NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER ON HISPANIC CHILDREN & FAMILIES

Using Existing Large-Scale Data to Study Early Care and Education Among Hispanics:

Project Overview and Methodology

Danielle Crosby and Julia Mendez

March 2016

Why research on low-income Hispanic children and families matters

Hispanic children currently make up roughly one in four of all children in the United States,[a] and by 2050 are projected to make up one in three, similar to the number of white children.[b] Given this, how Hispanic children fare will have a profound and increasing impact on the social and economic well-being of the country as a whole.

Notably, though, 5.7 million Hispanic children, or one third of all Hispanic children in the United States, are in poverty, more than in any other racial/ethnic group.[c] Nearly two thirds of Hispanic children live in low-income families, defined as having incomes of less than two times the federal poverty level.[d] Despite their high levels of economic need, Hispanics, particularly those in immigrant families, have lower rates of participation in many government support programs when compared with other racial/ethnic minority groups.[e–g] High-quality, research-based information on the characteristics, experiences, and diversity of Hispanic children and families is needed to inform programs and policies supporting the sizable population of low-income Hispanic families and children.

[a] Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2014). *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2014, Table POP3*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/tables.asp

[b] Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2012). *America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being, 2012, Tables POP1 and POP3*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. http://www.childstats.gov/americaschildren/tables.asp

[c] DeNavas-Walt, C., & Proctor, B.D. (2015). *Income and Poverty in the United States: 2014, Table B-2, Current Population Reports, P60-252*. Washington, DC: U.S.Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p60-252.pdf#TableB-2

[d] Lopez, M. H., & Velasco, G. (2011). *Childhood Poverty Among Hispanics Sets Record, Leads Nation*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Hispanic Center. http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/09/28/childhood-poverty-among-hispanics-sets-record-leads-nation/

[e] Williams, S. (2013). *Public assistance participation among U.S. children in poverty, 2010*. Bowling Green, Ohio: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/NCFMR/documents/FP/FP-13-02.pdf

[f] Lichter, D., Sanders, S., & Johnson, K. (2015). *Behind at the starting line: Poverty among Hispanic infants*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire, Carsey School of Public Policy. http://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1250&context=carsey

[g] Child Trends Databank. (2014). *Health care coverage*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends. http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=health-care-coverage

Series overview and purpose

In communities across the United States, early care and education (ECE) settings serve as a key developmental context for children and critical work support for families. Given substantial evidence that high-quality ECE experiences can promote the healthy development of children and improve their short- and long-term outcomes, the federal government has invested in a range of ECE programs to help ensure that all children—regardless of income—can have access to these positive experiences.

Increased funding for child care subsidies (e.g., the Child Care and Development Fund), Head Start/Early Head Start, and public pre-kindergarten in recent decades has greatly expanded ECE enrollment among children from low-income families.[1] However, many eligible children still do not participate in these programs. Hispanic[a] children, in particular, are less likely than other groups to receive publicly supported ECE services.[2-5] Reasons for this vary, but include access barriers, family preferences and constraints, limited availability of affordable or quality programs, or some combination of these factors.[6] Immigrant Latino families in particular may face additional language barriers, or they may be hesitant about involvement with public assistance programs because of safety concerns, if they have undocumented household members.[7]

It is imperative that Latino children be a central part of early childhood policy and research discussions. More than one quarter of all children age 5 and younger in the United States are Hispanic, and more than two thirds of these children live in poverty or near poverty (<200 percent of the federal poverty level).[8] In order to better understand how Hispanic families perceive, access, and experience ECE, ongoing research is needed, with particular attention to the diversity that exists within the Latino population by nativity status, country of origin, language preferences, and other important characteristics.

Secondary analyses of existing large-scale data sets provide a cost-effective and valuable way to contribute to this knowledge base about Latino populations.[9]

[a] In this brief series, we use the terms *Hispanic* and *Latino* interchangeably. Most of the large-scale surveys included in this review give respondents the option of identifying themselves (or their minor children) as being "of Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino origin."

Publication #2016-08

Many available data sets are nationally representative, have sample sizes that permit subgroup analyses, and include detailed information about multiple aspects of families' lives, including how they care for and educate young children. However, the utility of these data sets to address questions of relevance to Hispanic children and families varies widely.

The purposes of this research brief series are to:

1. provide an inventory and critical assessment of data elements related to ECE search, access, decision-making and utilization that have been measured in large-scale, publicly available data sets with sizable Latino samples;
2. discuss the methodological strengths and challenges of available data, and consider how current knowledge may be limited by existing data elements describing Hispanic children and families; and
3. offer recommendations for potential new research questions that could be answered using some of these data sets, with a goal of building a more nuanced understanding of ECE access, decision-making, and utilization among low-income Hispanic families.

About this series

To promote the well-informed and strategic use of data for building the knowledge base about Latinos' ECE access and utilization, the interrelated briefs in this series provide summary information and data tables that can be used by researchers to select the studies, samples, and variables most appropriate for their research questions.

This is the first of four briefs in this series. It describes the project methodology and summarizes key design features of the selected data sets, including the availability of sociodemographic indicators of particular relevance to studying Hispanic populations.

The three companion briefs focus on specific types of ECE data available for Latino samples within these data sets:

- **Brief 2** describes available data elements related to ECE search and decision-making.

  Crosby, D., Mendez, J., & Helms, H. (2016). Using Existing Large-Scale Data to Study Early Care and Education among Hispanics: Search and Decision-Making. Research brief. Bethesda, MD: National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. http://www.childtrends.org/?post_type=publications&p=18721

- **Brief 3** describes elements related to ECE utilization.

  Mendez, J., Crosby, D., & Helms, H. (2016). Using Existing Large-Scale Data to Study Early Care and Education among Hispanics: Families' Utilization of Early Care and Education. Research brief. Bethesda, MD: National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. http://www.childtrends.org/?post_type=publications&p=18722

- **Brief 4** describes elements that capture child and parent experiences within ECE settings.

  Mendez, J., Crosby, D., Helms, H., Johnson, A., & Rodriguez, Y. (2016). Using Existing Large-Scale Data to Study Early Care and Education among Hispanics: How Hispanic Parents and Children Experience ECE Settings. Research brief. Bethesda, MD: National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. http://www.childtrends.org/?post_type=publications&p=18723

Additional resources: In addition to the four ECE data briefs that comprise this series, the Center has created two companion, online, interactive data tools that allow researchers to explore the data elements present or absent in the data sets reviewed. Specifically, we used the data elements in the tables on **search and decision-making** as well as **utilization** to create these tools. The tools showcase specific items that are indicators of each data element, and provide direct hyperlinks to the actual survey instruments used in the studies included in the review. These additional online resources include:

- Schwartz, G. & Bradshaw, J. (2016, February). Data Tool: ECE Search & Decision-Making among Hispanic Families. http://www.childtrends.org/nrc/resources/
- Bradshaw, J. & Schwartz, G. (2016, February). Data Tool: ECE Utilization among Hispanic Families. http://www.childtrends.org/nrc/resources/

Project methodology

This project proceeded in three phases. First, we identified a set of large-scale, publicly available data sets with population-based samples and substantive information about ECE that have been conducted since 2000. Then, from an initial list of 15 data sources, the following 12 were selected based on having sizable samples of low-income Hispanic households with young children.[b] Each of these data sets contains information about approximately one to two thousand Hispanic children, birth to age 6.

- *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)*
- *Early Childhood Longitudinal Study-Kindergarten Cohort, 2011 (ECLS-K:2011)*
- *Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (FFCWS)*
- *Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES), 2009*
- *Head Start Impact Study (HSIS)*
- *Los Angeles County Health Survey (LACHS), 2011*
- *National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS), 2012*
- *National Household Education Survey—Early Childhood Program Participation Survey, 2005 (NHES-ECPP:2005)*
- *National Household Education Survey—Early Childhood Program Participation Survey, 2012 (NHES-ECPP:2012)*
- *National Survey of American Families (NSAF), 2002*
- *National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)*
- *Study of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), 2008*

While some of the data sets represent single, independent studies, others are part of long-term periodic data collection efforts. In the case of the latter, we focus our analysis and discussion on the most recent panel or survey with ECE data that has been publicly released, but note when prior surveys were administered. The one exception to this is the National Household Education Survey—Early Childhood Program Participation, for which we describe both the 2005 and 2012 surveys because of a significant re-design, as it changed from being telephone-administered to being a mailed paper survey. With the change in format, items were modified, the length of the survey was shortened, and information was collected for only one child per household (versus up to two children in earlier surveys). For longitudinal studies of child development, we highlight the information available at different ages within early childhood, given that ECE issues and experiences often differ for infants, toddlers, and 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds.

In the third phase of the project, we conducted a thorough review of the parent (or guardian) survey instruments used in each of the 12 studies, documenting the type and extent of information collected, as summarized in the data tables that accompany each brief. Some of the studies include components beyond a parent survey (e.g., ECE provider and/or director surveys, child care observation data, and/or child assessments); although these were not included in the primary analysis for the brief series, we summarize their availability in Table 1 and provide some discussion of these components in Brief 4, on child and family experiences in ECE settings.

[b] Three data sets originally included in the analysis – the Panel Study of Income Dynamics-Child Development Supplement, the National Longitudinal Study of Youth, and the Three-City Study – were determined to have relatively small sample sizes of Hispanic families with children younger than age 6 (<500) and were dropped from further analysis.

Scope and type of ECE data available in large-scale data sets

The scope and type of ECE information available for Hispanic children across the data sets included in this review varies widely, given differences in their intended purpose and design. For example, two of the surveys were designed primarily to collect detailed information about household economic activity (SIPP, NAWS); two provide a point-in-time snapshot of family well-being (LACHS, NSAF); three represent prospective studies of developmental contexts and outcomes for a target child (ECLS-B, ECLS-K, FFCWS); and, four were developed for the express purpose of better understanding households' and families' ECE experiences (FACES, HSIS, NHES-ECPP, NSECE).

Table 1 at the end of this brief provides a summary of key study and sample characteristics for the featured data sets, including design, periodicity, how and for whom ECE-relevant information was collected, and sample size estimates for Latinos. Below we provide a brief overview of the key dimensions along which these studies vary.

Study design and sampling frame. With two exceptions, all of the data sources included in this review contain information from nationally representative samples. Some were designed to be representative of U.S. households in general (SIPP, NSAF), while others provide national estimates for households with children younger than age 13 (NSECE) or younger than age 6 (ECLS-B, NHES-ECPP). Still others include nationally representative samples of particular populations of interest, including children who applied to Head Start (HSIS), children attending Head Start (FACES), children attending kindergarten (ECLS-K), and parents working in crop agriculture (NAWS). Two additional studies were included because of their suitability for studying low-income Latino families: the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study (FFCWS) is representative of large U.S. cities, and the Los Angeles County Health Survey (LACHS) is representative of L.A. County.

As indicated in Table 1, several of the studies over-sampled low-income families or households. Researchers are advised to consult individual study documentation for details about the sampling frame and strategy.

Reporter and target of ECE data. In all but two of the surveys, information about ECE was collected from only one parent or guardian per family, typically identified as the person most knowledgeable about the focal child(ren). Across these data sets, mothers or maternal figures make up the large majority of respondents. Notably, the ECLS-B and Fragile Families studies intentionally surveyed resident and non-resident fathers, and therefore have some ECE data that were reported by both parents.

In terms of the children about whom ECE data are available, five of the studies (ECLS-B, ECLS-K, FFCWS, FACES, HSIS) collected data for a focal child who met specific criteria (e.g., birth cohort, kindergarten cohort, Head Start applicant); four of the studies (LACHS, NHES-ECPP:2005, NHES-ECPP:2012, NSAF) asked parents about the care arrangements of a randomly selected child in the household younger than age 6; two of the studies (NSECE, SIPP) collected data for all children in the household younger than age 14; and one study (NAWS) asked about ECE experiences at the household level for families with at least one child younger than age 6. Studies with ECE data about multiple children in a household may be informative for understanding the broader family context in which ECE decisions are made, while those focused on a target child tend to offer more in-depth information about that child's ECE experiences, and in the case of the longitudinal studies, both short- and long-term developmental outcomes. Hispanic children comprise between 20 to 50 percent of these samples (see Table 1), meaning that each data set offers ECE data for at least one to two thousand Hispanic children (ages zero to 5) and their families.

Focus of ECE data collection. As summarized in Table 1, this set of studies varies widely in terms of the amount and types of ECE data that were collected from Latino parents. For the purposes of organizing the brief series, we have categorized available data elements into three broad topic areas representing different aspects of families' involvement with ECE. Each companion brief in this series focuses on one of these topic areas, and details the types of data available about Hispanics in each study.

Approximately half of the studies include data elements (beyond a minimal level of one or two items) related to how and why Latino families seek out and select certain ECE arrangements and not others. As detailed in **Brief 2**, these include survey items about parents' ECE preferences and priorities, perceptions of community ECE options, sources of information, search behaviors, decision-making processes, and barriers that families may encounter.

The most common type of information available for Hispanics across these large-scale surveys pertains to ECE utilization, which serves as the focus of **Brief 3**. Utilization elements include the number and types of arrangements families are using at the time of data collection, ECE hours and schedule, duration, cost, and basic provider characteristics.

In **Brief 4**, we summarize what data are available in these studies about the types of experiences Hispanic children and parents are having with their current ECE arrangements. Seven of the studies collected this type of data (beyond a minimal level), which includes parent perceptions and satisfaction with current arrangements, child care and employment compatibility and disruptions, and indicators of ECE quality.

Along with variation in the amount and type of ECE data elements available in each study, there is likely variability in measurement quality and appropriateness for addressing particular research questions. Because it is beyond the scope of this brief series to provide detailed commentary on data quality, researchers are urged to give this careful consideration once they have used this review to identify potentially relevant data set(s).

Study components beyond the parent survey. As noted above, the focus of this brief series is primarily on parent survey data in terms of what can be learned about Latino families' ECE preferences, needs, and experiences from the perspective of Latino parents. However, several of the studies included components beyond the parent survey that offer ECE-relevant data that may complement and/or extend insights from the parent data. These additional components include direct child assessments, ECE provider and director surveys, observation-based assessments of ECE quality, and elementary school data. As noted in Table 1, in some of the studies, additional components were administered for a subsample of participants only. Researchers interested in using these data sources to study Hispanics should refer to the individual user guides for information about who was included in particular sub-studies. The final column of Table 1 provides information about the possibility of linking each data set to other data sources using geographic indicators or other shared identifiers.

Exploring diversity among Hispanic families with young children

To expand the knowledge base and improve programs serving Hispanics, greater recognition and understanding of heterogeneity within this population is needed. In 2014, the ACF-sponsored Hispanic Research Work Group provided guidance in this area by identifying 10 priority data elements that can and should be used in surveys (along with more standard demographic indicators such as race/ethnicity, income, and education level) to reveal some of the diversity within U.S. Latino populations.[10] Table 2 indicates the presence of these **10 priority data elements** in the 12 data sets we reviewed for this brief series. The constructs underlying these elements and their potential relevance for research in the ECE area are discussed below. The information provided in Table 2 complements a recent publication of the National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families—Improving Data Infrastructure to Recognize Hispanic Diversity in the United States—which summarizes the inclusion of these elements in 34 national data sets focused broadly on child and family well-being.[11]

Hispanic heritage subgroup and country of birth. The broad categorizations of *Hispanic* or *Latino* represent a wide range of cultural groups with unique identities, migration histories, and sociodemographic profiles. These characteristics help shape families' preferences, opportunities, and constraints related to ECE. Families who are recent immigrants (first- or second-generation) may have different levels of acculturation, integration in the community, and access to resources, including employment, income support, and ECE services. Beyond the traditional survey item that identifies respondents as being of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish descent, information about specific ethnic heritage and country of origin can help researchers identify meaningful subgroups within the larger Hispanic category.

A majority of the reviewed studies (8 out of 12) include information about specific Hispanic ancestry, at least at the level of distinguishing between Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and "other" Hispanic origin groups. Latinos with roots in Central and South America tend to be more difficult to identify in existing data sets because they have been traditionally grouped as "other," but represent a rapidly growing segment of the population. Notably, some immigrants from these countries may have been granted refugee status by the United States. Specific information about country of birth, when available, can be used to further identify heritage subgroups, but only for recent immigrant populations.

All of the reviewed data sets include the nativity status of children and parents, though some variation exists in the comprehensiveness of this information. Nine of the 12 studies asked about specific country of birth for the focal child(ren)[c] and both parents (which is necessary for accurately identifying second-generation immigrant children); one study (LACHS) gathered this information for the focal child and respondent parent; and two studies (NHES-ECPP:2012 and SIPP) contain partial information gathered through questions about whether children and parents were born in the United States and its territories (without specifying country of origin).

In addition, four of the studies offer nativity status information about individuals beyond the focal child(ren) and parents. The NAWS, NSAF, and SIPP asked about country of birth for all household members, providing a more comprehensive picture of Latino households. One study (FFCWS) includes information about the birthplace of grandparents, which is useful for identifying whether children are first-, second-, or third-generation (and beyond) immigrants.

Time in the United States, citizenship status, and legal residency status. For first- and second-generation immigrant households, information about members' length of residency in the United States (and age at arrival), citizenship, and legal status can be used to identify key subgroups with different patterns of ECE access and use

As shown in the fourth and fifth columns of Table 2, all of the reviewed studies contain information about time in the United States for foreign-born children and parents, and seven also inquired directly about citizenship. However, only two of the data sets (NSAF, SIPP) gathered this information for all individuals in the household. A substantial number of young children in low-income Hispanic families live in mixed-status households (containing citizen and non-citizen members), which has implications for children's access to programs: adults in the household may be unaware of programs that children as citizens are eligible for, or may be reluctant to become involved with government assistance programs.[12] One caveat related to the citizenship variables is that some of the longitudinal studies assess changes in citizenship status over time, while others do not. For example, in the ECLS-B, citizenship information for fathers was collected in the 9-month survey, and for mothers in the 24-month survey. Parents were not asked again about their citizenship status at later waves, unless they were new respondents. In contrast, the SIPP and FFCWS collected this information at multiple time points.

Given the sensitive nature of questions about legal status, the ACF Hispanic Research Work Group recommends that this data element be included in studies only after careful consideration of its intended purpose and potential implications for sample confidentiality. Only one of the reviewed data sets (NAWS) includes information about legal residency status, and asked this of the respondent only.

Home language, English proficiency, parent literacy, and education completed outside the United States. Family language use and literacy data elements help capture another important layer of diversity within Latino populations. The languages spoken with children at home, as well as parents' levels of proficiency and literacy in English and their heritage language, have multiple implications for children's development and school experiences. These variables may also explain limitations in families' awareness of ECE-related information and services, and their ability to access and engage with programs. In addition, language variables are sometimes used as proxies or indicators of acculturation and may be related to parental preferences for culturally and linguistically responsive ECE settings.

All of the data sets contain information about home language use, with the most typical item asked being "What is the primary language spoken in your home?" or "What is your primary

[c] Two of the studies, the ECLS-B and FFCWS, sampled from hospital births and include only U.S.-born children.

language?". However, the depth and breadth of this data element varies substantially across studies, ranging from a single indicator of survey administration in English or Spanish (FFCWS) to extensive information about multiple aspects of language use by children, parents, and other household members (ECLS-K:2011, FACES). In addition, the SIPP contains a variable called "linguistic isolation," which identifies households where no person over the age of 14 speaks English very well. The NAWS (2010) asked respondents about the languages they were exposed to as a child, how well they (at that time) spoke and read those same languages, and which language they considered to be their dominant language.

Beyond assessing the languages families speak as part of daily life, 7 of the 12 studies include information about parents' level of English proficiency. The most common items for this data element (used in ECLS-K, FACES, NAWS, and SIPP) asked respondents to rate their English speaking and comprehension skills. In the HSIS, interviewers rated respondents' English language skills on a seven-point scale at the end of the survey.

Two of the recommended data elements (see Table 2) for understanding Hispanic populations—parent literacy in any language and parent education completed outside the United States—have significantly less coverage in this set of surveys. Three of the studies (ECLS-K:2011, FACES, NAWS) asked parents about their reading and writing skills in home languages other than English, and one study (NAWS) asked about the country in which each household member completed their highest level of education. These variables could be useful for exploring how parents' educational experiences outside the United States influence child outcomes, especially literacy and reading outcomes in dual languages, and also have implications for families' access to information and opportunities. For example, parents with limited literacy in Spanish may not yield much benefit from translated written materials.

Additional child, parent, and household characteristics with relevance for ECE participation. Beyond the 10 recommended elements for studying Latino families (see Table 2), we highlight a handful of other child, parent, and household characteristics that may have particular relevance for ECE studies (summarized in the last five columns of Table 2). In addition to the basic information about parents' employment and household income that was collected in all of the surveys (though in varying degrees of detail), these include:

- *Child disability or special needs.* Relatively little is known about the ECE experiences of young Latino children with disabilities, making this an important direction for future research. Most of the studies included in this review (with the exception of the NAWS) asked parents questions related to child disability, functional limitations, and/or chronic health needs. Careful consideration should be given to how these questions are asked. Identification of disabilities is a complex issue for some low-income Hispanic groups, given language and access barriers to services, cultural differences and the fact that identification often first occurs once children enter formal education settings.
- *Household composition.* Many families likely make ECE decisions in the context of broader family and household needs; for example, they may be considering care for multiple children of different ages, or the schedules of multiple adults. Low-income Latino children, especially those with a foreign-born parent, tend to live in larger households than their white or black peers.[13] All of the data sets include information about individuals living in the household, beyond the focal child(ren) and responding parent. In most, a detailed household roster was completed with the age, gender, and relationship of each member; however, in two of the studies (LACHS and NHES-ECPP:2012) this information is limited to the number of adults and children in different age ranges.
- *Parent physical or mental health.* Parents' physical and mental health has potential implications for their employment and economic outcomes, as well as their ability to access and maintain ECE services for their young children. Additionally, parents' physical and mental health problems may have a substantial impact on child development, potentially negating the developmental benefits of high-quality ECE, or alternatively, heightening its value as a protective factor. Six of the reviewed studies asked the responding parent about their physical and mental health, and one study (ECLS-B) collected this information in detail for both parents.
- *Parental work schedules.* In addition to the number of hours that parents are employed, the timing, regularity, and predictability of those hours each have significant implications for families' ECE needs and options. More than 20 percent of low-income working Latino mothers and fathers work nonstandard hours (evening, nighttime, weekend, or rotating) on a regular basis.[14] Seven of the data sets contain information about parental work schedules, and in five of these, data are available for up to two parents. In the NSECE, work schedule information was collected using a detailed weekly calendar, which was also used to record children's care arrangements while parents were working.
- *Receipt of public assistance.* Low-income Hispanic households' receipt of various public assistance programs may be interesting to examine in relation to their ECE participation and likelihood of using child care subsidies. All but two of the data sets include information about household receipt of major public benefits (e.g., cash assistance, food stamps, Medicaid), typically for the year prior to the survey.

Conclusion

A considerable body of research supports the importance of early care and education experiences, as both a key developmental context for children and critical work support for families. As a large and growing segment of the U.S. population (especially for young children), Latinos have been understudied in this literature. By highlighting the information that large-scale, publicly-available data sets can (and cannot) provide about the ECE experiences of Hispanic families, we hope this brief series provides researchers with a roadmap for how best to leverage existing data to address gaps in the field and examine policy- and practice- relevant questions.

Table 1: Design characteristics of large-scale data sets relevant to studying ECE for Hispanics

Data set	Featured survey(s) and timeframe	Design and sampling frame
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)	9-month parent survey (2001) 24-month parent survey (2003) 48-month parent survey (2005-06)	• Nationally representative sample of children born in 2001, followed from birth until kindergarten entry • Oversampled Chinese, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/ Alaskan Native families; twins; and children born with low or very low birth weight
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K: 2011)	Year 1 Fall K parent survey (2010) Year 1 Spring K parent survey (2011)	• Nationally representative sample of children attending public and private kindergarten in 2010, with annual data collections through 5th grade
Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCSW)	Year 1 parent survey (1999-2001) Year 3 parent survey (2001-2003) Year 3 Child Care Supplement (CCS)	• Representative sample of non-marital births in large cities (pop. 200k+), followed from birth through adolescence • Child Care Supplement in Year 3 and Year 5 in 18 of 20 cities
Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	2009 cohort Year 1 fall parent survey (2009) Year 1 spring parent survey (2010)[c]	• Periodic cohort study of nationally representative sample of children attending Head Start (previous cohorts in 1997, 2000, 2003, 2006) • Excludes Migrant and Seasonal Head Start (MSHS), American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) programs, programs in Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories
Head Start Impact Study (HSIS)	Year 1 fall parent survey (2002) Year 1 spring parent survey (2003)[c]	• Random-assignment study of nationally representative sample of 3- and 4-yr-olds who applied to Head Start in 2002, followed until spring of 1st grade
LA County Health Survey (LACHS)	2011 survey, child component	• Periodic population based phone survey of residents in LA County (prior surveys: 1997, 1999, 2002, 2005, 2007) • 2011 survey included cell phone sample
National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS)	Migrant Seasonal Head Start Supplement, 2011-12 surveys[d]	• Annual survey with national probability sample of crop agriculture workers. • Migrant Seasonal Head Start supplement administered to workers with children < age 6 (prior MSHS surveys: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010)
National Household Education Survey - Early Childhood Program Participation (NHES-ECPP)	2005 ECPP survey 2012 ECPP survey	• Household survey of nationally representative sample of children birth to age 6, not yet enrolled in kindergarten (prior surveys: 1991, 1995 ,1999, 2001) • Oversampled from census tracts with high percentage of Black and Hispanic households
National Survey of American Families (NSAF)	2002 household survey	• Household survey of nationally representative sample of civilian, noninstitutionalized population < age 65 • Oversampled low-income households and households with children; oversampled 13 states to yield state-level estimates
National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)	Household survey (2012)	• Household survey for nationally representative sample of households with children < age 13; intergrated with 3 other nationally representative surveys of home-based providers, center-based providers, and center workforce • Sample drawn from all 50 states and District of Columbia; oversampled from low-income communities
Study of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)	2008 panel Child care topical module in Wave 5 (2010) and Wave 8 (2011)	• Panel study of nationally representative sample of households; core interviews at 4-month intervals for 4 years and topical interviews at some waves • Oversampled low-income population

Notes. ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; FACES = Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS= National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. The ECLS-B sample includes about 800 twin pairs, for whom there is data about each child.

b. The ECLS-K provider interview is completed by the child's primary before- or after- school caregiver during the kindergarten year.

c. We focus our analysis on the Year 1 surveys; however, a second year of ECE data is available for children who were 3 years old at baseline.

d. Given relatively small sample sizes, study administrators suggest at least two years of data be combined for national-level analyses and four years of data be combined for regional-level analyses.

Table 1 Cont. Design characteristics of large-scale data sets relevant to studying ECE for Hispanics

Data set	Longitudinal	Cross-sectional	Reporting parent/ guardian	ECE data available for whom?	Overall ECE sample size	Hispanic ECE sample size
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)	✔		2 parents	Study focal child[a]	9 mos: 10,700 children 24 mos: 9,800 children 48 mos: 8,400 children	9 mos: 2,050 children 24 mos: 1,450 children 48 mos: 1,250 children
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K: 2011)	✔		1 parent	Study focal child	~18,000 children attending 900 kindergarten programs	~24% of weighted sample
Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study (FFCSW)	✔		2 parents	Study focal child	5,000 infants at baseline	~30% of baseline sample
Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	✔		1 parent	Head-Start-eligible focal child	3,349 children (ages 3-4 yrs)	1,205 children
Head Start Impact Study (HSIS)	✔		1 parent	Head-Start-eligible focal child	4,667 children (ages 3-4 yrs)	37.4% of 3-yr-olds 51.6% of 4-yr-olds
LA County Health Survey (LACHS)		✔	1 parent	Randomly selected child < age 6	~3,100 children < age 6 (51% age 0-3, 49% age 4-5)	~32% of sample
National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS)		✔	1 parent	Household level info for families with a child < age 6 who has lived in the U.S.	2011-12d: 3,025 agricultural workers with a child < age 6	86% of worker sample is Hispanic
National Household Education Survey - Early Childhood Program Participation (NHES-ECPP)		✔	1 parent	2005: Up to two randomly selected children in target age ranges (0-2 yrs; 3-5 yrs) 2012: One randomly selected child in target age range (< 6)	2005: 7,209 children < age 6 (3,855 0-2 yrs; 3,354 3-5 yrs) 2012: 7,892 children < age 6	2005: ~21% of weighted sample 2012: ~25% of weighted sample
National Survey of American Families (NSAF)		✔	1 parent	Randomly selected child < age 6	12,268 children < age 6	2,574 children < age 6
National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)		✔	1 parent	Each child in household, 0-13 yrs	11,629 children < age 13 (4,340 children ages 0-5)	~35% of weighted sample
Study of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)	✔		1 parent	Each child in household, 0-14 yrs	52,031 households (8.5% of weighted sample has a child < age 6)	7.5% of weighted sample with a child < age 6

Notes. ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; FACES = Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS= National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. The ECLS-B sample includes about 800 twin pairs, for whom there is data about each child.

b. The ECLS-K provider interview is completed by the child's primary before- or after- school caregiver during the kindergarten year.

c. We focus our analysis on the Year 1 surveys; however, a second year of ECE data is available for children who were 3 years old at baseline.

d. Given relatively small sample sizes, study administrators suggest at least two years of data be combined for national-level analyses and four years of data be combined for regional-level analyses.

Table 1 Cont. Design characteristics of large-scale data sets relevant to studying ECE for Hispanics

Data set	Type of ECE data reported by parents			Study components in addition to parent survey				
	Search/ decisons (Brief 2)	Utilization (Brief 3)	Experiences (Brief 4)	Child assessments	ECE provider survey	ECE director survey	ECE observation	Other
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, sub-study	•Birth certificate data •Resident father survey •Non-resident father survey •K teacher survey •K wrap-around care provider
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K: 2011)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No[b]	No[b]	No	•K-5 teacher survey •K-5 special ed. teacher survey •K-5 school admin. survey •K wrap-around care provider
Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCSW)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, sub-study	Yes, sub-study	Yes, sub-study	•Birth medical records •K teacher survey
Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	Minimal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•HS ed. coordinator survey •K teacher survey
Head Start Impact Study (HSIS)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	•K-1 teacher survey
LA County Health Survey (LACHS)	Yes	Yes	Minimal	No	No	No	No	
National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
National Household Education Survey - Early Childhood Program Participation (NHES-ECPP)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
National Survey of American Families (NSAF)	Minimal	Yes	Minmal	No	No	No	No	
National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	•Center workforce survey
Study of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)	Minimal	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	

Notes. ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; FACES = Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS= National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. The ECLS-B sample includes about 800 twin pairs, for whom there is data about each child.

b. The ECLS-K provider interview is completed by the child's primary before- or after- school caregiver during the kindergarten year.

c. We focus our analysis on the Year 1 surveys; however, a second year of ECE data is available for children who were 3 years old at baseline.

d. Given relatively small sample sizes, study administrators suggest at least two years of data be combined for national-level analyses and four years of data be combined for regional-level analyses.

Table 1 Cont. Design characteristics of large-scale data sets relevant to studying ECE for Hispanics

Data set	Geographic or other linking variable(s)
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Birth Cohort (ECLS-B)	•Zipcode, county and state info for household and ECE provider •NCES school IDs, links to Common Core Data (CCD) and Private School Survey (PSS)
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study - Kindergarten Class of 2010-11 (ECLS-K: 2011)	•Census tract and zip code tabulation area (ZCTA) codes for children's homes and schools •NCES school IDs, links to Common Core Data (CCD) and Private School Survey (PSS)
Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCSW)	•City of child's birth •State of residence over time •Census tract characteristics •Local labor market and macroeconomic datafile
Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey (FACES)	•State indicator
Head Start Impact Study (HSIS)	•NCES school IDs, links to Common Core Data (CCD) and Private School Survey (PSS) •Great Schools Database
LA County Health Survey (LACHS)	•City, zip code, census tract •Health district •Service planning area
National Agricultural Worker Survey (NAWS)	
National Household Education Survey - Early Childhood Program Participation (NHES-ECPP)	•Zip code
National Survey of American Families (NSAF)	•State indicator
National Survey of Early Care and Education (NSECE)	•State indicator •Geographic indicators for household, ECE provider and parent employment
Study of Income and Program Participation (SIPP)	•State indicator

Notes. ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; FACES = Head Start Family and Child Experiences Survey; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS= National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. The ECLS-B sample includes about 800 twin pairs, for whom there is data about each child.

b. The ECLS-K provider interview is completed by the child's primary before- or after- school caregiver during the kindergarten year.

c. We focus our analysis on the Year 1 surveys; however, a second year of ECE data is available for children who were 3 years old at baseline.

d. Given relatively small sample sizes, study administrators suggest at least two years of data be combined for national-level analyses and four years of data be combined for regional-level analyses.

Table 2. Data elements measuring key characteristics of Hispanic households with young children, by data set

	Priority data elements for studying Hispanic populations										Additional data elements relevant to studying ECE				
Data set	**Hispanic heritage**	**Child country of birth**	**Parent country of birth**	**Time in the U.S.**	**U.S. citizenship**	**Legal status**	**Home language(s)**	**Parent English proficiency**	**Parent literacy in any language**	**Parent education outside U.S.**	**Child disability or special need**	**Detailed house-hold roster**	**Parent physical, mental health**	**Parent work schedule**	**Household reciept of public assistance**
ECLS-B[a,b]	✔ C,2P	✔	✔ 2P	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P		✔ P,H				✔	✔	✔ 2P	✔ 2P	✔
ECLS-K:2011		✔	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P	✤ C		✔+ C,P,H	✔	✤		✔	✔			✔
FFCWS[b]	✔ 2P	✔	✔ 2P,GP	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P		✤				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
HS FACES 2009	✔ C,2P	✔	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P			✔+ C,P,H	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔		✔
HSIS	✔ C,2P	✔	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P			✔ H	✤			✔	✔	✔		
LACHS 2011	✔ C,P	✔	✔ P	✔ C,P	✔ C,P		✔ H				✔	✤	✔		
NAWS 2012	✔ P	✔	✔ H+, GP	✔ H+	✔ P	✔	✔ P	✔	✔	✤ H+		✔	✤	✔	✔

Notes. ✔+ = extensive information available; ✔= data element included in the study; ✤ = partial or limited information available. Unless otherwise noted, data element is available for the respondent parent. C = availabile for child; 2P = available for up to 2 parents; GP = available for grandparents; H = available at household level; H+ = available for all household members; ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FACES = Family and Child Experiences Survey; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS = National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSCECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. Mothers' country of birth, time in the U.S., and citizenship status were assessed during the second wave of data collection at 24 months, so this data is not available for the small sample of mothers who responded to the 9-month survey only.

b. Given the birth cohort design, all focal children were born in the U.S.

c. Because of significant changes in methodology between the 2005 and 2012 surveys, we present these data sources separately.

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER ON HISPANIC CHILDREN & FAMILIES

Table 2 Cont. Data elements measuring key characteristics of Hispanic households with young children, by data set

	Priority data elements for studying Hispanic populations										Additional data elements relevant to studying ECE				
Data set	**Hispanic heritage**	**Child country of birth**	**Parent country of birth**	**Time in the U.S.**	**U.S. citizenship**	**Legal status**	**Home language(s)**	**Parent English proficiency**	**Parent literacy in any language**	**Parent education outside U.S.**	**Child disability or special need**	**Detailed house-hold roster**	**Parent physical, mental health**	**Parent work schedule**	**Household reciept of public assistance**
NHES-ECPP: 2005[c]		✔	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P			✔ C,P	✤			✔	✔		✔ 2P	✔
NHES-ECPP: 2012[c]		✤	✤ 2P	✔ C,2P			✔ C,P,H	✤			✔	✤			✔
NSAF 2002	✔ C,2P	✔	✔ H+	✔ H+	✔ H+		✔ P				✔	✔	✔	✔ 2P	✔
NSECE		✔	✔ 2P	✔ C,2P			✔ H				✤	✔		✔ 2P	✔
SIPP 2008	✔ H+	✤	✤ H+	✔ H+	✔ H+		✔ P,H+	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔ 2P	✔

Notes. ✔+ = extensive information available; ✔= data element included in the study; ✤ = partial or limited information available. Unless otherwise noted, data element is available for the respondent parent. C = availabile for child; 2P = available for up to 2 parents; GP = available for grandparents; H = available at household level; H+ = available for all household members; ECLS-B = Early Childhood Longitudinal Birth Cohort; ECLS-K = Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Cohort; FACES = Family and Child Experiences Survey; FFCWS = Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study; HSIS= Head Start Impact Study; LACHS = LA County Health Survey; NAWS = National Agricultural Workers Survey; NHES-ECPP = National Household Education Survey, Early Childhood Program Participation Module; NSAF = National Survey of American Families; NSCECE = National Survey of Early Care and Education; SIPP = Survey of Income and Program Participation

a. Mothers' country of birth, time in the U.S., and citizenship status were assessed during the second wave of data collection at 24 months, so this data is not available for the small sample of mothers who responded to the 9-month survey only.

b. Given the birth cohort design, all focal children were born in the U.S.

c. Because of significant changes in methodology between the 2005 and 2012 surveys, we present these data sources separately.

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER ON HISPANIC CHILDREN & FAMILIES

Endnotes

1 Magnuson, K.A., Meyers, M.K., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Public funding and enrollment in formal child care in the 1990s. *Social Service Review, 81*(1), 47-83.

2 Child Trends Databank. (2014). Early childhood program enrollment. Retrieved from: http://www.childtrends.org/?indicators=early-childhood-program-enrollment

3 Johnson, A.D., Han, W., Ruhm, C., & Waldfogel, J. (2014). Child care subsidies and the school readiness of children of immigrants. *Child Development, 85*, 2140-2150. DOI: 10.1111/cdev.12285.

4 Hernandez, D.J., Denton, N.A., & Macartney, S.E. (2007). Family circumstances of children in immigrant families: Looking to the future of America. In J.E. Lansford K. Deater-Deckard & M.H. Bornstein (Eds.), Immigrant families in contemporary society (pp. 9–29). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

5 Matthews, H. & Jang, D. (2007). The challenges of change: Learning from the child care and early education experiences of immigrant families. Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy.

6 Chaundry, A., Pedroza, J.M., Sandstrom, H., Danzinger, A., Grosz, M., Scott, M. & Ting, S. (2011). Child care choices of low-income working families. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

7 Yoshikawa, H., Kholoptseva, J. & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2013). The role of public policies and community-based organizations in the developmental consequences of parent undocumented status. *Social Policy Report, 27*(3), 3-17.

8 Child Trends analysis of 2013 American Community Survey data.

9 Ha, Y. & Johnson, A.D. (2012). Studying child care subsidies with secondary data sources. Methodological Brief OPRE 2012-54. Washington, D.C.: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

10 ACF Hispanic Workgroup (2014). Survey data elements to unpack diversity of Hispanic populations. OPRE Report #2014-30. Washington, D.C.: Administration on Children, Youth and Families. Retrieved from https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/brief_enhancing_cultural_competence_final_022114.pdf

11 Wildsmith, E., Ansari, A., & Guzman, L. (2015). Improving data infrastructure to recognize Hispanic diversity in the United States. Research Brief. Bethesda, MD: National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. http://www.childtrends.org/?publications=improving-data-infrastructure-to-recognize-hispanic-diversity-in-the-united-states

12 Yoshikawa, H., Kholoptseva, J. & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2013). The role of public policies and community-based organizations in the developmental consequences of parent undocumented status. *Social Policy Report, 27*(3), 3-17.

13 Turner, K., Guzman, L., Wildsmith, E. & Scott, M. (2015). The complex and varied households of low-income Hispanic children. Research Brief. Bethesda, MD: National Center for Research on Hispanic Children & Families.

14 Enchautegui, M.E., Johnson, M., & Gelatt, J. (2015). Who minds the kids when mom works a nonstandard schedule? Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Steering Committee of the National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families, as well as Robert Crosnoe, Aletha Huston, Esther Calzada, and Heather Helms for their valuable feedback and insights on this work. We also appreciate the helpful review comments provided by Sarah Grady at the U.S. Department of Education - National Center for Educational Statistics.

Editor: August Aldebot-Green; **Designer:** Catherine Nichols

About the Authors

Danielle A. Crosby is an associate professor in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and a co-investigator of the National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. Her research focuses on understanding how social, economic, and cultural factors shape the educational experiences of young children in low-income families.

Julia L. Mendez is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and a co-investigator of the National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families. Her research focuses on understanding how parenting, peer influences and child care experiences impact the development of ethnic minority children in low-income families.

About the Center

The National Research Center on Hispanic Children & Families is a hub of research to help programs and policy better serve low-income Hispanics across three priority areas—poverty reduction and economic self-sufficiency, healthy marriage and responsible fatherhood, and early care and education. The Center was established in 2013 by a five-year cooperative agreement from the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (OPRE) within the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to Child Trends in partnership with Abt Associates and New York University, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and University of Maryland, College Park. This publication was made possible by Grant Number 90PH0025 from OPRE. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of OPRE, ACF, or HHS.

Copyright 2016 by the National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families

We welcome your feedback! Email us at Info@HispanicResearchCenter.org.

HispanicResearchCenter.org

Child TRENDS

Abt ASSOCIATES BOLD THINKERS DRIVING REAL-WORLD IMPACT

OPRE

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY Institute of Human Development and Social Change

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND 18 56 COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY of NORTH CAROLINA GREENSBORO

NATIONAL RESEARCH CENTER ON HISPANIC CHILDREN & FAMILIES