

Early Childhood Program Participation, Results from the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016

First Look



Early Childhood Program Participation, Results from the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016

First Look

January 2019

Lisa Corcoran
Katrina Steinley
American Institutes for Research

Sarah Grady
Project Officer
National Center for Education Statistics

U.S. Department of Education
Betsy DeVos
Secretary

Institute of Education Sciences
Mark Schneider
Director

National Center for Education Statistics
James L. Woodworth
Commissioner

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States; conduct and publish reports and specialized analyses of the meaning and significance of such statistics; assist state and local education agencies in improving their statistical systems; and review and report on education activities in foreign countries.

NCES activities are designed to address high-priority education data needs; provide consistent, reliable, complete, and accurate indicators of education status and trends; and report timely, useful, and high-quality data to the U.S. Department of Education, the Congress, the states, other education policymakers, practitioners, data users, and the general public. Unless specifically noted all information contained herein is in the public domain.

We strive to make our products available in a variety of formats and in language that is appropriate to a variety of audiences. You, as our customer, are the best judge of our success in communicating information effectively. If you have any comments or suggestions about this or any other NCES product or report, we would like to hear from you. Please direct your comments to

NCES, IES, U.S. Department of Education
Potomac Center Plaza
550 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202

January 2019

The NCES Home Page address is <http://nces.ed.gov>.
The NCES Publications and Products address is <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

This report was prepared for the National Center for Education Statistics under Contract No. ED-IES-12-D-0002 with the American Institutes for Research. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Suggested Citation

Corcoran, L., and Steinley, K. (2019). *Early Childhood Program Participation, From the National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016* (NCES 2017-101.REV), National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved [date] from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.

Content Contact

Sarah Grady
(202) 245-7063
Sarah.Grady@ed.gov

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the thousands of parents who completed the National Household Education Survey questionnaires upon which this report is based.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction.....	1
Selected Findings	5
Estimate Tables.....	7
References.....	25
Appendix A: Technical Notes.....	27
Appendix B: Glossary of Terms	35
Appendix C: Standard Error Tables.....	45

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 1. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016.....	8
Table 2. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016	10
Table 3. Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016.....	12
Table 4. Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016.....	14
Table 5. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016.....	16
Table 6. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016	18
Table 7. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016	21
Table 8. Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016	23
 Exhibit	
Exhibit B-1. Poverty definition for Early Childhood Program Participation (ECP) analyses, by household size: 2016	39
 Appendix Tables	
Table C-1. Standard errors for table 1: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016	46

Table	Page
Table C-2. Standard errors for table 2: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016	48
Table C-3. Standard errors for table 3: Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016	50
Table C-4. Standard errors for table 4: Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016	52
Table C-5. Standard errors for table 5: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016.....	54
Table C-6. Standard errors for table 6: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016	56
Table C-7. Standard errors for table 7: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016	59
Table C-8. Standard errors for table 8: Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016	61

This page is intentionally left blank.

Introduction

This report presents data on the early care and education arrangements and selected family activities of children in the United States from birth through the age of 5 who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten by 2016. The report also presents data on parents' ratings of factors that affected their choice of child care arrangements and on their participation in various learning activities with their children. For each category of information included in the report, the results are reported by child, parent, and family characteristics.

The data for this report come from the Early Childhood Program Participation (ECP) Survey, administered as part of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES:2016). The ECP survey collects data about children from birth through age 6 who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten.¹ The ECP asks detailed questions about children's participation in relative care, nonrelative care, and center-based care arrangements. It also asks about the main reason for choosing care; what factors were important to parents when choosing a care arrangement; the primary barriers to finding satisfactory care; what activities the family does with the child, such as reading, singing, and arts and crafts; and what the child is learning, such as counting, recognizing the letters of the alphabet, and reading. Parents are the respondents.

As noted, in the ECP questionnaire, parents are asked to report about children's participation in relative care, nonrelative care, and center-based care arrangements. Each type of care is presented to the parent as a distinct section of the questionnaire. If the child participates in a regularly scheduled, weekly arrangement for a given type of care, parents answer detailed questions about that care arrangement (e.g., information about the care provider, location of the care, and cost of the care). Since children could have more than one regularly scheduled care arrangement within a particular care type (e.g., two relative care arrangements), the questionnaire asked parents to focus on the person or center that provides the most care of that type. This report refers to these arrangements as the "primary care arrangement" for each particular type of care.

Children can have multiple primary care arrangements if they participate in more than one type of care. For example, if the child has a regularly scheduled arrangement with a relative and another at a center, then the child has two primary care arrangements from the perspective of this report. In this report, the term "multiple primary care arrangements" refers to children who have more than one regularly scheduled type of care arrangement. The questionnaire does not ask parents to identify which of type of care serves as the child's overall primary care arrangement.

This report (NCES 2017-101.REV) is revised from an earlier version of the report (NCES 2017-101) that was released in September 2017. Table 4 included a group of children who were reported as excluded from the table population in the table notes. Specifically, the population total estimates for the "Number of children (thousands)" column and the mean estimates for the "Hourly out-of-pocket expense by type of primary weekly nonparental care arrangement" columns included children whose parents reported \$0 for their out-of-pocket expense for care. The population and

¹ The ECP data file includes too few six-year-olds to support stable estimates; therefore, six-year-olds have been excluded from the estimates presented in this report.

mean estimates and their standard error estimates were incorrect in the initial report because they included those who reported \$0 for their out-of-pocket expense for care. This revised report excludes those children from the analysis for Table 4. This correction aligns the estimates and standard errors with the table note which reads “Children for whom no fee was charged, for whom another source paid the entire fee, or for whom the period of time covered by the amount indicated (e.g., per hour, per week) could not be determined are excluded from the estimates.” In addition, the selected finding for this table has been revised with the corrected estimates. All other estimates and findings presented in the report remain unchanged.

The NHES:2016 used a nationally representative address-based sample covering the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The survey was conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau from January through August 2016. The 2016 administration of NHES included a screener survey and three topical surveys: the Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey, the Adult Training and Education Survey, and the ECPP. The screener survey asked for an enumeration of household members and was used to select an eligible household member for a topical survey. All sampled households received initial contact by mail. While the majority of respondents completed paper questionnaires, a small sample of cases was part of a Web experiment with mailed invitations to complete the survey online. For more information about the 2016 web experiment, including methodology, please reference the forthcoming *Data File User’s Manual* (McPhee, Jackson, Bielick, Masterton, Battle, McQuiggan, Payri, Cox, and Medway, forthcoming).

The NHES:2012, which was the last time the NHES was administered, also used an address-based sample; however, there was no option to complete the survey online. Prior to 2012, the NHES used random digit dial (RDD) samples of landline telephones. Due to changes in the survey mode and item wording over the last few administrations, readers should use caution when comparing estimates with prior NHES administrations.

The ECPP questionnaires were completed by a parent or guardian who knew about the sampled child. When weighted, the ECPP data in this report are nationally representative of children between birth and the age of 5 not yet enrolled in kindergarten. The total number of ECPP cases in the NHES:2016 used in this report is 5,837 children, representing 21.4 million children between birth and age 5.

The screener questionnaire had a weighted response rate of 66.4 percent. The weighted unit response rate for the ECPP is 73.4 percent, and the overall response rate is 48.7 percent. An analysis of bias in the NHES:2016 data, described further in appendix A, detected some measurable bias in certain demographic characteristics (e.g., marital status, race/ethnicity, and home tenure). Measurable bias was detected on the ECPP for at least one level of 10 out of 16 demographic variables tested. For example, when examining race/ethnicity of the head of household, the percent of White respondents was significantly higher than the percent in the eligible sample, yielding an overrepresentation of these households in the weighted data. The level of potential bias detected is considered to be low. Additional details about the survey methodology, response rates, and data reliability are provided in appendix A. A full list of variables for which measurable bias was detected can be found in Chapter 10 of the *Data File User’s Manual* (McPhee, et al., forthcoming).

Results presented in this report are weighted. All statements of comparison have been tested for statistical significance using two-tailed *t*-tests and are significant at the 95 percent confidence level. No adjustments were made for multiple comparisons. Some estimates that appear different may not be measurably different in a statistical sense due to sampling error. Readers are directed to the Statistical Tests section of appendix A for information about how compare estimates in the tables.

This *First Look* report introduces new NHES survey data through the presentation of selected descriptive information. Readers are cautioned not to draw causal inferences based on the results presented. Many of the variables examined in this report may be related to one another, but the complex interactions and relationships among them have not been explored. The variables examined here are just a few of the variables that can be examined in these data; they were selected to demonstrate the range of information available from the study. The release of this report is intended to encourage more in-depth analysis of the data using more sophisticated statistical methods.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Selected Findings

- Approximately 60 percent of children age 5 and younger not enrolled in kindergarten were in at least one nonparental care arrangement that was regularly scheduled at least once a week, as reported by their parents. Among children in a weekly nonparental care arrangement, 41 percent were cared for by a relative (relative care), 22 percent were cared for in a private home by someone not related to them (nonrelative care), and 59 percent were attending a day care center, preschool, or prekindergarten (center-based care). Children may participate in more than one weekly arrangement across the three types of care, such as an arrangement with a relative and at a center. Among all children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten, 12 percent of children’s parents report having more than one type of regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement (table 1).
- Children may also have multiple weekly care arrangements within a single type of care (e.g., different arrangements with two or more relatives). In these instances, the *primary* care arrangement is defined as where the child spends the most time.² Among children with weekly relative care, the primary relative caregiver for 79 percent of children was a grandparent, compared with 13 percent who were cared for by an aunt or uncle and 9 percent whose care was provided by another relative (table 2).
- Since a child may have multiple weekly arrangements both within and across the three types of care, the child may then have multiple primary care arrangements.³ Among children who were 3 to 5 years old, the mean length of time they had been in a weekly nonparental care arrangement was longer for children in a primary relative care arrangement (31 months) compared to their primary nonrelative (26 months) or primary center-based care arrangement (17 months) (table 3).
- Among families with any out-of-pocket costs for a primary weekly nonparental care arrangement, the out-of-pocket costs per child for center-based care were higher for children in families with incomes at or above the poverty threshold (\$7.87 per hour) compared to children in families with incomes below the poverty threshold (\$4.01 per hour) (table 4).
- The most common location for children’s primary weekly center-based care arrangement was a building of its own (47 percent). Other reported locations were a church, synagogue, or other place of worship (19 percent); a public school (18 percent); and various other types of locations (17 percent) (table 5).
- Among children in a weekly nonparental care arrangement who had a parent who reported trying to find care, 86 percent had parents who reported that the reliability

² In follow-up questions about the three types of care arrangements, parents were asked to only report on the child’s primary weekly arrangement for that care type. All findings presented are regarding the child’s primary weekly arrangement within a given care type. For more information, refer to the Introduction section and Appendix B.

³ Multiple primary care arrangements occur when a child has more than one type of regularly scheduled, weekly care arrangement. For more information, refer to the Introduction section and Appendix B.

of the child care arrangement was very important to them when they chose the arrangement where their child spends the most time. A lower percentage, 77 percent of children, had parents who reported that learning activities were very important. Seventy-two percent reported that the availability of the care provider was very important (table 6).

- Although a higher percentage of children overall had parents who reported reliability as very important in choice of care arrangement, there was variability in the factors most commonly reported as very important by the type of care arrangement. For example, a higher percentage of children in nonrelative primary care arrangements had parents who reported availability of the care provider as very important (80 percent) compared to learning activities (58 percent). In contrast, higher percentages of children in center-based primary care arrangements reported learning activities as very important (83 percent) compared to availability of care provider (69 percent). Additionally, higher percentages of children in center-based care and multiple care arrangements had parents who reported time with other children as very important (74 and 73 percent, respectively) compared to children in relative or nonrelative primary care arrangements (58 and 38 percent, respectively) (table 6).
- Among children whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, a higher percentage (31 percent) had parents who reported cost as the primary reason for difficulty finding care compared to any other reason. Twenty-seven percent reported a lack of open slots for new children. A lower percentage, 22 percent of children, had parents who reported quality as the primary reason for difficulty finding care. Ten percent had parents who reported other reasons, and 9 percent had parents who reported location as the primary reason (table 7).
- Thirty-six percent of children less than 1 year old had parents who reported a lack of open slots as their primary reason for difficulty finding care. This percentage was higher than that of children who were 1 to 2 years old or 3 to 5 years old (25 percent each) (table 7).
- Approximately 81 percent of children ages 3 to 5 who were not yet in kindergarten had parents who read to them three or more times in the past week; 69 percent had parents who sang songs with them three or more times in the past week; 68 percent had parents who taught them letters, words, or numbers three or more times in the past week; 38 percent had parents who worked on arts and crafts with them three or more times in the past week; and 33 percent had parents who told them a story three or more times in the past week (table 8).

Estimate Tables

Table 1. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Weekly nonparental care arrangement				No weekly nonparental care arrangement
		At least one weekly nonparental care arrangement	Type ¹			
			Relative	Nonrelative	Center ²	
Total	21,362	60	41	22	59	40
Child's age						
Less than one year	4,724	47	59	29	26	53
1–2 years	8,552	54	43	26	45	46
3–5 years	8,087	73	32	16	82	27
Child's sex						
Male	10,800	60	42	22	58	40
Female	10,562	59	39	22	61	41
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	10,731	62	37	25	61	38
Black, non-Hispanic	2,837	68	46	19	57	32
Hispanic	5,418	51	48	17	54	49
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	1,009	57	41	15	63	43
Other race, non-Hispanic ³	1,367	59	38	22	62	41
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	17,033	58	38	22	61	42
One parent or guardian	4,329	67	50	22	54	33
English spoken at home by parents/guardians⁴						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	18,290	62	40	23	60	38
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	721	51	50	11 !	54	49
No parent/guardian speaks English	2,352	48	43	16	55	52
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	2,235	41	47	16	47	59
High school/GED	4,096	49	59	18	49	51
Vocational/technical or some college	5,168	60	47	20	54	40
Bachelor's degree	5,988	64	33	23	65	36
Graduate or professional degree	3,875	75	29	26	67	25
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁵						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	6,127	89	39	27	57	11
One full time, one part time	2,530	69	47	23	58	31
One full time, one not in labor force	6,590	29	28	10	74	71
Other	1,786	41	43	15	59	59
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	2,201	83	48	24	58	17
Part time	727	60	53	26	42	40
Not in the labor force	1,009	45	51	12 !	53	55
Looking for work	392	52	49	20 !	49	48
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	954	66	54	20	47	34
Both/only not enrolled	18,245	59	40	22	60	41
One enrolled, one not enrolled	2,163	63	37	24	58	37

See notes at end of table.

Table 1. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Weekly nonparental care arrangement				No weekly nonparental care arrangement
		At least one weekly nonparental care arrangement	Type ¹			
			Relative	Nonrelative	Center ²	
Region						
Northeast	3,334	65	40	25	62	35
South	7,881	61	37	17	62	39
Midwest	4,619	63	42	27	56	37
West	5,529	53	46	23	55	47
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	3,049	48	48	20	61	52
\$20,001–\$50,000	5,706	50	51	17	53	50
\$50,001–\$75,000	3,821	56	48	25	48	44
\$75,001–\$100,000	2,882	66	42	21	57	34
\$100,001 or more	5,904	75	28	25	69	25
Poverty status⁶						
At or above poverty threshold	17,159	63	39	22	60	37
Below poverty threshold	4,203	46	50	19	57	54

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent of greater.

¹Among children with at least one regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement.

²Center-based arrangements include day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, prekindergartens, and other early childhood programs.

³“Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

⁴Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁵Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁶Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B.

NOTE: Estimates include children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten. Children may have multiple weekly arrangements across the three types of care; therefore, a single child may be represented in multiple columns of this table. Among all children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten, 12 percent of children’s parents report having more than one type of regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPN-NHES:2016).

Table 2. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary relative caregiver ¹		
		Grandparent	Aunt or uncle	All other relatives ²
Total	5,194	79	13	9
Child's age				
Less than one year	1,314	80	14	7
1–2 years	2,002	81	10	9
3–5 years	1,878	75	15	10
Child's sex				
Male	2,750	78	12	10
Female	2,443	79	14	7
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	2,453	85	10	6
Black, non-Hispanic	874	71	20	10
Hispanic	1,325	71	15	13
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	236	81	6 !	13 !
Other race, non-Hispanic ³	307	85	10 !	‡
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	3,752	80	11	9
One parent or guardian	1,442	75	18	7
English spoken at home by parents/guardians⁴				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	4,527	81	12	7
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	187	74	‡	‡
No parent/guardian speaks English	480	62	17	21
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	429	65	20 !	14 !
High school/GED	1,192	74	13	13
Vocational/technical or some college	1,458	74	15	11
Bachelor's degree	1,268	85	11	4
Graduate or professional degree	846	91	6	3
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁵				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	2,089	80	10	9
One full time, one part time	814	82	12	6
One full time, one not in labor force	535	82	9 !	9 !
Other	315	67	13 !	20 !
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	879	72	20	8
Part time	229	88	5 !	‡
Not in the labor force	234	81	16 !	‡
Looking for work	100	62	‡	‡
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	336	84	12 !	‡
Both/only not enrolled	4,354	78	13	9
One enrolled, one not enrolled	504	81	12	8 !

See notes at end of table.

Table 2. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary relative caregiver ¹		
		Grandparent	Aunt or uncle	All other relatives ²
Region				
Northeast	860	83	10	7
South	1,770	79	13	8
Midwest	1,217	81	12	7
West	1,346	73	14	13
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	702	71	15	14
\$20,001–\$50,000	1,447	72	15	13
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,029	75	16	9
\$75,001–\$100,000	788	84	11	5 !
\$100,001 or more	1,229	90	6	3 !
Poverty status⁶				
At or above poverty threshold	4,227	81	12	7
Below poverty threshold	967	70	15	14

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent or greater.

‡ Reporting standards not met. There were too few cases for a reliable estimate.

¹Since a child may have multiple weekly arrangements within a single type of care (e.g., different arrangements with two or more relatives), parents were asked to only report on the primary arrangement for that care type. The primary care arrangement is defined as where the child spends the most time within a particular type of care as determined by the parent.

²This category includes the responses "brother/sister" and "another relative".

³"Other race, non-Hispanic" includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

⁴Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁵Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁶Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household's needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B. NOTE: Estimates include children from birth through 5 years of age, and not yet in kindergarten, with at least one regularly scheduled weekly relative care arrangement.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table 3. Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Mean number of months spent in different types of primary weekly nonparental care arrangements ¹		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center ²
Total	12,753	20	17	15
Child's age				
Less than one year	2,237	6	6	6
1–2 years	4,619	18	16	14
3–5 years	5,897	31	26	17
Child's sex				
Male	6,503	19	18	15
Female	6,250	21	16	15
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	6,673	21	18	15
Black, non-Hispanic	1,916	18	16	14
Hispanic	2,788	20	16	16
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	573	18	17	14
Other race, non-Hispanic ³	803	17	16	13
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	9,841	20	18	15
One parent or guardian	2,912	20	15	15
English spoken at home by parents/guardians⁴				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	11,261	20	17	15
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	371	19	22 †	16
No parent/guardian speaks English	1,121	18	19	13
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	908	17	16	16
High school/GED	2,027	19	15	14
Vocational/technical or some college	3,121	21	17	15
Bachelor's degree	3,803	20	19	15
Graduate or professional degree	2,894	21	17	16
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁵				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	5,425	20	18	17
One full time, one part time	1,740	21	19	14
One full time, one not in labor force	1,943	22	17	13
Other	733	17	11	13
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	1,818	21	15	16
Part time	434	17	17	15
Not in the labor force	456	19	14	14
Looking for work	204	13	‡	10
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	627	18	14	16
Both/only not enrolled	10,771	20	17	15
One enrolled, one not enrolled	1,355	21	16	15

See notes at end of table.

Table 3. Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Mean number of months spent in different types of primary weekly nonparental care arrangements ¹		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center ²
Region				
Northeast	2,157	19	16	15
South	4,768	19	16	15
Midwest	2,909	19	18	15
West	2,919	21	18	14
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	1,456	17	11	13
\$20,001–\$50,000	2,844	18	16	14
\$50,001–\$75,000	2,144	21	16	14
\$75,001–\$100,000	1,896	22	20	14
\$100,001 or more	4,413	21	19	17
Poverty status⁶				
At or above poverty threshold	10,837	21	18	15
Below poverty threshold	1,916	16	12	14

¹ Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent or greater.

[‡] Reporting standards not met. There were too few cases for a reliable estimate.

¹ If children were not in a given care arrangement, they were not included in the denominator for mean length of time in that particular care arrangement (e.g., children not in relative care were not included in the denominator for estimates for relative care).

² Center-based arrangements include day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, prekindergartens, and other early childhood programs.

³ “Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

⁴ Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁵ Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁶ Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B.

NOTE: Estimates include children from birth through 5 years of age, and not yet in kindergarten with at least one regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement. Since a child may have multiple weekly arrangements within a single type of care (e.g., different arrangements with two or more relatives), parents were asked to only report on the primary arrangement for that care type. The primary care arrangement is defined as where the child spends the most time within a particular type of care as determined by the parent. A child may also have multiple weekly arrangements across the three types of care. That is, a child may have a primary care arrangement with a relative as well as a primary care arrangement at a center. As a result, a single child may be represented in multiple columns of this table. Among all children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten, 12 percent of children's parents report having more than one type of regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement. Parents were not asked to distinguish which type of care is the most primary weekly arrangement for the child.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPN-NHES:2016).

Table 4. Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Hourly out-of-pocket expense by type of primary weekly nonparental care arrangement		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center ¹
Total	8,311	\$4.99	\$6.54	\$7.60
Child's age				
Less than one year	1,280	4.55	6.57	7.89
1–2 years	3,051	5.54	7.16	7.67
3–5 years	3,979	4.78	5.68	7.52
Child's sex				
Male	4,225	5.32	5.87	8.31
Female	4,085	4.61	7.26	6.92
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	4,758	3.95	6.08	7.36
Black, non-Hispanic	1,072	4.82	10.19 !	5.92
Hispanic	1,614	5.61	5.74	8.66
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	368	10.41 !	9.18	11.59
Other race, non-Hispanic ²	498	3.27	5.35	7.42
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	6,835	5.16	6.26	8.15
One parent or guardian	1,476	4.43	7.74 !	4.83
English spoken at home by parents/guardians³				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	7,507	4.56	6.44	7.43
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	157	11.29 !	6.57	7.44 !
No parent/guardian speaks English	646	6.06	7.67	10.33
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	369	5.65	4.79 !	2.21 !
High school/GED	873	4.83	4.77	5.22
Vocational/technical or some college	1,892	4.02	4.25	6.07
Bachelor's degree	2,820	5.54	7.51	7.78
Graduate or professional degree	2,357	6.65	7.94	9.41
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁴				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	4,225	4.70	6.05	7.99
One full time, one part time	1,106	5.59	6.89	8.07
One full time, one not in labor force	1,154	5.17	6.48	8.25
Other	349	‡	6.50	10.03
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	1,085	4.52	4.45	4.57
Part time	203	3.53 !	6.26	5.55
Not in the labor force	124	4.28 !	‡	5.54
Looking for work	64 !	‡	‡	6.84 !
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	306	‡	‡	5.49
Both/only not enrolled	7,127	4.84	6.00	7.75
One enrolled, one not enrolled	877	5.68	6.12	7.12

See notes at end of table.

Table 4. Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Hourly out-of-pocket expense by type of primary weekly nonparental care arrangement		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center ¹
Region				
Northeast	1,409	6.83	9.44	8.75
South	2,985	3.65	5.85	6.91
Midwest	1,985	4.49	4.46	6.46
West	1,930	6.22	7.62	9.10
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	608	3.80	‡	4.29
\$20,001–\$50,000	1,537	5.22	5.43	5.33
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,313	5.50	4.20	6.04
\$75,001–\$100,000	1,283	4.02	5.54	7.13
\$100,001 or more	3,569	6.06	7.83	9.27
Poverty status⁵				
At or above poverty threshold	7,535	5.42	6.32	7.87
Below poverty threshold	776	3.47	‡	4.01

¹ Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent of greater.

‡ Reporting standards not met. There were too few cases for a reliable estimate.

¹ Center-based arrangements include day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, prekindergartens, and other early childhood programs.

² “Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

³ Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁴ Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁵ Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B. NOTE: Estimates include children from birth through 5 years of age, and not yet in kindergarten, who have at least one regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement with out-of-pocket expense. Children for whom no fee was charged, for whom another source paid the entire fee, or for whom the period of time covered by the amount indicated (e.g., per hour, per week) could not be determined are excluded from the estimates. Since a child may have multiple weekly arrangements within a single type of care (e.g., different arrangements with two or more relatives), parents were asked to only report on the primary arrangement for that care type. The primary care arrangement is defined as where the child spends the most time within a particular type of care as determined by the parent. A child may also have multiple weekly arrangements across the three types of care. That is, a child may have a primary care arrangement with a relative as well as a primary care arrangement at a center. As a result, a single child may be represented in multiple columns of this table. Among all children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten, 12 percent of children's parents report having more than one type of regularly scheduled weekly nonparental care arrangement. Parents were not asked to distinguish which type of care is the most primary weekly arrangement for the child. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table 5. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Location of primary center-based care arrangement ¹			
		Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	Public school (K–12)	Its own building	All other locations ²
Total	7,538	19	18	47	17
Child's age					
Less than one year	593	14	6 !	68	12
1–2 years	2,085	19	4	61	16
3–5 years	4,860	20	25	38	18
Child's sex					
Male	3,751	19	18	46	17
Female	3,787	19	17	47	17
Child's race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	4,090	25	14	43	18
Black, non-Hispanic	1,098	7	20	62	11
Hispanic	1,494	13	25	45	17
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	361	13	18	44	26
Other race, non-Hispanic ³	495	15	18	49	18
Family type					
Two parents or guardians	5,960	21	17	44	17
One parent or guardian	1,577	10	19	56	15
English spoken at home by parents/guardians⁴					
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	6,723	20	16	47	17
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	199	‡	28 !	48	15 !
No parent/guardian speaks English	615	10	31	40	19
Highest education level of parents/guardians					
Less than high school	424	‡	39	49	11 !
High school/GED	996	7 !	33	45	14
Vocational/technical or some college	1,700	15	22	50	13
Bachelor's degree	2,467	24	10	48	18
Graduate or professional degree	1,951	25	10	42	22
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁵					
Two-parent/guardian family					
Both full time	3,072	18	12	51	19
One full time, one part time	1,010	26	17	39	18
One full time, one not in labor force	1,443	27	25	34	14
Other	436	15	26	40	19
Single-parent/guardian family					
Full time	1,052	10	15	64	12
Part time	183	17 !	23 !	38	22 !
Not in the labor force	242	‡	32	46	19 !
Looking for work	99	‡	32 !	35 !	‡
School enrollment status of parents/guardians					
Both/only enrolled	294	5 !	20	65	10 !
Both/only not enrolled	6,454	20	18	46	17
One enrolled, one not enrolled	790	20	16	47	17

See notes at end of table.

Table 5. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly primary center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Location of primary center-based care arrangement ¹			
		Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	Public school (K–12)	Its own building	All other locations ²
Region					
Northeast	1,328	16	13	46	25
South	2,978	23	17	46	14
Midwest	1,625	19	18	49	13
West	1,606	14	21	46	19
Household income					
\$20,000 or less	893	7	32	47	13
\$20,001–\$50,000	1,497	10	24	52	14
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,022	21	18	44	17
\$75,001–\$100,000	1,085	24	22	39	15
\$100,001 or more	3,041	25	8	47	20
Poverty status⁶					
At or above poverty threshold	6,455	21	15	46	17
Below poverty threshold	1,083	7	31	48	14

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent of greater.

‡ Reporting standards not met. There were too few cases for a reliable estimate.

¹Since a child may have multiple weekly arrangements within a single type of care (e.g., different arrangements at two or more centers), parents were asked to only report on the primary arrangement for that care type. The primary care arrangement is defined as where the child spends the most time within a particular type of care as determined by the parent.

²This category includes the responses “private elementary or secondary school”, “college or university”, “community center”, “public library”, and “some other place”.

³“Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

⁴Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁵Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁶Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B. NOTE: Estimates include all children from birth through 5 years of age, and not yet in kindergarten, with at least one regularly scheduled weekly center-based care arrangement. Center-based arrangements include day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, prekindergartens, and other early childhood programs.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-PP-NHES:2016).

Table 6. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement										
	Number of children (thousands)	Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Availability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommendations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation
Total	10,034	61	51	86	77	67	72	39	27	50	16
Arrangement type											
Relative only	1,231	65	63	85	73	58	78	45	31	53	26
Nonrelative only	1,385	65	58	89	58	38	80	33	19	53	12
Center only	5,093	60	47	85	83	74	69	41	29	48	15
Multiple types of arrangements ¹	2,324	58	50	86	76	73	71	37	26	52	16
Difficulty finding desired care program											
No difficulty	5,074	62	46	85	82	72	71	40	29	52	18
A little difficulty	1,753	55	52	85	74	65	68	32	18	46	11
Some difficulty	1,804	56	51	86	67	56	70	38	22	47	12
A lot of difficulty	1,066	67	71	91	81	71	83	52	35	56	22
Did not find the desired child care program	336	73	69	91	64	47	84	41	37	46	18
Child’s age											
Less than one year	1,472	65	57	86	65	43	80	43	30	57	13
1–2 years	3,391	62	51	87	74	64	74	40	29	50	16
3–5 years	5,171	58	49	85	82	75	69	38	25	49	17
Child’s sex											
Male	5,120	61	51	86	77	68	72	38	27	51	16
Female	4,914	61	51	86	77	66	72	41	27	49	16
Child’s race/ethnicity											
White, non-Hispanic	5,505	54	43	84	72	63	66	32	20	49	13
Black, non-Hispanic	1,551	74	69	91	91	75	86	59	41	56	31
Hispanic	1,903	66	59	87	82	71	77	47	34	53	17
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	438	63	48	82	69	64	66	34	32	54	15
Other race, non-Hispanic ²	635	68	52	85	75	67	75	35	26	36	8
Family type											
Two parents or guardians	7,857	58	48	86	75	63	69	37	24	49	14
One parent or guardian	2,177	69	61	87	86	79	84	50	38	54	26
English spoken at home by parents/guardians³											
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	9,078	60	50	86	77	67	72	39	26	50	16
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	227	77	70	87	84	74	79	51	34 !	38	24
No parent/guardian speaks English	729	60	58	85	78	64	68	45	33	52	18

See notes at end of table.

Table 6. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement										
	Number of children (thousands)	Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Availability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommendations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation
Highest education level of parents/guardians											
Less than high school	549	76	59	88	81	73	81	63	47	57	27
High school/GED	1,372	63	61	80	86	83	82	42	36	50	24
Vocational/technical or some college	2,343	64	60	89	83	71	78	44	31	52	18
Bachelor’s degree	3,220	56	49	87	74	63	69	36	25	50	14
Graduate or professional degree	2,550	58	39	84	70	58	64	33	17	47	11
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁴											
Two-parent/guardian family											
Both full time	4,489	62	48	89	72	59	78	36	24	49	10
One full time, one part time	1,336	51	48	83	71	62	54	33	18	47	16
One full time, one not in labor force	1,505	54	46	79	81	76	55	40	26	55	19
Other	527	60	56	85	84	71	71	42	32	47	18
Single-parent/guardian family											
Full time	1,404	71	64	94	87	74	85	49	36	51	20
Part time	303	71	60	78	75	81	79	49	35	54	23
Not in the labor force	322	60	47	71	90	85	78	49	53	66	53
Looking for work	148	57	61	83	90	98	88	53	31 !	57	24 !
School enrollment status of parents/guardians											
Both/only enrolled	418	66	56	83	84	77	86	41	42	57	30
Both/only not enrolled	8,478	61	50	86	77	67	72	40	26	50	16
One enrolled, one not enrolled	1,138	59	59	87	75	59	69	36	29	49	13
Region											
Northeast	1,794	62	51	85	76	70	72	37	24	50	11
South	3,715	62	53	86	83	70	73	45	34	53	24
Midwest	2,317	59	49	88	74	61	70	34	20	47	11
West	2,207	59	51	85	71	64	73	37	26	51	13
Household income											
\$20,000 or less	1,135	71	60	85	90	85	80	51	37	53	32
\$20,001–\$50,000	2,036	63	64	87	81	72	77	47	32	46	17
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,590	64	64	88	76	67	75	39	28	53	17
\$75,001–\$100,000	1,387	56	49	87	72	62	67	33	20	53	14
\$100,001 or more	3,886	57	37	84	73	60	69	34	23	50	11

See notes at end of table.

Table 6. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement										
	Number of children (thousands)	Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Avail-ability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommend-ations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation
Poverty status⁵											
At or above poverty threshold	8,623	59	49	86	75	64	71	37	25	50	14
Below poverty threshold	1,410	72	62	86	89	83	79	52	38	52	30

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent of greater.

¹“Multiple types of arrangements” includes children who are in more than one type of weekly care arrangement.

²“Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

³Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁴Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁵Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B.

NOTE: Estimates include all children from birth through 5 years of age who are not yet in kindergarten, are in at least one nonparental care arrangement, and whose parents tried to find care. The total number of children in this table is smaller than the total number of children in Tables 3 and 4. While all three tables provide information about children in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement, Table 3 and 4 include children who are in an arrangement and also had parents who reported that they did not search for care.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPPE-NHES:2016).

Table 7. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary reason for difficulty				
		Cost	Location	Quality	Lack of open slots for new children	All other reasons ¹
Total	6,450	31	9	22	27	10
Arrangement type						
Relative only	741	45	7	11	24	13
Nonrelative only	833	33	8	27	23	10
Center only	2,245	23	9	25	35	8
Multiple types of arrangements ²	1,142	27	9	26	24	13
No nonparental arrangement	1,490	40	11 !	17	21	11
Difficulty finding desired care program						
A little difficulty	2,045	28	10	22	32	8
Some difficulty	2,098	28	9	25	28	10
A lot of difficulty	1,375	35	6	18	29	11
Did not find the desired child care program	931	40	14 !	19	13	15
Child's age						
Less than one year	1,134	31	6	20	36	8
1–2 years	2,467	33	6	24	25	12
3–5 years	2,848	30	13	21	25	10
Child's sex						
Male	3,374	34	8	21	26	11
Female	3,076	29	10	23	28	10
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	3,139	27	7	26	29	10
Black, non-Hispanic	1,073	37	9	21	23	10
Hispanic	1,432	34	15 !	13	27	12
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	308	31	9 !	28	20	12 !
Other race, non-Hispanic ³	498	36	6 !	19	29	10
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	5,138	31	9	23	27	10
One parent or guardian	1,312	32	12	16	27	13
English spoken at home by parents/guardians⁴						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	5,619	31	8	23	28	10
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	189	31	13 !	21 !	18 !	17 !
No parent/guardian speaks English	642	34	20 !	15	24	8 !
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	373	29	‡	‡	23 !	‡
High school/GED	932	38	13	15	24	10
Vocational/technical or some college	1,627	36	8	21	22	12
Bachelor's degree	1,947	34	6	24	27	10
Graduate or professional degree	1,570	20	7	28	36	10
Labor force status of parents/guardians⁵						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	2,557	28	7	27	28	9
One full time, one part time	796	37	4 !	24	26	9
One full time, one not in labor force	1,301	33	12 !	17	27	11
Other	485	31	13	19	26	12
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	775	29	11	17	31	12
Part time	215	42	6 !	17 !	30 !	5 !
Not in the labor force	228	28	18 !	‡	16 !	20 !
Looking for work	94	44 !	‡	‡	‡	‡

See notes at end of table.

Table 7. Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary reason for difficulty				
		Cost	Location	Quality	Lack of open slots for new children	All other reasons ¹
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	325	36	11	26	18	10 !
Both/only not enrolled	5,294	30	9	22	28	11
One enrolled, one not enrolled	831	41	7	19	24	9
Region						
Northeast	1,065	32	6	25	31	6
South	2,322	33	9	21	27	10
Midwest	1,211	26	10	23	26	15
West	1,852	33	11 !	20	26	11
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	842	28	18	20	21	13
\$20,001–\$50,000	1,576	39	7	17	24	12
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,067	35	14 !	20	23	8
\$75,001–\$100,000	850	35	6	23	25	10
\$100,001 or more	2,115	24	6	27	35	9
Poverty status⁶						
At or above poverty threshold	5,377	32	8	23	27	10
Below poverty threshold	1,073	29	15	18	26	12

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent or greater.

‡ Reporting standards not met. There were too few cases for a reliable estimate.

¹This category includes the responses “needed a program for children with special needs” and “other reason”.

²“Multiple types of arrangements” includes children who are in more than one type of weekly care arrangement.

³“Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

⁴Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

⁵Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁶Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B.

NOTE: Estimates include all children from birth through 5 years of age who are not yet in kindergarten, and whose parents reported at least a little difficulty finding care.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-PP-NHES:2016).

Table 8. Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Home activities with child three or more times in past week					
	Number of children (thousands)	Read to child	Told a story	Taught letters, words, or numbers	Sang songs	Worked on arts and crafts
Total	8,087	81	33	68	69	38
Arrangement type						
Relative	1,878	79	33	68	69	33
Nonrelative	953	84	37	68	68	41
Center	4,860	84	32	69	68	37
No nonparental arrangement	2,190	75	35	70	69	40
Child's sex						
Male	4,184	80	36	69	63	34
Female	3,903	83	31	66	75	42
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	4,003	88	35	68	72	40
Black, non-Hispanic	1,086	79	36	76	73	31
Hispanic	2,133	71	25	62	61	38
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	400	74	43	69	60	34
Other race, non-Hispanic ¹	464	83	39	74	73	42
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	6,254	83	34	67	68	38
One parent or guardian	1,833	75	32	70	70	36
English spoken at home by parents/guardians²						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	6,909	84	34	69	70	39
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	272	73	28	62	65	31
No parent/guardian speaks English	906	63	26	58	58	33
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	922	61	29	53	67	22
High school/GED	1,492	75	22	68	64	34
Vocational/technical or some college	1,985	80	34	70	71	40
Bachelor's degree	2,219	88	36	71	69	40
Graduate or professional degree	1,469	91	44	71	71	46
Labor force status of parents/guardians³						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	2,254	82	34	66	67	35
One full time, one part time	1,069	89	38	69	71	41
One full time, one not in labor force	2,339	81	31	67	71	39
Other	592	84	38	70	60	40
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	1,046	73	32	72	71	34
Part time	221	72	34	72	69	49
Not in the labor force	422	75	32	66	68	37
Looking for work	145	94	21 !	60	69	32 !
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	317	74	36	67	71	42
Both/only not enrolled	7,020	81	34	68	69	38
One enrolled, one not enrolled	749	85	30	71	68	35

See notes at end of table.

Table 8. Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Home activities with child three or more times in past week					
	Number of children (thousands)	Read to child	Told a story	Taught letters, words, or numbers	Sang songs	Worked on arts and crafts
Region						
Northeast	1,202	83	31	74	71	39
South	2,969	82	33	71	69	37
Midwest	1,665	82	37	66	71	35
West	2,251	80	32	61	66	41
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	1,162	70	30	66	65	33
\$20,001–\$50,000	2,211	76	32	69	68	32
\$50,001–\$75,000	1,342	79	33	63	71	37
\$75,001–\$100,000	1,047	88	29	68	68	41
\$100,001 or more	2,325	90	39	70	70	44
Poverty status⁴						
At or above poverty threshold	6,551	84	34	68	69	39
Below poverty threshold	1,536	71	29	65	67	31

! Interpret data with caution. The coefficient of variation (CV) for this estimate is 30 percent or greater.

¹“Other race, non-Hispanic” includes American Indian and Alaska Native children who are not Hispanic, children who are not Hispanic and reported more than one race, and children with a race/ethnicity not listed.

²Complete descriptions of the categories for English spoken at home by parents/guardians are as follows: (1) Both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home, (2) One of two parents/guardians in a two-parent/guardian household learned English first or currently speaks English in the home, and (3) No parent/guardian learned English first and both parents/guardians or the only parent/guardian currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home.

³Full-time employment is defined as working 35 hours or more per week. Part-time employment is defined as working less than 35 hours per week.

⁴Children are considered poor if living in households with incomes below the poverty threshold, which is a dollar amount determined by the federal government to meet the household’s needs, given its size and composition. Income is collected in categories in the survey, rather than as an exact amount, and therefore the poverty measures used in this report are approximations of poverty. Detailed information on the poverty status calculation used in this report is available in appendix B.

NOTE: Estimates include all children from age 3 through 5 years of age who are not yet in kindergarten.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

References

McPhee, C., Jackson, M., Bielick, S., Masterton, M., Battle, D., McQuiggan, M., Payri, M., Cox, C., and Medway, R. (forthcoming). *National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016: Data File User's Manual* (NCES 2017-100). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix A: Technical Notes

The National Household Education Surveys Program (NHES) is a set of surveys sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) that provides descriptive data on the educational activities of the U.S. population. This *First Look* report presents survey data released from the Early Childhood Program Participation (ECP) Survey of the 2016 NHES. Earlier administrations of the NHES—in 1991, 1995, 1999, 2001, 2005, and 2012—also focused on early childhood program participation.

The ECPP data collection was conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau, from January through August of 2016. This section provides a brief description of the study methodology. For more extensive information on the study methodology and data collection procedures, readers are advised to consult the *National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016: Data File User's Manual* (McPhee et al., forthcoming).

The NHES:2016 sample was selected using a two-stage address-based sampling frame. The first sampling stage selected residential addresses; at this first stage, households were asked to complete a screener questionnaire. To increase the number of Blacks and Hispanics in the sample, Black and Hispanic households were sampled at a higher rate than other households by identifying census tracts with higher percentages of these residents. At the second stage, one individual from each household was sampled. The majority of data were collected using printed questionnaires that were mailed to the sampled respondents. However, 35,000 of 206,000 sampled households were first asked to complete the survey by web in order to assess the feasibility of including a web-based administration in future NHES collections. A total of 738 respondents completed the ECPP by web, which is about 13 percent of all ECPP respondents. For more information about the 2016 web experiment, including response rates by administration mode, please see the forthcoming *Data File User's Manual* (McPhee et al., forthcoming).

The NHES:2016 included four topical survey instruments: the Parent and Family Involvement Survey for enrolled students (PFI-Enrolled), the Parent and Family Involvement Survey for homeschooled students (PFI-Homeschooled), the Early Childhood Program Participation Survey (ECP), and the Adult Training and Education Survey (ATES). A within-household sampling scheme controlled for the number of persons sampled for topical questionnaires in each household. No household received more than one survey; either one child was sampled for the ECP survey, the PFI-Enrolled, or the PFI-Homeschooled survey; or an adult was sampled for the ATES.

Because ECPP-eligible children comprise a smaller portion of the population than the kindergarten through grade 12 children who are eligible for the PFI, differential sampling in households with children in both domains was applied to ensure a sufficient sample size for the ECPP survey. The differential probabilities of selection (for households overall and within households) are accounted for in the NHES weighting methodology. The ECPP sample is nationally representative of all

noninstitutionalized children in the 50 states and the District of Columbia between birth and age 6 who are not yet enrolled in kindergarten.⁴

The respondent to the ECPP questionnaire was a parent or guardian in the household who knew about the sampled child. The respondent was asked detailed questions about the sampled child's current nonparental care arrangements, finding and choosing care for the child, family activities, and things the child may be learning. The respondent was also asked basic demographic questions about the child, as well as questions about the child's health and disability status, parent/guardian characteristics, and household characteristics. Multiple follow-up attempts were made to obtain completed questionnaires from respondents who did not respond to the first questionnaire that was mailed to them. The survey contact materials and questionnaires (both printed and online) were available in English and Spanish. The total number of completed ECPP surveys was 5,844, representing a population of 21.4 million children when weighted to reflect national totals. This report excludes a small number of 6 year old children from the analysis, resulting in 5,837 ECPP cases, which represents a population of 21.4 million children when weighted to reflect national totals.

Data Reliability

Estimates produced using data from the NHES are subject to two types of errors: sampling errors and nonsampling errors. Nonsampling errors are errors made in the collection and processing of data. Sampling errors occur because the data are collected from a sample, rather than a census, of the population.

Nonsampling Errors

Nonsampling error is the term used to describe variations in the estimates that may be caused by population coverage limitations and data collection, processing, and reporting procedures. The sources of nonsampling errors are typically problems such as unit and item nonresponse, the differences in respondents' interpretations of the meaning of survey questions, response differences related to the particular month or time of the year when the survey was conducted, the tendency for respondents to give socially desirable responses, and mistakes in data preparation.

In general, it is difficult to identify and estimate either the amount of nonsampling error or the bias caused by this error. For each NHES survey, efforts are made to prevent such errors from occurring and to compensate for them, where possible. For instance, during the survey design phase, cognitive interviews were conducted to assess respondents' knowledge of the survey topics, their comprehension of questions and terms, and the sensitivity of items.

Sampling Errors

The sample of households selected for the NHES:2016 is just one of many possible samples that could have been selected from all households based on addresses. Therefore, estimates produced from this survey may differ from estimates that would have been produced from other samples. This type

⁴ The ECPP sample represents children who are age 6 but not yet in kindergarten; however, the tables in this report are for children birth to age 5 because there are not enough children who are age 6 and not yet in kindergarten in the final NHES data to support stable estimates.

of variability is called sampling error because it arises from using a sample of households rather than all households.

The standard error is a measure of the variability due to sampling when estimating a statistic; standard errors for estimates presented in this report were computed using a jackknife replication method. Standard errors can be used as a measure of the precision expected from a particular sample. The probability that a complete census count would differ from the sample estimate by less than 1 standard error is about 68 percent. The chance that the difference would be less than 1.65 standard errors is about 90 percent and that the chance that the difference would be less than 1.96 standard errors is about 95 percent.

Standard errors for all of the estimates are presented in appendix C and can be used to produce confidence intervals. For example, among children in relative care, an estimated 80 percent of children less than one year old received relative care from a grandparent (table 2). Because this figure has an estimated standard error of 3.0, the estimated 95 percent confidence interval is approximately 74 to 86 percent [80 percent \pm (1.96*3.0)]. If repeated samples were drawn from the same population and confidence intervals were constructed for the percentage of those children who were in relative care, less than one year old, who received care from a grandparent, then these intervals would contain the true population parameter 95 percent of the time.

Weighting

To produce estimates representing national totals rather than sample characteristics, all of the analyses in this report were weighted using the probabilities of selection of the respondents and other adjustments to account for nonresponse and coverage bias. The weight used in this *First Look* report is FEWT, which is the weight variable available in the ECPP data file that is used to estimate the characteristics of children not yet enrolled in school.

Complex sample designs, such as that used in NHES:2016, result in data that violate some of the assumptions that are made when assessing the statistical significance of results from a simple random sample. For example, the standard errors of the estimates from these surveys may vary from those that would be expected if the sample were a simple random sample and the observations were independent and identically distributed random variables. The estimates and standard errors presented in this report were produced using Stata 13.1 software and the jackknife 1 (jkrweight) option as a replication procedure. Eighty replicate weights, FEWT1 to FEWT80, were used to compute sampling errors of estimates. These replicate weights are also available in the ECPP data file.

Response Rates

In the NHES:2016 collection, an initial screener questionnaire was sent to all sampled households to determine which household members were eligible to be sampled for a second-stage survey on a specific topic. Screener questionnaires were completed by 115,342 households, for a weighted screener unit response rate of 66.4 percent. ECPP questionnaires were completed for 5,844 children, for a weighted unit response rate of 73.4 percent and an overall estimated weighted unit response rate (the product of the screener weighted unit response rate and the ECPP weighted unit response rate) of 48.7 percent.

Bias Analysis

NCES statistical standards require a bias analysis be conducted if the response rate at any phase of data collection falls below 85 percent. The NHES:2016 included a bias analysis to evaluate whether nonresponse at the unit and item levels impacted the estimates. The term “bias” has a specific technical definition in this context: It is the expected difference between the estimate from the survey and the actual population value. For example, if all households were included in the survey (i.e., if a census was conducted rather than a sample survey), then the difference between the estimate from the survey and the actual population value (which includes persons who did not respond to the survey) would be the bias due to unit nonresponse. Because NHES is based on a sample, the bias is defined as the expected or average value of this difference over all possible samples.

Unit nonresponse bias, or the bias due to the failure of some persons or households in the sample to respond to the survey, can be substantial when two conditions hold. First, the differences between the characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents must be relatively large. For example, consider estimating the percentage of preschool-age children who were read to in the past week. If the percentage is nearly identical for both respondents and nonrespondents, then the unit nonresponse bias of the estimate will be negligible. Conversely, if the difference between respondents and nonrespondents is large (e.g., large percentages of children among respondents were read to compared to small percentages of children among nonrespondents), then significant bias could be affecting the estimates. Second, the unit nonresponse rate must be relatively high. If the nonresponse rate is very low relative to the magnitude of the estimates, then the unit nonresponse bias in the estimates will be small, even if the differences in the characteristics between respondents and nonrespondents are relatively large. For example, if the unit nonresponse rate is only 2 percent, then estimates of totals that comprise 20 or 30 percent of the population will not be greatly affected by nonresponse, even if the differences in these characteristics between respondents and nonrespondents are relatively large. If the estimate is for a small domain or subgroup (of about 5 or 10 percent of the population), then even a relatively low overall rate of nonresponse can result in important biases if the differences between respondents and nonrespondents are large.

A number of strategies were used to evaluate the level of bias in NHES:2016 estimates. First, characteristics of the full sample of NHES:2016 addresses were compared to the sample of completed NHES surveys. Because we have relatively limited information about sampled addresses, the number of such possible comparisons is constrained to information available on the commercially-purchased sample frame, auxiliary data from the Census Bureau at the block group level, and variables related to survey operations, such as the types of mailings sent. These comparisons represent the most direct evidence of bias because they compare all sampled addresses, including nonresponders, to responding addresses.

Three additional analyses were conducted to look for approximate evidence of bias; the additional analyses suggest potential for bias but do not measure bias. In one set of analyses, addresses with responses to either of the first two survey mailings were compared to addresses who responded only after receiving the third or fourth survey mailings. The assumption behind these analyses is that late responders are more like nonresponders than early responders and that any differences between these groups can suggest potential sources of bias from nonresponding households. In another set of analyses, estimates generated using nonresponse-adjusted weights were compared to estimates generated using unadjusted weights to evaluate the extent to which the nonresponse adjustments may

have reduced bias in the estimates. Finally, NHES estimates were compared with extant survey estimates to find large differences, which may suggest some bias in NHES estimates. Results of all analyses are summarized below and suggest that there are a small number of demographic characteristics that are underrepresented in the NHES survey but are ameliorated with nonresponse weighting adjustments. Chapter 10 of the *National Household Education Surveys Program of 2016: Data File User's Manual* (McPhee et al., forthcoming) contains a detailed description of the nonresponse bias analysis.

Comparisons between the full sample population and the respondent populations were made before and after the nonresponse weighting adjustments were applied to evaluate the extent to which the adjustments reduced nonresponse bias. The NHES sampling frame variables were used for the unit nonresponse bias analysis for the screener and topical surveys. The analysis of unit nonresponse bias showed some evidence of bias based on the distributions of the sample characteristics for the survey respondents compared to the full eligible sample for specific demographic characteristics. Most differences between characteristics of the sample and those of the screener survey respondents were less than 5 percentage points. Respondents who were married, White, or homeowners were overrepresented in the screener survey sample by 5-7 percentage points prior to being statistically adjusted for nonresponse. All differences between ECPP respondents and initial sample member addresses were less than or equal to 4 percentage points, with most differences less than 3 percentage points prior to adjustment.

This bias was greatly reduced by the nonresponse weighting adjustments. In the post-adjusted screener estimates, the number of estimates showing measurable and practical differences was reduced approximately in half. Additionally, nonresponse weighting adjustments reduced the differences between married, White, or homeowner screener respondents and the full initial screener sample to less than 3 percentage points. The percentage of ECPP estimates with measurable survey and sample differences greater than 1 percentage point was reduced from 40 to 20 percent by the nonresponse weighting adjustments. After nonresponse adjustments, all ECPP comparisons were 1.5 percentage points different or less from the full sample characteristics except those by marital status (2.4 percentage point estimated bias for married respondents), tenure (2.6 percentage point estimated bias for homeowners), and race/ethnicity (1.7 percentage point estimated bias for White respondents).

Key survey estimates were also compared between early and late respondents at both the topical and screener phases. The subgroups with the highest percent relative difference between early and late topical respondents for ECPP were children whose parents had less than a high school diploma (50 percent), children in households with one parent and no sibling (47 percent), and children who had one parent who speaks English (45 percent). Key survey estimates related to children's care and education had an average percent relative difference between early and late topical responders of only 3 percent. Approximately 58 percent of the 48 ECPP demographic estimates and substantive estimates examined showed statistically significant differences of at least 1 percentage point between early and late screener respondents, and approximately 31 percent showed statistically significant differences of at least 1 percentage point between early and late topical respondents. This finding suggests a potential for bias in some ECPP estimates, although the magnitude of the potential bias is unknown because it might be incorrect to assume that late responders are similar to nonresponders.

When key survey estimates generated with unadjusted and nonresponse adjusted weights were compared, only a small number of measurable differences were observed. All differences were less than 2.4 percentage points. This suggests that none of these variables were powerful predictors of unit response. Therefore, the unit nonresponse adjustment had little effect on the potential bias, but it is possible that there was limited bias to be removed.

Nonresponse bias might be present in other variables that were not studied. For this reason, it is important to consider other methods of examining unit nonresponse bias. One such method is comparing NHES estimates with other sources. NHES estimates were compared with estimates from the American Community Survey, Current Population Survey, and prior NHES collections. Comparisons were made on common variables of interest—such as child’s race/ethnicity and sex; key questionnaire items; and parents’ education and household income—to discover any indication of potential bias that might exist in the NHES:2016 data. The results from these comparisons indicate that NHES survey estimates are comparable with other data sources.

Statistical Tests

Comparisons of proportions were tested using Student’s t statistic. Differences between proportions were tested against the probability of a Type I error⁵ or significance level. The statistical significance of each comparison was determined by calculating the Student’s t value for the difference between each pair of proportions and comparing the t value with published tables of significance levels for two-tailed hypothesis testing. Student’s t values were computed to test differences between independent proportions⁶ using the following formula:

$$t = \frac{p_2 - p_1}{\sqrt{[s.e.(p_1)]^2 + [s.e.(p_2)]^2}}$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the proportions to be compared and se_1 and se_2 are their corresponding standard errors.

There are hazards in reporting statistical tests for each comparison. First, comparisons based on large t statistics may appear to merit special attention. This can be misleading because the magnitude of the t statistic is related not only to the observed differences in proportions but also to the number of respondents in the specific categories used for comparisons. Hence, a small difference compared across a large number of respondents would produce a large (and thus possibly statistically significant) t statistic.

A second hazard in reporting statistical tests is the possibility that one can report a “false positive” or Type I error. Statistical tests are designed to limit the risk of this type of error using a value denoted by alpha. The alpha level of .05 was selected for findings in this report and ensures that a difference

⁵ A Type I error occurs when one concludes that a difference observed in a sample reflects a true difference in the population from which the sample was drawn, when no such difference is present.

⁶ Several significance tests in this report used the formula for the t -test of the difference between two *dependent* samples. This formula is used when the two proportions are estimated using partially or wholly overlapping samples. This formula is similar to that used for independent samples but accounts for the covariance between P_1 and P_2 .

of a certain magnitude or larger would be produced when there was no actual difference between the quantities in the underlying population no more than 1 time out of 20.⁷ When analysts test hypotheses that show alpha values at the .05 level or smaller, they reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the two quantities. Failing to reject a null hypothesis (i.e., detect a difference), however, does not imply the values are the same or equivalent.

⁷ No adjustments were made for multiple comparisons.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix B: Glossary of Terms

The row and column variables used in analyses for this *First Look* report are described in this appendix. The names of variables that are included in the data file and were used to produce estimates for this report appear in capital letters. In some cases, the variables have been used in the exact format in which they appear on the data file. In other cases, variables available on the data file have been modified, for instance, when the categories have been combined to create a smaller number of categories. Such collapsing of categories is noted in the descriptions. In other cases, new measures have been created specifically for this report by combining information from two or more variables in the data file. In these instances, the variables used to create the new measure are noted. Values were imputed for items with missing data. Unless otherwise noted, all data are based on either direct parent reports or imputed data.

Row Variables

Child Characteristics

Child's age: Child's age (AGE2015) is the sampled child's age as of December 31, 2015. For the analyses in this report, age is collapsed into three categories: less than one year old, 1–2 years old, and 3–5 years old. All tables include only children up to 5 years of age and not yet in kindergarten.

Child's sex: The data for the variable CSEX are taken directly from responses to the topical survey. If values are missing for this variable, then they are imputed from the screener survey where possible.

Child's race/ethnicity: RACEETH2 indicates the race and ethnicity of the sampled child. This variable is used in this report in the same format in which it appears on the data file and is derived from information in CHISPAN, CWHITE, CBLACK, CAMIND, CASIAN, and CPACI. If values are missing for these variables, they are imputed. If children are reported to be both Asian and Pacific Islander, and are not Hispanic, they are included in the "Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic" category.

The values of RACEETH2 are as follows:

- 1 = White, non-Hispanic
- 2 = Black, non-Hispanic
- 3 = Hispanic
- 4 = Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic
- 5 = All other races and multiple races, non-Hispanic

Region: The variable CENREG identifies the census region in which the sampled child lives. This derived variable was drawn from the sampling frame.

The values for CENREG are as follows:

- 1 = Northeast
- 2 = South
- 3 = Midwest
- 4 = West

Family Characteristics

Family type: Family type is derived from PAR1TYPE and PAR2TYPE. These two derived variables on the data file indicate whether the parents identified in the “Parent 1” and “Parent 2” sections of the questionnaire are birth or adoptive parents, step or foster parents, grandmothers or another type of female guardian, or grandfathers or another type of male guardian.

The values for family type are as follows:

- 1 = Two parents or guardians
- 2 = One parent or guardian

The code used to produce family type is as follows:

If PAR1TYPE in (1,2,3,4,5,6) and PAR2TYPE in (1,2,3,4,5,6) then family = 1;
Else family = 2;

English spoken at home by parents/guardians: LANGUAGEX indicates the knowledge and/or use of English by the parent(s) or guardian(s) in the household. LANGUAGEX is used in this report in the same format in which it appears on the data file and is created using the variables P1FRLNG, P1SPEAK, P2GUARD, P2FRLNG, and P2SPEAK.

The values for LANGUAGEX are as follows:

- 1 = Both or only parent(s)/guardian(s) learned English first or currently speak(s) English in the home
- 2 = One of two parents/guardians learned English first or currently speaks English in the home
- 3 = No parent/guardian learned English first and both/only parent(s) currently speak(s) a non-English language in the home

Highest education level of parents/guardians: PARGRADEX indicates the highest level of education for either of the child’s parents or nonparent guardians who reside in the household. This measure, which is used in this report in the same format in which it appears on the data file, is derived from PAR1EDUC and PAR2EDUC.

The values for PARGRADEX are as follows:

- 1 = Less than high school credential
- 2 = High school graduate or equivalent
- 3 = Vocational/technical education after high school or some college
- 4 = College graduate
- 5 = Graduate or professional degree

Labor force status of parents/guardians: The data indicate the employment status of the parents/guardians in the household. This variable is created using the derived variables P1EMPL and P2EMPL that provide employment information on the parents/guardians in the household.

The values for P1EMPL and P2EMPL are as follows:

- 1 = Working 35 hours or more per week
- 2 = Working less than 35 hours per week
- 3 = Looking for work
- 4 = Not in the labor force

The parent labor force status variable was separated into two-parent/guardian and single-parent/guardian households based on the same criteria for the family type variable described above. Working 35 hours or more per week was classified as full time; working less than 35 hours per week was classified as part time. For two-parent/guardian households, the “other” category includes all labor force combinations besides both parents/guardians working full time; one parent/guardian working full time, one parent/guardian working part time; and one parent/guardian working full time, one parent/guardian not in labor force.

Two-parent/guardian family

- 1 = Both full time
- 2 = One full time, one part time
- 3 = One full time, one not in labor force
- 4 = Other

Single-parent/guardian family

- 5 = Full time
- 6 = Part time
- 7 = Not in the labor force
- 8 = Looking for work

School enrollment status of parents/guardians: The data indicate the enrollment status of the parents/guardians in the household in a school, college, university, or adult learning center or in vocational education or job training. The data for this variable were taken from responses to P1ENRL and P2ENRL.

The values for school enrollment status of parents/guardians are as follows:

- 1 = Both/only enrolled
- 2 = Both/only not enrolled
- 3 = One enrolled, one not enrolled

Household income: TTLHHINC represents household income in categories. Households were asked to report the total income of all persons in the household over the past 12 months using income ranges rather than exact dollars (e.g., \$0–\$10,000, \$10,001–\$20,000, \$20,001–\$30,000, up to over

\$150,001). Income cut points for this report were selected to support estimates for the column variables represented in the tables.

The values of TTLHHINC in the ECPP questionnaire are as follows:

- 1 = \$0 to \$10,000
- 2 = \$10,001 to \$20,000
- 3 = \$20,001 to \$30,000
- 4 = \$30,001 to \$40,000
- 5 = \$40,001 to \$50,000
- 6 = \$50,001 to \$60,000
- 7 = \$60,001 to \$75,000
- 8 = \$75,001 to \$100,000
- 9 = \$100,001 to \$150,000
- 10 = \$150,001 or more

The values of TTLHHINC were collapsed for presentation as follows:

- 1 = \$20,000 or less
- 2 = \$20,001–\$50,000
- 3 = \$50,001–\$75,000
- 4 = \$75,001–\$100,000
- 5 = \$100,001 or more

Poverty status: This variable indicates whether a sample student resided in a household categorized as poor or nonpoor. The income variable used to establish whether a child resided in a household categorized as poor or nonpoor is TTLHHINC, which lists possible income ranges (e.g., \$0 to \$10,000, \$10,001 to 20,000, \$20,001 to \$30,000, up to over \$150,001). If data for TTLHHINC are missing, then they are imputed. This NHES item only provides an approximate measure of income, rather than a specific dollar amount. Therefore, a midpoint of each income variable range was calculated to take into account the variance of income, and therefore poverty status, within a given income range. The midpoint was calculated as follows: the minimum of a range (e.g., \$10,001) was subtracted from the maximum of a range (e.g., \$20,000), then this difference was divided in half (e.g., \$5,000), and then that value was added to the minimum of the range (e.g., \$15,001). Using these midpoints of TTLHHINC values and household size (HHTOTALXX), poverty thresholds are then used to establish whether a child resided in a household categorized as poor or nonpoor. Thresholds to define poverty are based on weighted averages from 2015 Census poverty thresholds. A household is considered poor if a household of a particular size matches the income categories shown in exhibit B-1. Otherwise, the household is considered to be nonpoor.

Exhibit B-1. Poverty definition for Early Childhood Program Participation (ECP) analyses, by household size: 2016

Household size (HHTOTALXX) ¹	Income categories in variable (TTLHHINC)
2	Less than or equal to \$20,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2)
3	Less than or equal to \$20,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2)
4	Less than or equal to \$20,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2)
5	Less than or equal to \$30,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2, 3)
6	Less than or equal to \$30,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2, 3)
7	Less than or equal to \$40,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2, 3, 4)
8	Less than or equal to \$40,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2, 3, 4)
9+	Less than or equal to \$50,000 (TTLHHINC = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

¹Household size indicates the total number of individuals living in the household, top-coded to 10 for the NHES:2016.

NOTE: TTLHHINC values in this table correspond to the 5 collapsed values of TTLHHINC, not the 10 values as written in the questionnaire.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-NHES:2016); U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds for 2015 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years, <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/income-poverty/historical-poverty-thresholds.html>.

Arrangement type: This variable is specifically found in tables 6, 7, and 8 of this report as row variables. It was derived using the following variables: RCNOW, RCWEEK, NCNOW, NCWEEK, CPNNOWX, and CPWEEKX. RCNOW, NCNOW, and CPNNOWX ask if the child is in various nonparental care or program arrangements. The corresponding follow-up questions (RCWEEK, NCWEEK, and CPWEEKX) ask whether the nonparental care arrangement occurs at least weekly. The levels of this variable are reported differently in tables 6, 7, and 8 due to different populations in each table.

In tables 6 and 7, the values for arrangement type are as follows:

- 1 = Relative only
- 2 = Nonrelative only
- 3 = Center only
- 4 = Multiple types of arrangements
- 5 = No nonparental arrangement (table 7 only)

In tables 6 and 7, multiple types of arrangements was defined as when a parent indicated their child has a weekly care arrangement in two or more of the care types. For example, a child who has a weekly relative care arrangement and a weekly center-based care arrangement would be considered to have multiple types of arrangements.

In table 8, the values for arrangement type are as follows:

- 1 = Relative
- 2 = Nonrelative
- 3 = Center
- 4 = No nonparental arrangement

In table 8, the relative, nonrelative, and center care arrangement type categories are not exclusive in the way that they are in tables 6 and 7. For example, cases associated with the “Relative” category

may be exclusively in relative care, or they may be in relative care and another care arrangement as well.

Difficulty finding desired child care program: This variable is specifically found in tables 6 and 7 of this report as a row variable, and it is derived using the variable PPDIFCLT. In table 7, the population is limited to parents who reported at least a little difficulty finding child care.

The values of this variable are as follows:

- 1 = No difficulty (table 6 only)
- 2 = A little difficulty
- 3 = Some difficulty
- 4 = A lot of difficulty
- 5 = Did not find the desired child care program

Column Variables

Table 1: Participation in various weekly nonparental care arrangements

At least one weekly nonparental care arrangement (ANYCARE2X) indicates whether the child currently participates in any nonparental care or program arrangements at least once each week. ANYCARE2X was created using the variables RCWEEK, indicating whether a relative care arrangement occurred at least weekly; NCWEEK, indicating whether a nonrelative care arrangement—the sampled child was cared for in a private home by someone not related to them—occurred at least weekly; and CPWEEKX, indicating whether a center-based arrangement—including day care centers, Head Start programs, preschools, prekindergartens, and other early childhood programs—occurred at least weekly.

The values for ANYCARE2X are as follows:

- 1 = Currently participates in any care or program arrangement that occurs at least once each week
- 2 = Does not currently participate in any care or program arrangement that occurs at least once each week

Relative weekly nonparental care arrangement (RCARRNEWX) is the categorical variable that indicates the number of relative care arrangements in which a sampled child participates at least once a week. RCARRNEWX is derived using RCWEEK and RCOTHC.

The values for RCARRNEWX are as follows:

- 0 = Does not currently participate in relative care arrangement
- 1 = Currently participates in one relative care arrangement
- 2 = Currently participates in two or more relative care arrangements

For table 1, the relative care arrangement was collapsed into a dichotomous variable, regardless of the number of relative care arrangements.

Nonrelative weekly nonparental care arrangement (NCARRNEWX) is the categorical variable that indicates the number of nonrelative care arrangements in which a sampled child participates at least once a week. NCARRNEWX is derived using NCWEEK and NCOTHC.

The values for NCARRNEWX are as follows:

- 0 = Does not currently participate in nonrelative care arrangement
- 1 = Currently participates in one nonrelative care arrangement
- 2 = Currently participates in two or more nonrelative care arrangements

For table 1, the nonrelative care arrangement was collapsed into a dichotomous variable, regardless of the number of nonrelative care arrangements.

Center-based weekly nonparental care arrangement (CPARRNEWX) is the categorical variable that indicates the number of center-based program arrangements in which a sampled child participates at least once a week. CPARRNEWX is derived using CPWEEKX and CPOTHC.

The values for CPARRNEWX are as follows:

- 0 = Does not currently participate in center-based care arrangement
- 1 = Currently participates in one center-based care arrangement
- 2 = Currently participates in two or more center-based care arrangements

For table 1, the center-based care arrangement was collapsed into a dichotomous variable, regardless of the number of center-based care arrangements.

Table 2: Relative type providing the primary weekly relative care

Relative care type (RCTYPE) indicates the type of relative who provided the most care (i.e., the primary relative care arrangement). Responses indicated whether this primary relative caregiver was a “grandmother,” “grandfather,” “aunt,” “uncle,” “brother,” “sister,” or “another relative” (RCTYPE = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7). For the analyses in this report, the categories were collapsed into the following:

- 1 = Grandparent
- 2 = Aunt or Uncle
- 3 = All other relatives

Table 3: Mean length of time in months in the primary weekly nonparental care arrangement

The return date of the questionnaire (RCVDATE) is a variable that indicates the date at which the completed questionnaire was received. It was used to calculate the approximate age of the child as of the date the questionnaire was received from the data collection contractor by subtracting RCVDATE from the child’s date of birth (CDOBMM and CDOBY).

Parents were asked how old (in years and months) their child was when he or she started going to the primary weekly relative care arrangement in RCSTRTM and RCSTRTY. Parents were asked how old (in years and months) their child was when he or she started going to the primary weekly nonrelative care arrangement in NCSTRTM and NCSTRTY. Parents were asked how old (in years and months)

their child was when he or she started going to the primary weekly center-based arrangement in CPSTRTM and CPSTRTY. For each type of care, age when the arrangement began was then subtracted from the computed child's age to determine length of time in months in the care arrangement. The estimates reported in table 3 represent the average length of time in months spent in each primary weekly nonparental care arrangement by various categories of child, parent, and family characteristics.

Table 4: Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket costs for the primary care arrangement

Parents indicated whether there was a charge or a fee for their primary relative care arrangement (RCFEE). If parents reported a charge, then they were asked their out-of-pocket cost (RCCOST) and unit of cost (i.e., hour, day, week, month, year, every 2 weeks, and other) for the primary relative care arrangement (RCUNIT). Parents were also asked how many days (RCDAYS) and hours each week (RCHRS) the child was in the primary relative arrangement. In addition, parents were asked to indicate how many children from the household the cost amount included (RCCSTHNX).

Parents indicated whether there was a charge or fee for their primary nonrelative care arrangement (NCFEE). If parents reported a charge, then they were asked their out-of-pocket cost (NCCOST) and unit of cost for the primary nonrelative care arrangement (NCUNIT). Parents were also asked how many days (NCDAYS) and hours each week (NCHRS) the child was in the primary nonrelative arrangement. In addition, parents were asked to indicate how many children from the household the cost amount included (NCCSTHNX).

Parents indicated whether there was a charge or fee for their primary center-based care arrangement (CPFEE). If parents reported a charge, they were asked their out-of-pocket cost (CPCOST) and unit of cost for the primary center-based care arrangement (CPUNIT). Parents were also asked how many days (CPDAYS) and hours each week (CPHRS) the child was in the primary center-based arrangement. In addition, parents were asked to indicate how many children from the household the cost amount included (CPCSTHNX).

As noted above, parents could report costs for primary care arrangements in different units (e.g., hourly, weekly, monthly, etc.). Information about time spent in each primary care arrangement, the out-of-pocket cost for the arrangement, the unit of cost for the arrangement, and the number of children covered by that cost were used to derive an hourly per-child cost for each primary arrangement type.

Table 5: Center-based care arrangement locations

Parents who reported that their children were in center-based care were asked to indicate the location of the primary center-based care setting (CPPLACEX). The values for CPPLACEX are (1) a church, synagogue, or other place of worship; (2) a public elementary or secondary school; (3) a private elementary or secondary school; (4) a college or university; (5) a community center; (6) a public library; (7) its own building, office space, or storefront; and (8) some other place. A "private elementary or secondary school," a "college or university," a "community center," a "public library," and "some other place" were combined into the "All other locations" category because of insufficient sample sizes for stable estimates.

Table 6: Factors used to select weekly nonparental care arrangement

Parents of children in the study were asked if they had had difficulty finding care (PPDIFCLT). Response options were “have not tried to find care,” “did not find the child care program you wanted,” “a lot of difficulty,” “some difficulty,” “a little difficulty,” and “no difficulty.” Parents who indicated they “have not tried to find care” were not asked about factors affecting selection of care arrangements. Those who reported seeking arrangements were then asked a series of questions about selection criteria for care arrangements. The factors for selecting child care were (a) location (DCLOA); (b) cost (DCOST); (c) reliability of arrangement (DRELY); (d) learning activities at the arrangement (DLERN); (e) child spending time with other children his/her age (DCHIL); (f) times during the day when the caregiver is available to provide care (DHROP); (g) number of other children in the care group (DNBGRP); (h) ratings on a website (DRTWEB); (i) recommendations from friends and family (DRECFAM); and (j) religious orientation of the program (DRELOR). The rates are based on the number of children whose parents rated a selection factor as very important divided by the number of children who had parents who had sought care.

Table 7: Primary reason for difficulty finding nonparental care arrangement

As a follow-up to a question asking parents how much difficulty they had finding the type of child care wanted for the child (PPDIFCLT), parents were asked what the primary reason was for their difficulty finding care (WHYDIFCLT). Response options were “cost,” “location,” “quality,” “lack of open slots for new children,” “needed a program for children with special needs,” and “other reason.” Parents who indicated that they did not try to find early care and education or had no difficulty finding care in PPDIFCLT were instructed not to answer this question; thus, those cases are excluded from the population of table 7. The categories “needed a program for children with special needs” and “other reason” were combined into the “All other reasons” category because of insufficient sample sizes for stable estimates.

Table 8: Parental participation in home activities

Parents were asked how many times they or someone in the family read to the child in the past week (FOREADTOX). Parents were also asked whether they did the following with the child in the past week: told a story (FOSTORYX); taught letters, words, or numbers (FOWORDSX); sang songs (FOSANG); and worked on arts and crafts (FOCRAFTSX). Each of the home activity variables were collapsed into dichotomous variables indicating whether the parent had done the activity with the child three or more times in the past week. The row variables in the table include the care arrangement type (relative, nonrelative, center, and none). For table 8 only, the categories for nonparental care are not exclusive, so the same child can be in relative, nonrelative, and center care arrangements and be included in the estimates in all sections. Only if there are no nonparental care arrangements will the child be counted in the estimates in the “no nonparental care arrangement” category.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Appendix C: Standard Error Tables

Table C-1. Standard errors for table 1: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Weekly nonparental care arrangement				No weekly nonparental care arrangement
		At least one weekly nonparental care arrangement	Type			
			Relative	Nonrelative	Center	
Total	54.2	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9
Child's age						
Less than one year	150.4	2.1	2.7	2.4	2.1	2.1
1–2 years	176.3	1.3	1.7	1.5	1.7	1.3
3–5 years	91.1	1.5	1.4	1.0	1.1	1.5
Child's sex						
Male	185.6	1.3	1.4	0.9	1.5	1.3
Female	180.5	1.4	1.6	1.2	1.3	1.4
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	97.5	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0.0	3.4	3.4	2.7	3.8	3.4
Hispanic	1.6	2.2	2.4	1.8	2.3	2.2
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	69.7	3.7	4.9	2.9	4.7	3.7
Other race, non-Hispanic	79.6	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.6	3.5
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	144.1	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.0
One parent or guardian	141.0	2.2	2.4	1.6	2.6	2.2
English spoken at home by parents/guardians						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	153.0	0.9	1.1	0.8	1.0	0.9
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	64.2	4.7	7.2	3.7	7.4	4.7
No parent/guardian speaks English	145.5	4.0	4.2	3.3	3.8	4.0
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	54.3	5.0	6.4	4.5	6.9	5.0
High school/GED	0.0	2.6	2.9	2.4	3.4	2.6
Vocational/technical or some college	124.1	1.3	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.3
Bachelor's degree	124.6	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.8	1.6
Graduate or professional degree	0.0	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.3
Labor force status of parents/guardians						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	148.2	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.4	1.0
One full time, one part time	108.9	2.2	2.8	2.0	2.4	2.2
One full time, one not in labor force	150.1	1.7	2.8	1.6	2.7	1.7
Other	121.1	2.6	5.0	2.9	4.2	2.6
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	120.8	2.8	3.2	2.2	3.7	2.8
Part time	66.2	4.6	5.9	5.0	4.9	4.6
Not in the labor force	98.1	4.9	6.3	3.8	7.1	4.9
Looking for work	47.8	6.8	9.9	8.7	10.0	6.8
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	94.8	4.4	4.8	4.1	5.3	4.4
Both/only not enrolled	147.2	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.9	0.9
One enrolled, one not enrolled	110.3	3.2	2.9	2.5	3.1	3.2

See notes at end of table.

Table C-1. Standard errors for table 1: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten participating in various weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Weekly nonparental care arrangement				No weekly nonparental care arrangement
		At least one weekly nonparental care arrangement	Type			
			Relative	Nonrelative	Center	
Region						
Northeast	125.0	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.3
South	188.0	1.5	2.0	1.3	2.0	1.5
Midwest	144.5	2.2	2.1	1.7	2.3	2.2
West	182.7	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.0
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	10.3	2.5	3.6	3.3	3.7	2.5
\$20,001–\$50,000	53.6	2.0	2.9	1.6	2.6	2.0
\$50,001–\$75,000	0.0	2.2	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.2
\$75,001–\$100,000	0.0	2.2	2.7	2.1	3.0	2.2
\$100,001 or more	4.6	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.5
Poverty status						
At or above poverty threshold	88.4	1.1	1.1	0.8	1.0	1.1
Below poverty threshold	92.6	2.5	3.3	2.6	3.4	2.5

NOTE: Standard errors are approximately zero in cases where the estimated population, based on weights, for that group exactly matches the actual population for that group.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPN-NHES:2016).

Table C-2. Standard errors for table 2: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary relative caregiver		
		Grandparent	Aunt or uncle	All other relatives
Total	158.9	1.5	1.2	1.1
Child's age				
Less than one year	100.5	3.0	2.8	1.5
1–2 years	102.7	2.5	1.8	2.0
3–5 years	92.8	2.3	2.1	1.7
Child's sex				
Male	125.4	2.1	1.6	1.7
Female	126.0	2.0	1.9	1.3
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	107.0	1.7	1.5	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	75.0	5.1	4.4	2.8
Hispanic	90.8	3.7	2.6	2.6
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	39.5	6.6	2.9	6.1
Other race, non-Hispanic	37.7	4.8	4.2	†
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	135.7	1.7	1.2	1.5
One parent or guardian	103.5	3.5	3.0	1.6
English spoken at home by parents/guardians				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	158.1	1.5	1.2	0.9
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	31.6	9.2	†	†
No parent/guardian speaks English	65.6	6.7	4.5	6.2
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	66.1	7.2	6.2	5.4
High school/GED	94.4	4.0	2.9	2.8
Vocational/technical or some college	91.4	2.8	1.9	2.3
Bachelor's degree	79.5	2.4	2.2	1.0
Graduate or professional degree	46.6	1.9	1.6	0.8
Labor force status of parents/guardians				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	97.4	2.2	1.6	1.8
One full time, one part time	59.6	2.8	2.6	1.7
One full time, one not in labor force	67.1	4.5	2.8	3.7
Other	43.6	6.9	4.7	6.9
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	80.3	5.1	4.0	2.3
Part time	39.1	4.0	2.2	†
Not in the labor force	50.3	7.7	7.3	†
Looking for work	25.4	15.7	†	†
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	52.6	5.3	4.6	†
Both/only not enrolled	148.0	1.7	1.3	1.3
One enrolled, one not enrolled	51.3	3.5	3.0	2.5

See notes at end of table.

Table C-2. Standard errors for table 2: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten receiving weekly care from a relative, by type of relative and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary relative caregiver		
		Grandparent	Aunt or uncle	All other relatives
Region				
Northeast	65.8	3.3	2.6	1.9
South	112.1	2.6	2.2	1.4
Midwest	80.0	2.9	2.4	1.8
West	85.5	3.0	2.8	2.8
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	65.9	4.9	3.3	3.1
\$20,001–\$50,000	85.5	3.3	2.9	2.7
\$50,001–\$75,000	71.5	3.5	3.3	2.4
\$75,001–\$100,000	58.4	3.3	2.9	1.5
\$100,001 or more	71.6	1.7	1.4	1.1
Poverty status				
At or above poverty threshold	143.1	1.5	1.3	1.1
Below poverty threshold	83.8	4.5	3.6	3.2

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table C-3. Standard errors for table 3: Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Mean number of months spent in different types of primary weekly nonparental care arrangements		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center
Total	206.0	0.6	0.7	0.3
Child's age				
Less than one year	121.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
1–2 years	140.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
3–5 years	134.8	1.1	1.6	0.4
Child's sex				
Male	164.5	0.9	0.9	0.4
Female	181.5	0.7	0.9	0.4
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	117.3	0.7	0.8	0.4
Black, non-Hispanic	95.9	1.6	2.0	0.9
Hispanic	120.8	1.2	1.8	0.7
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	43.6	2.8	2.7	1.0
Other race, non-Hispanic	70.7	1.6	3.3	1.1
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	189.2	0.7	0.8	0.3
One parent or guardian	142.2	1.0	1.5	0.7
English spoken at home by parents/guardians				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	184.1	0.6	0.8	0.3
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	44.9	3.0	7.9	2.1
No parent/guardian speaks English	97.6	2.6	2.8	1.0
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	113.4	3.3	4.0	1.5
High school/GED	107.9	1.5	1.8	0.9
Vocational/technical or some college	107.2	0.9	1.4	0.5
Bachelor's degree	115.1	0.9	1.1	0.5
Graduate or professional degree	51.4	0.8	1.0	0.4
Labor force status of parents/guardians				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	140.6	0.8	0.9	0.5
One full time, one part time	76.3	1.3	2.1	0.6
One full time, one not in labor force	120.4	2.7	2.4	0.5
Other	59.2	2.2	2.0	1.1
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	120.0	1.4	1.8	1.0
Part time	47.7	2.3	3.6	1.9
Not in the labor force	60.7	3.5	3.2	1.4
Looking for work	33.3	3.7	†	2.3
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	71.9	2.0	1.9	1.0
Both/only not enrolled	197.5	0.6	0.8	0.3
One enrolled, one not enrolled	93.4	1.9	1.3	0.7

See notes at end of table.

Table C-3. Standard errors for table 3: Mean length of time (in months) that children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten have been in current primary weekly nonparental care arrangements with relative, nonrelative, or center-based provider, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Mean number of months spent in different types of primary weekly nonparental care arrangements		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center
Region				
Northeast	95.5	1.1	1.4	0.7
South	137.7	1.0	1.3	0.5
Midwest	128.8	1.3	1.2	0.6
West	118.3	1.1	1.2	0.6
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	75.6	1.5	2.1	0.9
\$20,001–\$50,000	119.4	1.5	1.5	0.6
\$50,001–\$75,000	83.5	1.2	1.2	0.7
\$75,001–\$100,000	62.3	1.5	1.3	0.6
\$100,001 or more	86.2	0.9	1.1	0.4
Poverty status				
At or above poverty threshold	182.2	0.6	0.7	0.3
Below poverty threshold	107.8	1.2	1.9	0.8

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPN-NHES:2016).

Table C-4. Standard errors for table 4: Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Hourly out-of-pocket expense by type of primary weekly nonparental care arrangement		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center
Total	164.5	\$0.409	\$0.503	\$0.297
Child's age				
Less than one year	80.8	0.667	0.505	1.016
1–2 years	129.2	0.837	1.000	0.712
3–5 years	113.1	0.648	0.698	0.310
Child's sex				
Male	139.0	0.651	0.342	0.490
Female	121.3	0.525	1.005	0.279
Child's race/ethnicity				
White, non-Hispanic	105.5	0.590	0.315	0.291
Black, non-Hispanic	85.7	1.155	4.026	1.023
Hispanic	97.5	0.662	0.815	1.146
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	27.1	4.171	1.111	1.247
Other race, non-Hispanic	54.6	0.478	0.788	1.385
Family type				
Two parents or guardians	142.1	0.468	0.274	0.332
One parent or guardian	114.6	0.868	2.382	0.473
English spoken at home by parents/guardians				
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	140.8	0.403	0.550	0.303
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	33.2	4.785	1.791	3.168
No parent/guardian speaks English	66.3	1.352	0.935	2.004
Highest education level of parents/guardians				
Less than high school	84.2	1.458	1.601	0.696
High school/GED	87.0	1.088	1.104	0.731
Vocational/technical or some college	82.4	0.537	0.372	0.572
Bachelor's degree	104.6	0.901	1.375	0.438
Graduate or professional degree	54.5	1.198	0.468	0.571
Labor force status of parents/guardians				
Two-parent/guardian family				
Both full time	115.5	0.535	0.320	0.390
One full time, one part time	59.8	1.061	0.853	0.553
One full time, one not in labor force	78.1	1.279	0.839	0.921
Other	45.0	†	0.840	2.794
Single-parent/guardian family				
Full time	96.3	0.932	0.554	0.524
Part time	29.7	1.650	1.662	1.165
Not in the labor force	22.9	1.650	†	1.314
Looking for work	21.6	†	†	3.367
School enrollment status of parents/guardians				
Both/only enrolled	38.9	†	†	0.730
Both/only not enrolled	146.8	0.429	0.272	0.338
One enrolled, one not enrolled	69.6	1.315	0.544	0.797

See notes at end of table.

Table C-4. Standard errors for table 4: Mean per child hourly out-of-pocket expense paid for families with any out-of-pocket expense for child care for children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten for primary weekly nonparental care arrangements, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Hourly out-of-pocket expense by type of primary weekly nonparental care arrangement		
		Primary relative	Primary nonrelative	Primary center
Region				
Northeast	77.0	1.696	1.135	0.654
South	115.8	0.440	0.558	0.310
Midwest	106.5	0.952	0.388	0.764
West	91.8	0.917	1.696	0.822
Household income				
\$20,000 or less	61.6	0.775	†	0.721
\$20,001–\$50,000	108.0	0.906	1.121	0.801
\$50,001–\$75,000	75.8	1.152	0.482	0.502
\$75,001–\$100,000	66.8	1.103	0.496	0.419
\$100,001 or more	88.9	0.806	0.370	0.467
Poverty status				
At or above poverty threshold	146.1	0.453	0.307	0.321
Below poverty threshold	74.7	0.668	†	0.500

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECPN-NHES:2016).

Table C-5. Standard errors for table 5: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Location of primary center-based care arrangement			
		Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	Public school (K–12)	Its own building	All other locations
Total	169.4	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.0
Child's age					
Less than one year	54.4	3.1	2.5	4.3	2.6
1–2 years	104.3	1.6	1.2	2.5	1.7
3–5 years	129.6	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.2
Child's sex					
Male	117.2	1.2	1.2	1.7	1.3
Female	133.2	1.4	1.5	2.0	1.4
Child's race/ethnicity					
White, non-Hispanic	96.4	1.3	1.0	1.5	1.2
Black, non-Hispanic	95.6	1.7	3.4	4.3	2.7
Hispanic	85.8	2.1	3.0	3.3	2.3
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	25.0	2.7	3.9	4.9	3.6
Other race, non-Hispanic	57.2	3.3	4.8	4.9	3.0
Family type					
Two parents or guardians	140.2	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.1
One parent or guardian	96.0	1.8	2.6	4.2	2.4
English spoken at home by parents/guardians					
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	143.8	0.9	0.8	1.4	1.0
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	38.2	†	9.1	10.4	5.2
No parent/guardian speaks English	64.7	2.3	6.2	5.4	3.8
Highest education level of parents/guardians					
Less than high school	93.3	†	11.2	13.1	5.0
High school/GED	76.3	2.2	4.0	4.3	3.0
Vocational/technical or some college	77.0	2.2	2.0	2.5	1.7
Bachelor's degree	102.2	1.7	1.1	2.0	1.7
Graduate or professional degree	53.9	1.9	1.0	1.9	1.4
Labor force status of parents/guardians					
Two-parent/guardian family					
Both full time	97.8	1.2	1.2	1.9	1.5
One full time, one part time	61.6	2.9	2.5	3.6	2.7
One full time, one not in labor force	95.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	1.6
Other	46.1	3.6	5.3	7.0	4.6
Single-parent/guardian family					
Full time	88.8	2.3	2.7	4.7	2.8
Part time	26.1	6.0	7.3	7.2	7.7
Not in the labor force	33.5	†	6.7	7.8	6.1
Looking for work	23.9	†	13.4	13.8	†
School enrollment status of parents/guardians					
Both/only enrolled	41.5	2.0	4.6	6.4	3.9
Both/only not enrolled	155.7	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.0
One enrolled, one not enrolled	68.6	3.5	3.1	3.9	2.3

See notes at end of table.

Table C-5. Standard errors for table 5: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten enrolled in a primary weekly center-based program at a specified location, by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Location of primary center-based care arrangement			
		Church, synagogue, or other place of worship	Public school (K–12)	Its own building	All other locations
Region					
Northeast	64.9	1.9	2.0	2.8	2.2
South	110.9	1.6	2.0	2.2	1.2
Midwest	101.0	1.8	1.8	3.3	2.1
West	80.8	2.0	2.6	3.1	2.1
Household income					
\$20,000 or less	67.6	2.2	4.2	4.4	2.7
\$20,001–\$50,000	109.8	1.6	2.4	3.6	2.2
\$50,001–\$75,000	59.4	2.3	2.7	3.3	2.3
\$75,001–\$100,000	68.0	2.4	3.6	3.6	2.2
\$100,001 or more	93.6	1.6	0.8	1.7	1.4
Poverty status					
At or above poverty threshold	157.1	1.0	1.0	1.6	1.1
Below poverty threshold	81.6	1.8	3.8	3.8	2.4

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table C-6. Standard errors for table 6: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement										
	Number of children (thousands)	Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Avail-ability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommend-ations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation
Total	186.0	1.2	1.4	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.9
Arrangement type											
Relative only	88.9	4.5	4.4	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2
Nonrelative only	70.5	2.6	3.1	1.8	2.8	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.7	3.2	2.3
Center only	156.4	1.8	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.2
Multiple types of arrangements	88.3	2.1	2.7	1.5	1.5	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	1.5
Difficulty finding desired care program											
No difficulty	154.6	1.5	1.8	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.4
A little difficulty	101.2	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.3	3.3	2.4	2.0	2.4	1.5
Some difficulty	81.3	2.9	2.8	1.7	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.6	2.1	2.9	1.9
A lot of difficulty	71.7	3.4	3.0	2.3	2.7	3.3	2.4	3.6	4.2	3.8	3.4
Did not find the desired child care program	43.8	4.9	5.7	3.1	7.0	6.2	3.8	7.1	5.9	6.9	3.9
Child’s age											
Less than one year	100.4	3.2	3.4	2.8	3.1	3.3	2.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	2.9
1–2 years	120.6	2.1	2.4	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.4	1.8
3–5 years	128.4	1.5	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.6	1.1	1.5	1.1
Child’s sex											
Male	142.7	1.5	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.3
Female	146.2	1.7	1.9	1.4	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.6	2.0	1.6	1.3
Child’s race/ethnicity											
White, non-Hispanic	115.5	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	95.6	3.0	4.0	2.1	1.9	4.4	2.4	3.5	4.8	4.1	3.9
Hispanic	111.7	3.0	2.7	1.9	2.2	2.6	2.0	2.8	2.8	2.8	1.8
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	27.8	4.0	4.2	3.6	4.2	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.6	4.8	3.9
Other race, non-Hispanic	62.3	3.8	4.7	3.5	3.5	3.7	4.0	4.9	5.0	3.9	1.9
Family type											
Two parents or guardians	160.5	1.2	1.4	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.8
One parent or guardian	130.8	3.1	3.5	2.8	1.8	3.8	2.3	3.0	2.9	3.3	2.6

See notes at end of table.

Table C-6. Standard errors for table 6: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement										
		Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Avail-ability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommend-ations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation	
English spoken at home by parents/guardians												
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	169.4	1.2	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	0.8	
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	38.4	5.9	7.1	4.2	5.0	6.1	6.2	9.6	11.2	9.4	7.1	
No parent/guardian speaks English	67.4	4.8	4.0	2.6	3.8	4.6	4.3	5.6	4.0	4.8	3.4	
Highest education level of parents/guardians												
Less than high school	84.9	7.9	9.8	5.6	5.7	8.9	7.1	6.5	8.8	10.5	7.9	
High school/GED	95.4	4.5	4.8	4.3	2.3	3.1	3.5	4.7	4.0	4.1	3.7	
Vocational/technical or some college	91.8	2.3	2.4	1.4	1.9	2.4	1.7	2.3	2.3	2.3	1.7	
Bachelor’s degree	113.5	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.3	
Graduate or professional degree	47.2	1.4	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.1	
Labor force status of parents/guardians												
Two-parent/guardian family												
Both full time	131.3	1.4	2.0	0.9	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.1	
One full time, one part time	66.4	3.1	2.8	2.4	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.0	2.7	1.9	
One full time, one not in labor force	97.2	2.8	2.4	2.2	3.0	2.1	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.2	
Other	49.6	5.3	5.4	3.8	3.0	4.7	5.0	6.2	5.8	5.1	4.0	
Single-parent/guardian family												
Full time	107.5	3.4	3.9	1.6	1.9	5.5	2.3	3.1	4.0	4.2	3.2	
Part time	44.9	7.5	7.3	8.4	7.2	5.6	7.6	8.5	7.2	8.4	6.5	
Not in the labor force	52.4	8.9	9.6	9.2	2.9	4.9	7.3	9.0	8.4	6.4	7.4	
Looking for work	28.9	12.2	11.7	9.8	6.4	1.6	5.9	12.3	12.6	12.7	11.7	
School enrollment status of parents/guardians												
Both/only enrolled	57.4	6.7	8.2	7.6	3.8	4.4	3.2	6.4	6.4	5.2	7.1	
Both/only not enrolled	171.3	1.4	1.5	1.1	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.0	
One enrolled, one not enrolled	80.8	3.2	3.0	2.3	3.5	3.4	2.8	3.2	3.2	2.8	2.2	
Region												
Northeast	91.9	2.4	2.7	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.0	2.6	1.6	
South	122.8	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.1	1.8	
Midwest	110.1	2.4	3.0	1.4	1.9	3.0	2.1	2.9	2.8	2.6	1.3	
West	97.4	2.6	2.4	1.6	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.5	1.3	

See notes at end of table.

Table C-6. Standard errors for table 6: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten in at least one weekly nonparental care arrangement whose parents rated various factors used to select weekly care arrangement for children as “very important,” by child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Factor rated as “very important” when selecting care arrangement									
		Location	Cost	Reliability	Learning activities	Time with other children	Avail-ability of care provider	Number of children in care group	Ratings on a website	Recommend-ations from friends/family	Program’s religious orientation
Household income											
\$20,000 or less	76.0	3.5	4.2	3.4	2.2	2.5	3.7	3.9	4.3	3.8	3.9
\$20,001–\$50,000	111.0	3.5	2.9	2.1	2.2	3.1	2.6	2.9	3.7	2.9	1.9
\$50,001–\$75,000	83.0	2.8	3.0	1.6	2.4	2.8	2.3	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.4
\$75,001–\$100,000	68.1	2.9	2.5	1.9	2.1	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.3	1.8
\$100,001 or more	87.3	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.3
Poverty status											
At or above poverty threshold	165.3	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.8
Below poverty threshold	91.7	3.1	3.5	2.9	1.9	2.6	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.3	3.3

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table C-7. Standard errors for table 7: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary reason for difficulty				
		Cost	Location	Quality	Lack of open slots for new children	All other reasons
Total	177.7	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.5	0.9
Arrangement type						
Relative only	74.3	5.8	2.1	3.2	5.5	3.6
Nonrelative only	58.4	3.7	1.7	3.6	2.9	2.1
Center only	102.4	1.9	1.3	1.7	2.4	1.1
Multiple types of arrangements	69.4	2.8	1.9	2.9	2.7	2.3
No nonparental arrangement	128.6	4.2	4.2	3.4	3.1	1.9
Difficulty finding desired care program						
A little difficulty	102.2	2.3	1.4	2.0	2.5	1.3
Some difficulty	88.8	2.3	1.7	1.8	2.4	1.3
A lot of difficulty	80.9	3.0	1.3	2.5	3.1	2.0
Did not find the desired child care program	106.8	5.7	6.3	5.2	3.3	2.9
Child's age						
Less than one year	77.4	3.7	1.4	2.6	3.9	1.8
1–2 years	112.7	2.1	0.9	1.9	1.9	1.6
3–5 years	132.5	2.6	2.5	1.6	2.1	1.1
Child's sex						
Male	135.4	2.0	1.1	1.7	1.7	1.4
Female	122.9	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.2	1.1
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	112.5	1.7	0.7	1.7	1.7	1.0
Black, non-Hispanic	88.6	4.8	2.4	3.6	4.3	3.0
Hispanic	106.1	3.6	5.2	1.8	3.6	1.9
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	28.6	5.2	3.2	4.9	3.8	6.1
Other race, non-Hispanic	46.0	4.8	2.5	4.9	4.2	2.8
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	162.0	1.7	1.4	1.2	1.5	0.9
One parent or guardian	79.7	3.6	2.4	2.9	3.7	2.7
English spoken at home by parents/guardians						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	160.8	1.5	0.8	1.4	1.5	0.9
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	33.2	8.6	4.4	8.2	6.7	7.7
No parent/guardian speaks English	82.0	7.7	9.5	3.6	4.9	2.9
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	70.0	8.6	†	†	9.1	†
High school/GED	73.5	5.8	3.1	3.8	4.7	3.0
Vocational/technical or some college	90.8	2.7	1.2	2.3	2.7	1.7
Bachelor's degree	85.2	2.4	0.9	2.2	2.4	1.5
Graduate or professional degree	56.6	1.7	1.2	1.8	2.0	1.2
Labor force status of parents/guardians						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	110.0	2.1	0.8	1.9	1.9	1.4
One full time, one part time	71.8	5.5	1.2	3.6	4.1	1.9
One full time, one not in labor force	99.8	3.5	4.5	2.4	3.3	1.7
Other	50.5	4.7	3.2	5.3	5.2	3.1
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	67.5	3.8	3.1	3.6	5.2	2.9
Part time	42.6	11.7	2.9	6.1	11.2	2.2
Not in the labor force	40.1	7.8	5.7	†	5.9	7.6
Looking for work	24.5	15.5	†	†	†	†

See notes at end of table.

Table C-7. Standard errors for table 7: Percentage of children from birth through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported difficulty finding child care, by primary reason for difficulty, and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Primary reason for difficulty				
		Cost	Location	Quality	Lack of open slots for new children	All other reasons
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	38.8	6.6	3.2	5.9	4.5	3.4
Both/only not enrolled	156.2	1.8	1.6	1.3	1.6	1.0
One enrolled, one not enrolled	66.0	4.3	1.7	2.9	4.1	1.8
Region						
Northeast	76.6	3.1	1.6	3.1	3.4	1.7
South	103.2	2.4	1.2	1.8	2.4	1.2
Midwest	67.4	2.8	1.6	2.6	2.4	2.5
West	119.4	3.5	3.6	2.7	2.7	1.7
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	60.6	4.7	3.9	4.9	4.3	3.3
\$20,001–\$50,000	111.0	4.0	1.8	2.4	3.4	2.1
\$50,001–\$75,000	80.9	4.2	5.7	2.8	3.4	1.8
\$75,001–\$100,000	55.4	4.2	1.2	3.0	3.7	2.1
\$100,001 or more	91.2	2.0	0.9	2.0	2.2	1.2
Poverty status						
At or above poverty threshold	153.6	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.5	0.9
Below poverty threshold	69.7	4.2	3.2	4.0	4.0	2.8

† Not applicable.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).

Table C-8. Standard errors for table 8: Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Home activities with child three or more times in past week				
		Read to child	Told a story	Taught letters, words, or numbers	Sang songs	Worked on arts and crafts
Total	91.1	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.3
Arrangement type						
Relative	92.8	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.6
Nonrelative	60.6	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.6
Center	129.6	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.3
No nonparental arrangement	122.3	3.1	2.8	3.5	2.9	3.4
Child's sex						
Male	118.8	1.5	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8
Female	117.5	1.9	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.8
Child's race/ethnicity						
White, non-Hispanic	96.8	1.2	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.5
Black, non-Hispanic	67.4	3.3	4.4	3.9	3.9	4.2
Hispanic	84.9	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.5
Asian or Pacific Islander, non-Hispanic	44.7	6.5	6.8	5.0	5.3	4.5
Other race, non-Hispanic	50.3	3.6	4.9	3.8	5.0	5.4
Family type						
Two parents or guardians	120.3	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.4
One parent or guardian	94.1	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.1
English spoken at home by parents/guardians						
Both/only parent(s)/guardian(s) speak(s) English	114.1	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
One of two parents/guardians speaks English	36.9	6.1	6.2	7.5	7.2	6.8
No parent/guardian speaks English	93.0	6.0	5.9	6.4	5.9	5.7
Highest education level of parents/guardians						
Less than high school	88.7	6.7	6.2	7.7	5.7	5.0
High school/GED	84.5	2.9	3.4	3.8	4.1	4.0
Vocational/technical or some college	80.8	1.8	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.6
Bachelor's degree	73.5	1.4	2.0	2.0	2.3	2.0
Graduate or professional degree	52.5	1.2	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.3
Labor force status of parents/guardians						
Two-parent/guardian family						
Both full time	88.0	1.6	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8
One full time, one part time	77.4	2.6	4.0	3.1	3.6	4.2
One full time, one not in labor force	113.6	3.0	2.3	3.4	2.9	2.4
Other	50.3	3.0	4.8	4.6	5.5	4.9
Single-parent/guardian family						
Full time	64.6	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.8
Part time	31.7	7.0	7.4	7.8	8.2	6.8
Not in the labor force	56.5	6.3	7.5	6.9	6.3	7.2
Looking for work	30.5	5.2	9.7	10.9	11.1	11.5
School enrollment status of parents/guardians						
Both/only enrolled	39.1	4.6	6.0	6.0	5.4	6.7
Both/only not enrolled	107.0	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.4	1.4
One enrolled, one not enrolled	53.0	3.6	3.2	3.6	3.9	3.7

See notes at end of table.

Table C-8. Standard errors for table 8: Percentage of children from age 3 through age 5 and not yet in kindergarten whose parents reported participating in home activities with child three or more times in the past week, by type of involvement and child and family characteristics: 2016—Continued

Characteristic	Number of children (thousands)	Home activities with child three or more times in past week				
		Read to child	Told a story	Taught letters, words, or numbers	Sang songs	Worked on arts and crafts
Region						
Northeast	75.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4
South	108.9	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.2	1.8
Midwest	87.5	2.3	3.1	2.7	2.4	2.4
West	112.1	3.1	2.6	3.0	2.3	3.0
Household income						
\$20,000 or less	63.5	3.1	3.6	3.4	4.1	3.9
\$20,001–\$50,000	93.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.3
\$50,001–\$75,000	84.5	4.0	2.8	4.9	3.0	3.8
\$75,001–\$100,000	58.6	2.3	2.6	3.5	3.8	2.9
\$100,001 or more	70.0	1.5	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.5
Poverty status						
At or above poverty threshold	84.1	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.3	1.5
Below poverty threshold	67.1	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.4

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Early Childhood Program Participation Survey of the 2016 National Household Education Surveys Program (ECP-P-NHES:2016).