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Abstract:
Research on child care continues to support the claim that the quality of child care programs has a
definite and lasting effect on children’s developmental outcomes. Embarking on a study of quality
variables in child daycare requires an investigation of early childhood staff. Structural dimensions
examined in this study included staff/child ratios, group size, staff education and training, and staff
stability. Contextual aspects investigated included type of child daycare setting, licensure, staff salaries,
staff benefits, and staff working conditions.

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (a) to identify characteristics of the child care staff within
licensed, center-based daycare programs in the state of Montana; and (b) to examine structural and
contextual aspects of quality on licensed, center-based daycare in the state of Montana. Both structural
and contextual aspects were investigated as they related to geographic districts within the state and
program auspice. Out of 145 licensed daycare programs in Montana, 90 participated in the survey
(62%).

Licensed, center-based daycare staff were predominantly white/Caucasian females over the age of 30,
and had worked at their current position for over two years. A majority of programs do not require staff
to have greater education and training than that required by the state regulatory agency for licensing
purposes. The greatest percentage of licensed, center-based staff are employed by private, not-for-profit
programs, earn low wages, and reflected a turnover rate of 31% during the preceding 12 months.

Five research questions guided the study, and Chi-square analysis yielded nonsignificant results due to
low cell size. Discriminant analysis identified variables for benefits and working conditions which
were differentiated among three auspice groups.

Implications of this study for state agencies, center-based daycare programs, and further research were
discussed. This research represents one of the first comprehensive studies of licensed, center-based
daycare programs within the state of Montana.
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ABSTRACT

Research on child care continues to support the claim that the quality of child care programs has a definite and lasting effect on children's developmental outcomes. Embarking on a study of quality variables in child daycare requires an investigation of early childhood staff. Structural dimensions examined in this study included staff/child ratios, group size, staff education and training, and staff stability. Contextual aspects investigated included type of child daycare setting, licensure, staff salaries, staff benefits, and staff working conditions.

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (a) to identify characteristics of the child care staff within licensed, center-based daycare programs in the state of Montana; and (b) to examine structural and contextual aspects of quality on licensed, center-based daycare in the state of Montana. Both structural and contextual aspects were investigated as they related to geographic districts within the state and program auspice. Out of 145 licensed daycare programs in Montana, 90 participated in the survey (62%).

Licensed, center-based daycare staff were predominantly white/Caucasian females over the age of 30, and had worked at their current position for over two years. A majority of programs do not require staff to have greater education and training than that required by the state regulatory agency for licensing purposes. The greatest percentage of licensed, center-based staff are employed by private, not-for-profit programs, earn low wages, and reflected a turnover rate of 31% during the preceding 12 months.

Five research questions guided the study, and Chi-square analysis yielded nonsignificant results due to low cell size. Discriminant analysis identified variables for benefits and working conditions which were differentiated among three auspice groups.

Implications of this study for state agencies, center-based daycare programs, and further research were discussed. This research represents one of the first comprehensive studies of licensed, center-based daycare programs within the state of Montana.
CHAPTER 1

ORIENTATION OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The debate in the United States has shifted from the issue of whether or not mothers of young children should work to the recognition that women are employed and will continue to be employed (Galinsky, 1987). Two-thirds of all preschool children and four out of five school-age children will have mothers in the workforce by 1995 (Children's Defense Fund, 1987). In addition, in 1987, half of all married mothers in the workforce had infants younger than one year (Children's Defense Fund, 1987).

Research on child care continues to support the claim that the quality of child care programs has a definite and lasting effect on children's developmental outcomes (Phillips, 1987). The National Day Care Study (NDCS) (Roupp, Travers, Glantz, & Coelen, 1979) was the first research conducted on a national level to investigate the costs and effects of the regulatable characteristics of daycare. Factors affecting program quality, regardless of type of setting (family home, group home, or center-based), include group size, staff/child ratios, health and safety issues, and training opportunities for staff (Roupp et al., 1979).
Research indicates that employed parents have a difficult time finding quality care and, when under stress, they enroll their children in the lowest quality child care facilities (Galinsky, 1987; Howes, Rodning, Galluzzo, & Myers, 1988).

In addition, the true cost of child care is not reflected in program cost, but rather is obscured by the subsidies provided by early childhood staff through inadequate compensation (Zinsser, 1985). The National Child Care Staffing Study (NCCSS) was the second national survey to examine the costs and effects of quality daycare. Conducted in five major cities in the United States, the study discovered that poor staff compensation is related to poor program quality [Child Care Employee Project (CCEP), 1989].

Furthermore, inadequate wages contribute to high levels of staff turnover which adversely affect continuity of care (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips, & Pemberton, 1989). Continuity of care is another important aspect of quality as it relates to the relationship between child and caregiver (Cummings, 1980).

Contemporary research has identified two general approaches to delineating quality: global assessments and specific child care dimensions (Phillips, 1987). Global assessments involve criteria which measure the overall quality of environments. Rather than examining individual quality indicators, global assessments place quality on a high/low continuum or utilize rating scales to examine multiple aspects of program content. For example, the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) (Harms & Clifford, 1980)
examines seven quality dimensions: (a) personal care, (b) creative activities, (c) language/reasoning, (d) fine/gross motor activities, (e) adult facilities/opportunities, (f) furnishings/display, and (g) social development. Thus, global assessments have helped researchers conclude that "better child care is better for children . . . but [these assessments] do not identify which aspects of child care are better" (Phillips, 1987, p. 5).

Specific child daycare dimensions allow researchers to identify program aspects that relate directly to better care. These dimensions fall into three categories. First, structural dimensions are defined as group size, staff/child ratios, and caregiver education and training. These structural dimensions are the same dimensions identified by the NDCS as being linked to child care quality (Roupp et al., 1979). Typically, these dimensions are those which government agencies choose to regulate. "State regulation generally consists of setting minimum standards for health, safety, and development of children. States usually base licensing requirements on easily measurable features, such as group size and ratio of children to staff" (U.S. Department of Labor, 1988, p. 14). The idea behind regulation is to ensure that a minimum level of care is provided across child care settings. The regulatory system generally includes licensing for center-based care and registration (a variation of licensing) for family home or group home daycare. Oftentimes early childhood professionals have an idea for quality which is higher than that set by regulatory agencies. The result can pit policy makers against the early childhood professional in deciding who
will establish the criteria defined as "good quality" within regulations (Morgan, 1985).

Second, contextual aspects of child daycare quality include the type of child care setting and staff stability. Typical categories of child care settings are family home daycare, group home daycare, and center-based daycare. Stability is directly related to child/caregiver relationships and therefore is an important component of daycare quality (Ainslie & Anderson, 1984; Cummings, 1980; King & MacKinnon, 1988). In addition, for the purpose of this study, staff salaries, staff benefits, and staff working conditions can be identified as contextual aspects because they affect the quality of the adult work environment (Whitebook et al., 1989).

Third, dynamic aspects of daycare include those which capture children's daily experiences. Dynamic aspects of daycare include the amount of close interaction between children and teachers, maintaining order, the amount of time a child spends in group activities versus independent/reflective play, and the amount of verbal initiative used by children (Roupp et al., 1979). The dynamic aspects of daycare are impacted by structural features and influence developmental outcomes for children.

Embarking on a study of quality variables in daycare requires an investigation of the early childhood staff. Attempts to access demographic information as related to the child care workforce are fraught with problems (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986). The public lacks accurate perceptions of who the child care
worker is as well as what the child care worker does. Major national statistical agencies, such as the U.S. Bureau of the Census and the U.S. Department of Labor, do not agree on the way to collect and report data, nor do they categorize and define the child care workforce in the same manner (Phillips & Whitebook, 1986). If accurate, basic data on the early childhood workforce are going to be collected to provide the public with correct perceptions about this group of professionals, then the problem of definitions within the profession must be resolved. These definitions include differentiating among teachers, assistant teachers, aides, and so forth. This study utilizes demographic characteristics to provide an accurate picture of the early childhood staff working in Montana's licensed, center-based daycare programs.

Thus, a need exists to clarify who the daycare professional is and, secondly, to examine a variety of factors that influence the quality of daycare. The purpose of this study is two-fold: (a) to identify characteristics of the child care staff within licensed, center-based daycare in the state of Montana; and (b) to examine structural and contextual aspects of quality in licensed, center-based daycare in the state of Montana. Structural variables under consideration include staff/child ratios, group size, staff education/training, and stability. Contextual variables include the type of setting and licensure as well as macrosystem factors of staff salaries, staff benefits, and staff working conditions. Both structural and contextual aspects are investigated as they relate to district and auspice. Dynamic aspects of the daycare environment are not examined within the context of this study.
Conceptual Framework

Ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1977) involves interaction between the developing individual and the environment. The interaction is reciprocal and the environment is composed of four structural levels: (a) the microsystem, (b) the mesosystem, (c) the exosystem, and (d) the macrosystem.

The microsystem consists of the daycare setting or program type, agency regulation via licensure, staff/child ratios, and group size. Bronfenbrenner (1977) described the microsystem as "the factors of time, place, physical features, activity, participants, and roles" (p. 515). The exosystem includes primary social structures influencing the developing person, "such as the economy, the mass media, the legislature, education, health care, housing, technology, and others" (Vander Ven, 1988, p. 150). The macrosystem is comprised of values and beliefs which govern the way institutions are organized. Treatment of children and caregivers is reflective of the cultural value placed on children and the adults who care for them (Belsky, Steinberg, & Walker, 1982).

Because of the reciprocal nature of the interaction between the developing person and the environment, daycare, for the purpose of this study, is viewed as a work environment for adults as well as a learning environment for children. In daycare, caregiver well-being is linked to children’s experiences; for example, paid planning time and paid breaks for staff increase teacher effectiveness in the classroom (Whitebook et al., 1989). Thus, the daily learning experiences of
children are influenced by the value and sense of caring shown to the staff by providing good work environments. All ecological levels are viewed in terms of how structure influences experience and how the experiences influence development.

The microsystem, the daycare setting itself, is affected by program type as well as licensure. The environment within family home daycare differs from that of group home daycare as well as center-based care. Research shows marked differences among program types (Clarke-Stewart & Gruber, 1984) and the influence of licensing or lack of licensing on program environments (Morgan, 1985). In addition, the social structures impacting the setting are influenced by staff/child ratios and group sizes (Belsky, 1984). The exosystem, reflecting, in part, the economic issues of the daycare workplace, includes staff salaries, stability of staff, benefits, and working conditions.

**Nominal Definitions**

1. **Quality** — Positive interactions among staff and children within the daycare setting (Bredekamp, 1987).
2. **Profile** — Demographic characteristics of licensed, center-based daycare staff.
3. **Child daycare** — Care provided to a child away from home during the day (one-word spelling adopted from the National Campaign for Child Daycare for Working Families, 1980).
(4) **Family home daycare** — A child care program serving three to six children [Montana Department of Family Services (DFS), 1988b].

(5) **Group home daycare** — A child care program serving seven to twelve children, registered by the State of Montana DFS (Montana DFS, 1988c).

(6) **Center-based daycare** — Child care program serving 13 or more children on a full-day basis, licensed by the State of Montana DFS (Montana DFS, 1988a).

(7) **Auspice** — Private/not-for-profit, private/for-profit (synonymous with proprietary), or public/not-for-profit program status.

(8) **District** — Geographic areas defined by the State of Montana DFS.

(9) **Adult work environment** — Aspects of the work settings which influence staff in their daily contacts with children and other adults and include wages, benefits, and working conditions (Whitebook et al., 1989).

(10) **Working conditions** — Conditions included in the organizational climate of a program which enhance professional growth collegiality or sense of value, such as release time to attend conferences/workshops, written job descriptions, paid breaks, paid planning time, periodic merit increases in wages, and compensation for overtime (Jorde-Bloom, 1988).

(11) **Stability** — Length of time in a center (Ainslie & Anderson, 1984), represents continuity of care (Cummings, 1980), and is assessed through turnover rates using the following formula: number of staff who have left divided by number of staff positions (Whitebook & Granger, 1989).
(12) **Staff** — All teachers, assistant teachers, teacher/directors, and directors present in the licensed, center-based daycare facility. These four staff groups are individually defined as follows:

(a) **Teachers** — Persons in charge of a group of children, often with responsibilities; includes head or lead teachers (synonymous with caregiver).

(b) **Assistant teachers** — Persons working under the supervision of a teacher who help with the care and education of children (synonymous with aide).

(c) **Teacher/directors** — Persons with both teaching and administrative duties.

(d) **Directors** — Persons who have primary responsibility for administration of the program (CCEP, 1988).

(13) **Staff benefits** — Benefits provided to staff which include sick leave, paid holidays, health and dental coverage, life insurance, pension plans, and so forth (CCEP, 1988).

(14) **Microsystem** — The daycare setting and environment; limited in this study to center-based care and licensing by the State of Montana DFS.

(15) **Exosystem** — The social structures that influence the daycare setting; limited in this study to staff/child ratios, group size, staff education/training, and stability.
(16) **Macrosystem** — The cultural values and beliefs influencing the treatment of children and the adults who care for them; limited in this study to staff salaries, benefits, and working conditions.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A literature review was conducted to examine structural and contextual aspects of licensed, center-based daycare in the state of Montana as they relate to quality. The literature was reviewed using Bronfenbrenner's (1977) ecological framework. Variables in this study are limited to the levels of microsystems and exosystems.

Specific areas under investigation were:

1. **Microsystem** — Daycare setting (type of program), licensure, staff/child ratios, and group size.

2. **Exosystem** — Economic aspects such as staff salary levels and their impact on staff stability as well as work environments and benefits in licensed center-based daycare.

3. **Auspice** — Program sponsorship and its impact on the structural and contextual aspects of daycare.

**Microsystem**

The ability to provide quality daycare environments to enhance the development of children and the adults who care for them depends upon an
understanding of what comprises quality. Quality within the microsystem is influenced by the type of program and agency regulation. High quality center-based programs have classroom and outdoor space of sufficient size and design to meet the needs of children. In addition, better quality centers offer opportunities for social, emotional, physical, and cognitive interaction among peers and numerous adults (McCartney, Scarr, Phillips, Grajek, & Schwarz, 1982).

Licensure establishes a minimum level of quality when program size dictates either registration (family home and group home daycare in Montana) or licensing to ensure monitoring of structural aspects of daycare features (Morgan, 1985; U.S. Department of Labor, 1988). Montana requires that programs serving the needs of 13 or more young children full time on a regular basis must be licensed.

Staff/child ratios and group size comprise the social structures influencing the daycare setting. Low staff/child ratios have long been accepted as an indicator of high program quality (Federal Register, 1980; Roupp et al., 1979). Staff/child ratios and group size were first examined in connection with federally subsidized child care in the form of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR). "Originally established in 1968, the FIDCR were designed to promote development of and prevent harm to children in federally supported care" (Roupp et al., 1979, p. 4). The FIDCR required staff/child ratios of 1:4 for six-week-old to three-year-old children, 1:5 for three-year-olds, and 1:7 for four- and five-year-olds. In addition, group sizes were 15 for three-year-olds and 20
for four- and five-year-olds (Roupp et al., 1979). These ratios were far more stringent than any implemented by states at that time. The FIDCR were never fully implemented and were rescinded by the federal government in 1980 (Federal Register, 1980).

The National Day Care Study (NDCS) was undertaken, in part, to examine and collect statistically valid data on staff/child ratios and group size. Furthermore, the NDCS was designed to "investigate the costs and effects associated with variations of regulatable characteristics of center day care" (Roupp et al., 1979, p. iv).

Specifically, the NDCS investigated staff/child ratios, group size, and caregiver education and training and their impact on program quality. Interestingly, the study found that staff/child ratios had less impact on NDCS measures of quality than group size, yet had a stronger impact on program costs. Nearly all NDCS sites indicated a strong, positive association between group size and better care and developmental outcomes (Roupp et al., 1979). Moreover, caregiver education and training had moderate influence on quality measures. The NDCS was the first national study to offer evidence that regulation of center-based daycare affects the quality of care provided to young children.

McCartney et al. (1982) examined the effects of quality daycare experience on children in nonmaternal care in Bermuda. Quality was highly associated with the overall experience of the program director and lowest rates of caregiver turnover. Staff/child ratios were less influential in social competence
development but higher in language development of young children. Caregiver turnover also had a greater negative impact on children's social development but more positive influence on language development.

Thus, the structural components of the daycare setting — staff/child ratios and caregiver education and experience — have varied influence over the degree of program quality. Other aspects of the Bermuda study impacting program quality fall into the dynamic aspects of daycare and do not directly apply to the scope of this study.

In more recent studies, staff/child ratios have been found to have less effect on the quality of experiences for preschoolers but have a greater effect on the quality of experiences for infants and toddlers (Howes & Rubenstein, 1985). Howes and Rubenstein found that the staff/child ratio predicted the quality of interactions between caregivers and children, especially when the ratio was 1:3. Specifically, "children and adults engaged in more touching and laughing behaviors" (Howes & Rubenstein, 1985, p. 148). Thus, children in smaller groups had higher scores on talk and play scales.

Francis and Self (1982) studied imitative responsiveness of young children in daycare and home settings and found that lower staff/child ratios promoted an increase in initiative behaviors of young children. In addition, low staff/child ratios enhanced peer interactions, particularly among three-year-olds (Field, 1980). Small group size for children ages three to five had the greatest impact on children's experiences (Belsky et al., 1982).
The National Child Care Staffing Study conducted in 1988-89 (Whitebook et al., 1989) reported similar findings in terms of the structural components of staff/child ratios, group size, and caregiver education and training. Conducted in five major cities across the United States, the study, in part, compared structural components of existing programs to those guidelines initially recommended in the FIDCR. Center-based daycare programs meeting FIDCR guidelines had more sensitive, less harsh teachers who provided appropriate care. The result was a nurturing child daycare environment.

**Exosystem**

Exosystem quality, comprised of economic aspects as they relate to staff salary levels, stability and its interaction with salaries, the work environment, and benefits in licensed, center-based daycare, is indicative of the economic realities of the working environments of child care professionals. Low pay, limited benefits, and poor working conditions are reflective of a devalued view of child care practitioners. In essence, daycare staff currently subsidize the true cost of child care by continuing to accept abysmally low wages (Modigliani, 1986; Whitebook et al., 1989; Zinsser, 1986).

The most important predictor of the quality of care children receive among all the adult work environment variables is staff wages (CCEP, 1989). Lower wages are related to higher turnover rates which have a detrimental effect on the experiences and developmental outcomes of children. Oftentimes, benefits and
working conditions supplement salaries, but the child care professional does not receive an adequate supplement to low salaries (Jorde-Bloom, 1988; Kontos & Stremmel, 1988). Modigliani (1988), citing 12 reasons for low wages, stated that "the inequitable wages of women, the devaluation of children in this culture, and the subsequent minimization of the skill involved in working with children" (p. 15) are the main reasons for child care workers' low pay.

Stability is an important component of high quality care for young children because it is directly related to child/teacher interactions. Cummings (1980) defined stability as the length of time a child and caregiver have been together in a daycare setting and asserted that young children demonstrate preferences for stable caregivers. "Caregiver stability is of some importance to child-caregiver relationships; that is, in the ecologically more valid environment of the day-care center, children evidenced a preference for stable caregivers" (Cummings, 1980, p. 36). Whitebook and Granger (1989) predicted that instability, depicted in turnover rates, will continue to plague the daycare practitioner as long as salaries, benefits, and working conditions remain inequitable and non-reflective of education, experience, and training. The National Child Care Staffing Study (CCEP, 1989) found a 41% turnover rate across all participating centers.

In two studies conducted by Pettygrove, Whitebook, and Weir (1984), information was gathered pertaining to compensation received by child care workers. A seven-year span existed between the two studies of different child
care worker populations, yet wages decreased over the time span. In addition, the findings confirmed the disparity between the education/experience of the daycare practitioner and the wages and benefits received.

Several studies (Modigliani, 1988; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1985; Pettygrove et al., 1984; Whitebook et al., 1989; Wilier, 1987) found that daycare practitioners are overwhelmingly female, receive varying salaries depending on work settings, have some postsecondary education, lack the most basic employee benefits such as health insurance coverage, and leave caregiving jobs in large numbers.

Belsky et al. (1982) used an ecological model to examine the effects of daycare on the individual child. Their discussion reported that type of daycare program and variations within type comprised the microsystem. In their analysis of the exosystem, Belsky et al. viewed the adult work environment as that pertaining to the parent. In contrast, the focus of this study is an examination of the adult work environment for the daycare staff.

Thus, issues such as absenteeism, employee productivity, and flexible work hours are examined as they relate to the work environment of parents with children in daycare. These researchers also examined the mesosystem, dealing with communication patterns between parents and daycare staff, and the macrosystem. At the level of the macrosystem, "quality care is dependent on the maintenance of respect for the child rearer" (Belsky et al., 1982, p. 111). While Belsky et al. discussed a lack of respect for parents choosing to remain
at home to rear their children, the low salaries, high turnover rates, and little or no benefits and poor working conditions suggest little respect for staff employed in licensed, center-based daycare programs.

**Auspice**

Auspice was found to be a strong predictor of quality daycare (CCEP, 1989). Auspice is divided into three basic groups for the purpose of this study: (a) private/not-for-profit, (b) private/for-profit, and (c) public/not-for-profit. Auspice denotes program sponsorship with private/not-for-profits usually owned by non-profit corporations. Public/not-for-profit programs are those typically found associated with universities, colleges, or other public entities including Head Start (Kagen & Newton, 1989). Private/for-profit programs are ones that may be represented by chains, franchises, or individuals (Osborne, 1986).

In the past, proprietary centers were found to provide only minimal quality. Generally, only those items mandated by licensing requirements were provided. With respect to staff/child ratios and staff benefits, staff typically did not receive paid breaks and were subject to sudden layoffs when enrollment levels declined (Kagan & Glennon, 1982). Not-for-profit centers generally had better staff/child ratios, and neither form of sponsorship differed relative to group size.

Staff tend to have more experience and higher education/training levels in not-for-profit centers (Whitebook et al., 1989). Not-for-profit centers typically pay higher wages and have lower turnover.
Furthermore, proprietary center owners and managers formed the National Association of Child Care Management, an organization established to lobby against government regulation (Kagan & Glennon, 1982). Finally, for-profit centers participate in surveys designed to obtain data on staff working conditions at a lower rate than not-for-profit centers (Modigliani et al., 1986; Riley & Rogers, 1989; Whitebook et al., 1989).

Conclusion

The microsystem and exosystem provide an ecological framework within which to examine both structural and contextual components of center-based daycare in determining quality. The structural components comprising the microsystem include licensure, staff/child ratios, group size, and caregiver education and training. Licensure provides a minimum standard below which states generally do not allow daycare programs to fall. In Montana, licensed centers are those caring for 13 or more children on a regular basis. Group size has been found to be the most important factor impacting developmental outcomes for young children, with staff/child ratios having less of an impact on quality measures. Caregiver education and training has a moderate impact on program quality and developmental outcomes for children.

Contextual components of the exosystem impacting center-based daycare programs include staff salary levels, stability and its interaction with salaries, the work environment, and staff benefits. Stability is an important component of high
quality care and is influenced by staff wage levels, a predictor of quality of care for young children. High turnover rates negatively impact continuity of care for young children. Even benefits and work environment incentives typically used to supplement low salaries are not sufficient to significantly reduce high turnover rates. In addition, the salaries currently received by daycare practitioners are not reflective of the education, experience, and training held by daycare staff.

Auspice is identified as program sponsorship, i.e., private/for-profit, private/not-for-profit, and public/not-for-profit. Studies indicate that a strong relationship exists between daycare quality and program sponsorship. Private/for-profit programs typically meet only minimum standards in terms of quality measures. Conversely, staff in not-for-profit center-based programs receive higher wages, have higher education/more training, and lower turnover rates.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The descriptive method was chosen as the overall design for this research study. In keeping with the descriptive study design, this study assessed demographic information collected through a survey questionnaire. Given the exploratory nature of the research, formulated research questions rather than hypotheses guided the investigation. Based on the review of literature and the population selected, several research questions were formulated.

Research Questions

(1) What are the demographic characteristics of center staff? What are the ages of the staff? How long have the staff worked in the field? Is their education/training more than the minimum required by state regulation?

(2) What are the structural and contextual characteristics of center-based programs? What is the number of children being served? What is the number of staff employed? What is the number of for-profit businesses? What is the number of not-for-profit enterprises? What are the staff/child ratios and group sizes?

(3) What are the salary levels, benefits provided, and types of working conditions?
(4) What is the overall stability of center staff?

(5) Is there a relationship between: turnover rates and salary levels, auspice and salary, auspice and turnover, auspice and benefits, or auspice and working conditions?

Population

The population for this study was comprised of 145 licensed daycare centers in eight districts within the state of Montana. District configuration for child care licensing is determined by boundaries established by the Montana Department of Family Services. District sizes vary within the state and are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of licensed, center-based daycare programs by district.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts (N=8)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Centers per District (N=145)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Great Falls</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helena/Bozeman</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles City</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to map (Appendix F).
The size of the population (N=145) lends itself to the acquisition of information about the entire population, not just a representative sample. Therefore, the survey attempted to gather data from every member of the population (Gay, 1987).

**Limitations**

The quality dimensions explored in this study were limited to center-based programs. Licensed, center-based daycare programs were selected to serve as the population because mandatory state licensing makes them readily identifiable and ensures a large number of staff from which to compile the demographic characteristics. As a result, even though registered group daycare homes technically have "staff" in that they must have two providers for every seven to twelve children, these programs were not included in this survey. In addition, Montana does not regulate early childhood programs which label themselves "preschools" within the state; therefore, the quality dimensions investigated within the boundaries of this study were not applicable to preschool programs and their staff.

The survey questionnaire was completed by directors, owners, teacher/directors, and others for each center. Thus, responses do not represent information that might have been included had other center staff completed the survey. The survey instrument was designed to document salaries, benefits, working conditions, and stability, but not in an exhaustive manner. A survey of
each individual staff member at each center could be difficult and cumbersome
given the number of people to identify, contact, and follow-up.

Finally, participation was self-selected, and any findings must be reviewed
with that in mind. Participants may have several reasons for being reluctant to
cooperate with a survey of this type. Directors may resent the interruption of
their routine and the time needed to complete the survey. Also, some of the
survey items may be viewed as invasive or threatening to program operation or
the director's managerial skills (Miller, 1986). Lack of prior experience or a
distrust of and lack of knowledge about the research process may cause
reluctance to participate.

Survey Instrument

The Child Care Staff Salary and Working Conditions Survey (CCSSWCS)
was developed by the Child Care Employee Project (CCEP) of Oakland,
California (CCEP, 1989). The purpose of the instrument was to identify key
issues including child care staff salaries, staff benefits, staff working conditions,
and stability, as well as group size and staff/child ratios. In addition, the
instrument lends itself to discovery of auspice and other categorical information
desired by users. (A copy of the survey instrument is presented in Appendix A.)

In the spring of 1989, the CCEP analyzed data collected in three states
(Hawaii, Colorado, and Illinois) as well as data from seven regional/community
surveys using the CCSSWCS. Items included on the survey allow access to
information similar to the National Child Care Staffing Study so that indirect comparisons can be made. Direct comparisons are not possible when sampling techniques vary (CCEP, 1989).

Thirty-eight items relate to stability factors for teachers, assistant teachers, and directors. These stability factors include 13 subscale items on working conditions, 24 subscale items on retention and recruitment of staff, 11 subscale items on benefits, and 18 subscale items on salaries.

Group size factors and staff/child ratio factors are derived from five subscale items. Other items examine demographics of staff including number of staff on payroll, age, gender, ethnicity, and education/experience/training required beyond licensing.

Procedure

All licensed daycare centers in Montana \((N=145)\) were invited to participate in this research. A list of all licensed daycare facilities was obtained from the Montana Department of Family Services (DFS). Licensed facilities were divided into eight DFS districts within the state (see Table 1).

A formal request soliciting participation in the study was included in the survey cover letter (Appendix B). One week after the cover letter and survey were sent, a follow-up postcard reminder was mailed (Appendix C). A final follow-up telephone call was made to urge those who had not yet sent in their surveys to do so (Appendix D). A response rate of 60% was considered
sufficient for descriptive purposes. Several salary surveys conducted on both the national and state levels have reported response rates less than or close to 70% (CCEP, 1989).

Data Reduction and Transformation

The data gathered by the survey were entered and stored on disk utilizing the Database III computer software program. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences—Personal Computer (SPSS-PC), frequency checks were run on the data to detect gross inconsistencies. To ensure accuracy, 10% of the cases were randomly selected for verification of data. A code sheet was developed for use with the SPSS-PC.

Data Analysis

Data collected for this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequency tables and percentages were used to describe the variables. Cross-tabulation analysis using contingency tables investigated sets of relationships between two or more variables (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975).

Chi-square is a statistical process used to summarize the statistical independence of the variables. Used to compare group frequencies, chi-square involves comparing observed outcomes to expected outcomes (Ferguson & Takane, 1989). Expected frequencies were obtained by multiplying appropriate row and column marginal totals and dividing by the total number of observations.
(Hopkins & Glass, 1978). An underlying assumption in the use of this statistic is that variables are measured at the nominal level (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974). Variables under consideration for statistical independence were staff salaries, staff benefits, staff working conditions, stability (assessed through turnover rates), auspice, and district. For purposes of analysis, the variables of salaries and turnover rates were placed in categories. Salary categories included the highest hourly wage any staff member earns and the lowest hourly wage any staff member earns. The highest and lowest hourly wages were then categorized by amount based on the data received. Turnover rates would be determined as high or low in comparison to the NCCSS turnover rates for each staff category. Although the nature of this study was exploratory, the data were tested at the .05 level of significance but reported at a level between .10 and .05.

The continuous nature of the data collected on salaries allowed for assessment of the relative magnitude of variations using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure. The concept underlying the ANOVA procedure is that the total variance of values is attributed to the variance between groups and the variance within groups (Adams & Schvaneveldt, 1985). Thus, the one-way ANOVA was used to compare staff salaries by auspice and district. Statistically significant differences were further investigated using either the Neuman-Keuls or Scheffe Post Hoc comparison tests.
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RESULTS

Several research questions guided the focus of this study. First, demographic profiles were developed on center-based daycare staff. These profiles included age, length of employment in center-based programs, and the level of education/training of staff when compared to state regulation requirements.

Second, structural and contextual characteristics were examined by assessing the total number of children served in each program, the number of staff employed in each program, the determination of program auspice, and the request for information on staff/child ratios and group sizes.

Third, an examination was made of salary levels, staff benefits, and working conditions. Salary levels ranged from highest hourly wage paid to lowest hourly wage paid for each staff category. Benefits provided by the center-based program included sick leave, paid holidays, paid vacations, and an assortment of insurance coverage packages. Working conditions included a variety of items such as paid break time, paid planning time, written job descriptions, written contracts, and yearly cost-of-living increases in wages.

Fourth, stability was investigated through information supplied about the number of staff who had left during the 12 months prior to the study.
Last, the relationship between turnover rates and salaries was explored. In addition, an investigation was completed to determine if a relationship existed between auspice and salaries, auspice and turnover rates, auspice and benefits, or auspice and working conditions.

**Main Analysis**

**Research Questions 1-5**

**Question 1.** What are the demographic characteristics of center staff? What are the ages of the staff? How long have the staff worked in the field? Is their education/training more than the minimum required by state regulation?

The survey data revealed that the majority of teachers are over 30 years of age, while a majority of assistant teachers are under the age of 25 (Table 2). Age categories were established by CCEP (1989) and taken directly from the survey questionnaire. The survey instrument did not ask age questions of teacher/directors or directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>AGE (YEARS)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 25 (N=286)</td>
<td>25-29 (N=100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22 113</td>
<td>16 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. teachers</td>
<td>62 173</td>
<td>11 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categories for length of employment were taken directly from the survey instrument and tabulated for all staff members (Table 3). Half of all teachers
have been employed for two years or longer. Over half of all assistant teachers have been employed for less than one year. In comparison, over half of all teacher/directors and directors have been employed three years or longer.

Table 3. Percentage distribution of staff by length of employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 6 mo (N=149)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. teachers</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td></td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational requirements for staff varied by position. The survey asked if any education, experience, or credential beyond licensing regulations is required for teachers, assistant teachers, teacher/directors, or directors. Categories available for respondents varied among all staff. Categories for teachers were limited to: (a) no; (b) yes, for head teachers only; or (c) yes, for all teachers. Categories for assistant teachers were limited to: (a) no; and (b) yes, for all assistant teachers. Categories for teacher/directors and directors were limited to: (a) no, and (b) yes. (Refer to Table 4.)

Data gathered for education/training were tabulated based on the number of programs responding, not the number of staff. Thus, the total possible number of respondents is 90, representing the total number of programs returning surveys.
Table 4. Percentage distribution of staff by education/training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>EDUCATION/TRAINING REQUIRED BEYOND LICENSING</th>
<th>N*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (head teachers only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. teachers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = the number of programs, not the number of staff.

**Question 2.** What are the structural and contextual characteristics of center-based programs? What is the number of children being served? What is the number of staff employed? What is the number of for-profit businesses? What is the number of not-for-profit enterprises? What are the staff/child ratios and group sizes?

A total of 4,274 children were being served in licensed, center-based daycare programs at the time of the survey. The greatest number of children were between two and one-half and four years of age (Table 5). Age groupings were taken directly from the survey instrument.

Table 5. Frequency distribution of children by age.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INFANTS 6 wks-12 mos (N=30)</th>
<th>TODDLERS 13-30 mos (N=53)</th>
<th>PRESCHOOL 2½-4 yrs (N=81)</th>
<th>KINDERGARTEN 5 yrs (N=77)</th>
<th>5+ yrs (N=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>1058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = the number of programs out of 90 responding.
The programs responding to the survey were comprised of 421 teachers, 277 assistant teachers, 77 teacher/directors, and 89 directors. Although Billings is the second largest district in terms of total number of centers (Table 1), it has the largest number of teachers, teacher/directors, and directors. Missoula has the greatest number of assistant teachers (Table 6).

Table 6. Percentage distribution of staff by district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>#1 (N=276)</th>
<th>#2 (N=46)</th>
<th>#3 (N=6)</th>
<th>#4 (N=123)</th>
<th>#5 (N=123)</th>
<th>#6 (N=20)</th>
<th>#7 (N=80)</th>
<th>#8 (N=190)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=145)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Percentage distribution of staff by auspice group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUSPICE GROUP</th>
<th>Private/Not-for-Profit (N=468)</th>
<th>Private/For-Profit (N=148)</th>
<th>Public/Not-for-Profit (N=223)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=839)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAFF*</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. teachers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Missing staff: teachers = 9, assistant teachers = 8, teacher/directors = 4, directors = 4.

The greatest percentage of center-based staff are employed by private/not-for-profit programs (Table 7). Of the 90 participating programs, 49 were private,
not-for-profit; 19 were private, for-profit; 20 were public, not-for-profit; and 4 did not respond.

Very few programs responded to the survey questions concerning staff/child ratios and group size. Of those responding, staff/child ratios appeared to be within requirements of state regulations. Categories for determining staff/child ratios and group size were developed by CCEP (1989) and differed from Montana's regulations.

**Question 3. What are the salary levels, benefits provided, and types of working conditions?**

Salary levels varied by staff position, with teacher/directors and directors paid at a higher level than teachers and assistant teachers. Figure 1 graphically presents the mean low and high salary per hour received by staff. Salary levels were also examined by district. Figure 2 presents the highest mean salary by district for teachers and assistant teachers.

Because benefits and working conditions were further investigated using multiple discriminant analysis, the results are included in the discussion of research question 5.

**Question 4. What is the overall stability of center staff?**

Stability of center staff was examined by using turnover rates. Rates were established by determining the number of staff who have left within the past 12 months of program operation compared to the number of total staff in the state (Table 8).
Figure 1. Mean low and high salary per hour by staff.
Figure 2. Highest mean salaries by district for teachers and assistant teachers.
Table 8. Percentage distribution of turnover by staff.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>ASSISTANT TEACHERS</th>
<th>TEACHER/DIRECTORS</th>
<th>DIRECTORS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover rates</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Turnover rate for all staff is 31% (269/864).

Question 5. Is there a relationship between: turnover rates and salary levels, auspice and salary, auspice and turnover, auspice and benefits, or auspice and working conditions?

Turnover rates and salary levels were investigated for all staff. Salaries of teachers and assistant teachers in relation to turnover rates were examined separately (Table 9) from salaries of teacher/directors and directors in relation to turnover rates (Table 10). The total turnover rate represents those teachers and assistant teachers leaving in the last 12 months compared to all teachers and assistant teachers in the state. Figure 3 presents the highest mean salaries by auspice group for teachers and assistant teachers.

Table 9. Percentage distribution of teacher and assistant teacher turnover rates by salary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total turnover rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low to $3.99</td>
<td>$4.00-4.99</td>
<td>$5.00-5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Teachers</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Percentage distribution of teacher/director and director turnover rates by salary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total turnover rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low to $3.99</td>
<td>$4.00-4.99</td>
<td>$5.00-5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnover rates of staff by auspice group were inconclusive. They do not reflect any significant findings due to small cell sizes (Table 11). Auspice groups available for selection by respondents may not have been clearly explained in the survey instrument. Data were utilized despite the small cell sizes. Percentages presented in Table 11 are derived from the total number of staff for each auspice group taken from Table 7.

Table 11. Percentage distribution of staff turnover by auspice group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>AUSPICE GROUP</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Not-for-Profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/For-Profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/Not-for-Profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant teachers</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>157%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Highest mean salaries by auspice group for teachers and assistant teachers.
Further Analysis

**Discriminant Analysis**

Discriminant analysis is a statistical method used to examine the differences between two or more groups at the same time (Huck et al., 1974). While typically used to predict group membership (Huck et al., 1974), discriminant analysis in this study was used to describe which variables distinguish among groups (Klecka, 1980). The groups or categories for this analysis are the three types of auspice: (a) private/not-for-profit, (b) private/for-profit, and (c) public/not-for-profit. Rather than examining simple frequency distributions for benefits and working conditions, descriptive discriminant analysis was used to identify which variables for benefits and working conditions could be contributing to a discrimination among the three different auspice categories.

A stepwise selection process identifies and eliminates the weakest variables contributing to the discrimination (Klecka, 1980). The descriptive discriminant functions were evaluated at group means for each auspice. A Wilk's lambda test is used to determine if a difference exists between group means. A small Wilk's lambda and a large corresponding F value indicate a variable is contributing to the discriminating function (Klecka, 1980). For most of the variables for benefits and working conditions, there was no difference among auspice groups.

Standardized discriminant coefficients establish which variables are contributing to the three auspice groups (Klecka, 1980). The SPSS computer
program generates a structure matrix which contains the coefficients indicating the variables which load or highly contribute to the discriminant function (see Tables 12-15). Variables with coefficients .30 or higher are used to name the function.

Function 1 for benefits was labeled "extended benefits." Benefit variables loading on this function were paid maternity/paternity leave and paid sick leave (for teachers only), and life insurance, dental coverage, and pension plan (for teachers and assistant teachers) (Table 12).

Table 12. Structure matrix of extended benefits for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTENDED BENEFITS</th>
<th>CORRELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid maternity/paternity leave (teachers)</td>
<td>.45196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance (teachers)</td>
<td>.39680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.37942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension plan provided (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.35433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick leave provided (teachers)</td>
<td>.34456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental coverage provided (teachers)</td>
<td>.32453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension plan provided (teachers)</td>
<td>.30259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental coverage provided (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.30180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function 2 was labeled "educational stipend." Only one benefit variable loaded on this function: educational stipend for workshops, conferences, and so on. The educational stipend loaded for both teachers and assistant teachers (Table 13).
Table 13. Structure matrix of educational stipend for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL STIPEND</th>
<th>CORRELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for workshops, conferences, etc. (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.44392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for workshops, conferences, etc. (teachers)</td>
<td>.43191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function 1 for working conditions was labeled "personnel policies" and included the working conditions variables of written job descriptions, formal grievance procedures, and written contracts. All loaded for teachers and assistant teachers except written contracts. Written contracts loaded for assistant teachers only (Table 14). The correlation for the written contract variable for teachers was .27045, and therefore below the .3 parameter for accepted loading.

Table 14. Structure matrix of personnel policies for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL POLICIES</th>
<th>CORRELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written job descriptions (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.57172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written job descriptions (teachers)</td>
<td>.53843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal grievance procedures (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.51541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal grievance procedures (teachers)</td>
<td>.51020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written contract (assistant teachers)</td>
<td>.31184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Function 2 was labeled "incentives" and included variables of paid planning time and periodic merit increases in wages. Planning time loaded for teachers
only and merit wage increases loaded for both teachers and assistant teachers (Table 15).

Table 15. Structure matrix of incentives for staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCENTIVES</th>
<th>CORRELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid planning time <em>(teachers)</em></td>
<td>.61908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic merit increases in wages <em>(teachers)</em></td>
<td>.54105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic merit increases in wages <em>(assistant teachers)</em></td>
<td>.49333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the SPSS package computes canonical coefficients which measure the degree of association between the discriminant functions and the groups. A low discriminant function coefficient indicates a greater association between the function and the group (Huck et al., 1974). Public/not-for-profit programs have a high degree of association between maternity/paternity leave, sick leave, life insurance, pension plans, and dental coverage (Table 16). Private/for-profit programs have the lowest degree of association with the extended benefits function.

Table 16. Canonical discriminant functions for extended benefits and educational stipend by auspice group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>AUSPICE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/ Not-for-Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended benefits</td>
<td>.09633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational stipend</td>
<td>-.50433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same order for association exists with the educational stipend benefit. A higher association exists for private/not-for-profit programs, and private/for-profit programs have the lowest association.

The present study attempted to discover if an association between auspice and working conditions existed. Private/not-for-profit programs have a high degree of association with personnel policies, and private/for-profit programs have a low association with the personnel policies function (Table 17). However, private/for-profit programs have the highest association with incentives, and public/not-for-profit programs have the lowest association with the incentives function.

Table 17. Canonical discriminant functions for personnel policies and incentives by auspice group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>AUSPICE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private/Not-for-Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel policies</td>
<td>-.62162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>-.19437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Demographic Information

Other descriptive data collected which are of interest concern staff distributions in the areas of gender, ethnicity, and district. In addition, turnover rates were computed by district, as were the number of programs by district.
The majority of licensed, center-based daycare staff in Montana are female (Table 18) and white/Caucasian (Table 19). The survey did not ask for gender or ethnicity information from teacher/directors or directors.

Table 18. Percentage distribution of staff by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>GENDER (N=706)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (N=670)</td>
<td>Male (N=36)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant teachers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Percentage distribution of staff by ethnicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>ETHNICITY (N=90)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White/ Caucasian</td>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Isl.</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant teachers</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining staff turnover rates by district (Table 20), percentages were determined by comparing rates to total staff in each district. Total staff in each district are presented in Table 6.

Table 21 shows the distribution of programs responding to the survey by district.
Table 20. Percentage distribution of staff turnover by district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF TURNOVER</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant teachers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/directors</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Frequency distribution of programs by district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Findings

The majority of licensed, center-based daycare staff in Montana are white females and work in private/not-for-profit programs. The majority of teachers, teacher/directors, and directors have been employed at their current jobs for two years or more.

The highest salaries are not paid in the largest districts. Public/not-for-profit programs pay higher staff salaries than both private/not-for-profit and private/for-profit programs. This study found that staff earning lower salaries are less stable than staff earning higher salaries.
An association does exist between auspice and benefits and working conditions. Private/for-profit programs have the highest association with incentives for staff. However, private/for-profit programs have the lowest associations with other discriminating variables among benefits and working conditions.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The results of this survey revealed that licensed, center-based daycare programs are staffed predominantly by females over the age of 25 who have been with their current programs for two years or more. Staff tend to have more education/training than required by the state regulating agency and work primarily in private/not-for-profit programs. In addition, not-for-profit programs (which comprise the greatest segment of the study participants) offer the greatest benefits, the best working conditions, and highest salaries compared to for-profit programs.

Findings

Demographics

The results of this survey indicated that the majority of licensed, center-based daycare staff are female, white/Caucasian, and over the age of 25. Assistant teachers are predominantly less than 25 years of age and have been employed less than one year in their current program. The majority of licensed, center-based daycare programs are located in districts with large urban areas. Montana is a geographically remote state and the researcher expected to find most licensed centers to be located in larger urban areas.
Structural Components

Structural components which comprise the microsystem include licensing, staff/child ratios, group size, and staff education/training.

Most licensed, center-based daycare programs in the state serve children two and one-half years of age or older. Older children require fewer staff. Thus, the state-regulated ratio is 1:8 for two- to four-year-olds and 1:10 for four- to six-year-olds (Montana DFS, 1988a). A higher staff/child ratio allows fewer dollars to be spent on staff wages.

Data on staff/child ratios and group sizes proved unusable. Responses were few and not clearly labeled due in part to the survey design. Questions on staff/child ratios and group size were based on data provided earlier in the survey on ages of children served. Age categories did not correspond to those established by the Department of Family Services for regulation of child care in Montana. Montana regulation identifies infants as children under the age of two. However, the survey identifies infants as children under the age of one. The lack of clarity in question structure contributed greatly to the lack of consistency in data provided by respondents.

A greater percentage of assistant teachers and teacher/directors are required to have education, experience, or credentialing beyond state licensing requirements (refer to Table 4). Montana regulations for center-based programs require assistant teachers to be at least 16 years of age, and have "sufficient language skills, good mental and physical health, and one day of on-the-job
orientation" (Montana DFS, 1988a, p. 6). State regulations require directors who also function as teachers to meet the requirements of both staff positions. Clearly, those requirements quoted above for assistant teachers can be described as minimal. Teacher/directors may be required by participating programs to have more education, experience, or credentialing in areas of administration.

**Contextual Components**

Contextual components in the exosystem impacting center-based daycare programs include staff salary levels, stability, the interaction of salaries and stability, working conditions, and benefits. While no data were available concerning how salary levels related to education/training levels, there was no overlap in salaries among staff (refer to Figure 1). Interestingly, clear, distinct lines exist among staff salaries. Apparently even the highest paid assistant teacher does not earn as high an hourly wage as the lowest paid teacher. The same pattern emerged for all other staff. The lowest mean salary for teachers was still higher than the highest mean salary for assistant teachers. In addition, the grand mean salary for teachers was $1.00 higher than the grand mean for assistant teachers (Figure 2).

The three districts paying the highest salaries are not the three largest districts in terms of number of licensed, center-based programs. One explanation for this finding may be that in larger, urban areas such as Billings, Missoula, or Great Falls, more individuals compete for the same jobs, thereby driving down the wage.
Chi-square analysis was a planned analysis of relationships among salaries, benefits, and working conditions. Chi-square analysis did not yield significant results due to low response which produced small cell size. The researcher elected not to run ANOVAs due to low response rates and lack of homogeneity which would produce inaccurate results.

Stability. The overall turnover rate for all center-based staff was 31% (refer to Table 8). This is slightly lower than the national turnover rate of 41% (CCEP, 1989). However, turnover rates varied by staffing position and exceeded 50% for teachers, assistant teachers, and directors earning less than $5.00 per hour (see Table 9). Lowest turnover rates were recorded for directors, but the number of directors responding makes the rate suspect. Not all directors responding to the question on salary information also responded to questions on turnover. Thus, an accurate assessment of turnover rates for directors is not possible.

While turnover rates by auspice were telling, results were inconclusive due to the small cell size for identified auspice groups. Rates were higher in not-for-profit programs than for-profit programs (see Table 11). The turnover rate should be higher for private, not-for-profit groups since there were over twice as many of these programs participating in the survey as private, for-profit programs. While the turnover rates for public, not-for-profit programs appear much higher than private, not-for-profit programs, the former auspice group has a greater number of staff than the latter group.
Other Analysis

Discriminant analysis was used to examine which variables for benefits and working conditions were most contributory to the discrimination among auspice groups. Variables loaded according to function. Benefit functions were labeled "extended benefits" and "educational stipend." Working conditions functions were labeled "personnel policies" and "incentives."

Extended benefits loading to functions included variables of life insurance, dental coverage, pension plans, and maternity/paternity and sick leave. Extended benefits loading for both teachers and assistant teachers included life insurance, dental coverage, and pension plans. One explanation as to why both teachers and assistant teachers may be receiving these benefits is that they are found in a "package" for staff of any business, corporation, or agency. Thus, a program purchasing life insurance benefits for teachers must also include assistant teachers, as all staff are covered in the package life insurance plan. In addition, these benefits were highly associated with public/not-for-profit programs such as colleges or Head Start programs which may have large enough staffing to provide additional benefits to staff (refer to Table 16). Many benefit policies require large numbers of staff in order to receive policy provisions. In addition, larger programs may have greater funding bases to afford better policies or policies with a wider scope of benefits.

Included in the extended benefits function were paid maternity/paternity leave and sick leave provided to teachers only. Maternity/paternity leave would be expected in a field dominated by female workers, and both maternity/paternity
leave and sick leave might not be offered to assistant teachers due to the possible part-time nature of the position or a motive to attract more skilled teachers. The practice of hiring more part-time workers allows programs to establish personnel policies which provide fewer benefits to part-time staff.

The educational stipend loaded slightly higher for assistant teachers than teachers (see Table 13). Program directors might be endeavoring to provide professional development opportunities to less skilled staff, such as assistant teachers, in an effort to upgrade staff quality through attendance at workshops, conferences, etc. This benefit of educational stipend had a high degree of association with private/not-for-profit programs (refer to Table 16).

The personnel policies function for working conditions was comprised of written job descriptions, formal grievance procedures, and written contracts. With the exception of written contracts, which loaded for assistant teachers only, the variables loaded for both teachers and assistant teachers. In each instance, the variable correlations for assistant teachers were higher than those for teachers (see Table 14). Private/not-for-profit programs had the highest association, and thus are more likely to offer their teaching staff written job descriptions, formal grievance procedures, and written contracts. The typical corporate structure of not-for-profit programs may explain the greater likelihood of providing such personnel policies.

Working conditions labeled "incentives" included variables of paid planning time for teachers and periodic merit increases in wages for both teachers and assistant teachers (see Table 15). Assistant teachers generally would not
receive paid planning time since most assistant teachers typically are not responsible for planning daily activities. Neither of the terms "periodic" or "merit" were defined by the survey for respondents. Yearly cost of living increases was a survey variable in addition to periodic merit wage increases. Thus, it is not clear why wage increases occurred or for what reason they were earned by staff. The incentives function loaded for private/for-profit programs (refer to Table 17). The researcher did not expect periodic merit wage increases to be highly associated with for-profit programs. Private/for-profit programs paid the lowest wages among the three auspice groups; therefore, the reason behind the association with merit wage increases remains obscure and may be due to the confusing language of the survey instrument.

Limitations

Only 63% of all licensed, center-based daycare programs in Montana responded to the survey. Because respondents self-selected to participate, the findings may not accurately reflect staff demographics or auspice of all programs in the state.

The timing of data collection may have been problematic for some programs. The survey was conducted during June 1990. The decision to conduct the survey in June was based on the premise that respondents would have fewer program pressures in June as compared to those pressures associated with fall. Fall is often a busy time of new enrollments, new staff, and
parent interviews which might contribute to hectic schedules for respondents. Several programs licensed by the State of Montana do not operate year-round; they were already closed for the summer and thus did not respond. Follow-up telephone calls were initiated to prompt data collection. The calls revealed which programs had already closed and which programs were no longer in operation.

The survey instrument posed some limitations to the success of the results of the investigation. The Child Care Staff Salary and Working Conditions Survey (CCER, 1989) was chosen due to its widespread use in other states to glean information on salaries, benefits, working conditions, turnover rates, and demographic information on licensed, center-based daycare staff. However, the ranges used to identify the number of children served, as well as staff/child ratios and group sizes, failed to correspond with those established by Montana's daycare regulatory agency, the Department of Family Services. Because of the inconsistency of age range criteria, data provided by respondents on staff/child ratios and group sizes were unusable. This factor was a major weakness of the study.

Implications for Further Research

Several opportunities for further research have emerged from this study. A change in design would allow researchers to gather additional information about why staff leave current jobs and what changes in career choice are made. Using a naturalistic design would facilitate a more in-depth look at staffing in
licensed, center-based programs. By utilizing an interviewing technique, an accurate assessment of program auspice would be possible to verify the number of not-for-profit and for-profit programs.

In addition, the dynamic aspects of the daycare environment, including the daily experiences of children, could yield important information about the quality of daycare programs within the state. Observational techniques as well as environmental assessment instruments are available to researchers to gain data on the dynamic aspects of daycare.

**Implications for State Agencies**

Montana daycare regulations were last revised in 1982 and are in need of updating. State requirements for the education, experience, or credentialing of staff are minimal and should be rewritten to reflect staff qualifications based on accurate perceptions of staff responsibilities. Qualifications for directors are less stringent than those for primary caregivers (defined as teachers in the current study) and do not reflect such duties as budgeting, fund raising, or supervision of other staff.

The Department of Family Services needs to play an active role in conducting a comprehensive study of licensed, center-based daycare programs that examines the quality of the environment as well as the quality of the staff caring for young children. It is important that the Department's personnel clearly understand quality issues if they are to accurately review and provide leadership
in the revision of policies including staff/child ratios or group size standards. The Department of Family Services must recognize how changes in either staff/child ratios or group sizes might impact developmental outcomes for children. Results from such research should eventually impact requirements for family and group home daycare programs as well.

Clearly, research abounds to substantiate the impact of quality daycare on children's development. It may be desirable for the State of Montana to go beyond the current regulations which establish only a minimum of quality below which children's basic health and safety should not be compromised. However, a priority at this time might be for the State to designate funds to adequately monitor compliance with current regulations. Personnel selected for monitoring regulations should be educated and trained in early childhood development and have skills necessary to determine program quality.

The Department of Family Services needs to be aware of the economic impact of regulations on salaries, benefits, working conditions, and turnover rates for staff in center-based care. The National Day Care Study (Roupp et al., 1979) found that group size had a less deleterious effect on program costs than staff/child ratios and enhanced quality by increasing interactions between teachers and the children they care for.

In addition, researchers have identified child care quality as a function of specific training in early childhood development, not the number of years of education. The Department of Family Services can enhance program quality by
improving teacher, teacher/director, and director qualifications to reflect the
importance of training in the early childhood development area. By requiring
staff with elementary education degrees or training to comply with a regulation
for training in the early childhood development area, the downward extension of
kindergarten and primary grade academics could be avoided. One way to
provide such training is through funds provided to resource and referral
agencies. These agencies provide technical assistance and training to child care
providers before and after compliance with state regulations.

Finally, the State of Montana needs to set goals and objectives to establish
a comprehensive approach to the daycare delivery system. Paramount to this
approach is the need for a collaborative effort. The Department of Family
Services needs to enlist the services of providers, professional organizations
whose memberships include early childhood professionals, community agencies
involved in direct or indirect services to children, and legislators well-versed in
developmental issues of young children. While compromises will undoubtedly
be needed, every effort must be made to design a comprehensive regulatory
model which has as its foundation the vision of providing what is best for the
growth and development of young children.

Implications for Center-Based
Daycare Programs

There are no easy solutions to the problems facing program directors of
licensed, center-based daycare facilities. While recognizing that stability of
staff and salaries are connected and related to program quality, daycare administrators still face problems of staff recruitment and retention. The quality of a program is related to the quality of its staff. Several suggestions are offered to help identify and prioritize an administrative approach to difficulties of staffing a program.

First, program administrators must clearly understand the pervasiveness of difficulties associated with recruiting and retaining staff. Low salaries in the daycare field may cause qualified staff to seek jobs outside their career choice where salaries are higher. In addition, low salaries, lack of benefits such as sick leave and annual paid vacations, a lack of adequate working conditions such as paid breaks, and yearly cost-of-living increases in wages make retaining qualified staff difficult. Program administrators must educate the parents of the children they serve (the consumers of services) as to the seriousness of the issues. One of the most important strengths of programs such as Head Start is the degree of parent involvement. Keeping parents abreast of issues surrounding rising costs, salary levels, and demographic information on who teaches in early childhood programs can help dispel the myth that "anyone can do child care."

Educating parents is educating potential voters. Informed parents may become allies in the struggle to accurately inform legislators of the issues involved and their impact on young children. All politicians kiss babies. Parents need to realistically perceive the meanings behind such gestures and then require politicians to put funds where their lips are.
Second, as funds are available, program administrators should provide training opportunities for staff. These may range from in-service opportunities to training provided through resource and referral agencies to local, state, and regional workshops and conferences. Various levels of provision can be given, such as reimbursing all or a portion of travel expenses and hiring substitute staff while regular personnel are receiving supplemental training. Regardless of the depth of the provision, some effort should be made to communicate to staff that their professional growth is an important aspect of their employment. Keeping staff apprised of budgeting constraints and educating them about various aspects of funding assures them that they are partners in decision making aspects of the program.

Finally, staying informed on a local, state, and national level about trends and issues relating to the daycare industry is critical to the development of strategies. Administrators and staff need to learn methods for identifying and promoting issues with policy makers, working with the media, approaches for varied audiences to inform and educate, and promoting collaborative efforts with other agencies, programs, and communities involved in meeting the needs of young children. A collaboration model which focuses on coordination of services to young children is mandatory in a time when the health of the daycare industry is in jeopardy. Programs of different auspice must work together, focusing on their similarities rather than their differences.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
WHAT WE'RE ASKING YOU TO DO:

* Please read and follow all directions carefully. Never check more than one answer to a question unless the instructions tell you to check more than one. Although this survey appears long, it takes less than 30 minutes to complete.

* Please do NOT write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. We have given each questionnaire a number to help us keep track of which centers have returned their forms and which need reminders, but all the information you provide will be held in strict confidence, including that describing your own job.

* Please try to answer every question (except those that we ask you to skip). If you're not sure of the answer, give us your best estimate. If you think an answer might be misleading, feel free to add explanatory notes.

* If there are any questions you prefer not to answer, please omit those and answer the rest. Given the importance of this survey to the child care community, we will appreciate your answering most, if not all, of the questions.

* Please fill out the questionnaire and mail it back in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

* Below are definitions of the job titles we have used in the survey. Please read them carefully. Then, if you have any questions about this definition, please call us at the number indicated on our cover letter, and we'll try to clarify what is meant. If this involves a toll call, feel free to call collect. (Be sure to complete those questions which describe your job in addition to those questions about people you supervise.)

What We Mean by Different Job Titles: For the purposes of this survey:

TEACHER refers to persons in charge of a group of children, often with staff supervisory responsibilities; including head or lead teachers.

ASSISTANT TEACHER refers to persons working under the supervision of a teacher who help with care & education of a group of children.

TEACHER-DIRECTOR refers to persons with both teaching and administrative duties.

DIRECTOR refers to persons who have primary responsibility for administration of the program.

We appreciate your cooperation in this important research project.

Copyright 1988

CHILD CARE EMPLOYEE PROJECT
P.O. Box 5603
Berkeley, CA 94705
(415) 653-9889
THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT TEACHERS. REMEMBER BY TEACHERS
WE MEAN A PERSON IN CHARGE OF A GROUP OF CHILDREN, OFTEN WITH STAFF
SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES.

1. How many teachers are on your payroll?

_______ TEACHERS [ ] NONE ---► PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 12 5-8

2. We are interested in the length of time different teachers have
been working in your program. For each space below, indicate the
number of teachers who have been employed for that time period.

____ less than six months 9-11

____ at least six months but less than a year 12-14

____ at least 1 year but less than 2 years 15-17

____ at least 2 years but less than 3 years 18-20

____ at least 3 years but less than 5 years 21-23

____ more than 5 years 24-26

3. How many teachers, if any, have left your program in the last 12
months?

_______ TEACHERS [ ] NONE ---► PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 6 27-29

4. Of those who have left in the last 12 months, how many fall into
each of the following categories? IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".

____ fired or dismissed for inadequate performance 30-32

____ laid off because of low enrollment 33-35

____ laid off for reason other than low enrollment 36-38

____ voluntary (employee terminated of own accord)
(If none left voluntarily, SKIP TO QUESTION 6) 39-41
5. There are many reasons teachers have for leaving child care programs voluntarily. For each reason listed below, please indicate whether or not it was a reason for teacher(s) leaving your program in the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A major reason</th>
<th>A minor reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Accepted a job in another early childhood education program</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accepted a job in an elementary school</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accepted a job unrelated to early childhood services</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dissatisfied with the pay</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dissatisfied with the benefits</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Dissatisfied with program policies and procedures</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dissatisfied with the working conditions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Job too stressful</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Conflict with coworkers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ill health</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Maternity/paternity leave</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Family move</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Problems with own family's child care arrangements (e.g. too costly, transportation, etc.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other personal reasons</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Return to school in early childhood education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Return to school in elementary education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Return to school in field unrelated to early childhood</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments: ______________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
6. Thinking about the last time you tried to fill a teacher vacancy, how long was it from the time the teacher left and a replacement was hired?

CHECK ONE ANSWER:

[ ] ... less than a week

[ ] ... 1 or 2 weeks

[ ] ... 3 or 4 weeks

[ ] ... more than a month

7. Do you require any education, experience or credential beyond what is required by licensing regulations for your teachers?

[ ] No —► PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 9

[ ] Yes for head teachers only

[ ] Yes for all teachers

8. If yes, what do you require?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

9. Indicate the **number** of teachers in your program who are:
   *IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".*

   _____ male

   _____ female
10. Indicate the number of teachers in your program who are:
   IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".
   
   ______ Black 65-67
   ______ White/Caucasian 68-70
   ______ Asian/Pacific Islander 71-73
   ______ Hispanic 74-76
   ______ American Indian/Alaskan Indian 77-79
   ______ Other

11. Indicate the number of teachers in your program who are:
   IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".
   
   ______ under 20 years of age 2-4
   ______ between 20-24 years old 5-7
   ______ between 25-29 years old 8-10
   ______ between 30-39 years old 11-13
   ______ between 40-49 years old 14-16
   ______ over 50 years old 17-19

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT ASSISTANT TEACHERS. REMEMBER BY ASSISTANT TEACHERS WE MEAN A PERSON WORKING UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A TEACHER.

12. How many assistant teachers are on your payroll?
   
   ______ ASSISTANT TEACHERS  [ ] NONE ——> SKIP TO QUESTION 23 20-22
13. We are interested in the length of time different assistant teachers have been working in your program. For each space below, indicate the number of assistant teachers who have been employed for that time period. If none in a category, write "0".

____ less than six months 23-25
____ at least six months but less than a year 26-28
____ at least 1 year but less than 2 years 29-31
____ at least 2 years but less than 3 years 32-34
____ at least 3 years but less than 5 years 35-37
____ more than 5 years 38-40

14. How many assistant teachers, if any, have left your program in the last 12 months?

______ assistant teachers [ ] none ----> skip to question 17 41-43

15. Of those who have left in the last 12 months, how many fall into each of the following categories? If none in a category, write "0".

____ fired or dismissed for inadequate performance 44-46
____ laid off because of low enrollment 47-49
____ laid off for reason other than low enrollment 50-52
____ voluntary (employee terminated of own accord)
   [If none left voluntarily, skip to question 17] 53-55

(GO TO NEXT PAGE ----> )
16. There are many reasons assistant teachers have for leaving child care programs voluntarily. For each reason listed below, please indicate whether or not it was a reason for assistant teacher(s) leaving your program in the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A major reason</th>
<th>A minor reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Accepted a job in another early childhood education program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accepted a job in an elementary school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accepted a job unrelated to early childhood services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dissatisfied with the pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dissatisfied with the benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Dissatisfied with program policies and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dissatisfied with the working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Job too stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Conflict with coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ill health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Maternity/paternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Family move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Problems with own family's child care arrangements (e.g. too costly, transportation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other personal reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Return to school in early childhood education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Return to school in elementary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Return to school in field unrelated to early childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
17. Thinking about the last time you tried to fill an assistant teacher vacancy, how long was it from the time the teacher left and a replacement was hired?

CHECK ONE ANSWER.

[ ] ... less than a week

[ ] ... 1 or 2 weeks

[ ] ... 3 or 4 weeks

[ ] ... more than a month

18. Do you require any education, experience or credential beyond what is required by licensing regulations for your assistant teachers?

[ ] No ---> PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 20

[ ] Yes for all assistant teachers

19. If yes, what do you require?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

20. Indicate the **number** of assistant teachers in your program who are: **IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".**

    _____ male

    _____ female
21. Indicate the number of assistant teachers in your program who are: IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".

   _____ Black  2-4
   _____ White/Caucasian  5-7
   _____ Asian/Pacific Islander  8-10
   _____ Hispanic  11-13
   _____ American Indican/Alaskan Indian  14-16
   _____ Other

22. Indicate the number of assistant teachers in your program who are: IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".

   _____ under 20 years of age  17-19
   _____ between 20-24 years old  20-22
   _____ between 25-29 years old  23-25
   _____ between 30-39 years old  26-28
   _____ between 40-49 years old  29-31
   _____ over 50 years old  32-34

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT TEACHER-DIRECTORS. REMEMBER BY TEACHER-DIRECTORS WE MEAN A PERSON WITH BOTH TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES.

23. How many teacher-directors are on your payroll?

   _____ TEACHER-DIRECTORS  [ ] NONE  ---> PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 31
24. We are interested in the length of time different teacher-directors have been working in your program. For each space below, indicate the number of teacher-directors who have been employed for that time period. *IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".*

- [ ] less than six months: 38-40
- [ ] at least six months but less than a year: 41-43
- [ ] at least 1 year but less than 2 years: 44-46
- [ ] at least 2 years but less than 3 years: 47-49
- [ ] at least 3 years but less than 5 years: 50-52
- [ ] more than 5 years: 53-55

25. How many teacher-directors, if any, have left your program in the last 12 months?

- [ ] TEACHERS-DIRECTORS [ ] NONE -->>> SKIP TO QUESTION 28: 56-58

26. Of those who have left in the last 12 months, how many fall into each of the following categories? *IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".*

- [ ] fired or dismissed for inadequate performance: 59-61
- [ ] laid off because of low enrollment: 62-64
- [ ] laid off for reason other than low enrollment: 65-67
- [ ] voluntary (employee terminated of own accord)
  *(If none left voluntarily, SKIP TO QUESTION 28)*: 68-70
27. There are many reasons teacher-directors have for leaving child care programs voluntarily. For each reason listed below, please indicate whether or not it was a reason for teacher-director(s) leaving your program in the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A major reason</th>
<th>A minor reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Accepted a job in another early childhood education program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accepted a job in an elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accepted a job unrelated to early childhood services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dissatisfied with the pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dissatisfied with the benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Dissatisfied with program policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dissatisfied with the working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Job too stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Conflict with coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ill health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Maternity/paternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Family move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Problems with own family's child care arrangements (e.g. too costly, transportation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other personal reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Return to school in early childhood education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Return to school in elementary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Return to school in field unrelated to early childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments: ____________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
28. Thinking about the last time you tried to fill a teacher-director vacancy, how long was it from the time the teacher-director left and a replacement was hired?

CHECK ONE ANSWER.

[ ] ... less than a week

[ ] ... 1 or 2 weeks

[ ] ... 3 or 4 weeks

[ ] ... more than a month

29. Do you require any education, experience or credential beyond what is required by licensing regulations for your teacher-directors?

[ ] No — PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 31

[ ] Yes

30. If yes, what do you require?

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

31. How many directors are on your payroll?

_____ DIRECTORS [ ] NONE — PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 39
32. We are interested in the length of time different directors have been working in your program. For each space below, indicate the number of directors who have been employed for that time period. **IF NONE IN A CATEGORY, WRITE "0".**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than six months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least six months but less than a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 1 year but less than 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 2 years but less than 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 3 years but less than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. How many directors, if any, have left your program in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTORS</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Of those who have left in the last 12 months, how many fall into each of the following categories?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fired or dismissed for inadequate performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laid off because of low enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laid off for reason other than low enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary (employee terminated of own accord)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. There are many reasons directors have for leaving child care programs voluntarily. For each reason listed below, please indicate whether or not it was a reason for director(s) leaving your program in the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>A major reason</th>
<th>A minor reason</th>
<th>Not a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Accepted a job in another early childhood education program .......</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accepted a job in an elementary school.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Accepted a job unrelated to early childhood services. .............</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dissatisfied with the pay. ...........................................</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Dissatisfied with the benefits. .....................................</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Dissatisfied with program policies and procedures. ................</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dissatisfied with the working conditions</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Job too stressful</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Conflict with coworkers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ill health.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Maternity/paternity leave</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Family move</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Problems with own family's child care arrangements (e.g. too costly, transportation, etc.)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other personal reasons.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Return to school in early childhood education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Return to school in elementary education</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Return to school in field unrelated to early childhood</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ] 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments: ____________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________
36. Thinking about the last time you tried to fill a director vacancy, how long was it from the time the director left and a replacement was hired?

CHECK ONE ANSWER.

[ ] . . . less than a week

[ ] . . . 1 or 2 weeks

[ ] . . . 3 or 4 weeks

[ ] . . . more than a month

37. Do you require any education, experience or credential beyond what is required by licensing regulations for your directors?

[ ] No ——— PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 39

[ ] Yes

38. If yes, what do you require?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(GO TO NEXT PAGE ———)

39. **Working Conditions**

Below is a list of working conditions that are sometimes provided to teaching staff. For each one, please indicate in the first column whether or not you offer it to teachers at your center. In the second column, please indicate whether or not you offer it to assistant teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provided for Teachers</th>
<th>Provided for Assistant Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Paid breaks ......... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Paid lunch. .......... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Paid preparation/planning time. [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Payment for attendance at staff meetings. .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Payment for attendance at on-site inservice training. .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Paid release time for off-site training, workshops, etc. .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Written job description .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Formal grievance procedure. .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Written contract. ....... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Written salary schedule .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Yearly cost of living increase in wages. ....... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Periodic merit increases in wages [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Compensation (either financial or time off) for overtime .... [ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40. **Benefits**

Below is a list of benefits that are sometimes provided to teaching staff. For each one please indicate in the first column whether or not you offer it to teachers at your center. In the second column, please indicate whether or not you offer it to assistant teachers.

We understand that many centers offer increased benefits for length of employment. If that is the case, please provide an estimate of the average benefit you offer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Provided for Teachers</th>
<th>Provided for Assistant Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reduced child care fee for parent employees.</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Educational stipend to cover workshops, conferences, etc.</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Paid maternity/paternity leave.</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Unpaid job protected maternity/paternity leave.</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sick leave.</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Paid holidays</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How many days do you offer? days per year.                             | 34-35                 |

| G. Annual paid vacations                                               | [ ] yes [ ] no        | [ ] yes [ ] no                  |

<p>| How many days do you offer? days per year.                             | 36-37                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits (cont.)</th>
<th>Provided for Teachers</th>
<th>Provided for Assistant Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Health coverage</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available but unpaid</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee and dependents</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Dental coverage</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available but unpaid</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee and dependents</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Life insurance</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available but unpaid</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee and dependents</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Pension Plan</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available but unpaid</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee and dependents</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially paid for employee only</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
<td>[ ] yes [ ] no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments on benefits: ____________________________
Salaries (To estimate an hourly wage, divide gross earnings for each pay period by the number of hours worked during that time)

41. Do all teachers receive the same starting salary regardless of qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the starting hourly wage for all teachers? $_______ per hour

Range for teachers? $_______ to $_______ per hour

3-7

42. Do all assistant teachers receive the same starting salary regardless of qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the starting hourly wage for all assistant teachers? $_______ per hour

Range for assistant teachers? $_______ to $_______ per hour

14-18

43. Do all teacher-directors receive the same starting salary regardless of qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
<td>![Diagram](attachment:teacher_salaries amativeness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the starting hourly wage for all teacher-directors? $_______ per hour

Range for teacher-directors? $_______ to $_______ per hour

25-29
44. Do all directors receive the same starting salary regardless of qualifications?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

What is the starting hourly wage for directors?
$______ per hour

What is the starting hourly range for directors?
$______ to ______ per hour

Please answer questions 45 & 46 even if the highest and lowest wages are the same.

45. What **hourly wage** does the **highest** paid person in each category currently earn?

A. Teacher . . . . . . $_______ per hour  
B. Assistant Teacher . . $_______ per hour  
C. Teacher-Director. . . $_______ per hour  
D. Director. . . . . . . $_______ per hour

46. What **hourly wage** does the **lowest** paid person in each category currently earn?

A. Teacher . . . . . . $_______ per hour  
B. Assistant Teacher . . $_______ per hour  
C. Teacher-Director. . . $_______ per hour  
D. Director. . . . . . . $_______ per hour
47. How severe are the following problems in your center?

CHECK ONE BOX FOR EACH PROBLEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>This is a major problem</th>
<th>This is a problem but not major</th>
<th>This is a minor problem</th>
<th>This is not a problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Retaining staff</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Finding substitutes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Filling teaching vacancies</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Finding trained staff</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Securing training resources</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Thinking about the last time you tried to fill a vacancy, how did you feel the qualifications of the replacement compared to those of the staff you hired one to two years ago?

PLEASE CHECK ONE ANSWER FOR EACH CATEGORY OF STAFF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Much more qualified</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Somewhat less qualified</th>
<th>Much less qualified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Teacher</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Assistant Teacher/Aide</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Teacher-Director</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Director</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. Do teachers in your center work under a collective bargaining agreement? CHECK ONE.
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

50. Do assistant teachers in your center work under a collective bargaining agreement? CHECK ONE.
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

51. Does your center participate in the Center Accreditation Project of the National Association for the Education of Young Children?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

Are you accredited by NAEYC in addition to your state licensing?
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

52. How many children does your center currently serve in each of the following age groups? WRITE "0" IF NO CHILDREN OF A PARTICULAR AGE GROUP ARE SERVED.

A. _______ Infants 6 weeks to 12 months
B. _______ Toddlers 13 to 30 months
C. _______ Preschoolers/2 1/2 - 4 year olds
D. _______ Kindergarteners/5 year olds
E. _______ School Age/over 5 years old

53. What is the average weekly full time parent fee (or equivalent cost if subsidized) for each of the following age groups. WRITE "0" IF NO CHILDREN OF A PARTICULAR AGE GROUP ARE SERVED.

A. _______ per week for Infants 6 weeks to 12 months
B. _______ per week for Young Toddlers 12 to 30 months
C. _______ per week for Preschoolers/2 1/2 - 4 year olds
D. _______ per week for Kindergarteners/5 year olds
E. _______ per week for School Age/over 5 year olds
54. Are your staff/child ratios more stringent (more adults per children) than required by state standards?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

What are the ratios for each group served?  
A 18-20  B 21-23  C 24-26  D 27-29  E 30-32

55. Do you have a smaller number of children per group than required by state standards?

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

What is the group size for each age of children served?  
A 34-35  B 36-37  C 38-39  D 40-41  E 42-43

56. Which of the following best describes your program?  CHECK ONE.

[ ] A. Private, not-for-profit  
[ ] B. Private, for profit business  
[ ] C. Public, not-for-profit

57. Position of person filling out survey:

___ Owner  
___ Director  
___ Owner/Director  
___ Teacher/Director  
___ Other, please specify: ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT
APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER
15 June 1990

Dear Center Director:

I am writing to request your participation in a salary and benefit survey to obtain comprehensive, up-to-date information on child care workers in center-based care in the state of Montana. This information is critical at this time because of the upcoming legislative session in January of 1991. It is our intention to convey survey findings to Montana legislators during the upcoming session. This survey has been endorsed by the Montana Child Care Association and the Montana Association for the Education of Young Children working in cooperation with the Montana State University Early Childhood Project.

All centers licensed as of May 1, 1990 in Montana are invited to participate in the survey and your response is extremely important. My goal is to have 100% of the centers respond. Please be assured that your program's name will not be used; all information you provide will be kept confidential. I ask you not to place your program's name or address on the survey form itself or on the return envelope.

If you are willing to participate in this survey, I ask that you complete the enclosed survey and return them to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. Completion of the survey will only take you about 15 minutes. Please return your survey by July 1, 1990.

The results of this survey will be made available to all participants expressing an interest.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this survey. If you have any questions about how to complete the survey, call me at 994-3241. I will return your call if I am not available.

Sincerely,

Carrie R. Leu
Graduate Student, Early Childhood Project
APPENDIX C

REMINDER POSTCARD
Dear Center Director:

Last week you should have received a survey questionnaire about child care staff salaries and benefits as part of our statewide survey.

If you have already completed and returned the survey, I sincerely thank you. If not, please take the time to do so today. Your response will help guarantee the accuracy of the survey which will be helpful in presenting to the Montana Legislature a request for increased funding for child care programs.

If you did not receive the survey or it has been misplaced, please call me today at 994-3241, and I will mail you another. Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Carrie R. Leu, Graduate Student
Early Childhood Project
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE CALL SCRIPT
FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE CALL SCRIPT

July 5, 1990

Good morning (afternoon). My name is Carrie Leu. I am calling from the Early Childhood Project at Montana State University. May I speak with the program director, please?

(Repeat if director doesn’t answer.)

My name is Carrie Leu, and I recently sent you a survey questionnaire about child care salaries and benefits. Did you receive such a survey in the mail?

(YES.) Good. I am calling to find out if you have completed the survey and returned it.

(YES.) Great! Thank you so much for participating in our survey.

*****

My name is Carrie Leu, and I recently sent you a survey questionnaire about child care salaries and benefits. Did you receive such a survey in the mail?

(NO.) I would like to mail you another copy. Is your correct address ______? I will get this survey in the mail to you today. Thank you for your willingness to participate.

(YES.) Good. I am calling to find out if you have completed the survey and returned it.

(NO.) I would like to urge you to complete the form and mail it to me. It is important to hear from as many programs as possible. The survey results are expected to have a major impact on legislative budget decisions. Thank you for your time and participation.
APPENDIX E

PERMISSION LETTER FOR USE OF SURVEY
June 5, 1990

Carrie Leu  
Early Childhood Program  
Herrick Hall  
Montana State University  
Bozeman, MT 59717

Dear Carrie:

As we have discussed, I am granting you formal permission to use the Child Care Employee Project *Child Care Staff Wages and Working Conditions Survey* for your research endeavor.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of your final report.

Sincerely,

Marcy Whitebook  
Executive Director

MW/ml
APPENDIX F

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES

DISTRICT MAP
Figure 4. Montana Department of Family Services district map.