

Effect of Daily School and Care Disruptions During the COVID-19 Pandemic on Child Behavior Problems

Anna Gassman-Pines¹, Elizabeth O. Ananat², John Fitz-Henley II¹, and Jane Leer¹

¹ Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University

² Department of Economics, Barnard College, Columbia University

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly affected American families and children, including through the closure or change in the nature of their care and school settings. As the pandemic has persisted, many children remain in remote schooling and those attending in-person childcare or school have contended with unpredictable closures. This study investigated the frequency and consequences of disruptions to children's childcare and school arrangements during Fall 2020. The sample is parents who were hourly service-sector workers prior to the pandemic, had a young child between the ages of 3 and 8, and were at least partially responsible for their children's school and/or care in Fall 2020 ($N = 676$); half of the sample were non-Hispanic Black, 22% were Hispanic, and 18% are non-Hispanic White. Parents were asked to complete 30 days of daily surveys about whether their care and school arrangements went smoothly and as predicted that day, about their mood, parenting behaviors, and children's behavior. Results showed that daily disruptions to care and school were common, with families reporting a disruption on 24% of days. Families with children in exclusively remote schooling experienced more frequent disruption than families with children in in-person care or school. For all families, care or school disruptions were related to worse child behavior, more negative parental mood, and increased likelihood of losing temper and punishment. Within-family mediation suggests that parents' difficulties supporting children's learning, and to a lesser degree their mood and parenting behaviors, partially mediate effects of disruptions on child behavior.

Keywords: COVID-19 pandemic, school closures, child behavior problems, parenting, low-income families

The outbreak of the novel coronavirus has profoundly affected American families. Most areas of the country have experienced stay-at-home orders (National Academy for State Health Policy, 2020), unemployment claims skyrocketed to unprecedented levels (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2020), and millions of cases of the illness have been confirmed (Center for Systems Science and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University, 2020). Given the size and scope of both the economic and health effects of the current crisis,

it likely has strongly affected the psychological well-being of both parents and children (Gassman-Pines et al., 2020), but there continues to be limited evidence about psychological effects.

One substantial change for many children during the COVID-19 crisis has been the closure or change in the nature of their primary care and school settings. At the onset of the crisis, in March 2020; nearly all schools closed, moved education virtual, and remained closed for the rest of the school year. Throughout the 2020/2021 school year, the majority of children remained in remote or partially remote (hybrid) school (USC Center for Economic & Social Research, 2021). Although some schools and many childcare centers reopened over summer and fall 2020; they were subject to frequent, unpredictable closures as COVID-19 cases occurred in the setting or due to staff shortages when substantial numbers of staff were ill or required to quarantine. Anecdotal evidence suggests that parents and children struggled with these types of instability (Grose, 2021; Hsu, 2020), which compounded underlying stressors from the pandemic including job and income loss, material hardship, social isolation, and grief. Further, school disruptions persisted throughout the 2021/2022 school year as new waves of the pandemic led to staff shortages and a move to remote instruction in many areas.

These disruptions to care and schooling mean that the COVID-19 crisis, while affecting all Americans, have hit families with children particularly hard. The impact is even more pronounced

This article was published Online First April 28, 2022.

Anna Gassman-Pines  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0608-6813>

Elizabeth O. Ananat  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9709-1441>

Jane Leer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7594-217X>

The authors acknowledge support from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health (Grant 1R21HD100893-01), the National Science Foundation (Grant SES-1921190), the Russell Sage Foundation (Grant 1811-10382), and the Washington Center for Equitable Growth. We thank Jennifer Copeland for her excellent research support.

This study was not preregistered. The study data and analysis code are available on request from the corresponding author.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anna Gassman-Pines, Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University, Box 90312, Durham, NC 27708, United States. Email: agassman.pines@duke.edu

for populations of families with children that are particularly vulnerable due to marginalized economic or social identities (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2020), including hourly worker parents, who face unstable employment and earnings (Kurmann et al., 2020); families of color, whose communities face high rates of infection, inadequate medical care (Williams & Collins, 2001), and preexisting health disparities that worsen clinical outcomes (Haynes et al., 2020); and essential workers, who cannot work remotely and therefore cannot earn without childcare. Identifying the psychological effects of this crisis on children in such vulnerable families is essential for building both an understanding of how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected children and developmental psychology theory on instability in microsystem settings and resulting effects on child well-being.

To address this gap in the literature, this is the first study to examine daily variation in disruptions to care and school in the fall 2020 phase of the COVID-19 pandemic and identify disruptions' causal effects on daily child behavior problems. Further, this article examines differences in the frequency and consequences of care and school disruptions for families using remote versus in-person care, and for families of different racial and ethnic groups.

Theoretical Linkages Between Disruptions to Care and School and Children's Behavior Problems

Ecological systems theory posits that microsystems, or settings in which children spend time, have the most direct and immediate influence on development (Bronfenbrenner & Evans, 2000; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). Outside of their families, schools and childcare settings are the primary microsystems in which young children in early childhood and early middle childhood spend time and, thus, are key developmental contexts. Within microsystems, the main drivers of child development are *proximal processes*, defined as interactions between individuals within those settings, such as between parents and children within families.

The pandemic radically altered children's school and care microsystems (Becker et al., 2020). In-person care and school settings have had different procedures, policies and experiences for students, such as mask wearing and social distancing (Sharfstein & Morphew, 2020; Simon et al., 2020; The Hunt Institute, 2021). For remote schooling, the pandemic blurred the lines between settings, with both schooling and family interactions happening in the same physical space (Roy et al., 2021) and many parents juggled work and family responsibilities at the same time (Garbe et al., 2020).


Within the context of these broad changes, the COVID-19 pandemic also caused daily disruptions to school and care. For example, childcare centers that were still operating in person at times had to close temporarily due to school-based COVID-19 clusters. For remote schooling, the need for technology led to additional disruptions for children, as many families did not have reliable Internet access or devices (Auxier & Anderson, 2020) and remote school relied on software that was difficult to manage (Domina et al., 2021).

An ecological systems theory approach provides a framework for understanding how those day-to-day changes in the circumstances from day to day likely altered the proximal processes between children in early and middle childhood and others, primarily parents. When care or school is disrupted, parents may feel unable to provide support to their children's learning, a key role during the pandemic (Roy et al., 2021). Further, prior work shows that days with disruptions increased the difficulty of balancing work and family demands (Garbe et al., 2020), leading to increased parental stress (Ashforth et al., 2000; Pleck, 1995) and altered parent-child interactions (Berger et al., 1994; Williams & Alliger, 1994). Each of these changes to family routines, parental mood, and parent-child interactions reflect daily alterations to proximal processes that are, in turn, related to children's behavior and well-being (Bass et al., 2009; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Ilies et al., 2007). Our theoretical model is summarized in Figure 1.

Ecological systems theory also acknowledges the relevance of contextual circumstances—such as access to social and material resources—in shaping developmental processes (Bronfenbrenner, 1993, 1995; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Tudge et al., 2009). Consistent with this approach, day-to-day pandemic-related disruptions were likely especially challenging for hourly service workers, who either lost work (e.g., clothing store employees) or had to continue working in person (e.g., “essential” workers at grocery stores). Thus, hourly service workers either dealt with unemployment or the strains of serving as an essential, customer-facing worker during the pandemic, both of which increase mental health risks (Pfefferbaum & North, 2020). In addition, hourly service workers typically earn low wages, resulting in few economic resources to buffer daily pandemic-related strains.

A focus on contextual circumstances also suggests that dealing with day-to-day disruptions may have been especially challenging for families of color, for several reasons. First, people of color were more likely to contract and become severely ill with COVID-19 (Mackey et al., 2021), increasing strain on families of color and taxing family resources, and potentially leading to more

Figure 1
Theoretical Model Linking School or Care Disruption to Child Behavior Via Parent Mood and Behavior



Note. Figure shows overall conceptual model. In empirical mediation models, we separately test mediation for four mediators (parent negative mood, difficulty supporting children's learning, lost temper and punished child) and two child behavior outcomes (sad/worried and uncooperative).

daily reactivity to school and care disruptions. Second, even among lower-income families, families of color have faced more pandemic-related hardships, such as food insecurity and increased debt, than non-Hispanic White families (Enriquez & Goldstein, 2020) and wealth disparities by race that predated the pandemic are well documented (Darity & Nicholson, 2005). These hardships likely made balancing work and daily care/school demands more challenging for parents of color who had fewer economic resources with which to buffer other pandemic stressors. Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic coincided with renewed attention to racial justice and a national reckoning with racism in the United States, which, while important and long overdue, may also compound stress for families of color (Neighmond, 2020) and lead to larger daily effects when school or care is disrupted.

Empirical Findings

The emergent research on child well-being during the COVID pandemic shows increased behavior problems and psychological distress overall. Behavior problems and psychological distress among young children have increased since the pandemic began (Ehrler et al., 2021; Gadermann et al., 2021; Steimle et al., 2021), and are correlated with cumulative exposure to pandemic-related stressors, such as job loss and family illness (Gassman-Pines et al., 2020). Parents' psychological distress mediates the effects of pandemic-related stressors on child behavior problems (Koehler-Dauner et al., 2021; Marchetti et al., 2020) and the pandemic has had stronger effects on Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) children than White children (Clawson et al., 2021).

The growing literature on families' experiences with care and schooling during the pandemic shows that managing schooling has been challenging. Worry about schooling has been a major source of stress for parents (American Psychological Association, 2020). The less prepared parents felt to support children's learning at home and the more challenges they had with children, the worse their own self-reported mental health (Lee et al., 2021; Patrick et al., 2020). In Fall 2020, parents with children in in-person schooling reported significantly higher levels of emotional distress than parents of children in remote only or hybrid schooling (Verlenden, 2021). Although childcare for younger children was also disrupted by the pandemic (Ali et al., 2021; Jessen-Howard & Workman, 2020), much less of the ongoing research has focused on linking childcare changes to parent or child well-being.

Daily Diary Studies

The emerging literature on the effects of changes to school and care during the COVID-19 pandemic has primarily described children's and parents' experiences in general in different care and school settings, or during the Spring 2020 shift from in-person to remote instruction. A novel approach consistent with our theoretical conceptualization is to examine families' experiences of day-to-day variability in disruptions to care and school arrangements during Fall 2020; in order to match the time scale of family life, capture daily variation in context and behavior, and investigate the proximal processes connecting disruptions to child behavior (Bolger et al., 2003). Investigating families' daily lives can facilitate culturally grounded inquiries about family life in diverse families (Weisner, 2002). Using daily surveys also has methodological

strengths, reducing recall bias and reducing the need for individuals to mentally aggregate across instances, both of which can result in underreporting (Bound et al., 2001; Mathiowetz et al., 2002; Winter, 2004).

Given the ongoing nature of the pandemic and the nascent literature about its effects, no research with this type of daily diary design has been used to examine daily disruptions to care and school arrangements and their consequences for children's daily well-being. Emerging literature focused on families' daily experiences at the beginning of the pandemic showed that family psychological well-being decreased markedly when school closures were initially announced (Gassman-Pines et al., 2020). Children's daily behavior problems, including uncooperativeness and feelings of sadness or worry, increased at the time of school closures and were substantially higher after school closures than in the days prior to the closures (Steimle et al., 2021). No research, however, has examined daily variability in care and schooling during the pandemic or how care and school disruptions relate to daily child behavior.

Although the emerging literature on the COVID pandemic has yet to fully examine disruptions to school and care, research conducted prior to the pandemic provides insights into how other types of disruptions, including disruptions to parents' work schedules, are related to both parent and, ultimately, child well-being. For example, among low-wage workers with children in early childhood, daily nighttime work hours and unexpected daily work schedule changes were related to worse daily parent mood (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2021; Gassman-Pines, 2011). Parents were also harsher with their children and children displayed less positive behavior on days when their parents worked more nighttime hours (Gassman-Pines, 2011).

The Current Study

In order to understand how disruptions to care and schooling due to the COVID-19 pandemic have affected children's daily psychological well-being, this study examined four research questions in a sample of hourly service workers with young children, that is majority families of color. Identifying the psychological effects of this crisis on children in such families is essential for building an understanding of how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected children and formulating developmental psychology theory on instability in microsystem settings and effects on child well-being. The questions we examined were as follows:

How common are disruptions to children's care and school arrangements from day to day? Do they vary for those in remote versus in-person settings?

What are the daily effects of school/care disruptions on children's daily behavior problems?

Are the daily effects of school/care disruptions on children's daily behavior problems mediated by parents' self-reported difficulty managing children's learning, parents' well-being, or harsh parenting behaviors?

How do these effects vary by families' racial and ethnic group?

Method

Sample Recruitment

Individuals were eligible if they worked in an hourly service-industry position in a retail, food service, or hotel business in a large U.S. city, had a child aged 2 to 7 at the time of enrollment (between August and November 2019), and had a mobile phone that could send and receive basic SMS text messages. The sample was originally recruited for a study examining parents' work schedule unpredictability and family well-being (for additional detail about this sample, see [Gassman-Pines et al., 2020](#)). Recruitment used a venue-based sampling approach, a commonly used technique for producing generalizable samples of hard-to-reach, unrostered populations ([Semaan, 2010](#)). The key to successfully using this technique is generating a complete list of venues, which in this case were food service, retail and hospitality businesses in the city, provided by the Columbia University Earth Institute. We then constructed a sampling frame of venue (business) day-time units (VDTs), randomly selected VDTs, and systematically identified and recruited eligible individuals present in those VDTs, thus plausibly identifying a representative sample of the population ([Muhib et al., 2001](#)). To do so, at the time that study staff visited each business, they aimed to identify all workers who met sampling criteria who were at work at that time by approaching workers at each business, determining their eligibility, and asking those workers to direct them to any other employee with a young child who was currently at the venue. This strategy differs from snow-ball sampling in that study staff only recruited and only followed up with potentially eligible workers who were present at that time, to preserve random sampling.

Procedure

Initial Procedure

When first recruited, for the original study purpose of estimating effects of work schedules on family well-being, all participants were asked to complete 30 days of daily surveys and a one-time survey about demographic and household characteristics. All aspects of this study received approval from the Duke University Institutional Review Board (Title: "The Effects of Scheduling Regulation on Workers and Families"; Protocol: 2017-0053).

Current Study Data Collection

Each participant from the original sample was contacted about participating in an additional 30-day wave of daily data collection, with recruitment and data collection occurring between September 8, 2020 and January 13, 2021 (when children were between 3 and 8 years old). Participants were randomly assigned to one of six groups for initial invitations to participate in this wave. One group received an initial invitation each week, with outreach to all participants continuing through mid-December 2020. 733 participants enrolled in this wave of data collection (70% response rate). For the present analysis, we excluded parents who reported that they were not involved in their children's schooling or care ($n = 33$) and those who did not provide any survey responses to any of the questions about the outcome variables ($n = 24$). Thus, the analysis sample for the present study was 676, with approximately 17,000

person-days for analysis (daily sample sizes varied slightly for the different outcomes and mediators due to missing data).

Respondents were prompted to report on each day's experiences with disruptions of care or school and their own and their child's well-being via SMS text message for 30 consecutive days. All survey materials used for this study were available in both English and Spanish.

The daily text surveys were programmed and automated by a third-party vendor. On the day of enrollment in this wave, participants received a text welcoming them to the start of the wave. The following day, the 30-day data collection period began. During that period, the first survey question was sent out each evening at 7:00 p.m. As soon as respondents sent back their answer to the first survey question, the second question was sent. This sequence was repeated until all questions and answers had been sent and received. A thank-you text sent at the end of the sequence let individuals know they had completed all that day's survey questions. If a respondent failed to reply to the first survey question, a reminder text was sent at 8:00 p.m. Additionally, if an individual started the survey but did not complete all questions, a reminder text was sent after 2 hr of inactivity (with the question on which the individual left off resent as part of the reminder) and then again after 14 hr of inactivity. Additional details about the text-message survey protocol are available in [Ananat and Gassman-Pines \(2021\)](#).

Participant compensation was structured to incentivize completion of all 30 daily surveys. Participants received \$1.50 for each survey completed, with bonuses of \$12 offered for each week with seven completed surveys, and an additional completion bonus of \$45 for those who answered all 30 daily surveys and the one-time survey (see the following text). These incentives led to high rates of daily survey completion: Although the number of completed surveys ranged from 1 to 30, most participants (54%) answered 100%, or all 30, of the daily surveys; two thirds completed at least 28 of the 30 surveys; and 90% completed the majority of the surveys. This pattern, including majorities completing 100% of surveys, persisted within each race/ethnic group, albeit with slight differences in the mean number of surveys completed (27.6 for non-Hispanic White, 23.9 for non-Hispanic Black, and 24.9 for Hispanic participants). Further, there was no significant difference in average number of surveys completed between who answered in English and those who answered in Spanish, nor between male and female participants.

Single Point-in-Time Survey Data Collection

At the end of the 30-day daily data collection all participants were asked to complete a one-time survey that gathered information about children's school and care arrangements. All survey questions and answers were sent and received via SMS text message. Response rate to the one-time survey was very high ($n = 664$; 99% response rate among analysis sample). Participants were offered \$25 for completing this one-time survey if they had not completed all daily surveys.

Measures

Disruptions to School and Care

Parents were asked, "Did your child(ren)'s childcare/school go smoothly today (on schedule, Internet worked, etc.)?" The examples

given were meant to emphasize irregularities in daily care and school arrangements outside of the participant's control. Answer choices were as follows: *yes*; *mostly*; *somewhat*; and *not at all*. A dichotomous indicator representing disruption was constructed equal to 1 if the respondent answered *not at all*, *somewhat*, or *mostly* and 0 if they answered *yes*. In supplemental analyses, we dichotomize this variable coding *somewhat* and *not at all* as 1 and *yes* and *mostly* as 0; results are substantially similar to those reported in the following text.

Child Behavior Problems

Daily child uncooperative behavior was measured with a single item asking: "How much was your child uncooperative today?" Answer choices were *not at all*, *just a little*, *some*, and *a lot*. This question was modified from an item in the inattention/overactivity with Aggression Conners Rating Scale (Loney & Milich, 1982), which asks parents to rate how much the adjective describes their child at the present time.

Daily child worry was measured with a single item that asked, "How much did your child appear to be sad or worried today?" Answer choices were *not at all*, *just a little*, *some*, and *a lot*. This question was modified from an item in the Preschool Behavior Questionnaire (Behar & Stringfield, 1974), which asks parents to rate to what degree the child exhibits each behavior.

For both child behaviors, prior research has demonstrated the reliability and validity of multiitem scale versions adapted for measuring daily externalizing and internalizing behavior problems (Gassman-Pines, 2015). In the current study, single items were used to reduce respondent burden and attrition. Dichotomous indicator variables were set equal to 1 if the parent responded *some* or *a lot* and 0 if the parent responded *not at all* or *just a little*.

Parent Psychological Well-Being

Daily parental negative mood was measured with a single item that asked, "How much of the time today did you feel fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed?" Answer choices were *none of the time*, *some of the time*, and *all of the time*. This question (i.e., "During the last 4 weeks, how often did you feel fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed?") was modified from a question from the Health Utilities Index (Furlong et al., 2001; Horsman et al., 2003) with a 4-week recall period. The single item, which increased substantially once COVID-19 restrictions were put into place (Gassman-Pines et al., 2020), has been validated as a daily measure of negative mood as it is positively correlated with daily stressors, including daily food insecurity (Gassman-Pines & Schenck-Fontaine, 2019) and daily work schedule disruptions (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2021). A dichotomous indicator was created equal to 1 for those who answered *some of the time* or *all of the time* and 0 for those who answered *none of the time*.

Daily perceived negative sleep quality was measured with a single item, which has been used in other daily survey studies (George et al., 2019), that asked, "How well did you sleep last night?" Answers were given on a 10-point scale, ranging from 1 (*really badly*) to 10 (*really well*). We treat self-reported sleep quality as a measure of daily well-being, as perceived sleep quality is associated with daily affect (Bower et al., 2010). The sleep quality measure was reverse coded so that higher numbers indicated worse perceived sleep quality. This measure has been validated, as it is correlated in expected directions with negative and positive daily

mood, daily self-esteem (George et al., 2019), and daily work schedule disruptions, a daily stressor (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2021).

Parenting Behavior

Difficulty supporting children's care or learning was measured with a single item asking, "How hard was it to support your child(ren)'s participation in care/learning today?" Answer choices were *not hard at all*, *somewhat hard*, and *very hard*. A dichotomous indicator was created equal to 1 for those who answered *somewhat hard* or *very hard* and 0 for those who answered *not hard at all*.

Harsh parenting was measured using the following questions: "Did you punish your child today?" and "Did you lose your temper with your child today?" Both questions were answered either *yes* or *no*. Dichotomous indicator variables were set equal to 1 if the parent responded *yes* and 0 if the parent responded *no*.

Single Point-in-Time Survey Measure of School and Care Context

Parents were asked two questions: "Do you have a child/children enrolled in remote school?" and "Do you have a child/children in out-of-home care and/or school?" Both questions were answered either *yes* or *no*. From those responses, a set of mutually exclusive indicators were created representing having children only in remote school, only in out-of-home care/school, both remote and out-of-home care/school, or neither.

Other Analysis Variables

At the outset of the study, participants were asked two questions about their racial and ethnic group: "What is your race?" and "Are you Hispanic/Latino/Latina?" For the first question, participants could select all that applied from the following list: Black/African American, White/Caucasian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native, and other. From the responses to the two questions, three indicators were created non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic White, and Hispanic (any race).

An indicator variable for weekend was created that equaled 1 when that day was a Saturday or Sunday and 0 otherwise. An indicator variable for workday was created that equaled 1 when that day was a day that the parent worked and 0 otherwise.

Analytic Plan

First, we calculated descriptive statistics overall, by care/school type, and by family race and ethnicity. Second, we estimated regression models with family fixed effects (equivalent to person-centering in a multilevel regression model) and standard errors clustered by family. All models included indicators for whether the day in question was a weekend day and whether the day was a workday. This model allowed us to estimate the average within-family effects of school and care disruptions, comparing child behaviors on days with and without disruptions for the same families. We also estimated subgroup regressions on the subsample that was reported to be in remote school only and the subsample that was reported to be in in-person care/school only. We estimated both the overall regressions and the care-type subsample regressions separately for families in which the respondent

identified as Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, and non-Hispanic White. Correlations among all predictor variables are available in Table A1 in the Appendix.

Finally, we estimated within-subject, 1-1-1 mediation models, with person-centered predictor and child outcomes as described in the preceding text, and parental psychological well-being and parenting behaviors as level 1 mediators. We ran separate mediation models for each mediator and outcome, following the within-subject mediation analysis described in Bolger and Laurenceau (2013). All mediation models used full information maximum likelihood to address missing data.

Results

Sample Characteristics

Sample characteristics appear in Table 1. Our sample is majority female, consistent with working in the service industry and with having custody of a young child (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2021; Gassman-Pines et al., 2020). About half are African American and about one fifth are Hispanic, consistent with being central-city hourly workers (Transportation Research Board & National Research Council, 1999). At the time of study enrollment, mean age was 31, consistent with being the parent of a young child (Ananat & Gassman-Pines, 2021), and the modal education was 12 years, consistent with hourly service employment (Schwartz et al., 2015). About half of focal

children are female; focal children were, on average, 5.0 years of age at the time of initial study enrollment ($SD = 2.6$; range = 2–7), one year prior to the time period in the present study. Mean income prior to the pandemic was \$2,187 per month.

Descriptive Results

Table 2 reports the distribution of learning modalities, both overall and by race. Remote-only was the most common modality, reported by 44% of the sample overall; as public schools were entirely remote in the fall in the city of our study, that is not surprising. Next most common was a combination of in-person and remote learning, at 33% of the sample. Another 13% of families reporting having only in-person care or schooling, whereas 11% reported that their family was currently using no care or school of either kind. For the most part, patterns of use by race and ethnicity were similar, and there were no race/ethnic differences in learning modality that were significant at conventional levels. However, the difference between the non-Hispanic Black rate (11.7%) and non-Hispanic White rate (19.0%) of using only in-person care/school was marginally statistically significant ($p < .10$).

Table 3 reports the incidence of school and care disruptions overall and by modality and race/ethnicity. The percentage of days on which school/care did not go as planned is strikingly high, at nearly a quarter of days (24.4%) overall, as is the percentage of days when respondents reported it was difficult to support their child's learning (24.9%). Across the month of the daily surveys, 77% of respondents reported at least one day when school/care did not go as planned, and 74% reported at least one day when it was difficult to support their child's learning. Although daily disruptions were frequent for all groups, they were more common for families using only remote learning (23.8% of days) than for those using only in-person school/care (17.6%) and percentage of days on which it was difficult to support learning were similarly elevated for remote (25.4%) versus in-person (19.1%); both differences were statistically significant ($p < .01$). The daily percentage of families with a disruption throughout Fall 2020 is shown in Figure 2. Disruptions decreased in September but then leveled off from mid-October through November.

Overall, Hispanic parents reported the highest incidence and frequency of disruption and of difficulty supporting learning, while non-Hispanic Black parents' reports were lower and non-Hispanic White parents' reports were in between. The difference between Hispanics' and non-Hispanic Blacks' experiences were statistically significant for both measures overall and for all the measures among remote learners; among families using in-person care, the differences were significant only for disruption frequency.

For all race/ethnic groups, the frequency of daily disruptions to learning was higher in remote than in in-person school/care. The differences were larger for Hispanics (39% more frequent disruptions in remote than in in-person learning, $p < .01$) and non-Hispanic Blacks (51% more frequent, $p < .001$) than for non-Hispanic Whites (24% more frequent, $p < .01$).

Daily Effects

Child Behavior

Table 4 shows the effect of daily school or care disruptions on child behavior, overall and by race/ethnicity and modality; overall

Table 1
Sample Characteristics at Study Enrollment (Fall 2019) and Descriptive Statistics of Daily Measures in Fall 2020

Characteristic	<i>M</i> or %	<i>SD</i>
Parent		
Age (years)	30.8	6.9
Parent female	84.0%	
Race/ethnicity		
Hispanic (of any race)	22.1%	
African American (non-Hispanic)	50.4%	
White (non-Hispanic)	18.0%	
Asian (non-Hispanic)	2.9%	
Multiracial (non-Hispanic)	2.3%	
Education		
<High school education	8.7%	
High school education	61.9%	
>High school education	29.3%	
Monthly household income	\$2,188	\$1,649
Child		
Age (years)	5.0	2.6
Female	50%	
Daily measure		
Child behavior		
Uncooperative	14.1%	
Sad/worried	6.7%	
Parent well-being		
Fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, depressed	41.6%	
Difficulty sleeping (1–10 scale)	4.1	2.4
Parenting behavior		
Lost temper with child	7.0%	
Punished child	5.8%	

Note. $N = 676$. Number of person days = 17,074. Person-days are the number of observations used in analysis of daily measures, indicating all daily survey reports provided by all participants.

Table 2*Distribution of School/Care Modalities Among Families Overall and by Race*

Family race	Remote only		In person only		Both modalities		Neither modality	
	%, SE	n	%, SE	n	%, SE	n	%, SE	n
All	43.6%, 1.9	284	13.0%, 1.3	85	32.7%, 1.8	213	10.7%, 1.2	70
Hispanic	41.3%, 4.2	57	14.5%, 3.0	20	30.4%, 3.9	42	13.8%, 2.9	19
Non-Hispanic Black	42.9%, 2.7	143	11.7%, 1.8	39	34.8%, 2.6	116	10.5%, 1.7	35
Non-Hispanic White	43.0%, 4.5	52	19.0%, 3.6	23	30.6%, 4.2	37	7.4%, 2.4	9

Note. $N = 676$.

effects are shown in Figure 3. A school or care disruption on a given day increased the percentage of children who were uncooperative “some or a lot today” by 9.1 percentage points, a striking increase from a base rate of 14.1%. The effect was significantly larger for non-Hispanic Whites (11.9 percentage points) than for non-Hispanic Blacks (6.8 percentage points), but the effects were significantly different from zero and substantial in size for all race/ethnic groups. The pattern was similar for effects on the probability that the child appeared to be sad or worried some or a lot today, with an overall effect of 6.0 percentage points (nearly doubling the base rate of 6.7%); the effect was significantly larger for non-Hispanic Whites (7.6 percentage points) than for Hispanics (4.1 percentage points), but again, effects were significantly different from zero and substantial in size for all race/ethnic groups.

Effects of disruption were consistently significant across modalities and outcomes. They were often typically smaller for children in remote school, and larger for those in-person, than for children overall; the difference in effects for in-person versus remote was statistically significant for uncooperativeness overall and among non-Hispanic Black respondents (15.3% vs. 5.1%).

Parent Mood

Disruptions to school or care also strongly affected daily parent mood, increasing by a statistically significant 12.7 percentage points the percentage of respondents that day who said they felt fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed, from a base rate of 41.6%. Effects were large and significant for all race/ethnic groups, with a higher point estimate for non-Hispanic White parents (16.7 percentage points) but no statistically significant differences in estimates between groups. Parent sleep difficulty also rose by a significant standard deviation (.056, $p < .05$) the night after a disruption. The magnitude of this impact appeared larger for parents of children in remote school only ($SD = .134$, $p < .01$) than for parents of children attending school or care in person only ($SD = .00$), but the difference was not statistically significant.


In contrast to effects on child behavior, effects of disruption on parent mood were similar across modalities overall—those using remote only had a 12.9 percentage point increase in feeling fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed after a disruption, while those using in-person only had a 13.5 percentage point increase.

Table 3*Incidence and Frequency of School/Care Disruptions by Modality and Race/Ethnicity*

Disruptions by day and by family	All %, SE	Hispanic %, SE	Non-Hispanic Black %, SE	Non-Hispanic White %, SE
All modalities				
Daily				
School/care disruption	24.4%, .3	30.9%, .8	21.3%, .5	22.2%, .7
Difficulty supporting learning	24.9%, .3	28.2%, .7	22.1%, .5	24.7%, .8
Parents reporting at least one instance during the month				
School/care disruption	77.4%, 1.6	81.4%, 3.2	72.2%, 2.5	78.8%, 3.8
Difficulty supporting learning	74.1%, 1.7	81.4%, 3.2	69.5%, 2.5	72.0%, 4.1
Remote only				
Daily				
School/care disruption	23.8%, .5	29.9%, 1.2	19.2%, .7	25.0%, 1.2
Difficulty supporting learning	25.4%, .5	30.6%, 1.2	20.2%, .7	26.0%, 1.2
Parents reporting at least one instance during the month				
School/care disruption	78.5%, 2.4	86.0%, 4.6	71.2%, 3.9	80.4%, 5.6
Difficulty supporting learning	75.4%, 2.6	84.2%, 4.9	69.8%, 3.9	70.6%, 6.4
In person only				
Daily				
School/care disruption	17.6%, .8	21.5%, 1.7	12.7%, 1.1	20.2%, 1.7
Difficulty supporting learning	19.1%, .8	17.3%, 1.6	20.0%, 1.3	20.3%, 1.7
Parents reporting at least one instance during the month				
School/care disruption	69.4%, 5.0	60.0%, 11.2	69.4%, 7.8	81.0%, 8.8
Difficulty supporting learning	64.7%, 5.2	75.0%, 9.9	66.7%, 8.0	57.1%, 11.1
Person days	$N = 17,003$	$n = 3,626$	$n = 7,938$	$n = 3,257$
Sample size	$N = 676$	$n = 145$	$n = 331$	$n = 118$

Note. Person days refers to the number of observations used in analysis of daily measures, indicating all daily survey reports provided by all participants.

Figure 2
School/Care Disruptions by Date



However, this consistency masked some differences by race. Non-Hispanic White parents experienced much worse effects from disruptions in in-person schooling (20.1 percentage points) than from disruptions in remote only school (10.0 percentage points), while the point estimate for the effect on non-Hispanic Black parents from disruptions in remote schooling (15.3 percentage points) was larger than from disruptions in in-person (8.4 percentage points). However, neither of these differences was statistically significant.

Parenting Behaviors

Perhaps not surprisingly given effects on mood, parents were more likely to lose their temper with their child on a day with a disruption. The overall increase was a statistically significant 5.6 percentage points from a base rate of 7.0%. Effects were large and significant for all race/ethnic groups, but the effect for non-Hispanic White parents (8.6 percentage points) was significantly larger than for non-Hispanic Black parents (4.4 percentage points). Parents were also more likely to punish their child on a day with a disruption, with an increase of 4.5 percentage points from a base rate of 5.8%. These effects were large and significant for all race/ethnic groups, but were larger for non-Hispanic White parents (8.2 percentage points; difference with non-Hispanic Black parents statistically significant at $p < .05$). Effects on parenting behaviors did not differ significantly by school/care modality.

Mediation

Within-family mediation models showed that effects of disruptions on children's uncooperative and sad/worried behavior were partially mediated by parent mood and parenting behavior (see Table 5 and Figure 4). Parents' difficulty supporting children's learning accounted for 37% of the total effect of disruptions on children's worried behavior and children's uncooperative behavior ($ps < .001$), and negative mood accounted for 17% ($ps < .001$). Losing temper and punishment both accounted for 13% of the total effect on children's worried behavior and 23% of the total effect on children's uncooperative behavior ($ps < .001$). Results were

generally consistent for in-person and remote care. Full mediation model results are shown in Table A2 of the Appendix.

Discussion

The COVID-19 pandemic has altered daily life for most families with young children. In particular, the closure or change in the nature of children's primary care and school settings has been one of the most substantial changes experienced by children themselves. Emergent evidence has shed light on the disruptions caused by the abrupt shift to remote schooling in Spring 2020 (Bacher-Hicks et al., 2021; Domina et al., 2021). But there is little evidence about the experiences of disruptions as the pandemic persisted through Fall 2020 or about the effects of those disruptions on children's well-being. This study filled that gap by using daily survey data gathered in Fall 2020 from a representative sample of hourly service workers with young children—a group with significant but common vulnerabilities—to shed light on the frequency of instances of disruptions to school and care, and the consequences of those disruptions for child behavior. The national public discussion about the relative risks to bringing children back to the classroom versus keeping them at home has had little rigorous evidence on which to rely. We document an aspect of daily mental health burden during the pandemic, unexpected disruptions in care and learning, and show its costs for child well-being. Results indicate that disruptions were common overall, occurred regularly for both remote and in-person settings, and were most common in remote learning. Further, children's behavior is negatively affected by disruptions, with evidence that effects are partially mediated by parents' challenges supporting children's learning and by parents' mood and behavior.

Research has shown how radically family life was altered when school abruptly closed in Spring 2020 (Gassman-Pines et al., 2020; Gassman-Pines & Gennetian, 2020; Steimle et al., 2021). Our results underscore that although many schools and childcare facilities reopened throughout summer and fall, families continued to experience instability in school and care throughout the fall. On any given day, nearly 25% of parents said that their care or school

Table 4*Effect of School/Care Disruption Today on Daily Outcomes by Modality and Race/Ethnicity*

Daily outcome	All	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic Black	Non-Hispanic White
All modalities				
Child behavior				
Uncooperative some or a lot today	.091*** (.01)	.092*** (.023)	.068*** (.014)	.119*** (.023)
Sad or worried some or a lot today	.06*** (.007)	.041** (.015)	.055*** (.011)	.076*** (.018)
Parent well-being				
Felt fretful angry irritable anxious or depressed today	.127*** (.013)	.122*** (.029)	.112*** (.02)	.167*** (.034)
Sleep difficulty the night following this day (normalized)	.056* (.027)	0.06 (.061)	.067 (.043)	.026 (.062)
Parenting behavior				
Lost temper today	.056*** (.008)	.049* (.019)	.044*** (.011)	.086*** (.018)
Punished child today	.045*** (.007)	.037** (.014)	.033** (.01)	.082*** (.023)
Remote only				
Child behavior				
Uncooperative some or a lot today	.07*** (.014)	.062 [†] (.037)	.045** (.017)	.119** (.039)
Sad or worried some or a lot today	.051*** (.009)	0.023 (.015)	.049*** (.013)	.038* (.019)
Parent well-being				
Felt fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed today	.129*** (.019)	.146** (.049)	.153*** (.03)	.100* (.043)
Sleep difficulty the night following this day (normalized)	.134** (.041)	0.151 (.102)	.166** (.061)	0.082 (.098)
Parenting behavior				
Lost temper today	.046*** (.011)	0.024 (.025)	.041** (.014)	.053 [†] (.028)
Punished child today	.041*** (.011)	0.015 (.016)	.037** (.013)	.072 [†] (.042)
In person only				
Child behavior				
Uncooperative some or a lot today	.135*** (.028)	.136* (.067)	.157** (.051)	.114* (.054)
Sad or worried some or a lot today	.082** (.024)	.126** (.047)	0.054 (.033)	0.092 (.062)
Parent well-being				
Felt fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed today	.148** (.043)	0.14 (.101)	0.084 (.067)	.209** (.075)
Sleep difficulty the night following this day (normalized)	0.001 (.081)	0.158 (.175)	0.064 (.154)	-.323** (.101)
Parenting behaviors				
Lost temper today	.036 [†] (.02)	-.011 (.055)	0.042 (.034)	.065* (.027)
Punished child today	.042 [†] (.022)	0.023 (.047)	0.054 (.034)	.08 [†] (.043)
No. of person days	16,961	3,615	3,253	7,916


Note. Fixed effects (person-centered) regressions, all of which include an indicator for weekend days and whether the parent worked on that day. Standard errors clustered on family in parentheses. Person days refer to the number of observations used in analysis of daily measures, indicating all daily survey reports provided by all participants.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

arrangement had not gone smoothly that day, and the vast majority of families had at least one day during the month of data collection on which care or school was disrupted. Our innovative daily survey design enabled us to reveal how common these disruptions were as they were occurring in daily life. This approach reduces recall bias and eliminates the need to ask people to mentally aggregate instances of disruptions, both of which can lead to undercounting these experiences (Bound et al., 2001; Mathiowetz et al., 2002).

Further, our results show that keeping children home to attend school remotely did not eliminate disruptions. In fact, although disruptions were common across school/care modality, we found that disruptions in remote learning were more common than disruptions in in-person care or school. This is likely due to challenges related to lack of stable and reliable Internet access, dependable devices, user-friendly learning software, or other technological problems, which are more common among lower-income families (Auxier &

Figure 3
Daily Effects of School/Care Disruptions on Child Behavior Problems, Parent Mood, and Parenting Behaviors



Anderson, 2020). Daily reports of parental difficulty supporting learning were also higher for families using remote than in-person, consistent with the unprecedented demands on parents of implementing remote education.

In terms of effects of these daily school and care disruptions on children's behavior problems, we found striking and consistent evidence that parents reported that their children had more behavior problems on days with a disruption than days without a disruption. Compared with days without disruptions, on days with disruptions parents reported a 71% increase in the percentage of children who exhibited uncooperativeness (an aspect of externalizing behavior problems) and a 112% increase in the percentage of children who seemed sad or worried (aspects of internalizing behavior problems). These large increases in child behavior problems are consistent with ecological systems theory, as changes to children's microsystems are posited to have the largest and most direct effects on children's development and well-being. For example, in contrast, prior research has shown that daily changes to the exosystem (parents' workplaces)

have large effects on parent mood but do not affect children's daily behavior (Ananat et al., 2020).

Consistent with ecological systems theory and our general conceptual framework, these disruptions to care and schooling appeared to have both direct and indirect effects on children's behavior. In particular, given that the pandemic has blurred the lines between the family and school microsystems, parents' behaviors and mood are key mediating mechanisms. Children, who are embedded in family systems, are influenced by their parents' own mood and behavior.

More broadly beyond the pandemic, these results provide additional evidence of the harmful effects of daily unpredictability and instability in children's everyday lives. Instability in the family setting has been linked to young children's behavior problems (Fomby & Mollborn, 2017). Further, research has shown that daily hassles and stressors in childhood are just as strongly related to later life health as major stressful life events (Odgers & Jaffee, 2013). As developmental scientists seek to understand microsystem influences on child behavior, the disruptions and instability in school and care caused by the pandemic provide additional


Table 5
Indirect Effect of School/Care Disruption on Child Behavior by Parent Mood and Parenting Behavior

Mediator	N	No. of person days	Child sad/worried				Child uncooperative			
			Estimate	SE	95% CI		Estimate	SE	95% CI	
					LL	UL			LL	UL
Parent well-being	676	16,961								
Fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed today			0.010***	0.002	0.011	0.019	0.015***	0.003	0.010	0.020
Proportion of total effect			0.168***	0.028	0.121	0.214	0.166***	0.032	0.113	0.218
Parenting behavior	678	17,010								
Difficulty supporting child's learning			0.021***	0.004	0.015	0.027	0.033***	0.005	0.026	0.041
Proportion of total effect			0.369***	0.067	0.259	0.478	0.370***	0.056	0.277	0.462
Lost temper today	676	16,905	0.008***	0.002	0.004	0.011	0.022***	0.004	0.016	0.028
Proportion of total effect			0.133***	0.035	0.075	0.19	0.238***	0.037	0.178	0.299
Punished child today	676	16,919	0.008***	0.002	0.004	0.012	0.021***	0.004	0.015	0.027
Proportion of total effect			0.133***	0.041	0.065	0.201	0.226***	0.039	0.162	0.290

Note. Within-subject mediation of school or care disruption on child outcomes, mediated by parent well-being and parent behavior. Models run separately for each child outcome/mediator pair. All variables are person-centered. Person days refers to the number of observations used in analysis of daily measures, indicating all daily survey reports provided by all participants. CI = confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit.

*** $p < .001$.

Figure 4
Proportion of Total Effect of School or Childcare Disruptions on Child Behavior Mediated by Parent Mood and Behavior



evidence of how chronic lower-level stressors can lead to child behavior problems. Future research should seek to investigate how these daily disruptions accumulate over time or having lasting effects beyond the day that they occur.

Finally, in terms of understanding the context of children's care and schooling in fall 2020; we found differences for families from different racial and ethnic groups. Although school/care disruptions were common for all families, Hispanic parents reported the highest rates of disruptions and non-Hispanic Black parents reported the lowest. Non-Hispanic Black families also experienced somewhat milder effects of disruptions on well-being than did other families, while non-Hispanic White families experienced somewhat stronger effects than did other families. A complete understanding of the reasons underlying these differences will require further study, but we note that, consistent with prior literature (e.g., Akee et al., 2019), the non-Hispanic White families in our sample had more advantages at the outset of the study, including slightly higher levels of education and being more likely to be living with a spouse or partner. It is possible that during the pandemic, loss of access to some of the supports related to those advantages may have made disruptions experienced during the pandemic more salient. It is also possible that institutionalized racism embedded within school systems or structures may have provided supports that favored White families over families of color. Consequently, White families may have had higher expectations of institutional support, leading to disproportionate feelings of burden when such supports were no longer available.

Nonetheless, across race/ethnicity groups all families experienced severe—large, statistically significant, negative—effects from disruptions on parent mood, child mood, and parenting behaviors. Moreover, across all racial/ethnic groups families were 36% more likely to experience daily disruptions in remote school, with even greater increases for families of color. These findings provide compelling evidence that policymakers should prioritize efforts to make a safe and stable return to in-person school available to families while they bolster support for those who must learn remotely. They also underline concerns about ongoing closures related to COVID-19 or to staffing shortages, and call into question the potential disparate impact of recent announcements by some districts that going forward they will hold remote school rather than cancel school in severe weather.

Limitations

While our study demonstrates the impact of daily COVID-19-related disruptions on a vulnerable population, the sample population was limited and targeted. Families in which parents were hourly workers in other industries or salaried workers may have had different experiences with school and childcare during Fall 2020. Further, our findings are local to a particular major city. The experience of the pandemic may differ from city to city, based on infection prevalence and governmental and social response. In addition, while our mediation models tested parenting behaviors as mechanisms linking school or care disruptions to child behavior, the direction of effects may also lead from child behavior to parenting. For example, it is possible that parent temper and punishment occurred in response to increased child uncooperativeness due to care disruptions. Further, the mediation models examined both mediators and outcomes on the same day and did not examine longitudinal predictions. Finally, we used a simplified approach to allow us to have a large sample answer this question daily. However, this meant that we were not able to ask detailed follow-up questions, so we are not able to parse out from these data whether a given disruption was due to Internet failure, COVID-19 cases, or some other specific source.

Conclusion

Despite these limitations, however, this study provides compelling new evidence of disruptions to important microsystem settings for young children—school and childcare—during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. There has been little evidence about the experiences of disruptions to children's care and school arrangements as the pandemic persisted through the 2020–2021 school year, nor about the effects of those disruptions on child and family well-being. By using innovative daily survey data gathered in the fall of 2020 from a representative sample of hourly service workers with young children, we are able to shed light on the frequency of disruptions to school and care, and the consequences of those disruptions for child and parent mental health, among a group of families with significant but common vulnerabilities. While previous work had documented that universal, short closures (such as snow days) had few effects on children (Goodman, 2014), we document that frequent, unexpected disruptions in care and learning have significantly contributed to the daily

burden for families during the pandemic. Policies to increase the safety, accessibility, and predictability of in-person learning hold promise to reduce disruptions. Moreover, as school districts oversee a new school year in which many continue offering remote options and many others experience intermittent classroom or school-wide closures, additional support and resources for families in remote modes may be needed to stabilize their day-to-day experiences. Finally, this research provides further evidence on, as well as identifying additional sources of, emotional distress among children that schools and other child-serving organizations will need to address as they try to repair the damage incurred in the pandemic.

References

- Ali, U., Herbst, C. M., & Makridis, C. A. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on the U.S. childcare market: Evidence from stay-at-home orders. *Economics of Education Review*, 82, Article 102094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2021.102094>
- Akee, R., Jones, M. R., & Porter, S. R. (2019). Race matters: Income shares, income inequality, and income mobility for all U.S. races. *Demography*, 56(3), 999–1021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00773-7>
- American Psychological Association. (2020). *Stress in America 2020*. <https://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress/2020/sia-mental-health-crisis.pdf>
- Ananat, E. O., & Gassman-Pines, A. (2020). *Snapshot of the COVID crisis impact on working families*. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from <https://econofact.org/snapshot-of-the-covid-crisis-impact-on-working-families>
- Ananat, E. O., Gassman-Pines, A., & Fitz-Henley, J., II. (2020, November). *The effects of service-industry work schedule unpredictability on families* [Paper presentation]. Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Fall Research Conference, Virtual.
- Ananat, E. O., & Gassman-Pines, A. (2021). Work schedule unpredictability: Daily occurrence and effects on working parents' well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 83(1), 10–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12696>
- Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472–491. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259305>
- Auxier, B., & Anderson, M. (2020). As schools close due to the coronavirus, some U.S. students face a digital 'homework gap.' *Pew Research Center*, 16, 1–8. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/03/16/as-schools-close-due-to-the-coronavirus-some-u-s-students-face-a-digital-homework-gap/#>
- Bacher-Hicks, A., Goodman, J., & Mulhern, C. (2021). Inequality in household adaptation to schooling shocks: Covid-induced online learning engagement in real time. *Journal of Public Economics*, 193, Article 104345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104345>
- Bass, B. L., Butler, A. B., Grzywacz, J. G., & Linney, K. D. (2009). Do job demands undermine parenting? A daily analysis of spillover and crossover effects. *Family Relations*, 58(2), 201–215. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00547.x>
- Becker, S. P., Breaux, R., Cusick, C. N., Dvorsky, M. R., Marsh, N. P., Sciberras, E., & Langberg, J. M. (2020). Remote learning during COVID-19: Examining school practices, service continuation, and difficulties for adolescents with and without attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 67(6), 769–777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.09.002>
- Behar, L., & Stringfield, S. (1974). A behavior rating scale for the pre-school child. *Developmental Psychology*, 10(5), 601–610. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037058>
- Berger, P., Cook, A., DelCampo, R., Herrera, R., & Weigel, R. (1994). Family/work roles' relation to perceived stress: Do gender and ethnicity matter? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 15(3), 223–242. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02533629>
- Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J.-P. (2013). *Intensive longitudinal methods: An introduction to diary and experience sampling research*. Guilford Press.
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 579–616. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030>
- Bound, J., Brown, C., & Mathiowetz, N. (2001). Measurement error in survey data. In W. Brock, S. Durlauf, J. Heckman & E. Leamer (Eds.), *Handbook of econometrics* (Vol. 5, pp. 3705–3843). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4412\(01\)05012-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4412(01)05012-7)
- Bower, B., Bylsma, L. M., Morris, B. H., & Rottenberg, J. (2010). Poor reported sleep quality predicts low positive affect in daily life among healthy and mood-disordered persons. *Journal of Sleep Research*, 19(2), 323–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2869.2009.00816.x>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. Wozniak & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Development in context: Acting and thinking in specific environments* (pp. 3–46). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1995). Developmental ecology through space and time: A future perspective. In P. Moen, J. Elder, H. Glen, & K. Luscher (Eds.), *Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development* (pp. 619–647). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10176-018>
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Evans, G. W. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs and empirical findings. *Social Development*, 9(1), 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00114>
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 993–1028). Wiley.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2020). *Unemployment insurance weekly claims*. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from <https://www.dol.gov/ui/data.pdf>
- Center for Systems Science and Engineering at Johns Hopkins University. (2020). *COVID-19 dashboard*. <https://gisanddata.maps.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6>
- Clawson, A. H., Nwankwo, C. N., Blair, A. L., Pepper-Davis, M., Ruppe, N. M., & Cole, A. B. (2021). COVID-19 impacts on families of color and families of children with asthma. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 46(4), 378–391. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jpepsy/jsab021>
- Darity, W. A., Jr., & Nicholson, M. J. (2005). Racial wealth inequality and the Black family. In V. McLoyd, N. E. Hill, & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *African American family life: Ecological and cultural diversity* (pp. 78–85). Guilford Press.
- Domina, T., Renzulli, L., Murray, B., Garza, A. N., & Perez, L. (2021). Remote or removed: Predicting successful engagement with online learning during COVID-19. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 7, 2378023120988200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023120988200>
- Ehrler, M., Werninger, I., Schnider, B., Eichelberger, D. A., Naef, N., Disselhoff, V., & Wehrle, F. M. (2021). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on children with and without risk for neurodevelopmental impairments. *Acta Paediatrica*, 110(4), 1281–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.15775>
- Enriquez, D., & Goldstein, A. (2020). COVID-19's socioeconomic impact on low-income benefit recipients: Early evidence from tracking surveys. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 6, 2378023120970794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023120970794>
- Fomby, P., & Mollborn, S. (2017). Ecological instability and children's classroom behavior in kindergarten. *Demography*, 54(5), 1627–1651. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0602-2>
- Furlong, W. J., Feeny, D. H., Torrance, G. W., & Barr, R. D. (2001). The Health Utilities Index (HUI) system for assessing health-related quality of life in clinical studies. *Annals of Medicine*, 33(5), 375–384. <https://doi.org/10.3109/07853890109002092>
- Gadermann, A. C., Thomson, K. C., Richardson, C. G., Gagné, M., McAuliffe, C., Hirani, S., & Jenkins, E. (2021). Examining the impacts

- of the COVID-19 pandemic on family mental health in Canada: Findings from a national cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*, 11(1), e042871. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042871>
- Garbe, A., Ogurlu, U., Logan, N., & Cook, P. (2020). COVID-19 and remote learning: Experiences of parents with children during the pandemic. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 4(3), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/8471>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2011). Low-income mothers' nighttime and weekend work: Daily associations with child behavior, mother-child interactions and mood. *Family Relations*, 60(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00630.x>
- Gassman-Pines, A. (2015). Effects of Mexican immigrant parents' daily workplace discrimination on child behavior and family functioning. *Child Development*, 86(4), 1175–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12378>
- Gassman-Pines, A., & Gennetian, L. (2020). *COVID-19 job and income loss jeopardize child well-being: Income support policies can help*. <https://www.srcd.org/research/covid-19-job-and-income-loss-jeopardize-child-well-being-income-support-policies-can-help>
- Gassman-Pines, A., & Schenck-Fontaine, A. (2019). Daily food insufficiency and worry among economically disadvantaged families with young children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(5), 1269–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12593>
- Gassman-Pines, A., Ananat, E. O., & Fitz-Henley, J. II (2020). COVID-19 and parent-child psychological well-being. *Pediatrics*, 146(4), Article e2020007294. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-007294>
- George, M. J., Rivenbark, J. G., Russell, M. A., Ng'eno, L., Hoyle, R. H., & Odgers, C. L. (2019). Evaluating the use of commercially available wearable wristbands to capture adolescents' daily sleep duration. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 29(3), 613–626. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12467>
- Goodman, J. (2014). *Flaking out: Student absences and snow days as disruptions of instructional time* (No. w20221). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w20221>
- Grose, J. (2021, February 4). America's mothers are in crisis. Is anyone listening to them? *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/02/04/parenting/working-moms-coronavirus.html>
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111>
- Haynes, N., Cooper, L. A., & Albert, M. A. (2020). At the heart of the matter: Unmasking and addressing COVID-19's toll on diverse populations. *Circulation*, 142, 105–107. <https://doi.org/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.048126>
- Horsman, J., Furlong, W., Feeny, D., & Torrance, G. (2003). The Health Utilities Index (HUI): Concepts, measurement properties and applications. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 1(1), Article 54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-1-54>
- Hsu, A. (2020, September 29). 'This is too much': Working moms are reaching the breaking point during the pandemic. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2020/09/29/918127776/this-is-too-much-working-moms-are-reaching-the-breaking-point-during-the-pandemic>
- Ilies, R., Schwind, K. M., Wagner, D. T., Johnson, M. D., DeRue, D. S., & Ilgen, D. R. (2007). When can employees have a family life? The effects of daily workload and affect on work-family conflict and social behaviors at home. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(5), 1368–1379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1368>
- Jessen-Howard, S., & Workman, S. (2020). *Coronavirus pandemic could lead to permanent loss of nearly 4.5 million childcare slots*. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/news/2020/04/24/483817/coronavirus-pandemic-lead-permanent-loss-nearly-4-5-million-child-care-slots/>
- Koehler-Dauner, F., Clemens, V., Lange, S., Ziegenhain, U., & Fegert, J. M. (2021). Mothers daily perceived stress influences their children's mental health during SARS-CoV-2-pandemic. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 15, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-021-00385-3>
- Kurmann, A., Lale, E., & Ta, L. (2020, May). *The impact of COVID-19 on us employment and hours: Real-time estimates with homebase data*. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from http://www.andrekurmann.com/hb_covid
- Lee, S. J., Ward, K. P., Chang, O. D., & Downing, K. M. (2021). Parenting activities and the transition to home-based education during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 122, 105585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105585>
- Loney, J., & Milich, R. (1982). Hyperactivity, inattention, and aggression in clinical practice. In M. Wolraich & D. K. Rough (Eds.), *Advances in development and behavioral pediatrics* (Vol. 3, pp. 113–147). JAI Press.
- Mackey, K., Ayers, C. K., Kondo, K. K., Saha, S., Advani, S. M., Young, S., Spencer, H., Rusek, M., Anderson, J., Veazie, S., Smith, M., & Kansagara, D. (2021). Racial and ethnic disparities in COVID-19-related infections, hospitalizations, and deaths: A systematic review. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 174(3), 362–373. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M20-6306>
- Marchetti, D., Fontanesi, L., Di Giandomenico, S., Mazza, C., Roma, P., & Verrocchio, M. C. (2020). The effect of parent psychological distress on child hyperactivity/inattention during the COVID-19 lockdown: Testing the mediation of parent verbal hostility and child emotional symptoms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 567052. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.567052>
- Mathiowetz, N., Brown, C., & Bound, J. (2002). Measurement error in surveys of the low-income population. In M. Ver Ploeg, R. A. Moffitt & C. F. Citro (Eds.), *Studies of welfare populations: Data collection and research issues* (pp. 157–194). National Academies Press.
- Muhib, F. B., Lin, L. S., Stueve, A., Miller, R. L., Ford, W. L., Johnson, W. D., & Smith, P. J. (2001). A venue-based method for sampling hard-to-reach populations. *Public Health Reports*, 116(Suppl. 1), 216–222. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/116.S1.216>
- National Academy for State Health Policy. (2020). *Chart: Each state's COVID-19 reopening and reclosing plans and mask requirements*. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from <https://www.nashp.org/governors-prioritize-health-for-all/>
- Neighmond, P. (2020). 'Change can happen': Black families on racism, hope and parenting. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/07/19/891517857/change-can-happen-Black-families-on-racism-hope-and-parenting>
- Odgers, C. L., & Jaffee, S. R. (2013). Routine versus catastrophic influences on the developing child. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 34, 29–48. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114447>
- Patrick, S. W., Henkhaus, L. E., Zickafoose, J. S., Lovell, K., Halvorson, A., Loch, S., Letterie, M., & Davis, M. M. (2020). Well-being of parents and children during the COVID-19 pandemic: A national survey. *Pediatrics*, 146(4), Article e2020016824. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-016824>
- Pfefferbaum, B., & North, C. S. (2020). Mental health and the COVID-19 pandemic. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(6), 510–512. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2008017>
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). Work roles, family roles and well-being: Current conceptual perspectives. In G. L. Brown & J. F. Pittman (Eds.), *The work and family interface: Toward a contextual effects perspective* (pp. 17–22). National Council on Family Relations.
- Roy, A., Breaux, R., Sciberras, E., Patel, P., Ferrara, E., Shroff, D., Cash, A., Dvorsky, M., Langberg, J., & Quach, J. (2021). A preliminary examination of key strategies, challenges, and benefits of remote learning expressed by parents during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PsyArxiv*. <https://psyarxiv.com/5ca4v/>
- Schwartz, A., Wasser, M., Gillard, M., & Paarlberg, M. (2015). *Unpredictable, unsustainable: The impact of employers' scheduling practices in D.C.* <https://www.dcfpi.org/all/unpredictable-unsustainable-the-impact-of-employers-scheduling-practices-in-dc/>

- Semaan, S. (2010). Time-space sampling and respondent-driven sampling with hard-to-reach populations. *Methodological Innovations Online*, 5(2), 60.1–75. <https://doi.org/10.4256/mio.2010.0019>
- Sharfstein, J. M., & Morpew, C. C. (2020). The urgency and challenge of opening K-12 schools in the fall of 2020. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 324(2), 133–134. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.10175>
- Simon, A., Huebner, J., Berner, R., Munro, A. P. S., Exner, M., Huppertz, H.-I., & Walger, P. (2020). Measures to maintain regular operations and prevent outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2 in childcare facilities or schools under pandemic conditions and co-circulation of other respiratory pathogens. *GMS Hygiene and Infection Control*, 15, Article 22. <https://doi.org/10.3205/dgkh000357>
- Steimle, S., Gassman-Pines, A., Johnson, A. D., Hines, C., & Ryan, R. M. (2021). Understanding patterns of food insecurity and family well-being amid the COVID-19 pandemic using daily surveys. *Child Development*, 92(5), e781–e797. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13659>
- The Hunt Institute. (2021). *State childcare actions*. <https://hunt-institute.org/covid-19-resources/state-child-care-actions-covid-19/>
- Transportation Research Board and National Research Council. (1999). *Governance and opportunity in metropolitan America*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/6038>
- Tudge, J. R., Mokrova, I., Hatfield, B. E., & Karnik, R. B. (2009). Uses and misuses of Bronfenbrenner's bioecological theory of human development. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 1(4), 198–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-2589.2009.00026.x>
- USC Center for Economic and Social Research. (2021). *Understanding coronavirus in America*. Retrieved June 1, 2021, from <https://covid19pulse.usc.edu/>
- Verlenden, J. V., Pampati, S., Rasberry, C. N., Liddon, N., Hertz, M., Kilmer, G., Viox, M. H., Lee, S., Cramer, N. K., Barrios, L. C., & Ethier, K. A. (2021). Association of children's mode of school instruction with child and parent experiences and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic—COVID Experiences Survey, United States, October 8–November 13, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 70(11), 369–376. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7011a1>
- Weisner, T. S. (2002). Ecocultural understanding of children's developmental pathways. *Human Development*, 45(4), 275–281. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000064989>
- Williams, D. R., & Collins, C. (2001). Racial residential segregation: A fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. *Public Health Reports*, 116(5), 404–416. <https://doi.org/10.1093/phr/116.5.404>
- Williams, K. J., & Alliger, G. M. (1994). Role stressors, mood spillover, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 837–868. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256602>
- Winter, J. (2004). Response bias in survey-based measures of household consumption. *Economic Bulletin*, 3(9), 1–12. <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:ecbull:eb-03c80001>

Appendix

Supplemental Tables

Table A1
Correlation Matrix of Predictor Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. School disruption	—					
2. Had difficulty supporting learning	0.70	—				
3. Parent negative mood	0.34	0.53	—			
4. Lost temper with child	0.24	0.34	0.46	—		
5. Punished child	0.23	0.33	0.39	0.75	—	
6. Weekend	−0.05	−0.24	−0.11	−0.12	−0.09	—

Note. Tetrachoric correlation coefficients; all are significant at $p < .001$.

(Appendix continues)

Table A2*Mediated Effect of Learning Disruption on Children's Outcomes by Parent Mood and Parenting Behavior*

Child behavior/effect	n	No. of person days	Estimate	(SE)	Est./SE	p	95% CI	
							LL	UL
Parent felt fretful, angry, irritable, anxious, or depressed								
Child sad/worried	676	16,961						
a (X to M)			0.125	(0.013)	9.34	.00	0.103	0.147
b (M to Y)			0.047	(0.006)	7.427	.00	0.036	0.057
c' (X to Y)			0.048	(0.007)	6.642	.00	0.036	0.06
Cov (a/bj)			0.004	(0.002)	2.116	.03	0.001	0.007
Mediated effect			0.010	(0.002)	4.754	.00	0.006	0.013
Total effect			0.058	(0.007)	7.961	.00	0.046	0.07
Proportion mediated			0.168	(0.038)	4.382	.00	0.093	0.231
Proportion explained			0.185	(0.087)	2.13	.03	0.042	0.328
Child uncooperative	676	16,961						
a (X to M)			0.125	(0.013)	9.272	.00	0.103	0.147
b (M to Y)			0.069	(0.008)	8.506	.00	0.056	0.083
c' (X to Y)			0.076	(0.009)	7.977	.00	0.06	0.091
Cov (a/bj)			0.006	(0.002)	2.615	.01	0.002	0.01
Mediated effect			0.015	(0.003)	5.44	.00	0.01	0.02
Total effect			0.091	(0.010)	9.418	.00	0.075	0.106
Proportion mediated			0.166	(0.032)	5.172	.00	0.113	0.218
Proportion explained			0.244	0.091	2.685	.01	0.095	0.394
Parent had difficulty supporting child's learning								
Child sad/worried	678	17,010						
a (X to M)			0.284	(0.014)	19.650	.000	0.264	0.308
b (M to Y)			0.068	(0.008)	8.013	.000	0.054	0.082
c' (X to Y)			0.036	(0.007)	5.082	.000	0.024	0.048
Cov (a/bj)			0.002	(0.003)	0.620	.535	−0.003	0.006
Mediated effect			0.021	(0.004)	5.869	.00	0.015	0.027
Total effect			0.057	(0.007)	7.885	.00	0.045	0.069
Proportion mediated			0.369	(0.067)	5.536	.00	0.259	0.478
Proportion explained			0.048	(0.077)	0.62	.54	−0.079	0.175
Child uncooperative	678	17,010						
a (X to M)			0.284	(0.014)	19.656	.00	0.26	0.307
b (M to Y)			0.091	(0.010)	8.807	.00	0.016	0.026
c' (X to Y)			0.057	(0.010)	5.903	.00	0.041	0.073
Cov (a/bj)			0.008	(0.003)	2.213	.03	0.002	0.013
Mediated effect			0.033	(0.005)	7.306	.00	0.026	0.041
Total effect			0.09	(0.010)	9.3	.00	0.074	0.106
Proportion mediated			0.37	(0.056)	6.601	.00	0.277	0.462
Proportion explained			0.37	(0.056)	6.601	.00	0.277	0.462
Parent lost temper with child today								
Child sad/worried	676	16,905						
a (X to M)			0.054	(0.007)	7.478	.00	0.042	0.066
b (M to Y)			0.141	(0.017)	7.972	.00	0.113	0.169
c' (X to Y)			0.051	(0.007)	7.488	.00	0.04	0.062
Cov (a/bj)			0.000	(0.002)	0.075	.94	−0.003	0.003
Mediated effect			0.008	(0.002)	3.679	.00	0.004	0.011
Total effect			0.059	(0.007)	8.228	.00	0.047	0.07
Proportion mediated			0.133	(0.035)	3.816	.00	0.075	0.19
Proportion explained			0.005	(0.070)	0.075	.94	−0.11	0.012
Child uncooperative	676	16,905						
a (X to M)			0.053	(0.007)	7.341	.00	0.041	0.065
b (M to Y)			0.372	(0.021)	17.437	.00	0.337	0.407
c' (X to Y)			0.069	(0.009)	7.822	.00	0.055	0.084
Cov (a/bj)			0.002	(0.003)	0.794	.43	−0.002	0.006
Mediated effect			0.022	(0.004)	6.05	.00	0.016	0.028
Total effect			0.091	(0.010)	9.332	.00	0.075	0.107
Proportion mediated			0.238	(0.037)	6.465	.00	0.178	0.299
Proportion explained			0.062	(0.077)	0.809	.42	−0.064	0.188
Parent punished child today								
Child sad/worried	676	16,919						
a (X to M)			0.047	(0.007)	6.267	.00	0.034	0.059
b (M to Y)			0.138	(0.017)	7.956	.00	0.109	0.166
c' (X to Y)			0.051	(0.007)	7.242	.00	0.039	0.062
Cov (a/bj)			0.001	(0.002)	0.621	.53	−0.002	0.005
Mediated effect			0.008	(0.002)	3.16	.00	0.004	0.012

(Appendix continues)

Table A2 (*continued*)

Child behavior/effect	<i>n</i>	No. of person days	Estimate	(SE)	Est./SE	<i>p</i>	95% CI	
							LL	UL
Total effect			0.058	(0.007)	8.071	.00	0.047	0.07
Proportion mediated			0.133	(0.041)	3.255	.00	0.066	0.201
Proportion explained			0.047	(0.075)	0.622	.53	−0.077	0.17
Child uncooperative	676	16,919						
a (X to M)			0.046	0.008	6.143	.00	0.034	0.059
b (M to Y)			0.341	(0.021)	16.18	.00	0.307	0.376
c' (X to Y)			0.072	(0.009)	8.095	.00	0.057	0.086
Cov (<i>ajbj</i>)			0.005	(0.003)	2.025	.04	0.001	0.009
Mediated effect			0.021	(0.004)	5.381	.00	0.015	0.027
Total effect			0.093	(0.010)	9.515	.00	0.077	0.109
Proportion mediated			0.226	(0.039)	5.836	.00	0.162	0.29
Proportion explained			0.147	(0.072)	2.062	.04	0.028	0.266

Received June 3, 2021

Revision received February 22, 2022

Accepted February 28, 2022 ■