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Executive Summary

With universal pre-K and child care back on the national political agenda, increased scrutiny of these proposals is expected and welcome. A Manhattan Institute policy brief reviews evidence relating to both means-tested and universal early childhood care and education programs. It concludes that both means-tested and universal programs may harm long-term child development, especially, but not only, for more advantaged children. The brief recommends rolling back the coverage of existing preschool education programs, increasing the intensity of services provided to the most deeply disadvantaged, and expanding child tax credits. The brief raises warnings about potential unintended negative consequences that are warranted, but omissions of research and unjustified assumptions make it a misleading and inadequate policy guide. The complexity of early care and education does not lend itself to simple policy prescriptions. A more meticulous review of the literature relying on fewer preconceptions might have led to more nuanced conclusions.
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I. Introduction

Research suggests that public investments in early care and education (ECE) can produce two broad benefits: increased maternal employment and earnings; and improved child well-being, school readiness, and a host of later educational, social and economic outcomes.¹ From an economic perspective, public expenditure on ECE is a joint product that offers immediate and future benefits for both children and parents, whose well-being and development are interdependent. ECE includes a broad mix of activities—formal and informal, parental and nonparental, home-based and classroom-based—that vary in the mix of benefits they intend to produce and in the age ranges and populations served.²

How public policy can best secure the potential benefits from ECE is a complex question that does not lend itself to simple policy prescriptions. Political debates, by contrast, do not thrive on complexity. Proponents have promised large benefits from public investments in ECE to the direct recipients and the broader society. Reality often has fallen far short, as Max Eden documents in a Manhattan Institute (MI) policy brief, The drawbacks of universal pre-K: A review of the evidence.³ Despite the title’s focus on universal pre-K, the brief reviews evidence on the effects of means-tested programs as well as universal programs, and child care supports for children under three as well as preschool education for three- and four-year-olds.

The evidence on effectiveness matters because substantial public investments have already been made in ECE and more have been proposed. If these can be improved, many children and families, including the most disadvantaged, will benefit. This NEPC review considers the evidence presented by the brief, the evidence it omits, and the extent to which the evidence warrants the brief’s findings and conclusions.
II. Findings and Conclusions of the Report

The brief raises the specter that ECE policies will permanently harm children. It finds “more cause for alarm than optimism” and warns that universal programs can produce “lasting physical damage to their brain architecture.” The brief also concludes that neither proposed nor existing programs resemble those that produced long-term effects for children, while accepting claims that ECE programs increase women’s labor force participation and that direct payments to parents improve child development without reservations. The brief recommends against universal ECE programs and to “scale down the number of students who are served by publicly subsidized early education and focus intensively on the most disadvantaged children.” It calls for expansion of child tax credits and other direct subsidies to parents.

III. The Report’s Rationale for Its Findings and Conclusions

The brief’s narrative literature review finds that ECE programs supported by public policy generally produce little or no benefits to children and often produce harm. The brief claims that public ECE programs should reduce enrollments to deliver more intensive and effective services for the most severely disadvantaged in order to increase benefits and reduce harm. Given the demand for increased public investments in ECE, the brief views this proposal for cutbacks to be a “nonstarter” on its own, and therefore also recommends increasing direct payments to parents. According to the brief, parents could allocate these funds to purchase ECE or invest in parenting and the home learning environment, removing a political “thumb on the scale” favoring women’s workforce participation over child development.

IV. The Report’s Use of Research Literature

The brief reviews selected influential studies of seminal early intervention programs, center-based child care, public programs abroad, child subsidies in the United States, Head Start, and state-funded pre-K programs. Although the scope of the review is broad, it is insufficiently deep, and the brief’s findings and conclusions are shaped by omissions that alter the overall picture and interpretation of the studies included.

The brief leans heavily on three studies of seminal early interventions that found substantial persistent effects on learning and development that increased later social and economic success: the Perry Preschool Project, the Abecedarian Project, and the Chicago Child Parent Centers (CPC) study. It contrasts the findings from these studies with the lack of similar long-term outcomes for child care and large-scale public programs. A two-fold explanation is offered: Long-term outcomes may be largely due to effects on character and behavior rather than on academics; and, current and future ECE differ too much from the seminal interventions in design and population served to yield similar outcomes.

The case for character and social behavior as the principal pathway to long-term outcomes
is built entirely on one interpretation of the seminal Perry Preschool study, but this case is contradicted by other Perry Preschool analyses not cited in the brief and by the other two seminal studies. The Perry Preschool study achievement effects are evident from kindergarten entry through adolescence. Moreover, studies on the Perry Preschool omitted from the brief find cognitive pathways with interrelationships over time among cognition, motivation, and behavior. The Abecedarian study found cognitive advantage to be the sole mediator of long-term outcomes, and the Chicago CPC study identified multiple pathways including achievement. Other omitted seminal studies find a strong cognitive/academic pathway to long-term benefits. Finally, a small-scale randomized trial of a model pre-K program found some positive persistent effects on achievement for advantaged children.

The brief’s claim that ECE today differs from the seminal interventions in ways that invalidate simple extrapolations is on stronger ground. Child care and public preschool programs have weaker (and cheaper) designs and serve less disadvantaged populations, especially compared to the Perry and Abecedarian programs. Some public preschool programs today closely resemble the CPCs’, which were less intensive and expensive than the Perry and Abecedarian programs. However, many public programs lack the CPCs’ adequately paid and well-qualified teachers, small classes, parent engagement, referrals to social and health services, and two years of services.

The extent to which population changes may have altered program effectiveness from the time of the model programs remains unclear. Parent education levels have increased. Home learning environments have improved at all family income levels, and they have improved most for the lowest income families. However, more young children are from socially disadvantaged ethnic minority and from non-English home language backgrounds that may benefit more from high quality ECE. The alternative ECE arrangements of children in lieu of public programs also may have changed in ways that could reduce the benefits of public programs.

Studies of the effects of typical child care and subsidies find small lasting positive effects on cognition and negative effects on social behaviors. The brief emphasizes weak associations of ECE quality with cognitive outcomes and negative impacts of centers on social behavior regardless of quality, highlighting long-term negative impacts on social behavior from public support for universal low-cost child care in Quebec. Yet, a more comprehensive review reveals more nuanced findings. ECE policies negatively affect cognition and behavior for those induced to shift into lower quality care (typically more advantaged families) and positively affect those induced into higher quality.

The brief relies on a highly selective narrative review of a small number of studies, omitting important studies and giving undue weight to specific interpretations of a few studies that skew its findings.

The brief provides cursory reviews of Head Start and public pre-K, and it omits Early Head Start (EHS) altogether. Its conclusions about Head Start derive from one randomized trial and to an even greater extent from one sibling comparison study, despite validity concerns with the sibling approach. It also weighs heavily a randomized trial of Tennessee’s pre-K program that found positive effects on initial achievement that turned negative during the
elementary school years.

Notably, other studies given limited or no mention in the brief yield more nuanced findings. Head Start and public pre-K effects vary with family background, program characteristics, and context including subsequent experiences, and not all have null or negative long-term effects for today’s children.27

V. Review of the Report’s Methods

The brief relies on a highly selective narrative review of a small number of studies, omitting important studies28 and giving undue weight to specific interpretations of a few studies that skew its findings. Its failure to cite meta-analyses (including some of universal programs) is especially noteworthy.29 Meta-analysis permit systematic summaries across large numbers of studies that can more transparently identify patterns of similarity and differences in findings.

Although randomized trials deserve special attention because of their advantages for making causal inferences, they have their own vulnerabilities and disadvantages and do not necessarily yield more useful findings.30 The Tennessee study, for example, is unusual in its finding that pre-K seems to have increased special education rates and in finding initially positive effects that turn negative. However, this difference from other state studies is not attributable to research design; this same pattern of effects on special education and on third grade achievement in Tennessee also were found by earlier nonexperimental studies.31 The randomized trial gives additional credibility to these findings for Tennessee but does not make them more generalizable to other states. No other randomized trial of ECE, including the recent study of Boston’s pre-K program, suggests negative long-term effects.32

The brief’s strong reliance on a single sibling comparison study as evidence of negative Head Start effects is concerning. There is no suggestion of negative effects in either the Head Start randomized trial or in Head Start studies using other nonexperimental methods. Sibling comparison studies depend on untenable assumptions that unmeasured differences between siblings do not influence their ECE experiences and that parents do not compensate one sibling later for an early advantage given to another.

Finally, the omitted studies indicate that higher quality programs have larger, more enduring, and more broadly distributed effects than the brief acknowledges.33

VI. Review of the Validity of the Findings and Conclusions

Findings are, at best, partially supported by research. Some studies, indeed, find positive persistent impacts on children who are not economically disadvantaged.34 ECE impacts on character and behavior matter, but cognitive and other pathways to long-term benefits also are important.35 Far from suggesting that increased access to “high-quality” care harms
young children, the negative effects of Quebec’s universal child care subsidy policy can be explained as the result of a rapid expansion of child care that lowered quality (perhaps more in the short-run than the long-run) and led families to shift children into long hours of lower quality care. Although most public programs in the United States may be too weak to produce substantive long-term average outcomes for today’s children, some contemporary large-scale pre-K programs have produced long-term gains, on average or for subgroups. Research not considered by the brief suggests that universal programs could produce larger net benefits even if disadvantaged children benefit disproportionately.

In addition to the skewed findings, the brief’s conclusions depend on several unwarranted assertions: Short-term benefits for children are ignorable, cognitive benefits are unimportant and not linked to long-term outcomes, and policies should not seek to influence women’s employment. Yet, surely, child well-being and development before age five is not just valued for contributions to later well-being. Preventing hunger and maltreatment and providing rich experiences that bring children joy have intrinsic value. Cognitive impacts are important and interact with social-emotional benefits. Labor force participation and gender equity are valid concerns in ECE policymaking—all benefits and costs of ECE policy alternatives should be weighed together. Significantly, the brief offers no evidence on the child development effects of direct payments to parents. Such payments can benefit children, but much depends on how the payments are designed and whether other policies support access to high-quality ECE.

VII. Usefulness of the Report for Guidance of Policy and Practice

Policymakers should heed the brief’s warning that some ECE policies are ineffective and even harmful for children. Also useful is the brief’s assertion that highly disadvantaged children benefit most from high-quality ECE and that simply spending more public money to expand current ECE programs (without raising quality) will not support child development. If universal subsidies for cheap child care are substituted for investments in high-quality pre-K, the promised benefits will not materialize. The brief’s other conclusions and policy prescriptions are poorly supported.

More can be done to enroll highly disadvantaged children in high-quality programs than what is offered by the brief. Most three- and four-year-olds of parents with less than a high school education or family incomes below $20,000 per year do not attend any center-based ECE program. Rather than curtailing programs that still enroll less than half of highly disadvantaged preschoolers, policymakers could simultaneously improve quality and coverage for those who will benefit most. Providing highly effective ECE at scale is neither simple nor easy, but it is possible. The CPC and other effective models (e.g., New Jersey and North Carolina) should guide minimum standards for public pre-K programs. Universal programs may be better at enrolling all highly disadvantaged children and produce larger gains while benefitting other children. With respect to infants and toddler ECE, clearly quality
matters and can be improved. Policymakers might design mutually supportive policies for direct payments to parents and public investments in ECE to support child development rather than viewing them as alternatives.
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