

## APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

### Child Care Definitions

#### Child care provider

The person or group who provides the primary source of care for a child while the mother is engaged in work or school activities. This does not include secondary forms of care used to supplement the primary care arrangement or care provided during emergencies or for short periods of time when the mother is not working (e.g., to allow the mother to run an errand or go out for entertainment).

#### Supplemental child care

A secondary form of care used to supplement the child's primary child care arrangement. An example may include having the child's grandmother care for the child after Head Start classes end. Although many families must rely on multiple child care arrangements to cover the hours when the mother is working, most studies only report on primary child care arrangements and exclude supplemental care.

#### Categories of child care

This report focuses on families who use some type of nonparental child care on a regular basis. Where studies include parental care (i.e., care provided by the child's mother or father), these data were extracted from the statistics. If a report lacked sufficient information to reanalyze the data solely on non-parental arrangements, it is noted in the abstract. For school-age children, we tracked child care arrangements provided before and after school hours. If a study indicated that it included time spent in school as a type of child care arrangement (e.g., categorized under organized child care facility or other type of provider), this is indicated in the individual abstract.

#### Informal child care

For this report, informal child care may include care provided by relatives, in-home care providers, and unregulated family child care homes. Where possible, differences in these three types of care are indicated in the abstracts. Abstracts may include findings on only one or two types of informal child care and, thus, definitions of informal child care may vary. Each abstract includes the definition of informal child care used in that individual study.

#### Relative care

Care provided by extended family members (e.g., grandparents, aunts, and uncles) or "kin" either within the child's home or within the relative's home. Although this type of care may be regulated, this is rarely the case. Unless indicated, all care provided by extended family members is included in this report's definition of "informal child care."

#### Sibling care

Depending on the report, cases where a child is cared for by an older sibling may be included under "relative care," categorized with parents under care by immediate family members, or included under "other" forms of child care. If this information was given, it is reported in the individual abstracts.

#### In-home care

Care by nonrelatives who provide care in the child's home (e.g., nannies, *au pairs*, and babysitters) during the hours in which the mother works. Note that in-home providers may bring their own children along; they may also be shared by two families. Care provided in the provider's home, however, is considered family child care. In-home care is rarely regulated and, unless indicated, all in-home care arrangements in this report are considered informal.

#### Family Child Care Home

A private home, which is not the child's, where an adult cares for children on a regular basis. In most cases, the care is provided by nonrelatives; unless indicated, all relative providers are categorized under relative care. Family child care can be regulated or unregulated. Regulated providers are those who have become regulated by their state's child care licensing system. Where possible, data on regulated versus unregulated family child care homes are separated. Where regulatory status is not indicated, all family child care homes are considered regulated family child care homes, and thus "formal" providers.

#### Care by Kith

Care provided by a friend or neighbor of the child's parents. Where regulatory status and location of services is indicated, these providers are categorized under either regulated or unregulated family child care or in-home care. Otherwise, "kith" providers are considered unregulated family child care homes.

#### Organized Child Care Facility

Established center-based programs where children are cared for in a group away from their homes for all or part of the day. There are many different kinds of center-based care, including nursery schools and preschools. Although there are some exceptions, most center-based child care facilities are regulated and, unless indicated, all center-based care in this report are considered formal child care settings.

#### Self-care

This refers to cases where a child cares for him/herself. Where this type of care was included in a study sample, it was generally grouped with other types of care, making it difficult to either include it as a type of informal child care or exclude it from the sample being analyzed. Most reports did not indicate which type of care self-care was categorized under. However, unless indicated, this type of care falls under the category of "other type of provider."

## **Program/Data Source Definitions**

### **AFDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children**

The former welfare program established by the Social Security Act of 1935 that was replaced in 1996 by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. AFDC provided a cash grant to eligible children who had been deprived of parental support or care because their mother and/or father was either continuously absent from the home, incapacitated, unemployed, or deceased. Some two-parent households also received benefits. Individual states defined need, set benefit levels, established income and resource limits within federal guidelines, and supervised program administration.

### **CCR&R—Child Care Resource & Referral Agencies**

Local and statewide independent agencies that provide guidance and referrals for parents seeking child care, maintain data sets that describe the supply of care in their communities, and provide training and support to child care providers. Some agencies also administer federal child care subsidies.

### **CWEP—Community Work Experience Program**

A work activity for parents or other caretaker relatives age 18 and older administered by individual states. CWEP sponsors are federal, local, state, and nonprofit agencies. Eligible clients are assisted in finding agencies in which to participate. (Participating hours are determined by the amount of food stamps and cash assistance received, divided by the federal minimum wage, but may not exceed 40 hours per week or 12 consecutive months.)

### **Food Stamps**

Federal program that provides coupons to eligible low-income families with which to buy food supplies. To qualify, a family must have a gross income at or below 130 percent of the poverty level and a net income at or below the poverty level.

### **GA—General Assistance**

A state-funded cash assistance program that provided benefits to nonelderly impoverished adults without dependent children.

### **National Child Care Consumer Study**

A survey of the nation's children age 13 or younger and their child care arrangements, sponsored by the Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration of the Children's Bureau in 1975. The survey employed a strict definition of the term "day care center" and excluded arrangements where children were in day care centers part of the day and in family day care for the remainder.

### **NCCS—National Child Care Survey**

A nationally representative sample of U.S. families

with children under age 13 that were interviewed by telephone in 1990, the NCCS was co-funded by the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the Head Start Bureau of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. It was designed to provide scientifically valid, reliable, and useful information on current use of child care and early childhood programs. Questions covered primary child care arrangement, parental expenditures for child care, searching for and selecting child care, parental perceptions of care, previous care arrangements, employers and child care, and parents' opinions of federal child care policy.

### **NHES—National Household Education Survey**

A data collection system of the National Center for Education Statistics since 1991, NHES provides descriptive data on the educational activities of the U.S. population by conducting repeated measurements of the same phenomena. Survey topics include: adult education and lifelong learning, civic involvement, early childhood education and school readiness, household library use, parent involvement in education, school safety, and discipline. Early childhood education and school readiness was a particular topic for data collection in 1995. The spring 2001 NHES will include early childhood program participation and before- and after-school programs and activities, a new survey.

### **NLSY—National Longitudinal Survey of Youth**

A part of a series of surveys exploring the labor market experiences of several population groups facing employment problems of particular concern to policymakers sponsored by the U.S. Departments of Labor and Defense and various National Institutes of Health, the NLSY samples approximately 5,800 females and an equal number of males, ages 14-21. Blacks, Hispanics, and disadvantaged youth are oversampled to facilitate analysis of youth in these groups. Questions focus on school-to-work transition, occupational choice, earnings, adaptation to the world of work, employment, work-family issues, substance use, illegal activities, family planning, child care, and maternal and child health.

### **NSAF—National Survey of America's Families**

NSAF offers a comprehensive look at the well-being of adults and children in 13 states: Alabama, California, Colorado, Florida, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. It is representative of the noninstitutionalized, civilian population of persons under age 65 in the nation as a whole and in these states. The findings represent a wide range of fiscal capacity, child well-being, and government policies. Initial results are available as Snapshots of America's Families. Westat conducts the survey, under subcontract with the Urban Institute; Child Trends designed the ways of measuring changes in child well-being.

### **NSFH—National Survey of Families & Households**

A national cross-sectional survey with over 13,000 respondents, the NSFH was funded by the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and conducted by the University of Wisconsin from 1987 to 1989. Questions covered demographic data, psychological well-being, satisfaction with work, marriage, and parenthood, health, access to and receipt of social services, and alcohol and drug abuse.

### **SIPP—Survey of Income & Program Participation**

Conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, SIPP provides demographic and economic information on the status of individuals and families in the U.S. to give a better understanding of the distribution of wealth, income, and poverty, and of the effects of federal and state programs on the well-being of individuals and families. Over 12,000 participating households are interviewed once every four months over a two and a half year period; individuals are followed even if they leave the household. Topics include employment, child care, child support, health status, fertility, and public assistance receipt.

### **TANF—Temporary Assistance to Needy Families**

The block grant to the states mandating work or education and training activities for welfare recipients created by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act in 1996 to replace AFDC, Emergency Assistance, GA, and JOBS programs. Under TANF, cash benefits are limited to five years over a lifetime and violation of program rules set by states can result in sanctions and terminations. TANF was one of two block grants created by P.L. 103-193 and eliminates the federal entitlement to welfare benefits for needy families.

### **WIC—Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children**

Provides nutritional screening and food assistance to low-income pregnant and postpartum women and their infants and children up to age five. Participants have incomes at or below 185 percent of the federal poverty line and are nutritionally at risk.

### **WIN**

Work Incentive (WIN) programs for AFDC recipients supervised by the U.S. Department of Labor until 1988 when state welfare agencies began their Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) programs. Both programs were superseded by TANF in 1996.

## **APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY**

When comparing usage data from these various data sets it is important to keep in mind that, in addition to differences in geographical locations and data collection time points, varying target populations (e.g., low-income, young mothers, employed mothers, AFDC mothers, etc.) and other methodological differences may have influenced their results. So that differences between research studies could be reviewed, the abstracts in this report include information on study design. Following is a list of some methodological differences that are worth considering. Please note that we are not saying that these methodological decisions are wrong; they may still yield important findings, but they should be considered when comparing these data to data collected in other reports.

- Although most reports focus on the primary child care arrangement of one focal child in the respondent's household, this was not always the case. For some studies, such as the NHES, information was collected on all child care arrangements used by up to two children in each household. No consideration was given to the number of hours a child spent in one setting as compared to others; since a child may have been counted under several care arrangements if time was spent in more than one setting on a regular basis, the percentages summed to over 100 percent. The definition of child care used by each report is included in the study design section of each abstracts.
- Some categories of child care vary in definition from one report to the next. For this report, attempts were made to categorize all types of care into six groups: relative care, in-home care, unregulated family child care, regulated family child care, center care, and other care arrangements. However, data presented in these reports did not always make this possible. Most importantly, few reports broke down family child care by regulatory status, and, thus, this group was generally combined. Also, some reports did not include an "other" care category, choosing instead to fit all types of care within four main child care types. Reports that did include an "other" care category did not always use the same definition. Other care usually included lessons, sports, and clubs, but, in some reports, self-care, sibling care, and/or before- and after-school programs were also included in this category; in other reports, these forms of care were merged within other categories (e.g., sibling care may have been added to relative care, and before- and after-school programs may have been included with center-based care). Where possible, these types of care were recategorized to maintain standardized definitions, although, for many reports, this was not possible. All abstracts include a list of types of care considered in the report

being summarized and, where the report suggests that definitions of care types vary from those mentioned in the glossary of this report, footnotes were added.

- Definitions of informal care vary from one report to the next. Most reports included both relative and in-home care. However, few reports made it possible to separate nonregulated family child care from regulated family child care, and, thus, family child care was generally not considered part of the informal care universe. Other reports, such as Folk (1994), grouped all nonrelative care together, considering both in-home care and all family child care homes formal “market” care.
- Although, as mentioned, attempts were made to exclude parental care from the denominator of all usage statistics, it was not always possible to do this based solely on the data presented in the summarized reports.
- Differences in the states where data were collected should also be considered, given that states’ definitions of regulation requirements and licensure exemptions often vary. Also, some states further classify unlicensed homes with such titles as “certified,” “registered” or “approved.”
- Age group definitions were not always consistent. For example, while most reports that targeted children who had not yet entered school limited their sample to children under age five, the NHES sampled all children under age six who had not yet entered school. Also, some studies that included samples of school-age children sampled all children under age 14 while others sampled children under age 15.
- Most reports that included data on school-age children limited child care arrangements to those provided before and after school hours. However, some included time spent in school as a type of child care arrangement (e.g., categorized under organized child care facility or other type of provider). Where this occurred, it is indicated in the report abstract.
- As always, variations in sample design, mode of data collection, and unit of analysis should also be considered.

## APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- Alcalay, R. (1996). Child care practices of Mexican-American working mothers: A pilot study. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*, 16(2), 155–174.
- Bayder, N. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1991). Effects of maternal employment and child-care arrangements on preschoolers’ cognitive and behavioral outcomes: Evidence from the children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(6), 932–945.
- Child Care Law Center (1995). Child care as welfare prevention. *Labor News*, (Summer).
- Clark-Stewart, K. A. (1991). A home is not a school: The effects of child care on children’s development. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(2), 105–123.
- Cohen, A. (1996). *Regulation-exempt family child care in the context of publicly subsidized child care: An exploratory study*. San Francisco, CA: Child Care Law Center.
- Dombro, A. L. & Modigliani, K. (1995). *Family child care providers speak about training, trainers, accreditation, and professionalism: Findings from a study of family-to-family graduates*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.
- Fischer, J. L. (1989). Family day care: Factors influencing the quality of caring practices. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Fosburg, S. (1981). *Family day care in the United States. Summary of findings* (DHHS Publication No. 80-30282). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Fosburg, S. (1982). Family day care: The role of the surrogated mothers. In L. Laosa & I. Sigel (Eds.), *Families as learning environments for children*. New York, NY: Plenum, 223–260.
- Fuller, B.; Holloway, S. D.; & Liang, X. (1996). Family selection of child care centers: The influence of household support, ethnicity, and parental practice. *Child Development*, 67(6), 3320–3337.
- Goelman, H. & Pence, A. (1987). Some aspects of the relationship between family structure and child language in three types of day care. In D. Peters & S. Kontos (Eds.), *Annual advances in applied developmental psychology*, Vol. II. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 129–146.
- Hofferth, S.L. (1995). Caring for children at the poverty line. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 17(1–2), 1–31.
- Hofferth, S. L.; Chaplin, D. D.; Wissoker, D. A.; & Robins, R. K. (1996). Choice characteristics and parents’ child care decisions. *Rationality and Society*, 8(4), 453–495.

- Hofferth, S. L. & Phillips, D. A. (1987). Child care in the United States, 1970 to 1995. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 49(3), 559–571.
- Howes, C. & Smith, E. (1994). Effects of typical child care on children in poverty. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles. Paper presented at research briefing, Board on Children and Families, December 5–6.
- Hurst, M. & Zambrana, R. E. (1982). Child care and working mothers in Puerto Rican families. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 461(May), 113–124.
- Kisker, E. E.; Maynard, R.; Gordon, A.; & Strain, M. (1989). *The child care challenge: What parents need and what is available in three metropolitan areas*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Kisker, E. E. & Silverberg, M. (1991). Child care utilization by disadvantaged teenage mothers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47(2), 159–78.
- Kontos, S.; Howes, C.; Shinn, M.; & Galinsky, E. (1995). *Quality in family child care and relative care*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Kontos, S.; Howes, C.; Shinn, M.; & Galinsky, E. (1997). Children's experiences in family child care and relative care as a function of family income and ethnicity. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43(3), 386–403.
- Lesser, D. (2000). A vital child care quality initiative: Addressing the needs of license-exempt home providers. *Clearinghouse Review*, 34(7–8), 446–458.
- Malaske-Samu, K. (1996). *Highlights from the 1996 license-exempt child care provider survey*. Los Angeles, CA: County of Los Angeles Department of Human Services.
- Miller, B. M.; O'Connor, S.; Sirignano, S. W.; & Joshi, P. (1996). *I wish the kids didn't watch so much TV: Out-of-school time in three low income communities*. Boston, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, School-Age Child Care Project.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1997). Child care during the first year of life. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 43(3), 340–360.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1997). Familial factors associated with characteristics of nonmaternal care for infants. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(3), 389–408.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1995). Child care and child development. The NICHD Study of Early Child Care. In S. L. Friedman & H. C. Haywood (Eds.), *Developmental follow-up: Concepts, domains, and methods*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1993). Child care debate: Transformed or distorted? *American Psychologist*, 48(6), 692–693.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1996). Child care and the family: An opportunity to study development in context. *Newsletter of the Society for Research in Child Development*, (Spring), 4–7.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1997). Infant child care and attachment security: Results of the NICHD Study of Early Child Care. *Child Development*, 68(5), 860–879.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1998). When child-care classrooms meet recommended guidelines for quality. Presentation for the National Association for the Education of Young People, November.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (in press). Relations between family predictors and child outcomes: are they weaker for children in child care. *Developmental Psychology*.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (in press). Infant child care and qualities of mother-infant interaction at 6 and 15 months. *Developmental Psychology*.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (submitted for publication). Child care and mother-child interaction at 24 and 36 months. *Developmental Psychology*.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (in press). Early child care and self-control, compliance and problem behavior. *Child Development*.
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (1997). The relationship of child care to cognitive and language development. Presented at the Society for Research in Child Development meeting, April 3–6, Washington, DC.
- Pawasarat, J. & Quinn, L. (1998). *Removing barriers to employment: The child care-jobs equation*. Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin, University Outreach, Employment, and Training Institute.
- Phillips, D. A. (1994). With a little help: Children in poverty and child care. In A. C. Huston (Ed.), *Children in poverty*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 158–189.
- Porter, T. (1999). Infants and toddlers in kith and kin care: Findings from the Informal Care Project. *Zero to Three: Bulletin of Zero to Three: National Center for Infants, Toddlers, and Families*, 19(6), 27–35.
- Porter, T. (1991). *Just like any parent: The child care choices of welfare mothers in New Jersey*. New York, NY: Bank Street College of Education, Center for Family Support, Division of Continuing Education.
- Posner, J. K. & Vandell, D. L. (1994). Low-income children's after-school care: Are there beneficial effects of after-school programs? *Child Development*, 65(2), 440–456.
- Schweikers, M. (1997). *Legal unlicensed child care: A report on the use of informal and relative care in Olmsted County, Minnesota*. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota, Master of Social Work Program, Plan B Research Project.
- Shoffner, S. (1986). Child care in rural areas: Needs, attitudes and preferences. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(5), 521–539.

Smith, A. P. & Endsley, R. C. (1995). Comparison of accredited and non-accredited family child care programs on program quality, provider professionalism, and family support. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 25(6), 353–378.

Stegelin, D. A. (1990). Kentucky's statewide parent survey on child care needs and resources: Implications for policy and research. *Dimensions*, 18(2), 9–12.

Unco, Inc. (1975). *National Childcare Consumer Study: 1975. Volumes 1–4*. Washington, DC: Unco, Inc.

Wheelock College (Forthcoming). *Economics of Family Child Care Study*. Boston, MA: Wheelock College.

Whitebook, M.; Howes, C.; & Phillips, D. (1989). *Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America: Final report, National Child Care Staffing Study*. Berkeley, CA: Child Care Employee Project. (Executive summary also available.)

### Overviews of Multiple Research Studies

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1999). *Child care you can count on*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Beach, B. A. (1995). *Perspectives on rural child care*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Chilman, C. S. (1991). Working poor families: Trends, causes, effects, and suggested policies. *Family Relations*, 40, 191–198.

Chung, An-Me & Stoney, L. (1997). Using research to improve child care for low-income families. Prepared for the Child Care Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Collins, A. & Carlson, B. (1998). *Child care by kith and kin: Supporting family, friends, and neighbors caring for children*. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health.

Hayes, C. D.; Palmer, J.; & Zaslow, M. (Eds.). (1990). *Who cares for America's children? Child care policy for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 523).

Larner, M. & Phillips, D. (1994). Defining and valuing quality as a parent. In P. Moss & A. Pence (Eds.), *Valuing quality in early childhood services: New approaches to defining quality*. London, England: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Love, J. M.; Schochet, P. Z.; & Meckstroth, A. L. (1996). Are they in any real danger? What research does—and doesn't—tell us about child care quality and children's well-being. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

National Center for Children in Poverty. (1996). *Child care provided by kith and kin: Thinking "out of the box."* New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health. (Summary of key themes from October 1996 conference.)

Peth-Pierce, R. (2000). *The NICHD Study of Early Child Care*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Public Information and Communications Branch.

Phillips, B. (1995). *Child care for low income families: Summary of two workshops*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Vandell, D. L. & Shumow, L. (1990). After-school child care programs. In Special Issue: When school is out. *The Future of Children*, 9(2), 64–80.