-level analysis of child care spending includes all arrangements for children younger than age 13 who live in the home. Using nationally representative data from the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), we report on Hispanic households’ weekly out-of-pocket child care costs, and the percentage of household income this represents. We examine costs separately for immigrant and nonimmigrant Hispanic households given evidence that some aspects of care access and utilization (including receipt of subsidies) vary by parents’ nativity status. For comparison purposes, we also report cost data for low-income non-Hispanic, nonimmigrant, and white and black households. Finally, to better understand associations between costs and utilization for Latinos, we examine the amounts and types of care being used by Hispanic households with three different levels of child care spending: those with no out-of-pocket costs,

those paying affordable costs ([less than or equal to] 7% of income), and those with high costs ([greater than] 7% of income).”

**Crosby, D. A., Mendez, J. L., Guzman, L., & Lopez, M. (2016). *Hispanic children’s participation in early care and education: Type of care by household nativity status, race/ethnicity, and child age* (Publication No. 2016-59). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32876>

“In this brief, we provide a national snapshot of ECE participation among low-income Hispanic households. We use publicly available data from the 2012 NSECE to describe the percentage of young children in low-income Hispanic households who are in nonparental care on a regular basis (more than 5 hours per week), and the different types of settings they experience. ECE is broadly defined in this analysis to include the full range of home- and center-based arrangements children experience when not in the care of their parents. We focus on low-income households because the challenges of coordinating parental employment and the care of young children are most acute for families with limited economic resources. Low-income families are therefore the primary audience of policy efforts and public investments to improve ECE access, utilization, and quality. Households’ ECE needs, preferences, and available options may vary by family members’ demographic characteristics and child age. Thus, we report separate estimates for Hispanic children in immigrant households (in other words, including at least one foreign-born adult) and those living with United States–born adults only, and provide comparison data for young non-Hispanic white and black children from low-income households. We also examine ECE participation patterns separately for infants and toddlers (younger than age 3), and preschoolers (3 to 5 years).”

**Datta, A. R., & Borton, J. (2020). *How much of children’s early care and education participation in 2012 was publicly funded?* (OPRE Report No. 2020-69). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38386>

“In the United States in 2012, public funding of ECE could come from a variety of programs and levels of government (federal, state, local). This snapshot uses household reports to estimate percentages of children younger than 60 months who enrolled that year in two types of publicly funded ECE: center-based and paid home-based care. Using household reports allows us to document income and age-related differences in children’s participation in publicly funded and non-publicly funded care, as well as differences by parental employment status.”

**Datta, A. R., Ugarte, G., & Resnick, D. (2020). Linking survey data with commercial or administrative data for data quality assessment. In C. A. Hill, P. P. Biemer, T. D. Buskirk, L. Japac, A. Kirchner, S. Kolenikov, & L. E. Lyberg (Eds.), *Big data meets survey science: A collection of innovative methods* (pp. 99–129). John Wiley & Sons. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128206>**

“For most data quality assessments, we wish to determine the suitability of the data for a particular substantive analysis. In this study, we had three objectives for data quality assessment: (1) What can we learn about bias or other error in the survey process for gathering NSECE data? This information is relevant for any analyses using the NSECE household survey data, and perhaps for other studies using similar data collection methodologies. (2) What can we learn about the data quality properties of newly available research datafiles from Zillow.com? This information helps inform a variety of potential research efforts that seek to exploit administrative and commercial data to enhance survey data sources. (3) What are the properties of a linked NSECE–Zillow datafile,

and what do those properties indicate about potential uses of the linked data to answer substantive questions about ECE usage by different types of families in different types of communities?”

**Davis, E. E., & Sojourner, A. J. (2021). *Increasing federal investment in children’s early care and education to raise quality, access, and affordability*. Hamilton Project.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128096>

“The core challenge our proposal seeks to address is how to ensure that every American family and child has access to high-quality, affordable ECE services in a critical period of human development, breaking a shortage of investment in young children. America’s status quo asks the most of parents when they have the least. The public invests only about \$1,500 per child annually in care and education in children’s first 5 years of life, when parents have the least earning and borrowing power, and then invests \$12,800 per child annually for the next 13 years, when parents have more. Under this proposal, every family can choose to access affordable ECE services at qualified, high-quality center-, home-, and school-based providers using either a slot that providers have been contracted to provide or a scholarship. Families in poverty can choose Early Head Start and Head Start with the option of full-time, full-year services. Total family financial payments are capped and depend on family income-to-poverty ratio. The combination of family and public payments to providers will adjust to be sufficient to cover the local costs of efficiently producing high-quality care and services. Competition focuses in three domains: procurement competitions for local service contracts that reveal information about local production costs, competition between providers about how best to use a localized sufficient care-labor budget to attract, develop, motivate, and retain care talent, and competition between providers to serve local families better.”

**Derrick-Mills, T., Isaacs, J. B., Greenberg, E., Michie, M., & Stevens, K. (2018). *Are higher subsidy payment rates and provider-friendly payment policies associated with child care quality?* Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35589>

“First, we provide the research questions for this methods brief and summarize the research questions we explored in the full report. Next, we discuss the CCDF Policies Database and the policies and rates that our study examined. The bulk of this brief explores the methodological challenges and solutions to using the CCDF Policies Database for statistical analyses. Finally, we look at implications for future research and provide links to related resources.”

**Duer, J. K., & Jenkins, J. M. (2022). *Paying for preschool: Who blends funding in early childhood education?* *Educational Policy*, Advanced online publication.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143456>

“As a result of patchwork policies, ECE providers combine funding from multiple sources, known as blended funding. However, little is known about the consequences of blended funding for policy goals. We use national ECE provider data to identify the prevalence of blended funding models, and detailed state quality rating data to describe the relation between funding and quality through the lens of organizational theory. We operationalize blended funding as the total number of revenue sources, which reflects participation in multiple ECE institutions. Results emphasize that combining funding from distinct ECE policies within programs is a typical practice for ECE providers and reveal a positive association between a provider’s number of funding sources and program quality.”

**Ferreira Van Leer, K. (2018). *Early childhood education decision-making among Latino foreign-born parents in the United States: A mixed-methods study* [Doctoral dissertation, Boston College]. eScholarship@BC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37664>**

“One in eight children in the U.S. live in an immigrant Latino family. The contexts common to their families include accumulated disadvantages that result in diminished educational attainment. High quality ECE is increasingly seen as a cost-effective intervention that can mitigate negative educational outcomes for children, yet research has found that Latino immigrant families have lower utilization rates of center-based care, often associated with high quality, than other racial and ethnic counterparts. This research study aimed to better understand the ECE decision-making process of Latino foreign-born parents with children ages 3 to 5 through an examination of the accommodation model to develop a culturally informed model that delineates family and community characteristics, parental preferences, and perceived opportunities and constraints that relate to ECE selection for this population. This aim was addressed through a two phase, mixed methods study. Through group interviews with 22 Latino immigrant parents across four communities in the Greater New York City metropolitan area, phase 1 sought to explore the decision-making process through which such parents pursue ECE decisions for their young children. Thematic analysis informed by grounded theory identified seven themes central to these families: beliefs about development and parental goals, “*cara vemos, corazon no sabemos*”/trusting providers, understanding of ECE, perceived context of reception, informed preferences, opportunities and constraints, and evaluating ECE. The resulting culturally informed model highlights the ways that the culturally bounded contexts common to Latino immigrant families inform their mental representations of available ECE choices, parental beliefs and socialization goals, and social context to create a set of informed preferences that guide their decision-making. These findings highlight the importance of maternal employment and parental beliefs about development in constraining parent’s informed preferences and ECE choice. Phase 2 aimed to test the overall integrity of the culturally informed model of decision-making and assesses its prediction of Latino immigrant parents’ ECE selection. Data were drawn from the Household and Center-based Surveys of the 2012 NSECE, with data on 744 children ages 3 to 5 years in Latino immigrant families. Measures from parent reports and administrative data operationalized six of the themes found in the first phase. Findings from multinomial logistic regression analyses found that maternal employment and child age moderated components of the model and ECE selection. Results also highlight the importance of culturally bounded contexts of the ECE decision-making process of Latino immigrant families. Findings from each phase were compared through side-by-side analysis for convergence. Implications for future research, policy and the field are discussed.”

**Ferreira Van Leer, K., Crosby, D. A., & Mendez, J. L. (2021). *Disruptions to child care arrangements and work schedules for low-income Hispanic families are common and costly* (Report 2021-01). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38931>**

“In this brief, we estimate the prevalence of care-work disruptions and their consequences for parents’ work in low-income households (defined as incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty threshold), examining how both the prevalence and consequences of disruptions may differ for immigrant Hispanic, nonimmigrant Hispanic, Black, and White households. We draw on data from the 2012 NSECE focusing on households with children younger than age 13 and at least one employed caregiver (in other words, households at risk of experiencing disruptions and the intended age population for federal child care subsidies). In supplemental analyses, we examine disruptions for the subsample of households with children younger than age 6 to explore whether

the coordination of child care and work differs for children not yet in (or just entering) formal schooling.”

**Flood, S., McMurry, J., Sojourner, A. J., & Wiswall, M. (2022). Inequality in early care experienced by U.S. children. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 36(2), 199–222. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142996>**

“Using multiple datasets on parental and nonparental care provided to children up to age 6, we quantify differences in American children's care experiences by socioeconomic status (SES), proxied primarily with maternal education. Increasingly, higher SES children spend less time with their parents and more time in the care of others. Nonparental care for high-SES children is more likely to be in child care centers, where average quality is higher, and less likely to be provided by relatives, where average quality is lower. Even within types of child care, higher-SES children tend to receive care of higher measured quality and higher cost. Inequality is evident at home as well: measures of parental enrichment at home, from both self-reports and outside observers, are on average higher for higher-SES children. Parental and nonparental quality are positively correlated, leading to substantial inequality in the total quality of care received from all sources in early childhood.”

**Flood, S., McMurry, J., Sojourner, A. J., & Wiswall, M. (2021). *Inequality in early care experienced by U.S. children* (Working Paper No. 29249). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/132696>**

“Using every major nationally representative dataset on parental and nonparental care provided to children up to age 6, we quantify differences in American children's care experiences by socioeconomic status (SES), proxied primarily with maternal education. Increasingly, higher-SES children spend less time with their parents and more time in the care of others. Nonparental care for high-SES children is more likely to be in child care centers, where average quality is higher, and less likely to be provided by relatives where average quality is lower. Even within types of child care, higher-SES children tend to receive care of higher measured quality and higher cost. Inequality is evident at home as well: measures of parental enrichment at home, from both self-reports and outside observers, are on average higher for higher-SES children. We also find that parental and nonparental quality is reinforcing: children who receive higher quality non-parental care also tend to receive higher quality parental care. Head Start, one of the largest government care subsidy programs for low-income households, reduces inequality in care provided, but it is mainly limited to older children and to the lowest income households. Our evidence is from the pre-COVID-19 period, and the latest year we examine is 2019.”

**Forry, N. D., Madill, R., & Halle, T. (2018). *Snapshots from the NSECE: How much did households in the United States pay for child care in 2012?: An examination of differences by household income* (OPRE Report No. 2018-112). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36873>**

“This Snapshot is based on information collected by the NSECE, a nationally representative study of American households and ECE providers conducted in 2012. The information in this Snapshot is based on a report on nonparental care usage and costs from the NSECE household survey (NSECE Project Team, 2016). This Snapshot focuses on care for children under age 13. Household costs are calculated based on how much a household paid, in total, for children's regular nonparental care arrangements. Regular nonparental care arrangements are those that a

child attended for at least 5 hours per week, not including K-8 schooling. Households may use only free care arrangements, a combination of free and paid care, or only paid care arrangements. Only households that had out-of-pocket costs for care are included in the average cost estimates.”

**Forry, N. D., Madill, R., Shuey, E., Halle, T., Ugarte, G., & Borton, J. (2018). *Snapshots from the NSECE: How much did households in the United States pay for child care in 2012?: An examination of differences by child age* (OPRE Report No. 2018-110). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36872>**

“This Snapshot is based on information collected by the NSECE, a nationally representative study of American households and early care and education providers conducted in 2012. The information in this Snapshot is based on a report on nonparental care usage and costs from the NSECE household survey (NSECE Project Team, 2016) as well as supplemental analyses conducted by the NSECE Project Team for this Snapshot.”

**Gardner-Neblett, N., Henk, J., Vallotton, C., Rucker, L., & Chazan-Cohen, R. (2021). The what, how, and who, of early childhood professional development (PD): Differential associations of PD and self-reported beliefs and practices. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 42(1), 53–75. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/124451>**

“Although there have been calls in the early childhood field for effective approaches to preparing the workforce to support optimal early child development, there is a gap in understanding how different types of professional development predict teachers’ beliefs about children and their self-reported classroom practices. Using the NSECE, a nationally representative sample of the workforce, the present study analyzed the pathways through which different professional development experiences predict teachers’ beliefs and self-reported practices, and the extent to which these pathways differed for teachers serving infants and toddlers compared to teachers serving preschoolers. Results indicated that professional development experiences differ among infant/toddler teachers compared to preschool teachers and that these experiences are differentially associated with beliefs and self-reported practices. For infant/toddler teachers, receiving coaching predicted less traditional beliefs and visiting other classrooms predicted a higher frequency of planned classroom activities. For preschool teachers, coaching was similarly related to less traditional beliefs as for infant/toddler teachers and was also predictive of higher frequency of planned classroom activities, in addition to attending workshops. College coursework was associated with more progressive beliefs for preschool teachers. Implications for professional development are discussed.”

**Gebhart, T., Warner-Richter, M., Boddicker-Young, P., Hooper, A., Halle, T., & Hallam, R. A. (2020). *Snapshots from the NSECE: Who provides early care and education for young children with special needs?: Findings from the 2012 National Survey of Early Care and Education* (OPRE Report 2020-135). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38974>**

“This Snapshot uses data from the 2012 NSECE to examine caregiving arrangements for young children with special needs to better understand where these children receive ECE services. Findings in this Snapshot are focused on children under age 6 and ECE providers serving children under age 6.”

**Gennetian, L. A., Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., Zanoni, W., Brandon, R., Witte, A., & Krishnamurty, P. (2019).** How much of children's time in nonparental care coincides with their parents' time at work? *Socius*, 5, 1–10.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37571>

“Nonparental care (NPC) for children before they enter kindergarten has had two primary purposes for American families since the start of the 20th century: supporting parental employment and providing children developmentally enriching out-of-home experiences. Today's policymakers are increasingly expanding publicly funded opportunities for children in low-income families to experience center-based care. Yet parents' work commitments often occur on evenings, weekends, and other times outside of the traditional school day. Understanding parental work schedules vis-à-vis NPC timing is essential to informing public expansions of accessible and affordable nonparental care options. Using a 7-day calendar from the 2012 NSECE, the authors uncover new patterns in the temporal synchronization of parental work and children's time in various NPC settings and for households of varying incomes. Across all income groups and types of care, center-based care overlaps least with parental work hours. Children living in poverty have the lowest rates of NPC occurring during parental work time. The uncoupling of parental work status from children's time in nonparental care suggests potential shifts in parents' choices to expose children to care settings for the purpose of children's development.”

**Gordon, R. A., Sheridan, K. M., Bates, J., de Souza, S., & Pradzinski, A. (2020).** Child care arrangements and gender: A national portrait of preschool-aged children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 53, 40–49.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/123206>

“Gender disparities in academic achievement are of longstanding scholarly and societal concern. In the extensive literature on this topic, however, relatively few studies have considered the nonparental child care contexts where children spend their earliest years. This state of the evidence differs from disparities by race-ethnicity and socioeconomic status, where differences in types of child care attended have been considered. The current study provides a national portrait of gender differences in the type of child care attended among preschool-aged children in the United States. Framed by the accommodation model, we found boys were more likely than girls to attend centers in higher socio-economic status families, but the reverse was true among less affluent families. Parents' general perspectives that center-based or home-based child care was better for preschool-aged children's development and safety also differed when the study child was a boy versus girl in these higher and lower socioeconomic status families. Because preschool-aged children's center-based child care attendance has been associated with academic school readiness, we encourage future studies to probe these findings as part of continued efforts to understand and address gender disparities in average levels of school progress and achievement.”

**Gould, E., Whitebook, M., Mokhiber, Z., & Austin, L. J. E. (2019).** *Breaking the silence on early child care and education costs: A values-based budget for children, parents, and teachers in California*. Economic Policy Institute; University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37256>

“This paper makes the case for aligning the costs of our ECE system with what is required to create a strong and sustainable system. Herein, we model a system to meet the needs of all families in California and solve the myriad problems the current system fails to address.”

**Greenberg, E., Healy, O., & Derrick-Mills, T. (2018). *Assessing quality across the center-based early care and education workforce: Evidence from the National Survey of Early Care and Education*. Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35590>

“Building on existing research and newly available, nationally representative data in the NSECE, this study addresses the following research questions: (1) What does the current landscape of early care and education centers look like? (2) What does workforce quality in ECE centers look like? (3) How does workforce quality vary by center characteristics? (4) How does workforce quality vary by the characteristics of children and families using centers?”

**Greenberg, E., Isaacs, J. B., Derrick-Mills, T., Michie, M., & Stevens, K. (2018). *Are higher subsidy payment rates and provider-friendly payment policies associated with child care quality?* Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35698>

“This study examines associations between state-determined payment rates and policies and several quality indicators to inform CCDF quality improvement efforts. It is guided by three research questions: (1) How much do payment rates and policies vary across states? (2) How much variation is there in the quality of child care centers and homes serving subsidized children? (3) And the key analytical question: What is the association between payment rates and policies and the quality of child care providers serving subsidized children? Our analyses leverage policy variation within the system of subsidized care, capturing payment-quality dynamics in child care centers and homes. In doing so, we employ the most recent and comprehensive data available: the NSECE. Conducted in 2012, the NSECE provides a nationally representative picture of program and caregiver quality characteristics in centers and homes, including those serving children receiving subsidies, providing a very timely baseline view of quality before the CCDF reauthorization. We also draw on the CCDF Policies Database, a comprehensive database of CCDF policies covering all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories and outlying areas. Our main analytic tools include quantitative description and multivariate regression analysis, which allow us to explore possible causal links between payment rates and policies and child care quality.”

**Greenberg, E., & Luetmer, G. (2022). *State policies shape the racial and ethnic diversity of the prekindergarten workforce*. Urban Institute.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/135641>

“This essay highlights how the misalignment of federal, state, and local requirements is draining talent and affecting diversity in the United States’ ECE workforce. Specifically, varying state education requirements for lead teachers is compared in three types of programs: home-based child care, child care centers, and public prekindergarten. Policy considerations are discussed.”

**Greenberg, E., & Monarrez, T. (2019). *Segregated from the start: Comparing segregation in early childhood and K-12 education*. Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37725>

“Most research has focused on the benefits of integration in elementary and secondary schools, even though schools have become more segregated. But segregation in early childhood programs is even more pronounced than in K–12 classrooms, and that separation can lead to missed opportunities for contact and kinship during a critical point in child development. Our analysis is the first that aims to characterize segregation across early childhood education in the United States. To ensure the possibility of integration, we analyze only ECE programs that serve at least five children.”

**Greenberg, E., & Monarrez, T. (2019). *Segregated from the start: Methodology*. Urban Institute. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37726>**

“Data for the figures presented in this feature come from three sources measuring school and program enrollment by race or ethnicity nationally. The first is the NSECE, a nationally representative study of center- and home-based early childhood programs conducted in 2012. The study draws on integrated surveys of providers and households to offer comprehensive information on early childhood program use and availability. Our analyses leverage public-use center and home-based provider files and incorporate sampling weights and related information to support nationally representative estimates. We restrict all analyses to programs serving at least five children to ensure the possibility of integration. To supplement these data, we use additional data from the Common Core of Data and the Private School Universe Survey, both from the National Center for Education Statistics.”

**Grunewald, R., Nunn, R., & Palmer, V. (2022). *Examining teacher turnover in early care and education*. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138441>**

“Using data from the 2019 NSECE, authors analyzed ECE teacher turnover by center type and by status of public reimbursement. Research findings are followed by a discussion of how policymakers and practitioners can reduce teacher turnover.”

**Guzman, L., Hickman, S., Turner, K., & Gennetian, L. A. (2016). *Hispanic children’s participation in early care and education: Parents’ perceptions of care arrangements, and relatives’ availability to provide care* (Publication No. 2016-60). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32878>**

“We examined parents’ perceptions of different types of child care arrangements and whether relatives (and other adults living with them) are available to provide care to those parents’ children. More specifically, using data from the 2012 NSECE, we assessed how Hispanic parents’ (with children between zero and 5) perceptions of various types of early care arrangements—center-based, home-based, nonrelative, and relative care—differ from those of their white and Black counterparts. We looked at these parents’ perceptions regardless of whether their children were in care, or the type of care they used. We also considered how the availability of relatives and other adults who might provide care for young children differs across Hispanic, Black, and white households and by household poverty level.”

**Guzman, L., Hickman, S., Turner, K., & Gennetian, L. A. (2017). *How well are early care and education providers who serve Hispanic children doing on access and availability?* (Publication No. 2017-49). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34956>**

“After decades of lagging behind, Latino children—including those who are low-income—are enrolling in ECE programs at rates approaching those of their low-income white peers, at least among preschool-aged children. However, we still know little about the providers of ECE programs (both formal and informal) that care for and serve Latino children. Given the increasing enrollment of Hispanic children in ECE programs, what do the programs that serve this population look like? This brief provides a national portrait of providers serving a large proportion of Hispanic children, focusing on characteristics that shape access to and availability of ECE programs. We find that roughly one in five providers serve a high proportion of Hispanic children (also referred to as high-Hispanic-serving), in which 25 percent or more of the children enrolled are Hispanic. Collectively,

our findings suggest many ways in which providers—and home-based providers in particular—are likely responding to the needs of Hispanic families, as well as possible areas of unmet need.”

**Guzman, L., Hickman, S., Turner, K., & Gennetian, L. A. (2018).** *Who is caring for Latino children?: The characteristics of early care and education teachers and caregivers serving a high proportion of Hispanic children* (Publication No. 2018-24). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36557>

“This brief examines three aspects of the ECE workforce that are linked with how children learn, their socioemotional development, classroom environment, and quality of care: (1) training, experience, and education; (2) attitudes, including motivations for working with children; and (3) linguistic and racial and ethnic diversity drawing from the NSECE, the first nationally representative survey to provide a national portrait of the ECE workforce. We examine these characteristics across three teacher or caregiver types: center-based staff (which includes lead and assistant teachers, as well as aides working in Head Start, prekindergarten, and other community-based centers); listed, home-based teachers and caregivers (which generally includes those who care for at least one child with whom they have no prior relationship); and unlisted, home-based teachers and caregivers (which generally includes relatives, friends, and neighbors who provide care to children with whom they had a prior relationship). We compared these features of the workforce among teachers and caregivers of children ages 0 to 5 working in high-Hispanic-serving settings (defined as settings where 25 percent or more of the children served are Hispanic) with those in low-Hispanic-serving settings (in other words, those teachers and caregivers in settings where less than 25 percent of the children enrolled are Hispanic).”

**Hardy, E., & Park, J. E. (2022).** *2019 NSECE snapshot: Child care cost burden for U.S. households with children under age 5* (OPRE Report #2022-05). United States, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/134431>

“This NSECE snapshot examines child care and early education (CCEE) cost burdens for households that used regular CCEE and had at least 1 child under age 5 (0 to 59 months).”

**Hepburn, P. (2018).** *Limited resources, little time: Work, family, and childcare challenges facing low-income households* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkely]. EScholarship. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/129376>

“These three papers serve to document changes in work scheduling and the potential consequences thereof, particularly the consequences for child care. The first paper sheds light on nonstandard and flexible employment and their changing prevalence over time. The second paper explores the consequences of work scheduling for low-income families with young children. The third paper looks at one specific aspect of scheduling—schedule coordination in dual-earner households with children—and examines how it is structured by socioeconomic position. The overarching goal throughout these papers is to better understand labor market inequalities and how those inequalities affect subsequent generations. This is, I argue, an important field for stratification analysis. Each paper opens up the potential for a range of policy interventions. In writing these papers I have attempted to develop a robust conceptual framework in favor of such interventions, as well as specific proposals for policymakers.”

**Hepburn, P. (2018). Parental work schedules and child-care arrangements in low-income families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(5), 1187–1209.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36294>

“Objective: This study analyzes the relationships between parental working schedules and several aspects of child-care arrangements for young children in low-income single-mother and two-partner households. Background: Children whose parents work nonstandard schedules may hold child-care arrangements that are less stimulating or developmentally productive than their peers whose parents work standard schedules. This study builds on previous research by expanding the set of outcomes under analysis, accounting for coscheduling in two-partner households, revising traditional shift definitions, and using recent, nationally representative data. Method: The 2012 NSECE is used to develop work schedule typologies. Regression methods are employed to evaluate the relationships between these schedules and the use of center-based, home-based, and relative care; continuity of care; and complexity of care (a new measure introduced as an alternative to care multiplicity). Results: Nonstandard schedules are associated with increased child-care complexity and decreased continuity and the types of care that children receive in single-mother households but less so in two-partner households. In two-partner households the largest effects are in households in which both partners work standard schedules; children in these households receive more nonparental care and are in more complex child-care arrangements. Conclusion: Findings point to the cumulative disadvantage accruing to the children of single mothers, especially those working nontraditional shifts.”

**Hepburn, P. (2020). Work scheduling for American mothers, 1990 and 2012. *Social Problems*, 67(4), 741–762.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/124441>

“American working conditions have deteriorated over the last 40 years. One commonly noted change is the rise of nonstandard and unstable work schedules. Such schedules, especially when held by mothers, negatively affect family functioning and the well-being and development of children; they have implications for the intergenerational transmission of disadvantage. This article describes and compares the working schedules—in terms of type, duration, and variability—of American mothers in 1990 and 2012 to assess whether nonstandard and unstable schedules are growing more common. Analyses demonstrate that evening work has increased in prevalence for single mothers but not for their partnered peers. Mothers in both single-mother and two-partner households experienced considerably greater within-week schedule variability and higher likelihood of weekend work in 2012 than they did in 1990. These changes resulted from widespread shifts in the nature of work, especially affecting less educated mothers.”

**Herbst, C. M. (2022). *Child care in the United States: Markets, policy, and evidence* (IZA DP No. 15547). Institute of Labor Economics. <https://docs.iza.org/dp15547.pdf>**

“The United States’ policy landscape is dominated by three policies that subsidize costs for low-income families or attempt to improve the safety and quality of providers: Child Care and Development Fund, regulations, and quality rating and improvement systems. In this paper, I provide a thorough review of the evidence on each policy, focusing on how they influence a wide range of family and provider outcomes. The paper begins with a detailed description of the structure and functioning of the child care market, using the most up-to-date data on families’ utilization of care services and provider characteristics. I then draw on a diverse set of studies across multiple fields to summarize the evidence on the impact of child care policy. In the final section of the paper, I offer recommendations for future research in each policy area.”

Hill, Z., Bali, D., Gebhart, T., & Halle, T. (2021). *Snapshots from the NSECE: Parents' reasons for searching for care and results of search: An analysis using the Access Framework* (OPRE Report No. 2021-39). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/39317>

“Using data from the 2012 NSECE Household Survey, this snapshot examines the questions: Why did parents with young children search for a care provider? What percentage of parents found a new care provider? Why did some parents' searches end without using a new care provider? The findings presented in this snapshot illustrate some of the factors that drive demand for child care for children under age 6, not yet in kindergarten. Findings also describe the challenges that parents face when searching for providers for the first time or when looking for a new provider.”

Hill, Z., Ekyalongo, Y., Paschall, K., Madill, R., & Halle, T. (2021). *A demographic comparison of the listed home-based workforce and the children in their care* (OPRE Report No. 2020-128). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/126986>

“This snapshot is the third in a series of reports that describe the demographic characteristics of the ECE workforce using the 2012 NSECE data. The first report provides a descriptive analysis of the professional characteristics and motivations of the center- and home-based ECE workforce. The second report compares the demographic characteristics of the populations of center- and homebased ECE workforce and the populations of children enrolled in center- and home-based ECE, as well as compares the populations of ECE teachers and caregivers across communities with varying levels of demographic diversity. This third snapshot provides unique, additional information by comparing the demographic characteristics of the homebased workforce and the children in their direct care.”

Hooper, A. (2017). *Identifying and exploring profiles of home-based child care providers based on their beliefs and practices* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware]. UDSpace. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35112>

“This series of studies seeks to broaden the understanding of the diverse home-based child care provider workforce through identifying categories of providers based on their beliefs about caregiving and their practices with children and families. Seven million children from birth to five receive care in home-based child care settings. However, relatively little is known about characteristics of home-based providers and how to effectively engage them in quality improvement initiatives. Through secondary analysis of the NSECE data on listed home-based providers, latent profile analysis is used to explore how providers group into profiles based on key characteristics related to their beliefs and practices, as well as additional provider characteristics that predict profile membership. A similar strategy is used to analyze a sample of licensed and unlicensed home-based providers in Delaware based on the results of a statewide survey. Finally, a multiple case study approach is used to further explore providers in each profile, specifically considering how they view their roles and the quality of the care they provide and to better understand their practices with children and families.”

Hooper, A. (2018). Predictors of instructional practices among a nationally representative sample of home-based child care providers. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 47(5), 747–768. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36077>

“Background: Home-based child care is a widely used form of child care. However, given its prevalence, there is little research examining the providers' instructional practices and how these

may vary by provider characteristics. Objective: The goal of this study is to describe variation in instructional practices among home-based child care providers and to examine predictors of instructional practices, including provider, program, and community characteristics. Methods: This study examines the instructional practices of listed and unlisted paid home-based child care providers using data from the NSECE through descriptive analyses and hierarchical multiple regression. Results: Descriptive analyses suggest that providers across types report implementing learning activities, although this is more prevalent among listed providers. Results of a hierarchical multiple regression reveal that recent professional engagement predicts a higher frequency of planned learning activities for listed and unlisted paid providers, although the significant predictors are different for the two groups of providers. Conclusions: Home-based child care providers vary by provider type in the frequency of their instructional practices. Increasing access to professional development and social support opportunities may be an important strategy for supporting their implementation of educational activities with the children they serve. Additionally, different supports may be beneficial for listed and unlisted paid providers.”

**Hooper, A., & Hallam, R. A. (2019). Identifying profiles of listed home-based child care providers based on their beliefs and self-reported practices. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 47*(2), 194–205.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37496>

“This study seeks to broaden the knowledge base of the diverse home-based child care provider workforce in the United States. Home-based child care is a crucial part of the child care landscape with approximately seven million children from birth to 5 receiving care in home-based settings. Through secondary analysis of the NSECE data on listed home-based providers (n = 3493), latent profile analysis was used to explore how providers grouped into profiles based on key characteristics related to their caregiving beliefs and their self-reported instructional practices, professional engagement, and family supportive practices. Findings reveal providers aligned into three profiles: Educationally Focused (72.4%), Educationally Aware (15.7%), and Caregiver (11.8%). Frequency of implementing planned educational activities emerged as a particularly salient distinction among the three groups. Results suggest that although listed home-based providers appear somewhat homogeneous in their demographic characteristics, they vary in their instructional practices with children and their own professional engagement. Therefore, they may benefit from a tailored approach to quality improvement that attends to these differences.”

**Hooper, A., & Hallam, R. A. (2021). Prevalence and characteristics of home-based child care providers serving children with provider-reported disabilities. *Journal of Early Intervention, 43*(2), 135–154.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/124431>

“This study examines the prevalence of home-based child care providers who report serving at least one child whom they identify as having a disability. Although many families choose home-based child care, researchers know very little about how many home-based providers care for young children with disabilities. Through secondary analysis of the NSECE data about home-based child care providers, we examined the prevalence and predictors of serving children with provider-reported disabilities among listed and unlisted home-based providers. Descriptive analyses showed that 21.7% of listed providers, 20.5% of unlisted paid providers, and 10.1% of unlisted unpaid providers reported serving at least one child whom they identified as having a disability. These providers reported relatively low rates of connecting families to outside resources and utilizing outside resources to support them in their work with children. Providers who reported higher enrollment and who received child care subsidies were more likely to report serving a child with a disability.”

**Hooper, A., Slicker, G., & Riser, D. (2021). Identifying a typology of unlisted paid home-based child care providers using latent profile analysis. *Early Education and Development, 32*(7), 1053–1066.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/39236>

“This study provides a framework for categorizing one subset of the large and heterogeneous group of home-based child care providers, unlisted paid providers. We analyzed data on unlisted paid home-based child care providers (n = 448) from the 2012 NSECE conducted in the United States. We used latent profile analysis to explore how providers align into profiles based on key characteristics related to their caregiving beliefs, self-reported instructional practices, professional engagement, and family supportive practices. Findings reveal that unlisted paid home-based providers align into three profiles: Low Instruction, Low Professional Development (51.3%, n = 230); Higher Instruction (35.2%, n = 158); and Engaged with Outside Systems (13.4%, n = 60). Results suggest that there is variation in providers’ instructional practices, family supports, and professional engagement activities among profiles. Additionally, provider age, enrollment characteristics, and neighborhood urban density predicted profile membership. Practice or Policy: Results provide insight into the design and implementation of quality improvement supports for this subset of home-based child care providers. Using this typology can help match unlisted paid home-based providers with supports that align with their beliefs and practices. It also adds to the limited research base about this subset of providers that can be used to guide practices and policies related to home-based child care.”

**Hooper, A., & Schweiker, G. (2020). Prevalence and predictors of expulsion in home-based child care settings. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 41*(3), 411–425.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38335>

“This study explored the prevalence of expulsion in home-based child care (HBCC) settings using a nationally representative sample of HBCC providers from the NSECE. In addition to prevalence, enrollment and provider characteristics that predicted expulsion were examined. Although there is increasing awareness of the prevalence of early childhood suspension and expulsion in ECE settings, and the negative effects it has on children’s development, few studies have included or focused on HBCC, where many children receive care. This study highlights that many home-based providers, especially listed providers, report that they expelled at least one child within the last year. Significant predictors of expulsion emerged, including enrollment characteristics such as caring for children with disabilities, enrolling more children, and caring for children unrelated to the provider. Provider characteristics, including years of experience, provider education, and provider age, also predicted provider report of expulsion. These results provide insight as to possible strategies that may be effective in reducing expulsion rates in this caregiving context.”

**Hotz, V. J., & Wiswall, M. (2019). Child care and child care policy: Existing policies, their effects, and reforms. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 686*, 310–338.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37625>

“We analyze policies that support and affect the provision and costs of child care in the United States. These policies are motivated by at least three objectives: (1) improving the cognitive and social development of young children, (2) facilitating maternal employment, and (3) alleviating poverty. We summarize this policy landscape and the evidence on the effects they have on the development of children and parents. We provide a summary of the use and costs of nonparental child care services; and we summarize existing policies and programs that subsidize child care costs, provide child care to certain groups, and regulate various aspects of the services provided in the United States. We then review the evidence on the effects that child care policies have on

these objectives. We go on to discuss the existing evidence of their effects on various outcomes. Finally, we outline three reform proposals that will both facilitate work by low-income mothers and improve the quality of child care that their children receive.”

**Isaacs, J. B., Greenberg, E., & Derrick-Mills, T. (2018). *Subsidy policies and the quality of child care centers serving subsidized children*. Urban Institute.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35570>

“Over 1.4 million children from low-income families are in child care arrangements subsidized by federal and state governments through CCDF. Their development is affected by the quality of these arrangements, as children benefit from the supportive learning environments found in higher-quality programs. States have broad discretion in setting subsidy policies, and policies vary considerably from state to state. A key question is whether there is an observable relationship between the quality of child care centers serving subsidized children and state subsidy policies, such as the level of subsidy reimbursement rates, the use of tiered reimbursements to incentivize quality improvement, or the practice of paying for care when children are absent. Findings from a statistical analysis of the 2012 NSECE generally reveal the expected relationships between state subsidy policies and the quality of centers participating in the subsidy program. That is, the quality of these child care centers is higher in states with higher reimbursement rates and a larger gap between their highest and lowest reimbursement tiers, even after controlling for a variety of other state differences. Although quality is measured using proxy indicators and we cannot be sure that the observed associations are causal, our findings suggest that state agencies can affect the quality of centers participating in the subsidy system through their policy choices regarding rates and related payment policies. Findings and methods are highlighted in this brief, and a fuller description of study methods and findings can be found in our final report (Greenberg et al. 2018).”

**Jenkins, J. M., Duer, J. K., & Connors, M. C. (2021). *Who participates in quality rating and improvement systems? Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 54, 219–227*.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/124461>

“Even with rapid and widespread expansion of states’ quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS)—tiered frameworks that assess, communicate, and improve ECE quality—there exists no population-level information regarding which providers choose to participate in these primarily voluntary systems. We use a nationally representative survey of ECE centers to examine how the characteristics of ECE centers and the communities in which they are located predict participation in QRIS to understand the scope of QRIS policy implementation and the extent to which QRIS may be equity enhancing. We find that approximately one-third of centers nationwide participated in QRIS in 2012. Selection model results reveal that participation is more likely among centers that blend multiple funding sources and who are NAEYC accredited, and in communities with high poverty rates. However, QRIS participation is less likely in communities with relatively higher proportions of Black residents. Findings raise questions about how QRISs can equitably engage programs in all communities.”

**Johnson, A. D., Martin, A., & Schochet, O. N. (2020). *Inside the classroom door: Understanding early care and education workforce and classroom characteristics experienced by children in subsidized center-based care. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 51, 462–472*.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37940>

“The federal child care subsidy program is the nation’s largest public ECE program for low-income children, yet little research has documented the workforce and classroom characteristics that affect children’s experiences in subsidized classrooms. Moreover, no existing study has compared the workforce and classroom characteristics in subsidized classrooms to those in classrooms across

the range of alternative center-based settings available to low-income children. To fill this knowledge gap, the present study uses data from the newest national survey of child care available—the NSECE, collected in 2012—to describe subsidized classrooms on a broad set of workforce and classroom characteristics. Classrooms serving children with child care subsidies are compared to other classrooms serving low-income children, with a distinction between those that receive other public funds (Head Start or school-based prekindergarten), and those that do not (non-publicly funded centers). Consistent with prior research, which finds classrooms serving subsidized children to have lower observed global quality than Head Start or prekindergarten classrooms, our findings reveal that classrooms serving children receiving subsidies typically have a more disadvantaged workforce and fewer classroom characteristics indicative of higher quality and believed to promote child development. Compared to non-publicly funded center-based classrooms, classrooms serving subsidized children scored lower on several desirable workforce characteristics such as hourly pay and receipt of coaching but did not differ on classroom characteristics.”

**Jones, J. M. (2018). *Determinants of motivation among home-based providers serving 3–5 year olds* [Master’s thesis, Georgetown University]. DigitalGeorgetown. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37618>**

“This study analyzes the relationship between poverty-dense communities and the motivation of home-based providers to enhance the development of children ages 3–5 in their care. An educator’s expertise in engaging with preschool students has become an important policy topic as child development, psychological, and neuroscience scholars have determined the importance of cognitive and social-emotional development in the early years of life. Data for this research came from the Home-Based dataset created by the 2012 NSECE. From the review of the literature, there has not been much focus on providers working in poverty dense communities and their commitment to the development of the children in their care compared to providers working in communities that have less concentrations of poverty. Many studies have consistently found that children in low-income families benefit from quality center-based care. The findings from this study show that poverty concentration does not have a strong association with the motivation of home-based providers. From a policy perspective, it is important to encourage continued training for home-based care providers—the findings showed a strong motivational component to providing quality care.”

**Kashen, J., Potter, H., & Stettner, A. (2016). *Quality jobs, quality child care: The case for a well-paid, diverse early education workforce*. Century Foundation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32606>**

“This report focuses on achieving quality ECE by ensuring that its workforce is well-compensated, appropriately educated, diverse, and culturally competent. It looks particularly at strategies for maintaining diversity while transforming the industry so that it provides quality jobs and quality care, with a focus in this report on center-based and school-based care. This report recommends a multipronged strategy for strengthening early care and education, including increased public funding, new definitions of quality in ECE that include workforce compensation and diversity, expanded workforce development programs and career pathways, and policies to promote salary parity.”

**Lin, Y. (2019). *Examining access to and participation in early care and education among children of immigrants* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison]. UW Digital Collections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37670>**

“Children with at least one immigrant parent are one of the fastest growing child populations in the United States and they will become an essential part of the future workforce. However, children of

immigrants are more likely to fall behind their peers of United States–born parents on school readiness skills at kindergarten entry. Despite the positive effects of center-based ECE on children’s school readiness, children of immigrants are less likely than children of United States–born parents on school readiness skills at kindergarten entry. Despite the positive effects of center-based ECE on children’s school readiness, children of immigrants are less likely than children of United States–born parents to attend center-based ECE. Lower center-based ECE participation rates may be a missed opportunity for critical learning among children of immigrants. To understand what contributes to the gap in center-based ECE participation, prior research has largely focused on child and family factors to explain the gap and suggested that family characteristics specifically lower household income, lower parental education levels, and two-parent household with one non-working parent are important predictors of lower enrollment in center-based ECE. However, little is known about how broader community factors, such as child care subsidies and the supply of ECE, affect immigrant parents’ child care decisions. Paper 1 uses data from the American Community Survey and state Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) policies from 2009 to 2016 to examine the effects of state CCDF policies related to subsidy generosity and the ease of application on center-based ECE participation among low-income children of immigrants and children of U.S.-born parents. Results suggest that higher initial income eligibility and an easier application process increase the likelihood of using center-based ECE for children of immigrants. Paper 2 uses data from the NSECE to examine whether the availability of different types of ECE helps explain the gap in center-based ECE participation between children of immigrants and children of United States–born parents. Results indicate that the availability of care providers who are family members, friends, and neighbors is associated with lower center-based ECE participation among 0- to 2-year-olds, while the availability of child care centers is associated with higher center-based ECE participation among 3- to 5-year-olds. However, the supply of ECE does not explain the difference in ECE arrangements. Additionally, the availability of non-English-speaking and publicly funded child care centers are associated with higher center-based ECE participation. Taken together, findings highlight the importance of considering broader community factors in center-based ECE participation among children of immigrants. The dissertation concludes with a discussion of the implications for future research, public policy, and social work practice.”

**Lou, C., Schilder, D., & Wagner, L. (2022). *What types of child care do families use during nontraditional hours? Findings from an analysis of the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*. Urban Institute.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138201>

“This brief provides a snapshot of findings from the 2019 NSECE about what types of child care families use during nontraditional hours. Implications for policy and further research are presented.”

**Lou, C., Schilder, D., & Wagner, L. (2022). *When are children in nontraditional-hour child care? Findings from an analysis of the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education*. Urban Institute.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138196>

“This brief provides a snapshot of findings from the 2019 NSECE about the time of day or night that children spend in nontraditional-hour child care. Implications for policy and further research are presented.”

Lou, C., Schilder, D., & Wagner, L. (2022). *Who uses nontraditional-hour child care? Findings from an analysis of the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*. Urban Institute.

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/140791>

“We analyzed 2019 NSECE Household Survey data to explore the share of families with children younger than age 6 in nonparental care but not yet in kindergarten. This snapshot examines how common it is for families with young children to have parents working nontraditional hour schedules and the characteristics of these families and children.”

Madill, R., Blasberg, A., Halle, T., Zaslow, M., & Epstein, D. J. (2016). *Describing the preparation and ongoing professional development of the infant/toddler workforce: An analysis of the National Survey for Early Care and Education data (OPRE Report No. 2016-16)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31887>

“The analyses presented in this brief describe the professional development activities of the nation’s infant/toddler (I/T) workforce, based on nationally representative data collected by the NSECE (NSECE Project Team, 2012). The goal of this brief is to help the field better understand the strengths and needs of the I/T workforce in center-based as well as home-based ECE programs. Findings are presented separately for I/T teachers and caregivers in center-based and home-based settings. Results indicate that I/T teachers and caregivers tended to have low levels of education; furthermore, endorsements such as the Child Development Associate Credential or state certifications were uncommon. However, most of the I/T workforce had some exposure to college coursework. Among I/T teachers and caregivers in center-based programs, participation in professional development activities varied both by extent of previous education and whether the degree was in ECE or a related field. In general, participation in professional development activities was most common among teachers and caregivers with higher levels of education. For home-based I/T teachers and caregivers, professional development activities tended to be one-time workshops as opposed to more intensive forms of professional development, such as a workshop series or coaching. Only at higher levels of education did a substantial proportion of home-based I/T teachers and caregivers report meeting regularly with others who were looking after children. Professional development for home-based I/T teachers and caregivers tended to focus on health and safety and curriculum. Professional development for center-based I/T teachers and caregivers tended to focus on health and safety and supporting children’s social- emotional development. Time release and other supports for professional development varied by education level for both center-based and home-based I/T teachers and caregivers. However, only 15 percent of home-based I/T workforce reported having received financial support for professional development in the past 12 months. Findings are discussed in terms of implications for professional development systems.”

Madill, R., Forry, N. D., & Halle, T. (2018). *Snapshots from the NSECE: How much did households in the United States pay for child care in 2012?: An examination of differences by community urbanicity* (OPRE Report No. 2018-111). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36874>

“This Snapshot is based on information collected by the NSECE, a nationally representative study of American households and ECE providers conducted in 2012. The information in this Snapshot is based on a report on nonparental care usage and costs from the NSECE household survey

(NSECE Project Team, 2016). This Snapshot focuses on care for children under age 13. Household costs are calculated based on how much a household paid, in total, for children's regular nonparental care arrangements. Regular nonparental care arrangements are those that a child attended for at least 5 hours per week, not including K-8 schooling. Households may use only free care arrangements, a combination of free and paid care, or only paid care arrangements. Only households that had out-of-pocket costs for care are included in the average cost estimates."

**Madill, R., Gebhart, T., & Halle, T. (2020). *Prices reported by center-based early care and education providers: Associations with indicators of quality* (OPRE Report No. 2020148). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38944>

"Paying for child care can place a burden on households, especially those with low incomes. Currently there is a dearth of knowledge regarding whether households obtain higher-quality child care when they pay higher prices for that care. To that end, this research brief uses data from center-based providers to examine whether centers that report higher prices for child care provide higher-quality care, as measured with a variety of indicators."

**Madill, R., Halle, T., Gebhart, T., & Shuey, E. (2018). *Supporting the psychological well-being of the early care and education workforce: Findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education* (OPRE Report No. 2018-49). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36531>

"This report uses a recent nationally representative survey of the ECE workforce to identify supports to psychological well-being among teachers in center-based ECE programs (NSECE Project Team, 2016). Teachers responded to six items assessing symptoms of nonspecific psychological distress—for example, how often they feel like 'everything is an effort.' After accounting for teachers' background characteristics, we examined whether formal workforce supports (for example, coaching and mentoring) and informal workforce supports (for example, feeling respected at work) were associated with ECE teachers' psychological distress. Our analyses are restricted to teachers and lead teachers in the center-based workforce, so we use the term 'teachers' when discussing findings."

**Madill, R., Lin, V., Friese, S., & Paschall, K. W. (2018). *Access to early care and education for disadvantaged families: Do levels of access reflect states' child care subsidy policies?* (Child Trends Report No. 2018-07). Child Trends.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35767>

"To our knowledge, no studies have asked which combinations of subsidy policies are associated with better access to ECE for low-income families (relative to higher-income families), from either a demand perspective (in other words, the perspective of the family) or a supply perspective (in other words, the availability of high-quality ECE providers serving subsidized children). The fact that subsidy funds are limited makes it essential to understand the benefits and consequences of different combinations of subsidy policies as they relate to parents' access to high-quality ECE."

**Madill, R., Moodie, S., Zaslow, M., & Tout, K. (2015).** *Review of selected studies and professional standards related to the predictors of quality included in the National Survey of Early Care and Education (OPRE Report No. 2015-93b)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34368>

“The purpose of this annotated bibliography is to provide reviews of key selected studies and professional standards related to the predictors of quality (POQ) included in the NSECE. The intent is to provide a companion piece to the NSECE methodological report *Measuring Predictors of Quality in the National Survey of Early Care and Education* (NSECE Project Team, 2015). The two reports focus on the same POQs and follow the same numbering so that readers can easily cross-reference.”

**Mayfield, W. A., & Cho, I. (2022).** *NWRA 2021 longitudinal workforce report*. National Workforce Registry Alliance.

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/135901>

“The 2021 National Workforce Registry Alliance dataset consists of data from 14 of 17 eligible registries: Arizona; Connecticut; Miami-Dade (Florida); Illinois; Maine; Minnesota; Missouri; Montana; Nevada; New Jersey; New York; Ohio; Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. These Partners in Employment Reporting–approved registries have met quality standards in the data collection and reporting on early childhood and out of school time workforce data. The dataset represents active registry participants as of January 1, 2019, through January 1, 2021, and includes individual records from 466,115 professionals, 76% of whom were employed at the time of the draw (356,206), working across 64,237 programs and facilities. Of the 14 participating states, registry participation was required for most of the workforce in eight states: Arizona, Illinois, Maine, Montana Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.”

**McDougald Scott, A. M. (2021).** *Benefits for child care workers: How the state could help through a Medicaid waiver*. *Journal of Working-Class Studies*, 6(1), 22–56.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128151>

“Child care is expensive, and many parents struggle to afford care; furthermore, even though child care costs are high, child care providers in the United States are not making a living wage. Child care professionals (ages 0–5 in child care homes or centers) earn less income than kindergarten teachers, prekindergarten teachers, nonfarm animal caretakers, and the United States’ estimate of all workers’ annual median salary (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020a, 2020b). Workers in comparable professions are also usually offered benefits for their labor, which child care professionals are not (Kwon, 2019; National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team, 2020; Otten et al., 2019; Whitebook, McLean, Austin, & Edwards, 2018). This often necessitates use of public assistance. Because many child care workers are not provided access to health insurance or other health-related benefits through their employers, they must seek access to health care in other ways. Additionally, turnover rates among child care workers are high, and wages and benefits are a large part of the reason why child care professionals leave their jobs (McDougald Scott, 2021a). This policy analysis (a) reviewed the current struggle (as of May 2021) that child care workers in the United States (in general) and South Carolina (in particular) experience compared with employees in other fields; and (b) explored options (particularly a Medicaid waiver option) that might improve the situation. South Carolina is one of the 13 states that have not expanded Medicaid; most of the 13 states are in the southern United States region, which makes an extrapolation of South Carolina research reasonable. Lessons learned from South Carolina child

care data should reflect closely what may be found in other non-expansion states, but research from the literature review will not be specific to South Carolina. Relevant peer reviewed government documents, state and national data, and grey literature were reviewed and analyzed. There have been ongoing efforts (although insufficient even in more successful efforts) with mixed results to improve the pay for child care workers for decades. Progress for earning a living wage will require a systems overhaul for early education, but child care providers cannot wait for workforce environmental improvements. Action must be taken now to augment the shortage of health care access for child care providers. In South Carolina, Medicaid helps some child care workers receive access to health care, but expansion through Medicaid waiver 1115 would include many more child care workers who do not currently have access.”

**McDougald Scott, A. M. (2021). *Examining the everyday life of child care workers: How low wages and the lack of benefits affect their lives and decisions about employment* [Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University]. All Dissertations. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128156>**

“Child care workers’ wages have been an issue that has plagued the early childhood education field for over five decades. Although research exists on child care workers’ low wages, turnover rates, and lack of benefits, the details of daily life experiences from child care worker perspectives are scant. This study aims to add a lived experience perspective to the child care worker research, as well as provide stories which may be used as examples to inform policy change. This qualitative Participatory Action Research entailed semi-structured interviews with 14 child care workers to investigate: (a) the everyday life of child care workers; (b) how low wages and the lack of benefits affect child care workers’ decisions to either switch between jobs within the field or leave the field; (c) what child care workers would like others to know. Fourteen child care workers who either worked in centers, owned family child care homes, or were nannies in Greenville County, South Carolina, participated. Data from the semi structured interviews were analyzed using an iterative process.”

**Mendez, J. L., & Crosby, D. A. (2018). *Why and how do low-income Hispanic families search for early care and education (ECE)?* (Publication No. 2018-15). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36140>**

“Because the Hispanic population is growing rapidly and often faces considerable economic need—and because ECE can play an important role in reducing racial and ethnic disparities in early learning and later school outcomes—it is important for the research and policy community to better understand how and why low-income Hispanic parents search for ECE. This study takes a closer look at low-income Hispanic parents’ reported reasons for conducting a search for an ECE provider or program for their young children. This brief uses data from the 2012 NSECE to describe why low-income Hispanic parents with young children (birth to age 5) report searching for child care; comparison data for low-income non-Hispanic Black and white parents are also reported. Prior research involving low-income families from various racial and ethnic backgrounds showed that parents report a variety of reasons for their ECE searches. There are also several important barriers to low-income families’ use of care, including lack of availability, low affordability, and poor alignment with parents’ work schedules. Understanding similar or shared concerns about ECE across United States racial and ethnic groups—along with differences across these groups—can guide outreach by programs and inform policy adjustments that might better serve diverse groups.”

**Mendez, J. L., Crosby, D. A., Guzman, L., & Lopez, M. (2017). *Centers serving high percentages of young Hispanic children compare favorably to other centers on key predictors of quality* (Publication No. 2017-24). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34171>

“In this brief, we use recent national data to better understand the predictors of quality of ECE centers that serve significant numbers of low-income Hispanic children from birth through age 5. We compare ECE centers serving a high proportion of Hispanic children with ECE centers serving a low proportion of Hispanic children to see how they differ on various predictors of quality. We draw upon data from the 2012 NSECE, which was designed to assess several predictors of quality.”

**Mendez, J. L., Crosby, D. A., & Siskind, D. (2020). *Work hours, family composition, and employment predict use of child care for low-income Latino infants and toddlers* (Report 2020-04). National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38302>

“Using data from the 2012 NSECE, we examine how child, household, and community characteristics relate to low-income Hispanic families’ use of infant and toddler care (as illustrated in figure 1). We explore a range of child-level characteristics, including the number and ages of children, and whether there are children with special needs in the household. At the household level, we examine family structure and household composition (including the presence of grandparents or other relatives), parents’ work status, and other sociodemographic characteristics that shape the resources they may have to secure child care arrangements (for example, income, nativity status of the household, and the extent to which English is spoken regularly at home). For community context, we include two broad indicators of the environment in which families live—urbanicity and poverty density—because of their implications for influencing the search process and supply of care.”

**Miranda, B., Gebhart, T., Madill, R., & Halle, T. (2020). *Snapshots from the NSECE: How are lower-income households using nonparental care for children under age 6?: An analysis of primary and combinations of care types* (OPRE Report No. 2020-150). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38972>

“This Snapshot uses data from the 2012 NSECE household survey to elucidate the types of nonparental care that lower-income households with at least one working parent are using, either solely or in combination, to care for children under age 6. [In this Snapshot, children age birth through 5, not yet in kindergarten, are referred to as children under age 6.] This Snapshot also identifies the primary type of nonparental care that lower-income households use and the extent to which children from lower-income households access center-based care. Lower-income households are defined as those with an annual income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level and at least one working parent.”

**National Center on Early Childhood Quality Assurance. (2017). *Designing family-friendly consumer education on child care*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Care.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34611>

“Consumer education efforts are undergoing revisions in response to provisions in the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 and the 2016 CCDF final rule. Specifically, each state

must maintain a website that contains information about child care providers in the state or local area, results of providers' monitoring and inspection reports (including health and safety violations), and lists of resources for parents, including financial assistance. This brief provides research-based information to support state agency staff as they design and implement these websites and other resources, such as QRISs."

**Paschall, K., Davis, E. E., & Tout, K. (2021). *Measuring and comparing multiple dimensions of early care and education access* (OPRE Report No. 2021-08). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/126646>

"Describing access across multiple dimensions provides decision-makers with a deeper understanding of families' ECE needs and emphasizes the need for multifaceted policy solutions. Yet measuring and comparing access from different perspectives requires available data and a clear measurement approach that can be conveyed concisely. This report describes an exploratory study using data from the 2012 NSECE to model the complexity of ECE access and to consider how ECE access varies for families across the United States."

**Paschall, K., Halle, T., & Maxwell, K. (2020). *Early care and education in rural communities* (OPRE Research Brief No. 2020-62). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38213>**

"The purpose of this report is to use nationally representative data from the 2012 NSECE to provide a descriptive comparison of the types of ECE available in high-density urban, moderate-density urban (suburban), and rural areas. Additionally, this report compares the need for and use of child care among families with young children in both rural and urban areas. This report also sheds light on differences in ECE by rurality on a national scale. High-quality ECE is of great importance for children's development and school readiness. To understand unmet needs for child care and workforce support, it is necessary to evaluate the differences in supply and demand for ECE between rural, moderate-density urban, and high-density urban areas. Once these needs are clarified, useful support can be provided for high-quality care that fosters healthy development."

**Paschall, K., Madill, R., & Halle, T. (2020). *Demographic characteristics of the early care and education workforce: Comparisons with child and community characteristics* (OPRE Report No. 2020-108). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/126981>**

"This analysis uses the NSECE, a nationally representative set of integrated surveys of ECE providers and households with young children, to understand, at a national level, the demographic diversity of the ECE workforce in relation to the children and communities they serve. Findings compare populations of ECE providers to populations of young children, as well as populations of ECE providers across communities with varying levels of demographic diversity."

**Paschall, K., Madill, R., & Halle, T. (2020). *Professional characteristics of the early care and education workforce: Descriptions by race, ethnicity, languages spoken, and nativity status* (OPRE Report No. 2020-107). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/126976>**

"This report presents a national portrait of center-based and home-based ECE teachers and caregivers from the 2012 NSECE. It describes the professional characteristics and motivations of

teachers and caregivers working in center-based and home-based settings by race and Hispanic ethnicity, languages spoken, and nativity status.”

**Phillips, D. A., Anderson, S., Datta, A. R., & Kisker, E. E. (2018). The changing landscape of publicly-funded center-based child care: 1990 and 2012. *Children and Youth Services Review, 91*, 94–104.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36123>

“Low-income families’ ability to sustain employment while ensuring the care and safety of their young children is profoundly affected by federal policies regarding access to subsidies and programs, such as Head Start. The current structure of these policies evolved during the decades following the 1990 enactment of the Child Care and Development Block Grant—a period that also witnessed expansion of the Head Start program and growth of state prekindergarten programs. Using data from two nationally representative surveys of child care providers conducted in 1990 and 2012, this paper examines trends in the supply, sponsorship, and funding structure of publicly funded child care centers during this period of active policymaking in ECE. These changes include major expansion in the number and share of child care centers receiving public funds, as well as in the number of children enrolled in these centers; relatively more rapid growth among for-profit versus non-profit centers in the publicly funded sector, but consistency in that the major share of publicly funded centers remained nonprofit; and substantial growth in publicly-funded centers receiving vouchers as a primary funding mechanism. These trends carry the potential to enhance the reach of quality improvement efforts tagged to public funds and may have increased low-income families’ choice of centers with differing hours, in a range of locations, that serve a wider age range of children, as well as children supported with differing funding sources. Whether the growing supply of publicly funded centers has actually kept pace with demand, let alone enhanced access of low-income families to care that supports their children’s development, are critical, next-stage questions to address.”

**Phillips, D. A., Anderson, S., Datta, A. R., & Kisker, E. E. (2019). The changing portrait of center-based preschool teachers: 1990 and 2012. *Children and Youth Services Review, 107*, Article 104558.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37553>

“Preschool teachers are widely acknowledged as critical to supporting the school readiness of children, yet they remain under-paid relative to their education levels and have high rates of turnover relative to the United States’ workforce as a whole. Federal and state policies affect preschool teachers through education and training requirements, as well as guidelines affecting subsidy reimbursement rates, for example. Because these policies are focused on low-income children, they disproportionately experience the impacts. The present study describes trends affecting the racial-ethnic composition, education and experience, and compensation and turnover of preschool teachers of 3–5-year-old children in ECE programs receiving and not receiving public funds between 1990 and 2012—2 years when nationally representative data are available. Data sources are the Profile of Child Care Settings (1990) and the NSECE (2012). Results indicate that, while the experience and education levels of teachers have increased over this 22-year period, wages have remained flat. Access to health insurance, in contrast, has improved over time, and turnover rates have declined. The racial-ethnic composition of the preschool teaching workforce also shifted during this time, revealing a notable loss of Black teachers. Comparisons of programs receiving and not receiving public funds, and among those receiving different sources of public funds—Child Care and Development Block Grant and CCDF subsidies, Head Start funds, and prekindergarten funds—identified disparities within survey years, as well as differing trends over time. Results have implications for policies to support teachers and young children.”

**Pilarz, A. J., Lin, Y. -C., & Maguson, K. A. (2019). Do parental work hours and nonstandard schedules explain income-based gaps in center-based early care and education participation? *Social Service Review*, 93(1), 55–95.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37622>

“Despite increases in public funding for ECE programs in recent decades, low-income children ages 0–5 years are less likely to be enrolled in center-based ECE programs compared with higher-income children. Low-income working parents are also more likely to work jobs with nonstandard schedules, which are associated with lower rates of center-based ECE. This study examines whether parents’ work hours and nonstandard schedules explain income-based gaps in center-based ECE using detailed measures of parental work hours and schedules based on calendar data from the NSECE. We find that mothers’ work hours and schedules are predictive of 0–5-year-old children’s enrollment in center-based ECE, and accounting for mothers’ work hours and schedules significantly reduces income-based gaps in center-based ECE, particularly among infants and toddlers.”

**Pinter, V. (2021). *Hispanic families’ utilization of social benefits: A regional analysis* [Undergraduate honors thesis, Duke University]. DukeSpace.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/122486>

“The connection between race and social benefits is so strong that many times the issue of social benefits is seen as a racial versus a social issue. I hypothesize that Hispanic families in new destination locations, which are located in the Southern and Midwestern regions of the United States, will receive social benefits at a lower rate when compared to Hispanics who live in established immigrant locations, which are located in the Northeastern and Western regions of the United States. I conclude, based on a historical analysis, that the lower uptake rate of Hispanics living in Southern and Midwestern regions is due to the particularly racial history of these regions, as well as due to the racial and political ideology of those regions. To test my hypothesis, I conducted a logistic regression analysis using data that were collected by the NSECE, which is composed of four integrated, nationally representative surveys conducted in 2012. The logistic regression analysis of uptake rate by region reveals that being in the South or Midwest lowers a family’s uptake rate of social benefits. This result is significant because it indicates that the hypothesis proposed in this analysis is correct and can allow for future analysis in how to increase equity among Hispanics living in different regions of the United States.”

**Poyatzis, G. (2022). *Fixing the child care staffing shortage by making child care jobs “good jobs”* (IWPR #C512). Institute for Women's Policy Research.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142046>

“This brief begins with an overview of the composition of the child center care workforce in 2019, then provides detailed breakdowns of pay by race and ethnicity, examining changes since 2012. Next, the brief discusses the impact of educational attainment and certifications by race and ethnicity on earnings, and employer-provided support for professional development, before turning to the impact of low pay on child care workers’ economic security and overall well-being. The brief concludes with policy recommendations for tackling the child care staffing crisis and improving the job quality and pay of child care center workers.”

**Poyatzis, G. (2022). *Universal pre-K will save families \$17 billion in out-of-pocket expenses (IWPR #G721)*. Institute for Women's Policy Research.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142981>

“Based on current expenditures on care for 3- and 4-year-old children, this brief estimates the potential savings associated with universal prekindergarten for different types of families. Estimates of out-of-pocket expenses for child care are based on the NSECE 2019 household survey. Estimates include household expenditures after deducting any subsidies a family may have received. This survey records any kind of paid care arrangement including center-based, home-based, and individual care such as care provided by a friend or family member. The brief shows average annual child care costs for households by race and ethnicity and by family type, both in absolute dollars and as a percent of average monthly income. It also highlights substantial differences by race and ethnicity and family type of the level of expenditure and access to quality care (for more detail, see Methodology notes at the end of this brief).”

**Rucker, L., Zajicek, A. M., & Kerr, B. (2022). *How policy can help prepare early childhood teachers: The alignment between state childcare licensing policy and teacher qualification attainment*. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, 1–24.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143011>

“The qualifications that early childhood (EC) teachers attain vary across the 50 states. This variance is likely associated with the differences in state-level child care licensing policies governing the qualification attainment of EC teachers. This research explores the relationship between child care licensing policy and the qualifications that EC teachers attain. We examine secondary data from the NSECE merged with secondary policy data on child care licensing policies for all 50 states. We use a series of linear and logistic regression models to understand how the policy stringency of child care licensing predicts the attainment of educational degrees, EC certification, and professional development. We find more stringent policies predict teacher attainment of bachelor’s degrees in EC, certification, and professional development. Policy does not predict associate degree attainment in EC. Our finding that policy stringency aligns with qualification attainment demonstrates that policymakers can better target child care licensing policies to promote qualification attainment among the EC workforce. This research can be used by (1) teacher education programs to illustrate how policies and regulatory standards influence the qualifications of the workforce that they prepare for careers in EC, and (2) policymakers to better craft and target child care licensing policies that influence qualification attainment among their EC workforces.”

**Rucker, L., Zajicek, A. M., & Kerr, B. (2021). *Variation in state early childhood lead educator qualifications: Pre-service versus in-service qualification, professional organization, and geographical proximity [Advanced online publication]*. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/132056>**

“EC educator qualifications shape the quality of education and care provided to children. Although past research demonstrates that EC educator qualifications are lower than recommended by research, little is known about how qualification attainment differs at the state level where policy change primarily occurs. Using restricted-access data from the NSECE, inclusive of all 50 states, the current study seeks to understand EC lead educators’ qualifications. We ran a cluster analysis to understand the variation between state workforces. We found that, at the state level, EC lead educator workforces cluster in four distinct groups, which we label: the Informally-Qualified Educator, the Non-EC Track Educator, the K-12 Aligned Educator, and the Pre-Service Trained Educator. We

find the latter two clusters have the highest membership in unions and professional development associations. We also identify professional development, most likely to occur as in-service training, as the most common form of qualification. Finally, an emergent finding demonstrates evidence of geographical proximity across clusters. Findings contribute to a more adequate understanding of how the EC lead educator profession is qualified and, thus, permit informed policy decisions to support educators and improve the quality of EC care and education.”

**Rudich, J., Sugar, S., Chien, N. C., Peters, C. P., & Sommers, B. D. (2021). *Assessing uninsured rates in early care and education workers* (Data Point No. HP-2021-25). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/133491>

“Our objective in this Data Point is to analyze health insurance coverage rates among ECE workers (those serving young children birth to age 5) compared with the general population and other educators (elementary school teachers, high school teachers, and post-secondary school instructors and professors), and to assess geographic patterns in coverage rates for preschool and kindergarten teachers.”

**Sandstrom, H., & Gelatt, J. (2017). *Child care choices of low-income, immigrant families with young children: Findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education*. Urban Institute. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35080>**

“In this brief, we explore differences in the child care settings foreign-born, United States–born, limited English proficiency, and English-proficient parents select for their young children. We also explore differences in their child care preferences and perceptions, and in the household characteristics that might explain their patterns. In this way, we shed light on how being an immigrant and having limited English proficiency, among other factors, might influence parents’ interest in and ability to access different types of child care.”

**Sandstrom, H., & Gelatt, J. (2017). *How parental preferences and subsidy receipt shape immigrant families’ child care choices*. Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35082>

“We analyze data from the NSECE to (1) document the parental preferences and child care arrangements of immigrant families with young children; (2) determine the factors that predict immigrant families’ child care settings, including the relative roles of parental preferences for different care types, family characteristics, employment characteristics, the local community context, and local child care marketplace characteristics; (3) identify the state subsidy policies that promote subsidy participation among eligible immigrant families; and (4) estimate how much subsidy receipt facilitates access to regulated care settings for potentially eligible immigrant families. In this brief, we review our research questions and methods and then focus on the challenges and questions that arise when using secondary data to look at ECE experiences of immigrant households, with implications for future research.”

**Sandstrom, H., Sullivan, L., Lou, C., Spaulding, S., & Adams, G. (2019). *Balancing work with school and training while raising young children: A national portrait of young parents, their schedules, and children’s care arrangements*. Urban Institute.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37339>

“This study is motivated by existing research on the adverse impacts of early childbearing and observed trends in young parents (those ages 16 to 24) balancing work with education or training. Using data from the NSECE, a set of nationally representative surveys that provide a portrait of the

child care experiences of United States households, we aimed to address the following research questions: (1) How many children growing up in the United States have young parents who are balancing work with education or training? (2) What are the characteristics of these children and their families, and how do they compare with children with young parents who are only working or only in education or training? (3) What are the most common child care arrangements for children with young parents balancing work with education or training, and how do they compare with the care arrangements of other children?"

**Schilder, D., Lou, C., & Wagner, L. (2022). *How do parents with and without nontraditional-hour schedules rate different types of care? Findings from an analysis of the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education*. Urban Institute.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138191>

"This brief provides a snapshot of findings from the 2019 NSECE about how parents with traditional versus nontraditional work schedules rate different types of child care. Implications for policy and further research are presented."

**Schilder, D., Lou, C., & Wagner, L. (2022). *How many hours do young children spend in nontraditional-hour child care, and how does it vary by type of care? Findings from an analysis of the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education*. Urban Institute.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138186>

"This brief provides a snapshot of findings from the 2019 NSECE about how much time children under age 6 spend in nontraditional-hour child care by provider type. Implications for policy and further research are presented."

**Slicker, G., & Hustedt, J. T. (2022). *Predicting participation in the child care subsidy system from provider features, community characteristics, and use of funding streams*. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 136, Article 106392.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/135006>

"Child care subsidies and other sources of public funding for early education can assist low-income families with accessing child care. However, the number of providers that accept child care subsidies is declining, threatening both the sustainability of these government programs and access to early care and education for families from low-income backgrounds. The current study identifies factors that may influence center-based child care providers' subsidy system participation using nationally representative data from the 2012 NSECE (n = 7771). Our results suggest that certain features of providers, such as having a quality rating, and the poverty density of the community within which a center operates may be positively related to subsidy system participation."

**Slicker, G. (2022). *Examining provider participation in the child care subsidy system: A mixed methods study* (Publication No. 29208944) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware]. ProQuest Dissertations Express.**

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/2feaf2ff3ce71a19996dbed7ec28f4f2/1.pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

"This dissertation project is a three-phase mixed methods study aimed at understanding how ECE centers make decisions about subsidy system participation, paying close attention to the influence of state policies and other factors amenable to policy intervention. Phase I is a mixed methods statewide study that examines how providers make decisions about accepting subsidies. In phase II, nationally representative data is used to examine predictors of subsidy density, or the proportion

of children in a program using subsidies. Phase III uses a nationally representative sample of ECE centers alongside state-specific subsidy policies to examine the unique influence of subsidy policies on provider participation in the subsidy system. This dissertation provides useful insights into how to implement state policies and practices that could incentivize providers' participation in the subsidy system, and as a result better serve families from low-income backgrounds."

**Slicker, G., Tang, J., & Kelly, C. L. (2020). Workforce-, classroom- and program-level predictors of quality in infant and toddler programs: How subsidized programs compare with other center-based programs. *Children and Youth Services Review, 119*, Article 105675.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/126706>

"Finding affordable child care, especially for infants and toddlers, is incredibly challenging for low-income families. Child care subsidies can assist low-income working families with accessing child care and by expanding slots available for the youngest children. However, little is known about how workforce-, classroom-, and program-level predictors of quality vary across child care programs that serve low-income infants and toddlers. The current study fills a critical gap in the existing literature by comparing regulatable features of infant and toddler programs in moderate- and high-poverty areas that serve children paid for with child care subsidies with other publicly and non-publicly funded programs using nationally representative data from the 2012 NSECE (n = 1091). Our results show that while programs serving children receiving child care subsidies tend to fall short of other publicly funded programs (in other words, Early Head Start) as it relates to the program-level indicators of quality, programs that serve children receiving subsidies typically have smaller group sizes than Early Head Start. In addition, though they tend to be less educated and are compensated at lower rates, the workforce in subsidized programs is more likely to report that they work to help children and families. Our findings suggest specific features of the workforce, classrooms, and programs that are regulated by federal, state, and local funding streams and policies that could be targeted to better support access for quality infant and toddler care, particularly for low-income families."

**Spiegel, M., Hill, Z., & Gennetian, L. A. (2020). Harnessing a behavioral economic framework for supporting providers in improving early childhood care. *Early Years, 42*(3), 310–326. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/123201>**

"High-quality ECE is increasingly viewed as a path toward narrowing socioeconomic gaps in children's school readiness and development. Features of early childhood education environments such as pedagogical practices and provider-child interactions most strongly predict children's outcomes. We describe how the interdisciplinary framework of behavioral economics—blending insights from economics and psychology—can support efforts to improve the quality of these predictive features. The behavioral economic framework recognizes that early childhood providers face multiple demands on their time and attention that influence their day-to-day interactions with children beyond the pedagogical and related practices available to them and that they strive to deliver. Using data from a nationally representative sample of ECE center-based providers in the United States, we describe characteristics of the early education workforce serving low- and higher-income communities that intersect with three pertinent behavioral economic insights related to limited bandwidth, identity, and social influences. We then describe how insights and tools from behavioral economics can be integrated to positively support the early childhood workforce and enhance the impact of existing pedagogical practices, and economic and professional support."

**Tang, J., Hallam, R. A., & Sawyer-Morris, G. (2021). Preschool parents' perceptions of early care and education arrangements: A latent profile analysis. *Early Education and Development, 32*(3), 480–500.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/39227>

“Research Findings: Parents make child care decisions based on their existing perceptions of ECE arrangements. Through secondary analysis of the NSECE data on parents of preschoolers (n = 1674), an exploratory latent profile analysis was conducted to identify distinct profiles of parents based on their ratings of three regular ECE arrangements: center-based child care, family child care (FCC), and family, friend, and neighbor (FFN) care. The findings did not indicate a clear preference for a specific type of arrangements among preschool parents. Rather, two distinct profiles emerged: ‘favorable across all settings’ and ‘less favorable, prefer FFN care.’ For both profiles, FCC was rated lower than FFN care across almost all dimensions. A set of family demographics predicted the profile membership, such as family income, parental employment, and subsidy receipt. Practice or Policy: The reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 2014 requires states to develop consumer education programs to support families in their ECE search. Given that parents have to make tradeoffs when making ECE decisions, state government agencies need to provide credible, updated, and culturally responsive information to help parents make informed choices.”

**Tang, J., Lewis, S., Cutler, L., Hallam, R. A., & Collier, Z. K. (2021). Characteristics of home-based child care providers who offer non-standard hour care. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 55*, 284–294.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/39305>

“The past decade has seen a dramatic growth of nonstandard work schedules in the workforce, leading to increasing demand for non-standard hour child care during evenings, nights, and weekends. Low-income families, less-educated parents, and single parents with young children report greater demand for nonstandard hour care. Given the prevalence of non-standard hour care and the importance of quality child care, a better understanding of who provides nonstandard hour care and how to support this sector is necessary. Home-based child care (HBCC) providers are the largest caregiving group serving children under age 6 during nonstandard hours. Through secondary data analysis of the 2012 NSECE on listed home-based child care providers (n = 3476), decision tree analysis was used to predict whether listed HBCC providers offer nonstandard hour care. Results indicated those providers who offered nonstandard hour care are more likely to receive government subsidies, have lower educational levels, and serve fewer children. The overall accuracy of the decision tree model was 63%. The present study also examined the relationship between providers' professional engagement and the total number of nonstandard working hours (n = 880). The entire model presented a medium effect size. Providers who received home visitors or coaching, or both, tend to provide more hours of nonstandard hour care. To better support HBCC providers in offering nonstandard hour care, policy recommendations are presented.”

**Trivedi, P., Chadwick, L., & Burgess, K. (2017). *Factors associated with reduced expulsion in center-based early learning settings: Preliminary findings from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Human Services Policy.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/33655>

“This brief provides new national estimates of recent early childhood expulsion rates in a range of center-based early learning settings using data from the NSECE, indicating how characteristics of ECE centers relate to the likelihood that children are denied services due to behavior. The analysis describes how access to comprehensive services, support for professional development for ECE

teachers and staff, funding source (for example, Head Start, public prekindergarten, private, and so on), and program sponsorship (for example, nonprofit, government sponsored, for-profit, and so on) relate to recent expulsion rates.”

**Ullrich, R., Hamm, K., & Herzfeldt-Kamprath, R. (2016). *Underpaid and unequal: Racial wage disparities in the early childhood workforce*. Center for American Progress.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34392>

“This study discusses the low wages of the early childhood workforce, examines racial disparities in wages and workforce supports based on data from the NSECE, and provides recommendations.”

**Ullrich, R., Sojourner, A. J., Robbins, K. G., Schmit, S., Schulman, K., & White, C. (2020). *Child care is key to our economic recovery: What it will take to stabilize the system during the coronavirus crisis*. Center for Law and Social Policy; National Women’s Law Center.** <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37937>

“This brief provides new estimates of what it would cost to sustain the child care system during the coronavirus pandemic. We estimate that at least \$9.6 billion is needed each month to fully fund existing providers in the child care system. These funds would allow closed providers to retain their staff at full pay, be prepared to reopen at the appropriate time, and eliminate cost burdens for families whose providers are closed. These funds will also allow open providers to offer safe, comprehensive emergency care at no cost to an estimated 6 million children of essential workers.”

**Ullrich, R., Sojourner, A. J., Robbins, K. G., Schmit, S., Schulman, K., & White, C. (2020). *Child care is key to our economic recovery: What it will take to stabilize the system during the coronavirus crisis: Technical appendix*. Center for Law and Social Policy; National Women’s Law Center.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37938>

“This analysis provides new estimates of what it would cost to sustain the child care system through the coronavirus pandemic. We estimate that at least \$9.6 billion is needed each month to fully fund existing providers in the child care system—which would allow them to retain their staff at full pay and eliminate cost burdens for families—and to offer safe, comprehensive emergency care at no cost to an estimated 6 million children of essential workers in need of care. This Technical Appendix provides detailed information about our data sources, assumptions, and analytic process.”

**Vasanthi, R., Chen, R., Perkins, K., & Sevoyan, M. (2018). *South Carolina early care & education workforce study report 2018*. University of South Carolina, Yvonne and Schuyler Moore Child Development Research Center.**  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38552>

“Knowledge of the South Carolina ECE workforce is essential to understanding the impact of ECE initiatives, policies, and practices on children and child outcomes. Therefore, through funding from the Division of Early Care and Education at South Carolina Department of Social Services, the administrator for the federal CCDF, South Carolina Endeavors (formerly the South Carolina Center for Child Care Career Development) and Yvonne & Schuyler Moore Child Development Research Center at the University of South Carolina conducted a statewide survey of the ECE workforce. This study is the first of its kind in South Carolina, including responses from individuals who work directly in classrooms with young children across varied sectors. Building on the previous South Carolina ECE workforce study (Marsh, 2001), the goal of this study was to learn more about characteristics of the ECE workforce, ECE facilities where they work, the working conditions of their employment and their attitudes and dispositions about their work.”

**Warner-Richter, M., Paschall, K. W., Tout, K., & Lowe, C. (2020).** *Understanding facilitators and barriers to professional development use among the early care and education workforce* (OPRE Report No. 2020-103). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/38661>

“This report describes the factors associated with participation in professional development and highlights the individual-, program-, and system-level factors that may act as barriers to participating in specific professional development activities (in other words, workshops, coaching, and college courses). We present findings from a scan of recent professional development literature and share new multivariate findings from the 2012 NSECE (National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team, 2012) that explore how often and under what conditions center-based and home-based ECE teachers and caregivers participate in professional development activities.”

**Watts, K. S. (2017).** *Families with low incomes and the search for child care: An exploration of factors influencing search actions and choices* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland]. DRUM. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35466>

“Quality child care appears to have a positive effect on the school readiness of children with low incomes, and child care subsidy programs encourage parents to make informed decisions about choosing quality child care. However, research on child care decision making suggests that most parents do not consult with resources that are available to support informed decisions. The current study utilized a subsample of families with low incomes from the NSECE to increase understanding of child care decision making, focusing on search actions and choices of care. Guided by an accommodation model of child care decision making, the study examined (1) how parents in families with low incomes search for and choose child care; (2) whether there are differences in the searches and choices of families receiving child care subsidies and other families with low incomes; and (3) how child care preferences and priorities, family and child factors, and community factors relate to searches and choices. Results indicated that families with subsidies and other families with low incomes largely searched for care in similar ways, although families with subsidies were more likely to choose a center-based provider and less likely to choose a known home-based provider. Logistic regression analyses revealed that parents’ preferences and priorities regarding child care were related to search actions but were mostly unrelated to choices, and that the reason for the child care search was significantly associated with both search actions and choices. Certain family, child, and community factors were found to be related to child care search actions and choices, most notably parental immigration status and living in a rural area. Implications and future directions for research, measurement, and policy are discussed.”

**Whitebook, M. (2019).** *A bizarro world for infants and toddlers and their teachers*. Bank Street College of Education. *Occasional Paper Series, 42*. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37620>

“The 2012 NSECE allows us to examine wage disparities among early educators nationally, across four categories of center-based programs based on funding source and sponsorship: school-sponsored public prekindergarten, community-based public prekindergarten, Head Start, and other ECE centers (see figure 1). Seventy percent of center-based jobs working with infants and toddlers were in other ECE centers, which on average paid the lowest wages, regardless of whether the educator had a university degree or not (Whitebook et al., 2018, p. 36).”

**Whitebook, M., McLean, C., Austin, L. J. E., & Edwards, B. (2018). *Early childhood workforce index 2018*. University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36506>**

“This second edition of the biennial Early Childhood Workforce Index continues to track the status of the ECE workforce and related state policies to understand changes over time. We have added several new analyses and updated our policy indicators and recommendations. Highlights include the following: earnings data for preschool and child care center directors; state wage data, presented in the context of cost of living; the role of minimum wage legislation in increasing early educator wages; analyses of wage and opportunity disparities among groups of early educators based on race and ethnicity and program setting (the age of children served, funding streams); and revised policy indicators and a new weighted-point framework to allow for more sophisticated assessments of stalled, edging forward, and making headway.”

**Whitebook, M., Phillips, D. A., & Howes, C. (2014). *Worthy work, STILL unlivable wages: The early childhood workforce 25 years after the National Child Care Staffing Study*. University of California, Berkeley, Center for the Study of Child Care Employment. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/28662>**

“This report is a compilation of studies and discussions addressing the working conditions of early childhood teachers in 1989 and 2014. Additional chapters address the consequences of compensation decisions, the use of public benefits among families of staff, and the variety of state and national policy efforts related to the wages of early childhood teachers.”

**Zambrana, R., Amaro, G., Butler, C., DuPont-Reyes, M. & Parra-Medina, D. (2021). Analysis of Latina/o sociodemographic and health data sets in the United States from 1960 to 2019: Findings suggest improvements to future data collection efforts. *Health Education & Behavior*, 48(3), 320–331. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/128221>**

“Introduction: Before 1980, United States national demographic and health data collection did not identify individuals of Hispanic or Latina/o heritage as a population group. After 1990, robust immigration from Latin America (for example, South America, Central America, and Mexico) and subsequent growth in United States births, dynamically reconstructed the ethnoracial lines among Latinos from about 20 countries, increasing racial admixture and modifying patterns of health disparities. The increasing racial and class heterogeneity of United States Latina/os demands a critical analysis of sociodemographic factors associated with population health disparities. Purposes: To determine the state of available Latina/o population demographic and health data in the United States, assess demographic and health variables and trends from 1960 to the present, and identify current strengths, gaps, and areas of improvement. Method: Analysis of 101 existing datasets that included demographic, socioeconomic, and health characteristics of the United States Latina/o population, grouped by three, 20-year intervals: 1960–1979, 1980–1999, and 2000–2019. Results: Increased Latina/o immigration and United States births between 1960 and 2019 was associated with increases of Latina/o population samples in data collection. Findings indicate major gaps in the following four areas: children and youth younger than 18 years, gender and sexual identity, race and mixed-race measures, and immigration factors including nativity and generational status. Conclusions: The analysis of existing ethnoracial Latina/o population data collection efforts provides an opportunity for critical analysis of past trends, future directions in data collection efforts, and an equity lens to guide appropriate community health interventions and policies that will contribute to decreasing health disparities in Latina/o populations.”

Zhang, Y. (2023). *Subsidizing the childcare economy*. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*, 34, 1–68. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142891>

“To unpack the analysis, part I first uses the lens of formal and informal to outline the sectors in the child care economy and the sectoral distribution across families in different income groups. Part II maps the plural policy goals of childcare subsidies and describes how the tension among these policy goals plays out in CCDF. The rest of the article examines in detail the CCDF’s formalization reform. Part III maps invested interest groups’ different visions of child care and their divergent agendas on CCDF subsidy policies, concluding that the ECE advocates—who argue for formalization on an educational rather than a custodial model—are enjoying predominance in child care policy debates. Part IV analyzes the resulting CCDF’s formalization reform and its distributional consequences across the child care economy, with an emphasis on low-income families. Part V proposes some policy suggestions before the conclusion.”

Zhao, J., & Lu, J. (2019). *The overpaid and underpaid: A comparison of labor costs in nonprofit and for-profit service organizations*. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 12, 117–136.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36200>

“The comparison between nonprofit and for-profit organizations has been a lingering question for scholars and practitioners. This research explores employee wage differentials across sectors using a national sample of child care workforce. After controlling for a range of individual, occupational, organizational, and community factors, this research reports a significant wage premium for nonprofit child care teachers. In addition, this study finds evidence for both the labor donation and property rights hypotheses, but the property rights theory demonstrates comparatively stronger explanatory power. Although individuals with stronger intrinsic motivation are more willing to donate labor for charitable outputs, inefficient management in nonprofits actually sets wage levels over the market level. Overall, the study highlights nonprofits’ comparative advantage in employee motivation but disadvantage in efficient management. The findings have implications for public and nonprofit management.”

Zhou, A. (2021). *Building future generations: The macroeconomic consequences of family policies*. Social Science Research Network.

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/142991>

“In this paper, I study the aggregate impacts of family policies in a heterogeneous agent overlapping generations model. Relative to previous studies on family policies, this paper is the first to combine the quantity-quality trade-off, an endogenous demographic structure, and child care choices in a quantitative structural framework.”

## Data Sets

NSECE Project Team (National Opinion Research Center). (2012). *National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), [United States], 2012* (ICPSR 35519; Version V14) [Data set]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. <https://researchconnections.org/node/122441>

NSECE Project Team (National Opinion Research Center). (2019). *National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE), [United States], 2019* (ICPSR 37941; Version V2) [Data set]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor]. <https://researchconnections.org/node/127401>

NSECE Project Team (National Opinion Research Center). (2019). *National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) Level 1 Restricted-Use Files, [United States], 2019*. (ICPSR 28445) [Data set]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].  
<https://researchconnections.org/node/142946>

## User Guides, Training Webinars, and Methodological Reports

Datta, A. R. (2015). *Digging into the NSECE: Exploiting the potential of the household and provider data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Populating the calendar file (CAPI demo)*. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31292>

“This video presentation provides a Computer Assisted Personal Interview demo used to capture nonparental child care provision data to populate the calendar file used in the NSECE.”

Datta, A. R. (2015). *Digging into the NSECE: Exploiting the potential of the household and provider data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Prices and cost in the NSECE*. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31291>

“This video presentation discusses price and cost definitions as related to those used in the NSECE.”

Datta, A. R. (2015). *Digging into the NSECE: Exploiting the potential of the household and provider data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Using household and provider data to measure enrollment, usage*. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31238>

“This video presentation discusses the availability and potential uses of the nonparental care usage and enrollment data found in the NSECE household and provider data files. The following topics are examined: usage definition; types of variables provided; dataset usage (household or provider); considerations in choosing a data file; and advantage comparisons to using each data set.”

Datta, A. R. (2016). *What can we learn about ECE arrangements in the NSECE Household Survey?* [Webinar]. NORC; Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32834>

“The Household Survey of the NSECE includes extensive data about ECE arrangements used by a nationally representative sample of households in winter and spring 2012. Available arrangement-level data include the type of care, location of care, distance of care from the household’s residence, cost to parents for the care, and information about the schedule of care used in a reference week. Because multiple arrangements were collected for each child, and data are collected for all children under age 13 in the household, data are also available about how many arrangements each child uses, how many children in a household share an arrangement, or how many different providers a household uses. The webinar *What Can We Learn About ECE Arrangements in the NSECE Household Survey?* will provide an overview of arrangement-level information in the NSECE, including data on geography, cost, type of care, schedule, and how to match arrangements across providers or children within a household.”

**Datta, A. R. (2016). *What can we learn about ECE arrangements in the NSECE Household Survey?* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32835>**

“This PowerPoint presentation accompanies a webinar that provides an overview of key arrangement attributes from the NSECE Household Survey. Available data include type of care, cost of care, schedule of care, and distance between household and arrangement. Special issues such as school-age children, household-level information, and parent-like relationships are also addressed.”

**Datta, A. R. (2017). *NSECE webinar: Defining type of care in the NSECE* [Webinar]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/33300>**

“This webinar discusses type of care definitions as related to those used in the NSECE data files, particularly the Household Survey, the Center-Based Provider Survey, and the Home-Based Provider Survey. It presents a brief overview of the NSECE design, which provides researchers with some flexibility in defining type of care for various analyses. Similarities and differences in types of care across data files are also addressed.”

**Datta, A. R. (2017). *NSECE webinar: Defining type of care in the NSECE* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/33301>**

“This PowerPoint presentation accompanies a webinar that discusses type of care definitions as related to those used in the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) data files, particularly the Household Survey, the Center-Based Provider Survey, and the Home-Based Provider Survey. It presents a brief overview of the NSECE design, which provides researchers with some flexibility in defining type of care for various analyses. Similarities and differences in types of care across data files are also addressed.”

**Datta, A. R. (2018). *Looking forward to the proposed 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education—An overview* [Webinar]. *NORC; Child Care & Early Education Research Connections*. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36542>**

“This prerecorded webinar outlines the proposed plans for the 2019 NSECE, now including the household and unlisted home-based provider samples, as well as the previously planned listed home-based provider, center-based provider, and center-based workforce samples. It includes an overview of the proposed timeline, research goals, data collection plans, and planned analytic data products.”

**Datta, A. R. (2018). *Looking forward to the proposed 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education—An overview* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36545>**

“These PowerPoint slides accompany a prerecorded webinar that outlines the proposed plans for the 2019 NSECE, now including the household and unlisted home-based provider samples, as well as the previously planned listed home-based provider, center-based provider, and center-based workforce samples. It includes an overview of the proposed timeline, research goals, data collection plans, and planned analytic data products.”

**Datta, A. R. (2018).** *Looking forward to the proposed 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education overview: A state perspective* [Webinar]. NORC; Child Care & Early Education Research Connections.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36547>

“This webinar was recorded on May 24, 2018 and provides an overview of opportunities for additional state participation in the 2019 NSECE, including supplementing the national data collection sample for their state, provider sample frame supplementation, and state administrative subsidy data linkages. For more information, including a handout that provides more detail, please email [nsece@norc.org](mailto:nsece@norc.org).”

**Datta, A. R. (2018).** *Looking forward to the proposed 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education overview: A state perspective* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36548>

“These PowerPoint slides accompany a webinar that was recorded on May 24, 2018 and provides an overview of opportunities for additional state participation in the 2019 NSECE, including supplementing the national data collection sample for their state, provider sample frame supplementation, and state administrative subsidy data linkages. For more information, including a handout that provides more detail, please email [nsece@norc.org](mailto:nsece@norc.org).”

**Datta, A. R. (2018).** *What can we learn from licensing and other child care provider lists?* [Webinar]. NORC; Child Care & Early Education Research Connections.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36682>

“This webinar examines research possibilities related to the use of child care provider lists. It also addresses the process of acquiring accurate provider counts, presenting an example from the NSECE. Selected analysis ideas are included.”

**Datta, A. R. (2018).** *What can we learn from licensing and other child care provider lists?* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36683>

“This PowerPoint presentation accompanies a webinar that examines research possibilities related to the use of child care provider lists. It also addresses the process of acquiring accurate provider counts, presenting an example from the NSECE. Selected analysis ideas are included.”

**Datta, A. R. (2020).** *Getting to know the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)* [Webinar]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143766>

“The Getting To Know the 2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) webinar provides an overview of this survey, including its sample design, questionnaire content, its potential for comparisons over time and geography, and its data files for public use.”

**Datta, A. R., & Bowman, M. (2010).** *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Cognitive interview findings report for center-based provider questionnaire.* NORC.

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18865>

“This report contains a discussion of the methodology of the design and content of a questionnaire to survey center-based child care providers for their participation in the assessment of the national supply of child care.”

**Datta, A. R., & Connelly, J. (2015).** *Digging into the NSECE: Exploiting the potential of the household and provider data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Type of care in the NSECE.* Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31239>

“This video presentation discusses definitions of specific types of care, along with samples used in the NSECE.”

**Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., & Witte, A. D. (2010).** *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Final recommendations for the center-based provider questionnaire.* NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18903>

“This report contains recommendations for the improvement of the design and content of a survey instrument for the assessment of the national supply of center-based child care services.”

**Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., & Witte, A. D. (2010).** *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Final recommendations for the home-based provider questionnaire.* NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18905>

“This report contains recommendations for the improvement of the design and content of a survey instrument for the assessment of the national supply of home-based child care services, including comments of changes to the actual survey.”

**Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., & Yan, T. (2010).** *Design phase of the National Study of Early Child Care Supply and Demand (NSECCSD): Final report.* NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18826>

“This report contains a description of a proposed design for a study on the functions of supply and demand in the child care market, including a discussion of public policy questions addressed through the implementation of the proposed study.”

**Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., Yan, T., & Bowman, M. (2010).** *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Final recommendations for the demand questionnaire.* NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18906>

“This report contains recommendations for the improvement of the design and content of a survey instrument for the assessment of the parents’ demand for child care services across the United States.”

**Datta, A. R., & Milesi, C. (2017).** *NSECE webinar: Schedules of work and child care in the NSECE [Webinar].* Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34156>

“This webinar examines key components of the NSECE Household Survey, with particular focus on adult calendar data content. It considers research issues regarding parental employment that may be addressed using household calendar data. Examples of basic constructs derived from the adult calendar are presented.”

**Datta, A. R., & Milesi, C. (2017). *NSECE webinar: Schedules of work and child care in the NSECE* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34157>**

“This PowerPoint presentation accompanies a webinar that examines key components of the NSECE Household Survey, with particular focus on adult calendar data content. It considers research issues regarding parental employment that may be addressed using household calendar data. Examples of basic constructs derived from the adult calendar are presented.”

**Datta, A. R., Milesi, C., & Gelatt, J. (2018). *NSECE webinar: Levels of geography in the NSECE* [Webinar]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35733>**

“The NSECE data files include extensive geographic data about sampled providers and households, the communities in which those providers and households are located, and other characteristics such as distances. The goal of this webinar is to support current and potential users of the NSECE data. It covers what geographic information NSECE has available in different files (for example, public and restricted-use files), possible uses of geographic data to support different types of analyses, illustrations of sample sizes for state-specific analyses and other levels of geography, how reporting requirements minimize disclosure risk (in other words, analysis can be conducted at the state level, but only reported at the national level), and what other resources are available for users interested in using geographic information in the NSECE.”

**Datta, A. R., Gelatt, J., & Sandstrom, H. (2018). *NSECE webinar: Levels of geography in the NSECE* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35735>**

“The NSECE data files include extensive geographic data about sampled providers and households, the communities in which those providers and households are located, and other characteristics such as distances. The goal of this webinar is to support current and potential users of the NSECE data. It covers what geographic information NSECE has available in different files (for example, public and restricted-use files), possible uses of geographic data to support different types of analyses, illustrations of sample sizes for state-specific analyses and other levels of geography, how reporting requirements minimize disclosure risk (in other words, analysis can be conducted at the state level, but only reported at the national level), and what other resources are available for users interested in using geographic information in the NSECE.”

**Datta, A. R., Whitebook, M., Edwards, B., & Greenberg, E. (2020). *NSECE guest webinar: Using the 2012 NSECE to learn about ECE providers* [Webinar]. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37723>**

“This 45-minute webinar features two guest research teams: Marcy Whitebook and Bethany Edwards from The Center for the Study of Child Care Employment at the University of California, Berkeley, present findings from *California’s ECE Workforce: What We Know Now and the Data Deficit That Remains* and *The Early Childhood Workforce Index 2018*. Erica Greenberg from The Urban Institute presents her findings from *Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality?* and *Segregated from the Start.*”

**Datta, A. R., Whitebook, M., Edwards, B., & Greenberg, E. (2020). *NSECE guest webinar: Using the 2012 NSECE to learn about ECE providers* [PowerPoint slides]. Child Care & Early Research Connections.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37724>

“This PowerPoint presentation accompanies a 45-minute webinar that features two guest research teams: Marcy Whitebook and Bethany Edwards from The Center for the Study of Child Care Employment (CSCCE) at the University of California, Berkeley, present findings from *California’s ECE Workforce: What We Know Now and the Data Deficit That Remains* and *The Early Childhood Workforce Index 2018*. Erica Greenberg from The Urban Institute presents her findings from “Are Higher Subsidy Payment Rates and Provider-Friendly Payment Policies Associated with Child Care Quality? and Segregated from the Start.”

**Milesi, C. (2015). *Digging into the NSECE: Exploiting the potential of the household and provider data from the National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Age of child in the NSECE*. Child Care & Early Education Research Connections.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31240>

“This video presentation examines both definition distinctions concerning age of child and types of care used in the NSECE.”

**Milesi, C. & Park, J. E. (2021). *Comparing NSECE sample types: Center-based workforce and listed home-based providers* [Webinar]. (Making Comparisons Webinars, Video 3). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143836>

“This webinar outlines and demonstrates a five-step process for the comparison of characteristics of the workforce between home-based and center-based care providers surveyed in the 2019 NSECE. The examples used in this demonstration compare the levels of education and years of experience of center-based and home-based child care providers.”

**Milesi, C. & Park, J.E. (2021). *Comparing subgroups: Unlisted home-based providers by payment type (paid vs. unpaid)* [Webinar]. (Making Comparisons Webinars, Video 2). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143831>

“This webinar outlines and demonstrates a suggested strategy for reducing bias when comparing subgroups as part of an analysis of 2019 NSECE data. The presenters describe specific complexities of NSECE data and statistical analysis tools used to reduce complexity-related bias. The example compared the average number of children cared for by paid versus unpaid home-based unlisted child care providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2013). *National Survey of Early Care and Education: Summary data collection and sampling methodology* (NSECE Research Brief, OPRE Report 2013-46). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/26515>**

“This report contains an overview of the sample design and data collection of the NSECE and a study of the availability and utilization of ECE in the United States.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE Downloadable Presentation I: Overall study design and sampling approach* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30572>**

“This tutorial covers the overall study design and sampling approach of the NSECE. Discussion focuses on the sample sources and the four NSECE surveys at the foundation of the NSECE data collection design, including topics such as sample sizes, the use of provider clusters, geographic characteristics available, and the importance of weighting due to the study design.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE downloadable presentation II: Data files and documentation* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30571>**

“The slides of this presentation provide information on the structure and use of the data set of the NSECE. The data files and documentation are described in detail in this tutorial. The slides describe the type of variables available in each of the five categories of data files the NSECE offer: Quick Tabulation, Public Use, Level 1 Restricted-Use Questionnaire, Level 2 Restricted-Use Geographic, and Level 3 Restricted-Use Identifying. In addition, types of documentation and the information they contain is described.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE downloadable presentation III: Center-based provider survey* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30573>**

“This presentation focuses on the Center-Based Provider Survey used in the NSECE. Examined aspects of the survey include data collection, topics covered by the survey, provider data, survey respondents, levels of observation, and key differences across the categories of survey files.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE downloadable presentation IV: Workforce survey* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30574>**

“This presentation focuses on the Workforce Survey used in the NSECE. Examined aspects of the survey include data collection, topics covered by the survey, workforce data, survey respondents, levels of observation, and key differences across the categories of survey files.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE downloadable presentation V: Home-based provider survey* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30575>**

“This presentation focuses on the Home-Based Provider Survey used in the NSECE. Examined aspects of the survey include sample sources and classification, data collection, topics covered by the survey, provider data, survey respondents, levels of observation, and key differences across the categories of survey files.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2015). *NSECE downloadable presentation VI: Household survey* [PowerPoint slides]. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.**

<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/30576>

“This presentation focuses on the Household Survey used in the NSECE. Examined aspects of the survey include data collection, topics covered by the survey, household data, survey respondents, levels of observation, and key differences across the categories of survey files.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2018). *Constructing center-based cluster-level metrics to use in household level analysis: A tutorial for NSECE data*. NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36082>**

“This tutorial illustrates the process of creating cluster-level aggregates using center-based providers and how these metrics are integrated into the NSECE Household dataset for analysis.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2020). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook – Workforce*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143806>

“This documentation has been developed as a companion to the 2019 NSECE workforce quick tabulation data file. Workforce respondents are lead teachers, teachers, instructors, assistants or aides assigned to classrooms in center-based providers where they work with children ages 5 and under, not yet in kindergarten. Section 1.A provides additional detail on the workforce survey and its sampling methods. This manual has been designed to introduce users to the NSECE and the data available for analysis. It also offers an overview of key concepts important for the analysis of the workforce survey data. Section 2 of this manual contains detailed codebook entries for each variable contained in the 2019 NSECE workforce quick tabulation data file.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook – Center-based provider*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation.**

<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143811>

“This manual and codebook has been developed as a companion to the 2019 NSECE Center-based Quick Tabulation Data File. Section 1.A provides additional detail on the center-based survey and the study’s sampling methods. This manual has been designed to introduce users to the NSECE and the data available for analysis. It also offers an overview of key concepts important for the analysis of the center-based provider data. Section 2 of this manual contains detailed codebook entries for each variable contained in the 2019 NSECE Center-based Provider Quick Tabulation data file.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook – Home-based provider – Listed*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143821>**

“This manual and codebook has been developed as a companion to the 2019 NSECE home-based provider quick tabulation data file for listed providers. Listed home-based providers are those who

were identified through and sampled from state-level or national administrative lists. There is a separate quick tabulation data file for unlisted providers who were identified through household screening. Section 1.A provides additional detail on the home-based provider survey and its sampling methods. This manual has been designed to introduce users to the NSECE and the data available for analysis. It also offers an overview of key concepts important for the analysis of the listed home-based provider data. Section 2 of this manual contains detailed codebook entries for each variable contained in the 2019 NSECE home-based provider quick tabulation data file for listed providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook – Home-based provider – Unlisted*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143816>**

“This manual and codebook has been developed as a companion to the 2019 NSECE home-based provider quick tabulation data file for unlisted providers. Unlisted home-based providers were identified through household screening. There is a separate quick tabulation data file for listed providers which are those who were identified through and sampled from state-level or national administrative lists. Section 1.A provides additional detail on the home-based provider survey and its sampling methods. This manual has been designed to introduce users to the NSECE and the data available for analysis. It also offers an overview of key concepts important for the analysis of the unlisted home-based provider data. Section 2 of this manual contains detailed codebook entries for each variable contained in the 2019 NSECE home-based provider quick tabulation data file for unlisted providers.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2022). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education data collection and sampling methodology report (OPRE Report #2022-118)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/138701>**

“This report provides information about the 2019 NSECE sample design, key elements of its four component surveys, and other unique survey features, and explains how it compares to the 2012 NSECE. A detailed appendix provides information about the data collection methodologies used in the 2019 NSECE.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2022). *National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) level-2 restricted-use (L2) data application and information packet (OPRE Report #2022-53)*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/135181>**

“This document applies to analyses using L2 data from the 2012 NSECE, the 2019 NSECE, and both the 2012 and 2019 NSECE. It describes the four phases involved in using the L2 data, from applying for access to the data to extracting your research results.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team (2022).** *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook: Home-based provider – Listed addendum.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143771>

“The Home-based Listed Provider Quick Tabulation File released in early 2021 contained errors in two variables: HB9\_ENRL\_NHASIAN\_NUMCH and HB9\_ENRL\_NHOTHER\_NUMCH. The variable names for this pair of variables were swapped in earlier versions of the data files. The variable names have been corrected; none of the underlying values have changed. This document contains documentation for the corrected versions of these variables, which are included in the addendum data file.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2022).** *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) quick tabulation manual and codebook: Home-based provider – Unlisted addendum.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143776>

“The Home-based Unlisted Provider Quick Tabulation File released in early 2021 contained errors in two variables: HB9\_ENRL\_NHASIAN\_NUMCH and HB9\_ENRL\_NHOTHER\_NUMCH. The variable names for this pair of variables were swapped in earlier versions of the data files. The variable names have been corrected; none of the underlying values have changed. This document contains documentation for the corrected versions of these variables, which are included in the addendum data file.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2022).** *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) user's guide — Center-based provider (OPRE Report #2022-205).* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143761>

“This guide is a tool for users of the 2019 NSECE center-based provider public-use data files. NSECE sample design and data collection methods are summarized, along with documentation and data file conventions. It includes guidance on analyzing center-based provider survey data, sampling weights, variance estimation, and an explanation of study variables.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021).** *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) user's guide — Home-based provider (OPRE Report #-2021 [forthcoming]).* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. [https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/files/cfda/nsece-resources/documentation/2019/UsersGuides/37941-0007-User\\_guide.pdf](https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/files/cfda/nsece-resources/documentation/2019/UsersGuides/37941-0007-User_guide.pdf)

“This guide is a tool for users of the 2019 NSECE home-based provider public-use data files. NSECE sample design and data collection methods are summarized, along with documentation and data file conventions. It includes guidance on analyzing home-based provider survey data, sampling weights, variance estimation, and an explanation of study variables.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2022). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) user's guide — Home-based provider addendum* (OPRE Report #-2021 [forthcoming]). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143781>**

“This is an addendum to the guide for users of the 2019 NSECE home-based provider public-use data file. This addendum documents the corrected version of eight variables that contained errors in the original release.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) user's guide — Household* (OPRE Report #-2021 [forthcoming]). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143756>**

“This guide is a tool for users of the 2019 NSECE household public-use data files. NSECE sample design and data collection methods are summarized, along with documentation and data file conventions. It includes guidance on analyzing household survey data, sampling weights, variance estimation, and an explanation of study variables.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE) user's guide - Workforce* (OPRE Report #2022-34). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/141361>**

“This guide is a tool for users of the 2019 NSECE workforce public-use data files. NSECE sample design and data collection methods are summarized, along with documentation and data file conventions. It includes guidance on analyzing workforce survey data, sampling weights, variance estimation, and an explanation of study variables.”

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team, Gibbs, C., & Goerge, R. (2016). *NSECE documentation of 2011 state-level variation in lists of providers of early care and education: NSECE technical resource*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/32211>**

“The NSECE sample design called for construction of a national sampling frame of ECE center-based and home-based providers. The construction involved both national lists of ECE providers as well as lists collected from state agencies from all 50 states and the District of Columbia. This document specifies the lists, with their definitions, that were collected and incorporated into the NSECE provider sampling frame. Although there is some modest variation across lists for center-based ECE providers, the variation for home-based ECE lists is much greater. The definitions of home-based provider lists are also relevant because of the treatment of home-based ECE within the NSECE design. The NSECE Home-based Provider Survey supports estimates for two home-based provider populations: listed and unlisted. Listed providers are those who appeared on state and national lists gathered to build the national provider sampling frame. The project team collected all home-based provider lists maintained by each state (and the District of Columbia), but the types of lists maintained by each state differed. Some differences in states' list-keeping are due to definitional differences, for example, whether there is a 'licensed' or 'registered' status for home-based providers within the state, and some are due to differences in listing policies, for example,

whether or not the state maintains lists of exempt providers or those who are receiving CCDF subsidies but have no other interaction with the child care licensing system in that state. This document enumerates for each state its provider definitions and the lists it maintained at the time that the NSECE lists were collected from that state in the spring or summer of 2011. All enumerated lists were included in the NSECE provider frame and home-based providers sampled from those lists are classified as 'listed' in the NSECE Home-based Provider data."

**NORC. (2016). *Design-corrected variance estimation of NSECE statistics.***  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31739>

"This brief describes the sampling techniques used in the collection of statistical data for the NSECE and provides information regarding the proper use of weighting to obtain valid inferences for statistics of interest, such as percentages, means, totals, ratios, and regression coefficients. Two calculation examples are provided in Stata: a calculation of the total number of children enrolled by single age category, and a calculation of percent of programs by single age category."

**NORC. (2018). *PSU and cluster weights user guide.***  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/34792>

"This document is relevant for researchers interested in using the NSECE to carry out analysis of local-level interaction of supply and demand of ECE. This user guide briefly describes key elements of the NSECE sampling methodology, including Primary Sampling Units (PSU) for the household and listed center-based and home-based providers, Secondary Sampling Units (SSU) for the household sample, and the Provider Cluster. The user guide explains how to create PSU- and cluster-level aggregate measures and how to appropriately use PSU and Provider Cluster Weights to generate estimates for subnational geographic areas."

**NORC. (2018). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education: State supplement opportunities.*** <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/36603>

"First, this brochure describes the potential uses of 2019 NSECE data in state-specific and multistate research. Next, it presents a menu of options for states wishing to provide supplemental funding for additional data collection. Lastly, it presents five tables in which states are categorized into sample-size categories of the providers and households in the 2012 NSECE."

**Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. (2009). *Design phase: National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand--2010: Literature review and summary.*** U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18828>

"A review of studies on child care supply and demand for children ages birth through 13 conducted at the local, state, and national levels, and a discussion of the changing labor market and demographics of child care."

**Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. (2009). *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Feasibility test report.*** U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. NORC.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18869>

"This report contains a description of the method used to evaluate the feasibility of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand, including an assessment of the study to answer its research questions while remaining within budget constraints."

**Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. (2021). *Comparing the 2012 and 2019 NSECE: Listed home-based providers* [Making Comparisons Webinars, Video 1]. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143826>**

“Making comparisons between the variables as measured in the 2012 and 2019 NSECEs presents specific bias risks because the two datasets are not longitudinal. This webinar provides a detailed strategy for researchers who are analyzing both 2012 and 2019 NSECE datasets. A four-step process designed to reduce bias is demonstrated using an example of the estimated number of children served by home-based providers in the two datasets.”

**Paschall, K. W., Tout, K., & Fojut, J. (2022). *Measuring access to early care and education (ECE) with the 2019 NSECE* (OPRE Report #2022-234). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143616>**

“This resource provides guidance to data users interested in using the 2019 NSECE to examine questions related to ECE access using a multidimensional, family-centric definition of access. Access to ECE is best understood as a multidimensional construct requiring the consideration of multiple family and provider characteristics simultaneously.”

**Wolter, K., Bowman, M., Datta, A. R., Goerge, R., Welch, Jr., V., & Yan, T. (2010). *Design phase of the National Study of Child Care Supply and Demand (NSCCSD): Revised sampling report and addendum*. NORC. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/18863>**

“This report contains a presentation of alternate designs of sampling methods for achieving a representative number of sample respondents for the assessment of the supply and demand of the national child care market.”

## Instruments

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2019). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Center-based provider questionnaire*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37949>**

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2019). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Classroom staff (workforce) questionnaire*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37946>**

**National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2019). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Home-based provider questionnaire*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37947>**

- National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2019). *2019 National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE): Household questionnaire*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.  
<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/37948>
- National Survey of Early Care and Education Project Team. (2021). *Fall 2021 center-based provider worksheet*. NORC.  
<https://researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/143291>
- NORC. (2011). *National Survey of Early Care & Education: Center-based provider questionnaire* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/24927>
- NORC. (2011). *National Survey of Early Care & Education: Center-based provider screener* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/24928>
- NORC. (2011). *National Survey of Early Care & Education: Home-based provider questionnaire* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/24929>
- NORC. (2011). *National Survey of Early Care & Education: Household questionnaire* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/24931>
- NORC. (2011). *National Survey of Early Care & Education: Household screener* (Rev. ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation.  
<https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/24930>

This project is supported by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of a 5-year financial assistance award (Grant No. 90YE250) totaling \$3,953,308, with 100 percent funded by ACF/HHS. The contents are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement by, ACF/HHS or the U.S. Government. For more information, please visit the ACF website at [Administrative and National Policy Requirements](#).

