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Introduction

- Researcher’s personal experience

- Staff turnover almost tripled from 15% in 1977 to 41% in 1988 (Whitebook, et al., 2014); 82% childcare staff employed in 1994 and 76% employed in 1996, exited in 2000 (Cassidy et al., 2011)

- Advantages of quality care – (Abu Taleb, 2013). High-quality childcare is related to children’s positive developmental outcomes (Wilcox-Herzog, McLaren, Ward, & Wong, 2013); high quality childcare contributes to children’s cognitive, social, and emotional development (Todd & Deery-Schmitt, 1996);

- Worthy Work Still Unlivable Wages (Howes, Philips, and Whitebook, 2014)
Problem Statement

- Childcare staff earnings have been found to be at the bottom of the wage measure in spite of early childhood teachers having higher than average level of education (Whitebook, 1999; Howes, Philips, & Whitebook, 2014).

- The low wages have been linked to childcare staff turnover (Manlove & Guzell, 1997; Howes, Philips, and Whitebook, 2014, Cooney & Bittner, 2001; & Fuller & Strath, 2001).

- Childcare stability was an important factor for young children to build relationships with their caregivers and peers (Morrissey, 2009).

- Low wages may impact childcare staff job satisfaction, program quality, and job commitment.
The purpose of this research was to study early childcare staff in order to determine if individual wages were related to job satisfaction, program quality, and job commitment.
Research Question #1

- What is the relationship between the individual wages for early childcare staff and job satisfaction?
Research Question #2

- What is the relationship between the individual wages and program quality?
Research Question #3

What is the relationship between the individual wages and childcare staff commitment to the job?
Research Question #4

What is the relationship between the individual wages for teachers, directors, and support staff and their job commitment?
Literature Review

- Attachment (Bowlby’s attachment theory, 1973; Ainsworth, 1989)
- Increased Childcare Demand (Belsky, 2006)
- Childcare & Prof. Development (NICHD ECCRN, 2002; Pianta et al., 2005; Mims et al., 2008; Prentice, 2007; Degotardi, 2010)
- Benefits of Quality Childcare (Collins, 2012)
- Job Satisfaction (Bloom, 2010; Smith & Sheild, 2013)
- Job Commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Brewer & Lok, 1990)
- Childcare Staff Wages (Boyd, 2013; Whitebook et al., 2014)
- Childcare Staff Turnover (Cassidy et al., 2011)
Methodology

- Non-experimental - Quantitative design / Survey
- 25 DCFS licensed centers
- Midwestern city in Illinois
- Convenience sample
  - 135 surveys completed from 12 Centers
    - Teachers 76
    - Directors 23
    - Support staff 25
Data Collection

- Early Childhood Job Satisfaction Survey (ECJSS) (Bloom, 2010) that had statistical reliability and validity

- Response format: checklists and rating scales
  - Job Satisfaction & Job Commitment

- Researcher made, Supplemental Information Sheet (SIS) - for demographics, individual wage, and program quality with a total of 10 items
  - Individual wage and Program Quality
Findings for RQ #1

- What is the relationship between the individual wages for childcare staff and job satisfaction?
- Pearson product-moment correlation
- Non-significant correlation ($r = .088$, $p = .312$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.392**</td>
<td>1.00</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>3</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1.00</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>4</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.561**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.236**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.627**</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.188**</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.210**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.272**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>30.69</td>
<td>197.81</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**$p \leq 0.01$, *$p \leq 0.05$
Findings for RQ #2

- What is the relationship between the individual wages and program quality?
  - t-test for independent
  - Non-significant (M=1.9, SD = 1.2, t (103) = 1.567, p = .120).

76% NAEYC accredited programs, although, nationwide only 10% are accredited.
Findings for RQ #3

- What is the relationship between the individual wages and staff commitment to the job?

- Pearson product-moment correlation

- Non-significant correlation (r = .131, p = .141)

### Job Commitment Facets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Commitment</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Possible range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the Center</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the Profession</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>4-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Commitment</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>7-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores for Job Commitment
n = 135
Findings for RQ #4

- What is the relationship between the individual wages for teachers, directors, and support staff and their job commitment?

- ANOVA Non-significant ($F(2, 117) = 1.881, p = .157$)
Research Conclusions

- The relationship between individual wages and job satisfaction, program quality, and job commitment was statistically non significant.

- The program sample appeared skewed with 76% quality accredited programs and 24% not accredited programs, although, 10% programs are NAEYC accredited nation wide

- Job satisfaction and job commitment was statistically significant ($r = .389, p < .01$)

- Pay and promotion opportunities and commitment to the center was significant ($r = .274, p < .01$)
Implications

- Practitioners and key stakeholders continue to bring the childcare staff low wage issue to the front (Machado, 2008; Boyd, 2013; Fuller & Strath, 2001; Whitebook, 1999; Lifton, 2001; Manlove & Guzell, 1997)

- Use of public funds due to endemic poverty (Whitebook, et al., 2014)

- High service ethics (Bullough et al., 2012) demonstrated by childcare staff impact positively in young children’s development (NICD ECCRN, 2002; Pianta et al., 2005).

- Impacts children, staff, centers, communities, and society at large. To stay ahead as a number one country in the world
Limitations & Recommendations

- Follow-up with a focus group
- Repeat the study using qualitative component
- Online survey survey monkey
- Use random sampling
- Not NAEYC accredited program
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