

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MAKING IT WORK

Examining the Status of Non-Traditional Child Care in Pennsylvania



JUNE 2019 • KELLY SLOANE, PH.D. • JASON FONTANA • ANNA SHAW-AMOAH • DAVID LAPP • ALYN M. TURNER, PH.D.

- Acuna, Rhea, Michael H. Norton, and Ira Goldstein. "Estimating changes in the supply of and demand for child care Philadelphia." *The Reinvestment Fund*, 2018.
<https://www.reinvestment.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Reinvestment-Fund-ChildcareAnalysis2017-Final-web.pdf>
- Beers, Thomas M. "Flexible schedules and shift work: replacing the '9-to-5' workday?" *US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics*, 2000.
<https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2000/06/art3full.pdf>
- Ben-Ishai, Liz, Hannah Matthews, and Jodie Levin-Epstein. "Scrambling for Stability: The Challenges of Job Schedule Volatility and Child Care." *Center for Law and Social Policy*, 2014.
<https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/public/resources-and-publications/publication-1/2014-03-27-Scrambling-for-Stability-The-Challenges-of-Job-Schedule-Volat-.pdf>
- Bivens, Josh, Emma Garcia, Elise Gould, Elaine Weiss, and Valerie Wilson. "It's Time for an Ambitious National Investment in America's Children: Investments in Early Childhood Care and Education Would Have Enormous Benefits for Children, Families, Society, and the Economy." *Economic Policy Institute*, 2016. <https://www.epi.org/publication/its-time-for-an-ambitious-national-investment-in-americas-children/>
- Bruner, Charles and Richard Chase. "Family, Friend and Neighbor Care: Achieving Healthy Child Development by Strengthening Families." *Build Initiative*, 2012.
https://www.wilder.org/sites/default/files/imports/BuildInitiative-FFN%20Policy%20Brief_summer2012.pdf
- Center for American Progress. "Childcare Access in Pennsylvania." 2018.
<https://childcaredeserts.org/?state=PA>.
- City of Philadelphia. "Mayor Kenny Signs Fair Workweek and 21st Century Minimum Wage Bills." 2018. <https://www.phila.gov/2018-12-20-mayor-kenney-signs-fair-workweek-and-21st-century-minimum-wage-bills/>
- Clark, Clair, and Sally K. Gallagher. "The Influence of State Maternity Leave Policies on US Mothers' Employment." *Community, Work & Family* 20, no. 4 (2016): 459-478.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13668803.2016.1227769?journalCode=ccwf20>
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "The Pennsylvania Code. Title 55. Chapter 168. Child Care: General Provisions." https://www.pacode.com/secure/data/055/chapter168/055_0168.pdf

- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "The Pennsylvania Code. Title 55. Chapter 3041. Subsidized Child Care Eligibility." <https://www.pacode.com/secure/data/055/chapter3041/chap3041toc.html>
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "The Pennsylvania Code. Title 55. Chapter 3270. Child Day Care Centers." <https://www.pacode.com/secure/data/055/chapter3270/chap3270toc.html>
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "The Pennsylvania Code. Title 55. Chapter 3280. Group Child Day Care Homes." <https://www.pacode.com/secure/data/055/chapter3280/chap3280toc.html>
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "The Pennsylvania Code. Title 55. Chapter 3290. Family Child Day Care Homes." <https://www.pacode.com/secure/data/055/chapter3290/chap3290toc.html>
- Damaske, Sarah. "Work, Family, and Accounts of Mothers' Lives Using Discourse to Navigate Intensive Mothering Ideals." *Sociology Compass* 7, no. 6 (2013): 436-444. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12043>
- De Marco, Allison, Ann C. Crouter, Lynne Vernon-Feagans, and The Family Life Project Key Investigators. "The Relationship of Maternal Work Characteristics to Childcare Type and Quality in Rural Communities." *Community, Work & Family* 12, no.4 (2009), 369-387. doi:[10.1080/13668800802528249](https://doi.org/10.1080/13668800802528249)
- Dlugos, Sarah, "School-Age Care: Now's the Time to Support it." *National Women's Law Center* (blog), 2018. <https://nwlc.org/blog/school-age-care-nows-the-time-to-support-it/>
- Dodson, Wendy, and Lisa Luttrell. "Families Facing Untenable Choices." *Sage Journals* 10, no. 1 (2011): 38-42. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504211399049>
- Dohm, Arlene, and Lynn Scnipser. "Employment Outlook: 2006-2016: Occupational Employment Projections to 2016." *Monthly Labor Review* 130, no. 11 (2007). 86-125. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2007/11/art5full.pdf>
- Enchautegui, María E. "Nonstandard Work Schedules and the Well-Being of Low-Income Families." *Urban Institute Low Income Working Families*, no. 26 (2013). 1-30. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32696/412877-Nonstandard-Work-Schedules-and-the-Well-being-of-Low-Income-Families.PDF>
- Enchautegui, María E., Martha Johnson, and Julia Gelatt. "Who Minds the Kids when Mom Works a Nonstandard Shift?" *Urban Institute*, 2015. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/64696/2000307-Who-Minds-the-Kids-When-Mom-Works-a-Nonstandard-Schedule.pdf>
- Gerstel, Naomi, and Dan Clawson. "Control over Time: Employers, Workers, and Families Shaping Work Schedules." *Annual Review of Sociology* 44 (2018). 77-97. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073117-041400>
- Golden, Lonnie. "Flexible Work Schedules: What Are We Trading Off to Get Them?" *Monthly Labor Review* 124, no. 3 (2001). 50-67. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2001/03/art3full.pdf>
- Golden, Lonnie. "Irregular Work Scheduling and Its Consequences." *Economic Policy Institute*, no. 392 (2015). <https://www.epi.org/publication/irregular-work-scheduling-and-its->

[consequences/](#)

- Halfon, Shani, and Martha Friendly. "Work Around the Clock: A Snapshot of Non-Standard Hours Child Care in Canada." *Childcare Resource and Research Unit Childcare Canada*, no. 29 (2015).
[https://www.childcarecanada.org/sites/default/files/Occasional%20paper%20No.29%20\[Revised,%20Sept%2016\].pdf](https://www.childcarecanada.org/sites/default/files/Occasional%20paper%20No.29%20[Revised,%20Sept%2016].pdf)
- Hamre, Bridget, Bridget Hatfield, Robert Pianta, and Faiza Jamil. "Evidence for General and Domain-Specific Elements of Teacher-Child Interactions: Associations with Preschool Children's Development." *The Science of Early Child Development* 85, no. 3 (2013). 1257-1274.
doi:[10.1111/cdev.12184](https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12184)
- Han, Wen-Jui. "Maternal Nonstandard Work Schedules and Child Cognitive Outcomes." *Child Development* 76, no. 1 (2005). 137-154. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00835.x>
- Henly, Julia R., and Gina Adams. "Insights on Access to Quality Child Care for Families with Nontraditional Work Schedules." *Urban Institute*, 2018.
https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/99148/insights_on_access_to_quality_child_care_for_families_with_nontraditional_work_schedules_0.pdf
- Hepburn, Peter. "Parental Work Schedules and Child Care Arrangements in Low-income Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80, no. 5 (2018). 1187-12-9.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12505>
- Herman, Alexis M. "Futurework: Trends and Challenges for Work in the 21st Century." *United States Department of Labor*, 1999.
https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1066&context=key_workplace
- Hipp, Lena, Taryn W. Morrissey, and Mildred E. Warner. "Who Participates and Who Benefits from Employer-Provided Child Care Assistance?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79, no. 3 (2017). 614-635. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12359>
- Hsueh, Joann and Hirokazu Yoshikawa. "Working Nonstandard Schedules and Variable Shifts in Low-Income Families: Associations with Parental Psychological Well-Being, Family Functioning, and Child Well-Being." *Developmental Psychology* 43, no. 3 (2007). 630-632.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.3.620>
- Illinois Action for Children. "Child Care Needs of Families with Nonstandard and Unstable Schedules." 2016. <http://www.actforchildren.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/CCAP-Work-Schedules-Policy-Brief-FINAL-6.16.16.pdf>
- Illinois Action for Children. "Working Later in Illinois: Work Schedules, Incomes, and Parents Access to Child Care." 2007. http://www.actforchildren.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/MDP_ResearchPublications_PDFs_WorkSchedsCondensed.pdf

- Joshi, Pamela and Karen Bogen. "Nonstandard Schedules and Young Children's Behavior Outcomes Among Working Low-Income Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69, no. 1 (2007).139-156. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00350.x>
- Li, Jianghong, Sarah E. Johnson, Wen-Jui Huan, Sonia Andrews, Garth Kendall, Lyndall Strazdins, and Alfred Dockery. "Parents' Nonstandard Work Schedules and Child Well-Being: A Critical Review of the Literature." *The Journal of Primary Prevention* 35, no. 1 (2014). 53-73. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-013-0318-z>
- Martin, Emily, Amy Matsui, Karen Schulman, and Julie Vogtman. "Set Up for Success: Supporting Parents in Low-Wage Jobs and Their Children." *National Women's Law Center*, 2016. <https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Set-Up-for-Success.pdf>
- Matos, Kenneth, Ellen Galinsky, and James T. Bond. "National Study of Employers." *Society for Human Resource Management* (2017). <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/trends-and-forecasting/research-and-surveys/Documents/National%20Study%20of%20Employers.pdf>
- Matsui, Amy K. "Starbucks Announces New Backup Child Care Benefit for Employees." *National Women's Law Center*, 2018. <https://nwlc.org/blog/starbucks-announces-new-backup-child-care-benefit-for-employees/>
- Montgomery County Early Learning Resource Center. "Subsidized Child Care." <https://www.montcopa.org/120/Subsidized-Child-Care>
- Moran, Della, Joshua Lin, Ashley Campbell, and David Lapp. "Child Care Funding & Finance in Pennsylvania: Budgeting for Survival or Paying for the True Cost of Quality." *Research for Action*, 2017. <https://www.researchforaction.org/publications/child-care-funding-finance-pennsylvania-budgeting-survival-paying-cost-true-quality/>
- Morrissey, Taryn W., Rachel E. Dunifon, and Ariel Kalil. "Maternal Employment, Work Schedules and Children's Body Mass Index." *Child Development* 82, no. 1 (2011). 66-81. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01541.x>
- National Survey of Early Care & Education. "Provision of Early Care and Education During Non-Standard Hours." 2015. https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/factsheet_nonstandard_hours_provision_of_ece_toopre_041715_508.pdf
- National Women's Law Center. "Child Care is Fundamental to America's Children, Families, and Economy." 2016. <https://www.icrw.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Child-Care-101-1.2.17-1.pdf>
- National Women's Law Center. "Collateral Damage: Scheduling Challenges for Workers in Low-Wage Jobs and Their Consequences." 2017. <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Collateral-Damage.pdf>
- National Women's Law Center. "Helping Parents in Low-Wage Jobs Access Affordable Child Care: Opportunities Under the Reauthorized Child Care and Development Block Grant." 2015.

- <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CCDBG-Reauthorization-and-Low-Wage-Workers.pdf>
- National Women's Law Center. "State Child Care Assistance Policies: Pennsylvania." 2017. <https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/pennsylvania-childcare-subsidy2016.pdf>
- National Women's Law Center. "Strategies for Supporting Family, Friend and Neighbor Care Providers." 2016. https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/nwlc_BriefReport.pdf
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Child Care and Early Learning." <http://www.dhs.pa.gov/citizens/childcareearlylearning/index.htm>.
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Child Care Works Subsidized Child Care Program." <http://www.dhs.pa.gov/citizens/childcareearlylearning/childcareworkssubsidizedchildcareprogram/index.htm>
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Early Learning Resource Centers." <http://www.dhs.pa.gov/learnaboutdhs/helpfultelephonenumber/childcareinformation/services/index.htm>
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Manual Section '101 – DEFINITIONS.'" http://www.dhs.pa.gov/cs/groups/webcontent/documents/document/d_010561.pdf
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Maximum Daily Child Care Allowances." http://www.dhs.state.pa.us/cs/groups/webcontent/documents/document/p_022773.pdf
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, Office of Child Development and Early Learning. "Pennsylvania Keystone STARS Program Performance Standards." 2018. <http://www.pakeys.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Keystone-STARS-Performance-Standards-07-01-2018.pdf>
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Proposed Rulemaking: 55 PA Code Chapters 20, 3041, 3270, 3280 AND 3290, Child Care Facilities." 2018. <https://www.pabulletin.com/secure/data/vol48/48-41/1587.html>
- Pennsylvania Department of Human Services. "Provider Payments." http://www.dhs.pa.gov/cs/groups/webcontent/documents/manual/c_263528.pdf
- Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, Center for Workforce Information and Analysis. "Paid Family and Medical Leave in Pennsylvania: Research Findings Report." 2017. https://www.dol.gov/wb/media/Pennsylvania_Final_Report.pdf
- Perry-Jenkins, Maureen, Abbie E. Goldberg, Courtney P. Pierce, and Aline G Sayer. "Shift Work, Role Overload, and the Transition to Parenthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69, no. 1 (2007). 123-138. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00349.x>
- Phillips, Katherin Ross. "Parent work and child well-being in low-income families." *The Urban Institute*, no. 56, 2002. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/60146/310509-Parent-Work-and-Child-Well-Being-in-Low-Income-Families.PDF>

- Presser, Harriet B. "Can We Make Time for Children? The Economy, Work Schedules and Child Care: Population Association of America, 1989 Presidential Address" *Population Association of America*, 1989. doi: 10.2307/2061256
- Presser, Harriet B. "Working in a 24/7 Economy: Challenges for American Families". *New York: Russell Sage Foundation*, 2003. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610444590>
- Presser, Harriet B., and Amy G. Cox. "The Work Schedules of Low-Educated American Women and Welfare Reform." *Monthly Labor Review*, 1997. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/1997/04/art3full.pdf>
- Prickett, Kate C. "Nonstandard Work Schedules, Family Dynamics, and Mother-Child Interactions During Early Childhood." *Journal of Family Issues* 39, no. 4 (2016). 985-1007. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16684893>
- Quinton, Sophie. "Why the 'Skills Gap' Doesn't Explain Slow Hiring." *Pew Charitable Trusts*. 2016. <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2016/11/14/why-the-skills-gap-doesnt-explain-slow-hiring>
- Rachidi, Angela. "Child Care Assistance in the United States and Nonstandard Work Schedules." *American Enterprise Institute*, 2015. <https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Nonstandard-Sch-and-Child-Care-Working-Paper-Nov-2015.pdf>
- Rachidi, Angela. "Mothers at Work: Nonstandard-Hour Work Schedules and Childcare for Low-Income Families." *American Enterprise Institute*, 2018. <http://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Mothers-at-Work.pdf>
- Restaurant Opportunities Centers United. "NightCare: The Growing Challenge for Parents on the Late Shift." *Restaurant Opportunities Centers United in Partnership with National Women's Law Center*, 2016. http://rocunited.org/wp2015b/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Nightcare_Report_W.pdf
- Rodrigues, Gabrielle. "An Increasing Number of Parents Seek Child Care during Non-Standard Hours." *National Women's Law Center*, 2018. <https://nwlc.org/blog/an-increasing-number-of-parents-seek-child-care-during-non-standard-hours/>
- Rosch, Jacob and Ira Goldstein. "Investigating Philadelphia's Uncertified Childcare Providers," *The Reinvestment Fund*, 2016. <https://www.reinvestment.com/childcaremap/pdfs/Investigating%20Philadelphia's%20Uncertified%20Childcare%20Providers.pdf>
- Rosch, Jacob, Janine Simmons, and Michael Norton. "Estimating Changes in the Supply of and Demand for Child Care in Philadelphia," *The Reinvestment Fund*, 2019. https://www.reinvestment.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ReinvestmentFund_WPF_Childcare_Summary_2018.pdf
- Sandstrom, Heather, and Ajay Chaudry. "You Have to Choose Your Childcare to Fit Your Work: Childcare Decision-Making Among Low-Income Working Families." *Journal of Children and Poverty* 18, no. 2 (2012). 89-119. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10796126.2012.710480>

- Sandstrom, Heather, Lindsey Giesen, and Ajay Chaudry. "How Contextual Constraints Affect Low-Income Working Parents' Child Care Choices" *Urban Institute*, no. 22 (2012). 1-12.
<https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32726/412511-How-Contextual-Constraints-Affect-Low-Income-Working-Parents-Child-Care-Choices.PDF>
- Schmit, Stephanie and Christina Walker. "Disparate Access: Head Start and CCDBG Data by Race and Ethnicity." *Center for Law and Social Policy*, 2016.
<https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2017/04/Disparate-Access.pdf>
- Schulman, Karen and Daria Crawford. "Helping Family, Friend, and Neighbor Care Providers Meet New Requirements Under the Child Care and Development Block Grant Reauthorization Law." *National Women's Law Center*, 2018. <https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Helping-FFN-meet-CCDBG.pdf>
- Schumacher, Rachel, Kate Irish, and Mark H. Greenberg. "Untapped Potential? How States Contract Directly with Providers to Shore Up Child Care Choices for Low-Income Families." *Center for Law and Social Policy*, 2003. <https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/public/resources-and-publications/publication-1/0116.pdf>
- Secret, Mary. "Parenting in the Workplace: Child Care Options for Consideration." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 41, no. 3 (2005). 326-347.
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886305276386>
- Shdaimah, Corey S. and Elizabeth Palley. "Elusive Public Support for US Child Care Policy." *Community, Work & Family* 21, no. 1 (2018). 53 – 69.
 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2016.1230841>
- Silverman, Suzann. "When it Comes to Child Care, Hospitals May be Setting the Pace for Much of the Nation." *JAMA* 26, no. 13 (1989). 1857-1861. doi:10.1001/jama.1989.03420130015005
- Stoll, Marica, David Alexander, and Christine Nicpon. "Chicago Mothers on Finding and Using Child Care During Nonstandard Work Hours." *Early Childhood Research and Practice* 17, no. 1 (2015). <http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v17n1/stoll.html>
- Strazdins, Lyndall, Mark S. Clements, Rosemary J. Korda, Dorothy H. Broom, and Rennie M. D'Souza. "Unsociable Work? Nonstandard Work Schedules, Family Relationships, and Children's Well-Being." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68, no. 2 (2006). 394-410.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3838908>
- Strazdins, Lyndall, Rosemary J. Korda, Lynette L-Y Lim, Dorothy H. Broom, and Rennie M. D'Souza. "Around-the-Clock: Parent Work Schedules and Children's Well-Being in a 24-h Economy." *Social Science and Medicine* 59, no. 7 (2004). 1517-1527. doi:
[10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.01.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.01.022)
- Swanberg, Jennifer E., Elizabeth Watson, and Meridith Eastman. "Scheduling Challenges Among Workers in Low-Wage Hourly Jobs: Similarities and Differences Among Workers in Standard and Non-Standard Hour Jobs." *Community, Work & Family*. 17, no. 4 (2014): 409-435. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2014.931837>

- The Pennsylvania Key. "Child Care Reimbursement Rates Increased and Rate Freeze Lifted!" 2018. <http://www.pakeys.org/child-care-reimbursement-rates-increased-and-rate-freeze-lifted/>
- Thompson, Elizabeth B. "Mothers at Work: "Non-Standard Work Hour Child Care Project." *Washington State Child Care Resource & Referral Network*, 2000. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/31206>
- United States Department of Health & Human Services, Office of Child Care "FY 2016 CCDF Data Tables." 2018. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/preliminary-fy2016>
- United States Census Bureau. "County-to-County Migration Flows: 2012-2016 ACS." 2018. <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/2016/demo/geographic-mobility/county-to-county-migration-2012-2016.html>
- United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor and Statistics. "Workers on Flexible and Shift Schedules." 2005. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/flex.toc.htm>
- Washington State Child Care Resource and Referral Network. "Non-Standard Work Hour Child Care Project." 2000. http://www.childcarenet.org/Principals/advocacy/policy-resources/studies/non_standard.pdf
- Weber, Roberta B., Deana Grober, and Ellen K. Scott. "Predictors of Low-Income Parent Child Care Selections." *Children and Youth Services Review* 88, (2018). 528-540. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.04.001>

APPENDIX: MAKING IT WORK

Examining the Status of Non-Traditional Child Care in Pennsylvania



JUNE 2019 • KELLY SLOANE, PH.D. • JASON FONTANA • ANNA SHAW-AMOAH • DAVID LAPP • ALYN M. TURNER, PH.D.

Methodology

Research for Action (RFA) collected and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data about families, child care providers, and employers to examine the status of non-traditional child care in Pennsylvania. Specifically, to assess the **need for non-traditional child care** and describe the **characteristics of households¹ and providers**, RFA conducted descriptive analysis of state and national quantitative data sources. To describe **stakeholder experiences and perspectives**, including working families, non-traditional child care providers, employers, and policymakers, RFA collected and analyzed qualitative data from focus groups and interviews.

Quantitative Analysis Methodology

Data sources

This report used quantitative analysis of multiple data sources to understand the characteristics of households with non-traditional child care needs, children receiving CCW to access non-traditional child care, and the characteristics of regulated providers offering non-traditional child care:

- American Community Survey (ACS) 2012-2016;²
- Current Population Survey (CPS) 2004;³
- Child Care Works Subsidy participant data (CCW) 2018;⁴
- Provider self-reported data (PELICAN);⁵ and
- OCDEL's public data file of providers (PELICAN) 2018.⁶

RFA extracted CPS and ACS data from IPUMS. Analysis of ACS data below the state level uses county groups for counties with fewer than 100,000 residents.

¹ The analysis ACS data was conducted at the household level. Throughout this report, we use the terms household and family interchangeably.

² Steven Ruggles, Sarah Flood, Ronald Goeken, Josiah Grover, Erin Meyer, Jose Pacas, and Matthew Sobek. IPUMS USA: Version 9.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D010.V9.0>

³ Sarah Flood, Miriam King, Renae Rodgers, Steven Ruggles, and J. Robert Warren. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 6.0 [dataset]. Minneapolis, MN: IPUMS, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.18128/D030.V6.0>

⁴ Provided by OCDEL.

⁵ Provided by OCDEL.

⁶ Office of Child Development and Early Learning (OCDEL) Research. Retrieved from

<http://www.ocdelresearch.org/Reports/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2FReports%2FOCDEL%20Public%20Data%20File&FolderCTID=0x01200092FA27E29EEE3E4AAE2D4C5508AC9E5A&View=%7b5EEC6855-F8A8-486E-B6E0-FE6B9FDEBE2E%7d>

Estimating household demand for NTCC

Defining households with non-traditional care needs. Households were identified as having potential non-traditional child care needs if (1) a child under five resides in the home and (2) all guardians of the child in the home work in occupations that typically require non-standard schedules.

RFA used 5-year (2012-2016) ACS and 2004 CPS data to identify and describe households that likely need non-traditional child care. ACS survey data provided information on occupation, household composition, income, mode of transportation, race, and educational attainment on a state, regional, and county level. RFA produced estimates using 80 household and person-level replicate weights. Unreliable estimates are identified and suppressed.⁷

Defining occupations with non-standard work schedules. To categorize occupations as typically requiring non-standard work schedules, RFA conducted review of literature, RFA identified industries experiencing growth and of contemporary relevance in Pennsylvania and extracted work schedule data for occupations within identified industries from the 2004 CPS Work Schedule Supplement. The CPS survey definition of non-standard work schedules includes:

- Evening shifts (2pm to midnight);
- Night shifts (9pm to 8am);
- Rotating shifts (changes days/evenings/nights);
- Split shifts (two distinct periods per day); and
- Irregular schedules arranged by employers.

RFA used a crosswalk to match occupations identified in the 2004 CPS supplement with the occupation codes in the 2012-2016 ACS data. Table A1 provides the complete list of relevant industries and example occupations the require non-standard work schedules for each industry.

⁷ Unreliable estimates include those with relative standard errors that are greater than 30%.

Table A1. Industries and Example Occupations Requiring Non-standard Work Schedules, ACS, 2012-2016

| Industry | Example Occupations |
|---|--|
| Accommodation and Food Services | Waiters and Waitresses; Cooks; Food Service Managers |
| Administrative and Support and Waste Management Services | Grounds Maintenance Workers; Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners; Security Guards |
| Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting | Farmers, Ranchers, and Other Agricultural Managers; Miscellaneous Agriculture Workers; Drivers/Sales Workers and Truck Drivers |
| Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation | Waiters and Waitresses; Gaming Service Workers; Artists and Related Workers |
| Construction | Carpenters; Electricians; Pipe layers, Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Steamfitters |
| Educational Services | Postsecondary Teachers; Special Education Teachers; Counselors |
| Finance and Insurance | Insurance Claims and Policy Processing Clerks; Tellers; First-Line Supervisors of Non-Retail Sales |
| Health Care and Social Assistance | Nursing, Psychiatric, and Home Health Aides; Registered Nurses; Personal Care Aides |
| Information | Miscellaneous Managers; Sales Representatives; Postal Service Clerks |
| Management of Companies and Enterprises | Sales Representatives, Designers, First-Line Supervisors of Office and Administrative Support Workers |
| Manufacturing | Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers; Miscellaneous Assemblers and Fabricators; First-Line Supervisors of Production and Operating Workers |
| Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction | Miscellaneous Extraction Workers; Miscellaneous Managers; Driver/Sales Workers and Truck Drivers |
| Other Services, Except Public Administration | Hairdressers, Hairstylists, and Cosmetologists; Automotive Service Technicians and Mechanics; Child Care Workers |
| Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services | Miscellaneous Managers; Management Analysts; Designers |
| Public Administration | Police Officers; Bailiffs, Correctional Officers, and Jailers; Secretaries and Administrative Assistants |
| Real Estate and Rental and Leasing | Real Estate Brokers and Sales Agents; Property, Real Estate, and Community Association Managers; Janitors and Building Cleaners |
| Retail Trade | First-Line Supervisors of Retail Sales Workers; Cashiers; Retail Salespersons |
| Transportation and Warehousing | Driver/Sales Workers and Truck Drivers; Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers; Bus Drivers |
| Utilities | Miscellaneous Managers; Miscellaneous Production Workers; First-Line Supervisors of Production and Operating Workers |
| Wholesale Trade | Driver/Sales Workers and Truck Drivers; Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers; Stock Clerks and Order Fillers |

Proxy for demand. The estimates of need for non-traditional care reported in the text are a proxy for demand, in some ways resulting in a likely overestimation and in others an undercount. The data are limited in two major ways.

1. Merging CPS and ACS data result in **imprecise working schedule data**, in some cases underestimating need and other cases overestimating need. A more reliable measure would be self-reported work schedules rather than typical work schedules of a person's occupation. Thus, some families identified as needing non-traditional care may actually work schedules that do not require such care. On the other hand, some families working in occupations that do not typically have non-standard work schedules may actually work such schedules.
2. The unit of analysis is household, and respondents are not asked about their social networks. However, we know that **families use their networks** to fill their child care needs. Thus, our approach likely overestimates need for non-traditional care. In other words, families that rely on their networks for child care during non-traditional hours are identified as in need of non-traditional care.

Table A2 provides the estimated number and characteristics of households with young children and households with young children and likely need for non-traditional child care.

Table A2. Estimated Number and Characteristics of Households with Non-Traditional Child Care Needs in Pennsylvania, 2016

| | Households with Young Children | Households with Need for NTCC |
|---|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Number of Households | 498,788 | 151,644 |
| % Single-Guardian | 26% | 44% |
| % Two-Guardian | 74% | 56% |
| % Employed (Among Single or Two-Guardian Households) | 75% | 100% |
| % Employed (Among Single-Guardian Households) | 63% | 100% |
| % Employed (Among Two-Guardian Households) | 77% | 100% |
| % Working in Occupations that Require Non-standard Hours | 51% | 100% |
| % Working in Health Care and Social Assistance | 19% | 25% |
| % Working in Retail | 10% | 14% |
| % Working in Accommodation and Food Service | 7% | 11% |
| % Working in Manufacturing | 11% | 10% |
| % with a Grandparent in the Home (Among All Households) | 9% | 14% |

| | | |
|--|-----|-----|
| % with a Grandparent in the Home (Among Single-Guardian Households) | 42% | 38% |
| % with a Grandparent in the Home (Among Two-Guardian Households) | 3% | 3% |
| % with Family Income Below 100% of Poverty Threshold | 17% | 15% |
| % with Family Income 101 - 199% of Poverty Threshold | 18% | 22% |
| % with Family Income 200 - 299% of Poverty Threshold | 18% | 20% |
| % with Family Income 300 - 399% of Poverty Threshold | 14% | 15% |
| % with Family Income 400 - 499% of Poverty Threshold | 10% | 10% |
| % with Family Income 500% or Greater of Poverty Threshold | 22% | 18% |
| % Using Personal Vehicle to Travel to Work | 90% | 88% |
| % Using Public Transit to Travel to Work | 5% | 7% |
| % Using Bicycle or Walking to Travel to Work | 3% | 4% |
| % Using Other Mode of Transit to Travel to Work | 1% | 1% |
| % White | 74% | 68% |
| % Black or African American | 10% | 15% |
| % Hispanic | 9% | 11% |
| % Asian or Pacific Islander | 5% | 3% |
| % Other Race | 2% | 2% |
| % with Less than High School Diploma | 10% | 8% |
| % with High School Diploma or Equivalent | 26% | 31% |
| % with Some College, No Degree | 18% | 23% |
| % with Associate Degree | 9% | 11% |
| % with Bachelor's Degree | 22% | 17% |
| % with Master's Degree or Greater | 15% | 9% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates

Identifying Non-Traditional Child Care Providers

Defining providers that offer non-traditional care. RFA identified providers as non-traditional child care providers if they reported offering (1) at least three hours of care between the hours of 6:00 pm and 6:00 am during weekdays or (2) any amount of care on a Saturday and/or Sunday.

The quantitative analysis of characteristics of child care providers relies on data provided by the Office of Child Development and Early Learning (OCDEL). The provider data includes regulated providers with enrollments in October of 2018 and provides information on the hours and care

schedules providers offer, provider type, acceptance of financial programs, Keystone STARS quality ratings, special accommodations for children with special needs, transportation services offered, and additional fees. The analysis of Keystones STARS excludes 286 regulated providers for which data on STARS is not available. It is unclear if these providers have no STAR level or if the data is missing. Providers can have their STAR level suspended due to program noncompliance. Providers with suspended STAR levels do not have their rating revoked until they fail to meet the requirements of their STAR Suspension Action Plan. About 300 providers have suspended STAR levels. However, providers with suspended STAR levels retain their STAR level designation until their STAR level is revoked and are counted as retaining that level for this analysis. Analysis of additional charges for transportation and early dismissal care are limited to providers that report offering those services. Among regulated providers, 16% report offering some form of transportation and 62% report offering early dismissal care.

Child Care Schedules Reported in COMPASS. The provider self-reported data underlying the COMPASS provider search tool does not define the specific hours of various care schedules, so it is not clear whether a provider's before and after-school care falls under RFA's technical definition of NTCC. We include it in the analysis of care schedules (Figure 2) because many of the families and providers we spoke with highlighted the need from families and indicated that in some cases before and after-school care may extend into hours that fit the technical definition of non-traditional care.

Characteristics of Children Who Use CCW to Access Non-Traditional Child Care

OCDEL also provided RFA with data on CCW participants. The majority of CCW participants are children under the age of 13 (99%). Compared to available state estimates, CCW participants represent about 8% of children under 5 and 5% of children under 15.⁸ This child-level data of children actively receiving CCW as of October 2018 provided information on age, family income, location of provider, use of traditional and non-traditional care, and use of regulated or relative care providers. RFA conducted analysis of this data to understand the characteristics of subsidy participants using non-traditional care. RFA merged provider data from PELICAN with the list of providers used by subsidy participants for non-traditional care to understand the characteristics of providers that subsidy participants are accessing for non-traditional care. County of residence is missing for 140 CCW participants. County-level analysis of CCW participants is limited to those with a reported county of residence.

Qualitative Analysis Methodology

Research for Action conducted focus groups with parents/guardians (N=6) and interviews with child care providers (N= 6), workforce development board staff (N=8) and current and former policymakers (N=7).⁹ This qualitative data offers important insight about the needs of families

⁸ U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S0101.

⁹ The original research design included interviews with employers. Of the nearly two dozen employers contacted, only one agreed to participate in this study. Interviews with workforce development board staff were added to learn more about the challenges faced by employers and employees working in occupations with non-standard hours.

accessing non-traditional child care and the views of providers who offer care during non-standard hours. The qualitative data also generated recommendations from families, providers, employers and policymakers.

Focus Groups

RFA conducted six focus groups with 37 parents/guardians in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and North Central PA. The participants had experience with non-traditional child care including full- and part-time night-care, sleep care, weekend care, and before- and after-school care. The design of the focus groups produced interactions among participants that provided checks and balances to weed out false or extreme views and identify major themes.

The qualitative data reports the characteristics of the parents/guardians who participated in the focus group including: their occupational sectors and work schedules; family and social networks; and, if there are other adults who assist with their child care. The demographic, household and occupational characteristics of the focus group participants reflected the characteristics of the population data with the American Community Survey data. The focus group data also explored non-traditional child care experience, views, expectations, and policy recommendations of working parents/guardians in Pennsylvania.

Provider Interviews

Research for Action conducted interviews with six child care providers who offer non-traditional child care in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, or North Central PA. Research for Action used guided interviews to ensure that the same basic lines of inquiry are pursued with each interviewed provider. The interview guide provided topics or subjects which allowed the interviewer to explore, probe, and ask questions that will focus on specific topics determined in advance in order to conduct systematic and comprehensive interviews.

Two of the interviewed providers operate Child Care Centers and four providers operate Family Child Care Homes. The providers interviewed offer an array of non-traditional child care services ranging from 24-hour care, night-care, weekend care, and before- and after-school care. The qualitative interviews with child care providers revealed common challenges experienced by and promising practices implemented by non-traditional child care providers.

Workforce Development Board Interviews

RFA conducted interviews with eight workforce development board executives, managers, and frontline staff about the challenges faced by employers who operate with non-standard hours and the non-traditional child care needs of parents/guardians who work non-standard hours. The interview subjects work in service to employers and employees by shaping workforce development policies and goals in North Central Pennsylvania, Philadelphia County, and Allegheny County. The interviews produced qualitative data measuring difficulties of employers operating with non-standard hours including barriers to recruitment, difficulty in retaining employees, and difficulty in scheduling and family-friendly policies.

State and Local Government Agency Staff

RFA interviewed seven current and former state and local government agency staff with interest in the non-traditional child care needs of parents/guardians who work non-standard hours. The perspectives of policymakers, families, providers and employers contributed to policy considerations proposed in this report.

Data Analysis

Interview and focus group data were coded using Dedoose. Codes reflected the primary research questions that guided this study as well as other emerging themes. The coded data were analyzed both within data source (e.g., parent, child care provider) to identify themes for each group, as well as across data sources where appropriate to triangulate key findings. The analysis considered cross-regional themes and regional differences. A series of analytic memos were written and subject to quality review outside of the immediate research team.

County and County Group-Level Analysis Tables

Table A3. Estimated number of families with young children and the proportion of families with young children that likely need non-traditional child care, county or county group, 2016

| County | Number of Households with Young Children | % with Non-Traditional Child Care Needs |
|--|--|---|
| Pennsylvania | 498,788 | 30% |
| Adams & Franklin | 11,101 | 35% |
| Allegheny | 47,547 | 29% |
| Berks | 17,823 | 33% |
| Blair & Huntingdon | 6,848 | 33% |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 4,308 | 35% |
| Bucks | 23,468 | 23% |
| Butler | 6,581 | 20% |
| Cambria | 5,288 | 28% |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 29,390 | 37% |
| Centre | 5,382 | 26% |
| Chester | 20,582 | 28% |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 6,470 | 31% |
| Crawford & Warren | 4,606 | 31% |
| Cumberland & Perry | 11,557 | 31% |
| Dauphin | 12,230 | 36% |
| Delaware | 23,339 | 30% |
| Erie | 11,169 | 29% |
| Fayette | 4,294 | 26% |
| Green & Washington | 8,814 | 24% |
| Indiana & Armstrong | 5,799 | 26% |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 9,610 | 29% |
| Lancaster | 24,828 | 28% |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 8,812 | 34% |
| Lebanon | 5,416 | 39% |
| Luzerne & Columbia | 14,036 | 30% |

| | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| Lycoming & Clinton | 6,611 | 34% |
| Mercer | 4,105 | 33% |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 5,823 | 32% |
| Monroe | 5,243 | 33% |
| Montgomery | 33,096 | 24% |
| Northumberland & Montour | 4,430 | 32% |
| Philadelphia | 59,750 | 35% |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | 4,651 | 30% |
| Schuylkill | 5,118 | 33% |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 4,853 | 29% |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | 5,396 | 27% |
| Westmoreland | 12,964 | 28% |
| York | 17,450 | 32% |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A4. Employment status of parents/guardians among families with young children, county or county group, 2016

| County or County Group | Employed | Unemployed or Not in Labor Force |
|--|-----------------|---|
| Pennsylvania | 75% | 25% |
| Adams & Franklin | 77% | 23% |
| Allegheny | 77% | 23% |
| Berks | 77% | 23% |
| Blair & Huntingdon | 76% | 24% |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 73% | 27% |
| Bucks | 78% | 22% |
| Butler | 79% | 21% |
| Cambria | 73% | 27% |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 77% | 23% |
| Centre | 77% | 23% |
| Chester | 79% | 21% |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 73% | 27% |

| | | |
|---|-----|-----|
| Crawford & Warren | 69% | 31% |
| Cumberland & Perry | 78% | 22% |
| Dauphin | 78% | 22% |
| Delaware | 77% | 23% |
| Erie | 69% | 31% |
| Fayette | 62% | 38% |
| Green & Washington | 70% | 30% |
| Indiana & Armstrong | 69% | 31% |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 75% | 25% |
| Lancaster | 73% | 27% |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 77% | 23% |
| Lebanon | 78% | 22% |
| Luzerne & Columbia | 74% | 26% |
| Lycoming & Clinton | 76% | 24% |
| Mercer | 72% | 28% |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 72% | 28% |
| Monroe | 71% | 29% |
| Montgomery | 81% | 19% |
| Northumberland & Montour | 76% | 24% |
| Philadelphia | 67% | 33% |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | 71% | 29% |
| Schuylkill | 74% | 26% |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 71% | 29% |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | 71% | 29% |
| Westmoreland | 76% | 24% |
| York | 78% | 22% |

* Estimate does not meet reliability standards.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A5. Industry of parents/guardians among families with young children that likely need non-traditional child care, county or county group, 2016

| County | Accommodation & Food Service | Health Care & Social Assistance | Manufacturing | Retail | Other |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------|-------|
| Pennsylvania | 11% | 25% | 10% | 14% | 41% |
| Adams & Franklin | * | 24% | 15% | 14% | 38% |
| Allegheny | 10% | 29% | 5% | 13% | 43% |
| Berks | 9% | 20% | 20% | 12% | 39% |
| Blair & Huntingdon | * | 30% | 10% | 16% | 37% |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 12% | 20% | 17% | 9% | 41% |
| Bucks | 12% | 23% | 12% | 15% | 39% |
| Butler | * | 12% | * | 14% | 51% |
| Cambria | * | 25% | * | * | 34% |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 9% | 23% | 11% | 13% | 45% |
| Centre | * | 25% | * | * | 36% |
| Chester | 11% | 23% | 10% | 12% | 44% |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 12% | 25% | 19% | 19% | 24% |
| Crawford & Warren | * | 19% | 20% | 17% | 29% |
| Cumberland & Perry | 9% | 24% | * | 13% | 45% |
| Dauphin | 15% | 25% | * | 12% | 44% |
| Delaware | 12% | 33% | 5% | 9% | 41% |
| Erie | 13% | 28% | 15% | 12% | 31% |
| Fayette | * | 32% | * | * | 37% |
| Green & Washington | 13% | 25% | * | 18% | 37% |
| Indiana & Armstrong | * | 27% | 14% | 16% | 33% |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 13% | 21% | 8% | 15% | 43% |
| Lancaster | 10% | 20% | 12% | 15% | 44% |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 12% | 21% | 13% | 11% | 42% |
| Lebanon | * | 18% | 13% | * | 45% |
| Luzerne & Columbia | 9% | 28% | 12% | 15% | 36% |
| Lycoming & Clinton | 13% | 31% | 8% | 12% | 35% |
| Mercer | * | 27% | 10% | 20% | 33% |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 12% | 19% | 14% | 11% | 43% |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Monroe | * | * | * | 20% | 39% |
| Montgomery | 7% | 21% | 10% | 14% | 47% |
| Northumberland & Montour | * | 39% | 13% | * | 36% |
| Philadelphia | 11% | 31% | 4% | 16% | 37% |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | 20% | * | * | 21% | 41% |
| Schuylkill | * | 26% | 14% | 14% | 41% |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 9% | 19% | 13% | 14% | 46% |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | * | 27% | 19% | 9% | 40% |
| Westmoreland | 8% | 27% | 10% | 13% | 42% |
| York | 10% | 22% | 12% | 16% | 40% |

* Estimate does not meet reliability standards.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A6. Household composition of families with young children that likely need non-traditional child care, county or county group, 2016

| County or County Group | Grandparent Present |
|--|----------------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 14% |
| Adams & Franklin | 14% |
| Allegheny | 7% |
| Berks | 14% |
| Blair & Huntingdon | 12% |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 15% |
| Bucks | 14% |
| Butler | 11% |
| Cambria | 8% |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 15% |
| Centre | 9% |
| Chester | 10% |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 9% |
| Crawford & Warren | 7% |
| Cumberland & Perry | 13% |
| Dauphin | 10% |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Delaware | 17% |
| Erie | 12% |
| Fayette | 17% |
| Green & Washington | 15% |
| Indiana & Armstrong | 13% |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 16% |
| Lancaster | 13% |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 9% |
| Lebanon | 4% |
| Luzerne, & Columbia | 14% |
| Lycoming & Clinton | 12% |
| Mercer | 13% |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 10% |
| Monroe | 37% |
| Montgomery | 13% |
| Northumberland & Montour | 4% |
| Philadelphia | 21% |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | 25% |
| Schuylkill | 14% |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 12% |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | 8% |
| Westmoreland | 9% |
| York | 15% |

* Estimate does not meet reliability standards.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A7. Family income as a percent of poverty threshold of families with young children that likely need non-traditional child care, county or county group, 2016

| County or County Group | 100% or Lower | 101-199% | 200-299% | 300-399% | 400-499% | 500% or More |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 15% | 22% | 20% | 15% | 10% | 18% |
| Adams & Franklin | 14% | 24% | 23% | 10% | 11% | 16% |
| Allegheny | 14% | 20% | 19% | 14% | 10% | 24% |
| Berks | 17% | 24% | 24% | 14% | 8% | 13% |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Blair & Huntingdon | 17% | 21% | 27% | 18% | * | * |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 11% | 18% | 22% | 19% | 13% | 16% |
| Bucks | 12% | 7% | 14% | 22% | 11% | 34% |
| Butler | 17% | 15% | 13% | 23% | * | 23% |
| Cambria | 20% | 17% | 24% | * | * | * |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 14% | 25% | 21% | 14% | 10% | 17% |
| Centre | * | * | 28% | * | * | * |
| Chester | 12% | 15% | 22% | 12% | 10% | 28% |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 16% | 22% | 26% | 14% | * | 10% |
| Crawford & Warren | 21% | 35% | 22% | 11% | * | * |
| Cumberland & Perry | 12% | 19% | 21% | 18% | 17% | 13% |
| Dauphin | 18% | 29% | 18% | 14% | * | 17% |
| Delaware | 15% | 19% | 12% | 18% | 7% | 29% |
| Erie | 17% | 26% | 27% | * | 10% | 11% |
| Fayette | 23% | * | 34% | * | * | * |
| Green & Washington | 19% | 17% | 25% | * | 10% | 17% |
| Indiana & Armstrong | 19% | 23% | * | 17% | * | * |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 16% | 23% | 21% | 16% | 10% | 16% |
| Lancaster | 13% | 18% | 21% | 16% | 17% | 16% |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 16% | 20% | 18% | 20% | 11% | * |
| Lebanon | * | 21% | 28% | 17% | * | * |
| Luzerne & Columbia | 20% | 21% | 22% | 13% | * | 12% |
| Lycoming & Clinton | 26% | 22% | 26% | * | * | * |
| Mercer | * | 29% | 14% | * | * | * |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 14% | 30% | 23% | 13% | * | * |
| Monroe | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| Montgomery | 9% | 17% | 12% | 16% | 12% | 35% |
| Northumberland & Montour | * | 32% | 26% | * | * | * |
| Philadelphia | 21% | 29% | 19% | 11% | 6% | 14% |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | * | 14% | 27% | * | * | * |
| Schuylkill | 16% | 19% | 22% | 22% | * | * |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 8% | 21% | 24% | 14% | * | 20% |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | 17% | 30% | 26% | 18% | * | * |
| Westmoreland | 14% | 16% | 24% | 13% | 17% | 16% |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| York | 9% | 24% | 20% | 17% | 15% | 14% |
|-------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

* Estimate does not meet reliability standards.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A8. Mode of transportation to work used by employed parents/guardians among families with young children that likely need non-traditional child care, county or county group, 2016

| County or County Group | Personal Vehicle | Public Transit | Walk or Bicycle | Other |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Pennsylvania | 88% | 7% | 4% | † |
| Adams & Franklin | 94% | * | * | * |
| Allegheny | 85% | 11% | 4% | * |
| Berks | 92% | * | * | * |
| Blair & Huntingdon | 95% | † | * | * |
| Bradford, Tioga & Sullivan | 98% | † | * | * |
| Bucks | 96% | * | * | † |
| Butler | 93% | * | * | * |
| Cambria | 91% | * | * | * |
| Carbon, Lehigh & Northampton | 93% | * | 4% | * |
| Centre | 94% | † | * | † |
| Chester | 93% | * | * | * |
| Clearfield, McKean, Elk, Potter & Cameron | 96% | * | * | † |
| Crawford & Warren | 93% | * | * | * |
| Cumberland & Perry | 98% | † | * | * |
| Dauphin | 91% | * | * | * |
| Delaware | 83% | 16% | * | * |
| Erie | 94% | * | * | † |
| Fayette | 100% | * | † | † |
| Green & Washington | 98% | † | * | † |
| Indiana & Armstrong | 89% | † | * | † |
| Lackawanna & Wyoming | 99% | * | * | * |
| Lancaster | 95% | * | * | † |
| Lawrence & Beaver | 97% | * | * | * |
| Lebanon | 89% | * | * | † |
| Luzerne & Columbia | 92% | * | * | * |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|----|---|
| Lycoming & Clinton | 89% | * | * | * |
| Mercer | 99% | † | * | † |
| Mifflin, Union, Snyder & Juniata | 94% | † | * | * |
| Monroe | 90% | * | * | † |
| Montgomery | 89% | 7% | * | * |
| Northumberland & Montour | 95% | † | * | † |
| Philadelphia | 57% | 32% | 9% | * |
| Pike, Wayne & Susquehanna | 98% | * | * | † |
| Schuylkill | 99% | † | * | * |
| Somerset, Bedford & Fulton | 94% | * | * | * |
| Venango, Jefferson, Clarion & Forest | 97% | * | * | † |
| Westmoreland | 98% | * | * | * |
| York | 95% | * | * | * |

* Estimate does not meet reliability standards.

† Population too small to produce an estimate.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

Table A9: Number of total regulated providers and regulated providers that report offering non-traditional child care, county, 2018¹⁰

| County | Total Providers | NTCC Providers | Subsidy NTCC Providers | NTCC Slots |
|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 7,330 | 1,881 | 1,116 | 47,702 |
| Adams | 54 | 8 | 3 | 42 |
| Allegheny | 669 | 171 | 112 | 4,150 |
| Armstrong | 31 | 10 | 6 | 88 |
| Beaver | 68 | 21 | 15 | 674 |
| Bedford | 19 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Berks | 156 | 35 | 22 | 1,883 |
| Blair | 55 | 8 | 1 | 407 |
| Bradford | 31 | 6 | 0 | 127 |
| Bucks | 274 | 13 | 5 | 1,027 |

¹⁰ The number of NTCC slots was calculated by summing the total capacity of providers who reported offering non-traditional child care.

| | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Butler | 80 | 5 | 2 | 36 |
| Cambria | 75 | 9 | 4 | 157 |
| Cameron | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Carbon | 25 | 4 | 1 | 54 |
| Centre | 81 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| Chester | 262 | 22 | 11 | 471 |
| Clarion | 18 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| Clearfield | 50 | 9 | 4 | 177 |
| Clinton | 11 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Columbia | 27 | 1 | 0 | 95 |
| Crawford | 44 | 8 | 3 | 118 |
| Cumberland | 129 | 3 | 0 | 130 |
| Dauphin | 213 | 37 | 16 | 1,173 |
| Delaware | 336 | 112 | 88 | 3,960 |
| Elk | 16 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| Erie | 164 | 62 | 53 | 1,591 |
| Fayette | 45 | 12 | 10 | 400 |
| Forest | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Franklin | 94 | 13 | 7 | 387 |
| Fulton | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Greene | 20 | 7 | 2 | 97 |
| Huntingdon | 21 | 4 | 1 | 69 |
| Indiana | 31 | 7 | 6 | 198 |
| Jefferson | 22 | 6 | 4 | 78 |
| Juniata | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lackawanna | 89 | 7 | 4 | 537 |
| Lancaster | 245 | 68 | 39 | 992 |
| Lawrence | 28 | 10 | 7 | 241 |
| Lebanon | 82 | 37 | 22 | 449 |
| Lehigh | 289 | 142 | 101 | 3,369 |
| Luzerne | 131 | 27 | 15 | 1,189 |
| Lycoming | 66 | 5 | 0 | 266 |
| McKean | 15 | 1 | 1 | 41 |
| Mercer | 50 | 21 | 13 | 261 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|-----|-----|--------|
| Mifflin | 15 | 4 | 1 | 30 |
| Monroe | 81 | 23 | 13 | 922 |
| Montgomery | 435 | 17 | 10 | 574 |
| Montour | 10 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Northampton | 135 | 15 | 9 | 521 |
| Northumberland | 49 | 5 | 0 | 36 |
| Perry | 21 | 3 | 0 | 79 |
| Philadelphia | 1,743 | 816 | 469 | 18,516 |
| Pike | 16 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Potter | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Schuylkill | 64 | 8 | 4 | 167 |
| Snyder | 19 | 1 | 0 | 45 |
| Somerset | 32 | 3 | 1 | 84 |
| Sullivan | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Susquehanna | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tioga | 31 | 5 | 2 | 216 |
| Union | 13 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Venango | 25 | 6 | 3 | 42 |
| Warren | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington | 74 | 13 | 8 | 681 |
| Wayne | 28 | 2 | 1 | 18 |
| Westmoreland | 141 | 11 | 6 | 335 |
| Wyoming | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| York | 223 | 26 | 7 | 418 |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, PELICAN & CCW Participants Data, 2018.

Table A10. Proportion of all regulated providers by provider type, county, 2018

| County | Child Care Center | Family Child Care Home | Group Child Care Home |
|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 67% | 23% | 10% |
| Adams | 41% | 56% | 4% |
| Allegheny | 69% | 18% | 13% |
| Armstrong | 42% | 48% | 10% |
| Beaver | 76% | 15% | 9% |

| | | | |
|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Bedford | 37% | 37% | 26% |
| Berks | 76% | 19% | 5% |
| Blair | 78% | 13% | 9% |
| Bradford | 58% | 29% | 13% |
| Bucks | 89% | 7% | 4% |
| Butler | 73% | 20% | 8% |
| Cambria | 57% | 19% | 24% |
| Cameron | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| Carbon | 84% | 4% | 12% |
| Centre | 62% | 28% | 10% |
| Chester | 81% | 12% | 7% |
| Clarion | 61% | 22% | 17% |
| Clearfield | 32% | 44% | 24% |
| Clinton | 64% | 27% | 9% |
| Columbia | 74% | 19% | 7% |
| Crawford | 75% | 23% | 2% |
| Cumberland | 72% | 25% | 3% |
| Dauphin | 68% | 26% | 6% |
| Delaware | 74% | 13% | 13% |
| Elk | 38% | 63% | 0% |
| Erie | 52% | 34% | 13% |
| Fayette | 76% | 9% | 16% |
| Forest | - | - | - |
| Franklin | 48% | 45% | 7% |
| Fulton | 67% | 33% | 0% |
| Greene | 20% | 65% | 15% |
| Huntingdon | 38% | 33% | 29% |
| Indiana | 42% | 39% | 19% |
| Jefferson | 45% | 45% | 9% |
| Juniata | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| Lackawanna | 82% | 9% | 9% |
| Lancaster | 60% | 33% | 7% |
| Lawrence | 54% | 18% | 29% |
| Lebanon | 39% | 46% | 15% |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Lehigh | 54% | 41% | 5% |
| Luzerne | 78% | 7% | 15% |
| Lycoming | 73% | 20% | 8% |
| McKean | 60% | 20% | 20% |
| Mercer | 42% | 30% | 28% |
| Mifflin | 53% | 33% | 13% |
| Monroe | 85% | 11% | 4% |
| Montgomery | 89% | 8% | 3% |
| Montour | 60% | 40% | 0% |
| Northampton | 84% | 10% | 6% |
| Northumberland | 45% | 22% | 33% |
| Perry | 67% | 24% | 10% |
| Philadelphia | 63% | 27% | 10% |
| Pike | 81% | 13% | 6% |
| Potter | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| Schuylkill | 61% | 19% | 20% |
| Snyder | 47% | 5% | 47% |
| Somerset | 53% | 16% | 31% |
| Sullivan | 33% | 33% | 33% |
| Susquehanna | 59% | 18% | 24% |
| Tioga | 52% | 42% | 6% |
| Union | 62% | 23% | 15% |
| Venango | 44% | 48% | 8% |
| Warren | 53% | 47% | 0% |
| Washington | 80% | 11% | 9% |
| Wayne | 54% | 25% | 21% |
| Westmoreland | 77% | 16% | 8% |
| Wyoming | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| York | 61% | 31% | 8% |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, PELICAN, 2018.

Table A11. Proportion of all children using CCW to access regulated or relative care for traditional or non-traditional care, county, 2018¹¹

| County | Regulated | Relative |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Pennsylvania | 94% | 7% |
| Adams | 95% | 6% |
| Allegheny | 87% | 15% |
| Armstrong | 93% | 8% |
| Beaver | 90% | 12% |
| Bedford | 100% | 0% |
| Berks | 96% | 4% |
| Blair | 99% | 1% |
| Bradford | 98% | 2% |
| Bucks | 98% | 2% |
| Butler | 94% | 7% |
| Cambria | 98% | 2% |
| Cameron | 100% | 6% |
| Carbon | 100% | 0% |
| Centre | 98% | 2% |
| Chester | 98% | 2% |
| Clarion | 94% | 6% |
| Clearfield | 99% | 1% |
| Clinton | 99% | 1% |
| Columbia | 99% | 2% |
| Crawford | 97% | 5% |
| Cumberland | 98% | 2% |
| Dauphin | 96% | 4% |
| Delaware | 94% | 8% |
| Elk | 97% | 3% |
| Erie | 84% | 18% |
| Fayette | 92% | 9% |

¹¹ Sum of percentages may exceed 100% as children may use CCW to access both regulated and relative care.

| | | |
|-----------------------|------|-----|
| Forest | 100% | 0% |
| Franklin | 97% | 4% |
| Fulton | 96% | 4% |
| Greene | 97% | 3% |
| Huntingdon | 94% | 8% |
| Indiana | 94% | 6% |
| Jefferson | 97% | 4% |
| Juniata | 100% | 0% |
| Lackawanna | 97% | 3% |
| Lancaster | 97% | 4% |
| Lawrence | 88% | 13% |
| Lebanon | 98% | 3% |
| Lehigh | 97% | 3% |
| Luzerne | 99% | 1% |
| Lycoming | 96% | 4% |
| McKean | 96% | 5% |
| Mercer | 85% | 16% |
| Mifflin | 93% | 8% |
| Monroe | 100% | 1% |
| Montgomery | 98% | 3% |
| Montour | 100% | 0% |
| Northampton | 96% | 4% |
| Northumberland | 99% | 1% |
| Perry | 97% | 3% |
| Philadelphia | 94% | 7% |
| Pike | 100% | 0% |
| Potter | 91% | 9% |
| Schuylkill | 98% | 3% |
| Snyder | 98% | 2% |
| Somerset | 95% | 5% |
| Sullivan | 100% | 0% |
| Susquehanna | 100% | 0% |
| Tioga | 99% | 2% |
| Union | 100% | 0% |

| | | |
|---------------------|------|----|
| Venango | 96% | 6% |
| Warren | 95% | 6% |
| Washington | 95% | 5% |
| Wayne | 100% | 0% |
| Westmoreland | 93% | 8% |
| Wyoming | 100% | 0% |
| York | 95% | 7% |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, CCW Participants Data, 2018.

Table A12. Proportion of all regulated providers that report accepting CCW and offering special accommodations and transportation, county, 2018

| County | Accepts CCW | Offers Special Accommodations | Offers Transportation To/From Home | Offers Transportation To/From School |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Pennsylvania | 77% | 75% | 15% | 2% |
| Adams | 67% | 67% | 0% | 6% |
| Allegheny | 76% | 77% | 1% | 9% |
| Armstrong | 94% | 90% | 0% | 16% |
| Beaver | 49% | 44% | 1% | 1% |
| Bedford | 84% | 63% | 0% | 0% |
| Berks | 90% | 88% | 2% | 35% |
| Blair | 64% | 76% | 0% | 9% |
| Bradford | 77% | 45% | 0% | 10% |
| Bucks | 75% | 77% | 1% | 21% |
| Butler | 79% | 71% | 1% | 15% |
| Cambria | 81% | 76% | 0% | 4% |
| Cameron | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| Carbon | 84% | 88% | 0% | 12% |
| Centre | 84% | 83% | 1% | 12% |
| Chester | 63% | 61% | 2% | 11% |
| Clarion | 89% | 89% | 6% | 11% |
| Clearfield | 82% | 82% | 0% | 2% |
| Clinton | 82% | 73% | 0% | 55% |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------|----|-----|
| Columbia | 81% | 78% | 0% | 7% |
| Crawford | 89% | 77% | 0% | 5% |
| Cumberland | 80% | 73% | 0% | 15% |
| Dauphin | 87% | 77% | 2% | 25% |
| Delaware | 70% | 79% | 3% | 12% |
| Elk | 63% | 63% | 0% | 0% |
| Erie | 88% | 80% | 7% | 24% |
| Fayette | 89% | 89% | 2% | 0% |
| Forest | - | - | - | - |
| Franklin | 55% | 64% | 0% | 1% |
| Fulton | 67% | 67% | 0% | 0% |
| Greene | 80% | 70% | 5% | 5% |
| Huntingdon | 57% | 48% | 5% | 5% |
| Indiana | 84% | 94% | 3% | 3% |
| Jefferson | 91% | 91% | 0% | 5% |
| Juniata | 100% | 80% | 0% | 0% |
| Lackawanna | 69% | 62% | 1% | 11% |
| Lancaster | 84% | 56% | 1% | 4% |
| Lawrence | 71% | 64% | 0% | 18% |
| Lebanon | 78% | 76% | 2% | 15% |
| Lehigh | 89% | 78% | 7% | 34% |
| Luzerne | 86% | 80% | 0% | 18% |
| Lycoming | 61% | 52% | 0% | 11% |
| McKean | 87% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| Mercer | 72% | 80% | 4% | 12% |
| Mifflin | 93% | 80% | 0% | 0% |
| Monroe | 89% | 93% | 1% | 14% |
| Montgomery | 64% | 62% | 0% | 8% |
| Montour | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| Northampton | 81% | 79% | 1% | 16% |
| Northumberland | 82% | 71% | 0% | 12% |
| Perry | 81% | 81% | 0% | 10% |
| Philadelphia | 78% | 80% | 3% | 17% |
| Pike | 75% | 69% | 6% | 38% |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------|-----|----|-----|
| Potter | 75% | 50% | 0% | 0% |
| Schuylkill | 92% | 80% | 0% | 11% |
| Snyder | 89% | 79% | 0% | 5% |
| Somerset | 88% | 84% | 0% | 9% |
| Sullivan | 100% | 33% | 0% | 0% |
| Susquehanna | 100% | 88% | 0% | 6% |
| Tioga | 77% | 58% | 0% | 0% |
| Union | 92% | 92% | 0% | 23% |
| Venango | 68% | 68% | 4% | 4% |
| Warren | 88% | 88% | 0% | 12% |
| Washington | 70% | 73% | 1% | 23% |
| Wayne | 82% | 75% | 0% | 0% |
| Westmoreland | 84% | 75% | 3% | 17% |
| Wyoming | 50% | 75% | 0% | 0% |
| York | 66% | 63% | 1% | 21% |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, PELICAN, 2018.

Table A13. Proportion of all regulated providers that report charging additional fees, county, 2018¹²

| County | Charges Late Pick-Up Fee | Charges Transportation Fee | Charges Early Dismissal Fee |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Pennsylvania | 71% | 25% | 11% |
| Adams | 59% | 0% | 8% |
| Allegheny | 74% | 20% | 8% |
| Armstrong | 71% | 0% | 8% |
| Beaver | 34% | 50% | 6% |
| Bedford | 74% | N/A | 0% |
| Berks | 82% | 18% | 27% |
| Blair | 67% | 0% | 3% |
| Bradford | 39% | 33% | 9% |

¹² Analysis of providers charging additional fees for transportation and early dismissal care is limited to providers that report offering those services.

| | | | |
|-------------------|------|------|-----|
| Bucks | 73% | 26% | 20% |
| Butler | 59% | 0% | 4% |
| Cambria | 69% | 33% | 4% |
| Cameron | 100% | N/A | 0% |
| Carbon | 84% | 0% | 35% |
| Centre | 70% | 9% | 31% |
| Chester | 53% | 19% | 12% |
| Clarion | 61% | 33% | 27% |
| Clearfield | 76% | 0% | 7% |
| Clinton | 64% | 0% | 13% |
| Columbia | 78% | 0% | 14% |
| Crawford | 66% | 0% | 14% |
| Cumberland | 77% | 21% | 7% |
| Dauphin | 79% | 31% | 12% |
| Delaware | 74% | 20% | 16% |
| Elk | 56% | N/A | 0% |
| Erie | 80% | 33% | 6% |
| Fayette | 69% | 0% | 0% |
| Forest | - | - | - |
| Franklin | 64% | 0% | 15% |
| Fulton | 67% | N/A | 0% |
| Greene | 65% | 0% | 7% |
| Huntingdon | 29% | 100% | 0% |
| Indiana | 77% | 0% | 10% |
| Jefferson | 64% | 0% | 6% |
| Juniata | 60% | N/A | 0% |
| Lackawanna | 51% | 9% | 13% |
| Lancaster | 78% | 33% | 10% |
| Lawrence | 50% | 0% | 6% |
| Lebanon | 74% | 15% | 9% |
| Lehigh | 84% | 21% | 14% |
| Luzerne | 79% | 0% | 8% |
| Lycoming | 56% | 14% | 3% |
| McKean | 47% | N/A | 9% |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Mercer | 42% | 13% | 11% |
| Mifflin | 67% | N/A | 8% |
| Monroe | 89% | 36% | 22% |
| Montgomery | 63% | 17% | 9% |
| Montour | 70% | N/A | 11% |
| Northampton | 74% | 17% | 10% |
| Northumberland | 71% | 17% | 3% |
| Perry | 38% | 0% | 14% |
| Philadelphia | 73% | 36% | 9% |
| Pike | 75% | 0% | 18% |
| Potter | 50% | N/A | 0% |
| Schuylkill | 80% | 14% | 14% |
| Snyder | 68% | 0% | 31% |
| Somerset | 72% | 0% | 11% |
| Sullivan | 33% | N/A | 0% |
| Susquehanna | 82% | 0% | 50% |
| Tioga | 48% | N/A | 0% |
| Union | 69% | 33% | 17% |
| Venango | 60% | 50% | 8% |
| Warren | 82% | 0% | 0% |
| Washington | 69% | 44% | 7% |
| Wayne | 68% | N/A | 19% |
| Westmoreland | 72% | 27% | 13% |
| Wyoming | 50% | N/A | 50% |
| York | 64% | 12% | 11% |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, PELICAN, 2018.

Table A14. Proportion of all regulated providers by Keystone STARS rating, county, 2018

| County | No STAR Level | STAR 1 | STAR 2 | STAR 3 | STAR 4 |
|--------------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Pennsylvania | 2% | 57% | 17% | 9% | 14% |
| Adams | 0% | 69% | 13% | 2% | 15% |
| Allegheny | 3% | 64% | 14% | 5% | 14% |
| Armstrong | 0% | 60% | 23% | 10% | 7% |
| Beaver | 0% | 58% | 19% | 15% | 7% |
| Bedford | 0% | 44% | 28% | 6% | 22% |
| Berks | 1% | 41% | 27% | 8% | 22% |
| Blair | 2% | 28% | 22% | 11% | 37% |
| Bradford | 0% | 39% | 19% | 26% | 16% |
| Bucks | 0% | 52% | 14% | 13% | 21% |
| Butler | 3% | 58% | 14% | 13% | 13% |
| Cambria | 1% | 53% | 27% | 15% | 4% |
| Cameron | 0% | 50% | 0% | 50% | 0% |
| Carbon | 0% | 68% | 24% | 4% | 4% |
| Centre | 1% | 56% | 14% | 10% | 19% |
| Chester | 2% | 53% | 21% | 5% | 19% |
| Clarion | 6% | 67% | 11% | 11% | 6% |
| Clearfield | 2% | 47% | 35% | 8% | 8% |
| Clinton | 0% | 27% | 36% | 27% | 9% |
| Columbia | 0% | 44% | 33% | 15% | 7% |
| Crawford | 2% | 23% | 11% | 34% | 30% |
| Cumberland | 1% | 67% | 5% | 6% | 21% |
| Dauphin | 4% | 54% | 23% | 6% | 13% |
| Delaware | 1% | 66% | 13% | 6% | 14% |
| Elk | 0% | 56% | 25% | 19% | 0% |
| Erie | 2% | 45% | 19% | 11% | 24% |
| Fayette | 5% | 49% | 19% | 9% | 19% |
| Forest | - | - | - | - | - |
| Franklin | 8% | 80% | 8% | 3% | 1% |
| Fulton | 0% | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Greene | 0% | 80% | 10% | 0% | 10% |
| Huntingdon | 0% | 55% | 25% | 5% | 15% |
| Indiana | 4% | 52% | 10% | 7% | 28% |
| Jefferson | 5% | 29% | 52% | 5% | 10% |
| Juniata | 0% | 60% | 20% | 20% | 0% |
| Lackawanna | 4% | 37% | 28% | 10% | 21% |
| Lancaster | 1% | 52% | 12% | 9% | 25% |
| Lawrence | 0% | 42% | 12% | 31% | 15% |
| Lebanon | 1% | 51% | 30% | 11% | 7% |
| Lehigh | 0% | 38% | 36% | 15% | 11% |
| Luzerne | 2% | 50% | 27% | 13% | 9% |
| Lycoming | 7% | 33% | 22% | 28% | 10% |
| McKean | 0% | 29% | 50% | 14% | 7% |
| Mercer | 2% | 47% | 15% | 23% | 13% |
| Mifflin | 0% | 47% | 13% | 20% | 20% |
| Monroe | 3% | 72% | 3% | 8% | 15% |
| Montgomery | 1% | 52% | 14% | 11% | 22% |
| Montour | 0% | 20% | 30% | 20% | 30% |
| Northampton | 0% | 46% | 19% | 15% | 20% |
| Northumberland | 5% | 74% | 13% | 7% | 2% |
| Perry | 0% | 68% | 26% | 0% | 5% |
| Philadelphia | 2% | 67% | 14% | 8% | 9% |
| Pike | 0% | 63% | 6% | 19% | 13% |
| Potter | 14% | 38% | 50% | 0% | 0% |
| Schuylkill | 3% | 65% | 17% | 3% | 11% |
| Snyder | 0% | 79% | 5% | 0% | 16% |
| Somerset | 3% | 72% | 25% | 0% | 0% |
| Sullivan | 0% | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% |
| Susquehanna | 0% | 53% | 29% | 6% | 12% |
| Tioga | 0% | 47% | 17% | 7% | 30% |
| Union | 8% | 46% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| Venango | 5% | 52% | 4% | 13% | 26% |
| Warren | 0% | 41% | 41% | 6% | 12% |
| Washington | 1% | 57% | 4% | 15% | 22% |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Wayne | 0% | 50% | 21% | 18% | 11% |
| Westmoreland | 2% | 58% | 17% | 8% | 15% |
| Wyoming | 0% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 33% |
| York | 1% | 54% | 24% | 9% | 11% |

Source: Pennsylvania Department of Human Services, PELICAN, 2018.