

Childcare Students and N Nursery Workers

Follow Up surveys and In-depth Interviews

Claire Cameron, Ann Mooney, Charlie Owen and Peter Moss

Thomas Coram Research Unit
Institute of Education, University of London

Childcare Students and Nursery Workers

Follow Up surveys and In-depth Interviews

Claire Cameron, Ann Mooney, Charlie Owen and Peter Moss

Thomas Coram Research Unit
Institute of Education, University of London

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department for Education and Skills.

© Queen's Printer 2001. Published with the permission of DfES on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Crown Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.
ISBN 1 84185 654 1
December 2001

Contents

Contents	1
Tables	6
Executive Summary	9
Acknowledgements	14
Chapter One - Introduction	15
1.1 Introduction	15
1.2 Structure of the report	15
1.2.1 Background	16
1.2.2 Methods	17
1.3 Main themes from Part One	18
1.3.1 Description of the workforce	18
1.3.2 Commitment to the work - job satisfaction and enjoyment	19
1.3.3 Low pay	19
1.3.4 Low value	20
1.3.5 Retention	21
1.3.6 Careers and work-life balance	21
1.3.7 Ethnicity and variation in perspective and experience	22
1.3.8 Dependence on a declining group?	23
Chapter Two - Following up former childcare students	25
2.1 Introduction	25
Portrait One, Currently working in childcare	25
Portrait Two, Had worked in at least one childcare job since leaving college	26
Portrait Three: Not worked in childcare at all since leaving college	26
2.2 Features of former childcare students	27
2.3 Key characteristics of the former childcare students	27
2.3.1 Gender and age	27
2.3.2 Ethnicity	28
2.3.3 Household composition of former students	28
2.4 Approaches to Childcare work	30
2.4.1 Enjoyment and commitment	30
2.5 Summary	33
Chapter Three - Employment paths after college	35
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 Overall picture of employment	35
3.3 Employment Group 1 - Current childcare job	36
3.3.1 Jobs on leaving college	36
3.3.2 Non childcare jobs	38
3.3.3 Types of childcare work	38
3.3.4 Hours of work	40
3.3.5 Future plans	40
3.3.6 Employment paths - the in-depth interviews	40
3.4 Employment Group 2 – Past childcare job	40
3.4.1 Continuing commitment to childcare work	40
3.4.2 Number of jobs	41
3.4.3 Periods out of work	41
3.4.4. Employment paths - the in-depth interviews	42

3.4.5 Reasons for leaving jobs	43
3.5 Employment Group 3 – Not worked in childcare	44
3.5.1 What those not working are doing	44
3.5.2 Reasons for not working in childcare	44
3.5.3 Aspirations in childcare work	45
3.6 Comparisons with other groups	46
3.7 Summary	46
Chapter Four - Emergent issues in recruitment and retention	49
4.1 Introduction	49
4.2 Recruitment methods	49
4.3 Difficulties finding employment	50
4.4 Relations between childcare employers and employees	51
4.5 Relationship between employment and parenting responsibilities	52
4.6 Family life, prospective and actual	53
4.6.1 Time away from employment	53
4.6.2 Perspectives on combining motherhood and employment	54
4.6.3 Sources of help in combining employment and motherhood	55
4.7 Perspectives on further education in childcare	56
4.8 The course as preparation for work	57
4.8.1 Quality of placements	58
4.8.2 Organisation of the course	58
4.8.3 Tutors, support and suitability of courses	58
4.8.4 How useful is the qualification?	59
4.9 Studying in the future	60
4.10 Future prospects in childcare work	61
4.11 Frustrations in childcare work: what drives people out?	63
4.11.1 Pay and conditions	63
4.11.2 Staff and organisational matters	66
4.11.3 Parents and children	67
4.11.4 What makes people leave?	67
4.12 Suggestions from former childcare students	68
4.13 Summary	69
Chapter Five - Following up nursery workers' employment patterns	73
5.1 Introduction	73
5.2 Staff turnover	73
5.3 Entering and leaving the childcare workforce	74
Group 1 - Entered, left and re-entered	74
Group 2 - Continuous childcare employment	75
Group 3 - Entered by chance	75
Group 4 - Temporary position	75
5.4 Employment after leaving the nursery and future employment intentions	76
5.5 How current employment compares with previous nursery employment	77
5.5.1 Reasons for leaving the nursery	79
5.6 Summary	83
Chapter Six - Understanding Retention in Childcare	85
6.1 Introduction	85
6.2 Reasons for remaining in childcare employment	85
6.2.1 Close relationships with children	85
6.2.2 Job satisfaction	85

6.3 Commitment to childcare work	87
6.4 Expectations of childcare work.....	88
6.5 Distinguishing between those who remain in childcare employment and those who leave.....	89
6.6 Nursery workers who move within the childcare and early years sector .	91
6.7 Nursery workers who leave the childcare and early years sector	91
6.8 Summary	92
Chapter Seven - Wider issues in recruitment and retention.....	95
7.1 Introduction.....	95
7.2 Motherhood, employment and childcare	95
7.3 Sources of help for parents combining work with childcare	97
7.4 The importance of qualifications and training.....	97
7.4.1 Perspectives on future training and/or education in childcare	98
7.4.2 Improvements in training.....	99
7.5 Suggestions for recruitment and retention	100
7.5.1 Higher salaries	100
7.5.2 A better career structure.....	100
7.5.3 Better nursery management and organisation.....	101
7.5.4 Raising the status of the work.....	101
7.5.5 Childcare refresher courses.....	101
7.6 Summary	101
Chapter Eight - Conclusions	103
8.1 Key messages from the research.....	103
8.1.1 A fluid workforce.....	103
8.1.2 Pay and status.....	103
8.1.3 Nursery workers' own care responsibilities.....	104
8.1.4 Management.....	105
8.1.5 Nannies	105
8.2 Conceptualising the issue.....	105
8.3 Policy issues.....	106
8.4 Conclusion	108
References.....	109
Appendix One - Research design.....	111
Student follow-up survey	111
Sample selection	111
Response rates.....	111
Comparison of participants and non-participants at follow-up	112
Former student in-depth interviews	115
Sample selection	115
Staff follow-up survey	116
Contacting nurseries	116
Contacting ex-staff.....	117
Staff in-depth interviews.....	118
Appendix Two - Membership of Groups.....	119
Appendix Three- Research Instruments	121
Topic guide used with former childcare students	121
Topic guide used with follow up study of day nursery workers:.....	122
Interview Schedules.....	123
Nursery Screener Interview	125
Nursery Ex-Staff Follow-Up Interview	158

Ex-Childcare Student Follow-Up Interview	182
--	-----

Tables

Table 2.1 Age of former students by employment group	28
Table 2.2 Minority ethnic status by employment group	28
Table 2.3 Household arrangement by employment group	29
Table 2.4 Number and age of children of former students	29
Table 2.5 Children by employment group	29
Table 2.6 Age of youngest child by employment group	30
Table 2.7 Consider childcare work a temporary or short term job or a longer term career	31
Table 2.8 Whether feel settled in current childcare or early education job	31
Table 2.9 Reasons for feeling settled in current job	31
Table 2.10 How childcare work compares with expectations	32
Table 2.11 Childcare work better and worse than expected	32
Table 2.12 Former childcare students who would recommend childcare work to a friend	33
Table 2.13 Reasons for recommending and not recommending childcare work	33
Table 3.1 Paid work and childcare work	35
Table 3.2 Number of paid jobs held since leaving college by employment group	36
Table 3.3 Job title of first childcare or early education job on leaving college for those with a current childcare job	37
Table 3.4 Types of employer/employment in first childcare or early education job after leaving college for those with a current childcare job	37
Table 3.5 Settings for second jobs after leaving college for those with a current childcare job	38
Table 3.6 Non-childcare related employment for those with a current childcare job	38
Table 3.7 Types of employer/employment held by those in childcare work currently	39
Table 3.8 Job titles held in current job for those with a current childcare job ...	39
Table 3.9 Full-time or part-time job	40
Table 3.10 Those with past childcare job: whether and when consider work in childcare or early related sector	41
Table 3.11 Whether worked continuously since left college or periods not worked, by employment group	41
Table 3.12 Reasons not been working by employment group	42
Table 3.13 Reasons for leaving childcare jobs held since leaving college	43
Table 3.14 Reasons not worked in childcare	44
Table 3.15 Whether and when consider work in childcare or related sector	46
Table 3.16 Comparison of Groups 1 and 2 on settings for first job in childcare	46
Table 4.1 Method of obtaining current job and first job	49
Table 4.2 Whether expect to have time away from employment for caring responsibilities or other family reasons	53
Table 4.3 Types of family related reason for leaving employment	53
Table 4.4 How well course prepared former students for work	56
Table 4.5 Former childcare students' views on how courses prepared them for work	57
Table 4.6 Degree to which qualification helped obtain first job and better pay in first job	57

Table 4.7 Whether and when planning to undertake further study, and obstacles to do doing so: in-depth study group	61
Table 4.8 Expect to be working in childcare in five years time	62
Table 4.9 Former childcare students' envisaged work settings in five years time	62
Table 4.10 Former childcare students' reasons for thinking of leaving current posts	63
Table 4.11 Reasons for not feeling settled in current job	64
Table 4.12 Reasons had not worked in childcare since leaving college, for those with other jobs	64
Table 5.1 Employment after leaving the nursery	76
Table 5.2 Former nursery staff who had wanted to work in childcare	76
Table 5.3 Reasons for not working in childcare though wanted to	77
Table 5.4 Reasons for not wanting to work in childcare	77
Table 5.5 How current job compares with previous job in the nursery	77
Table 5.6 Reasons why current job is better or worse than previous job in the nursery	78
Table 5.7 Main reason why staff left according to nursery heads	79
Table 5.8 Reasons for leaving the nursery	80
Table 5.9 Main reason for leaving the nursery	80
Table 5.10 Household status	82
Table 6.1 Would recommend childcare work to a friend	86
Table 6.2 Reasons for recommending and not recommending childcare work ..	86
Table 6.3 How childcare work is perceived in career terms	87
Table 6.4 Feel settled in current childcare or early years job	87
Table 6.5 Reasons for feeling settled in current childcare or early years job ..	87
Table 6.6 Whether expect to be working in childcare over the next five years ..	88
Table 6.7 How childcare work compares with what was expected	88
Table 6.8 Reasons why childcare work is better or worse than expected	88
Table 7.1 Expect to have caring responsibilities in the next five years which will take them away from employment	95
Table 7.2 Future caring responsibilities	95
Table 7.3 Whether those currently working in childcare or related sector expect to study for a relevant qualification within the next five years	98
Table 7.4 Qualifications will be studying for	99
Table A1.1 Participation in the follow-up study from main and supplementary samples of colleges	111
Table A1.2: Outcome of sample	111
Table A1.3 Age group of participants and non-participants at follow-up	112
Table A1.4: Ethnic group of participants and non-participants at follow-up ...	112
Table A1.5 Household arrangement at first contact of participants and non-participants at follow-up	113
Table A1.6 Presence and absence of own children at first contact among participants and non-participants	113
Table A1.7. Age of children among participants and non-participants at follow-up	113
Table A1.8: Age started course, participants and non-participants at follow-up	114
Table A1.9: Employed while studying, participants and non-participants at follow-up	114

Table A1.10 Want to work with children after qualifying: participants and non-participants at follow-up	115
Table A1.11 Former students grouped by experiences of childcare employment	115
Table A1.12 Nursery response to telephone follow-up	116
Table A1.13 Ex-staff response to telephone follow-up	117
Table A2.1 Some characteristics of the in-depth sample of former nursery staff	120

Executive Summary

This report follows up earlier research of childcare students and nursery workers completed in 1999 and 2000 (Cameron et al., 2001). The focus of Entry, Retention and Loss Part One was to assess what brings people into childcare training and work, what influences whether they stay in the work and how childcare employment fits into the other demands of workers' lives. The current study (Part Two) returns to look at these students and workers approximately one year later, to see what kinds of employment, training and personal decisions had subsequently been made, including job and occupational changes, and whether views about childcare work had changed.

Part Two, commissioned by the Department for Education and Skills, includes data from two follow-up surveys and two qualitative studies. The first survey, of former childcare students, tracks their lives around 15 months after completing their courses, and is complemented by in-depth studies with 14 of those surveyed. The second survey followed up staff from the nurseries included in the Part One survey, 12-14 months after the original contact. Staff who were no longer employed at the nurseries were also interviewed as part of the study. This survey work was again complemented by in-depth interviews, with ten former members of staff. The fieldwork was undertaken in Autumn 2000, Spring 2001 and early Summer 2001.

The main findings from the earlier Part One study included: a profile of the workforce as predominantly young and female; high levels of commitment to childcare work and of job satisfaction, with most expecting to be working in childcare of some kind in five years – although less than half of nursery workers expected to be working in a day nursery; low pay and a perception that childcare work has low social value; ambivalence about leaving their own children in full-time childcare provision; and a distinctive profile for minority ethnic entrants to childcare work.

The report is divided into seven main chapters. The first chapter details the methods used and the themes from the Part One study. Chapters Two, Three and Four present the findings from the follow up study of students, examining in turn key characteristics, employment paths and issues of recruitment and retention. In Chapters Five, Six and Seven, findings from the follow up studies of nursery workers follows a similar pattern, looking at employment patterns, understanding retention and wider issues relevant to recruitment and retention. The overall themes of the report are entry, retention and loss in the childcare workforce and each chapter combines survey and in-depth interview data sources. Chapter Eight covers conclusions to the study, some policy recommendations and raises some issues for research.

Key findings are:

Chapter Two (Following up former childcare students)

- Nearly three-quarters of former childcare students (72%) were working in childcare or a related field when interviewed at the follow-up stage; 9

percent were not currently working in childcare but had had at least one such job since leaving college; the remainder (19%) had not worked at all in childcare since leaving college. Only 6 percent had had no employment of any kind since leaving college.

- Those former students who were not currently working in childcare jobs, were more likely to include those who were: 25-34 year olds; from certain minority ethnic groups; not living with parents or relatives; and parents themselves (especially of young children)

Chapter Three (Employment paths after college)

- Half of those currently working in childcare were in private day nurseries, around 20 percent were working in schools, and a further 11 percent were working in local authority day nurseries. Eight percent were working for private families as a nanny.
- Half of those currently working in childcare had had more than one job since leaving college, suggesting considerable movement within the childcare field.
- Among those who had had at least one childcare job since leaving college, 40 percent left jobs due to personal or family reasons, while 45 percent left for work-related reasons such as the ending of short-term contracts.
- Among those who had not worked in childcare at all, the main reasons for not doing so were continued study, followed by pay and inability to find a job in their area; family commitments and pregnancy were also important.
- Courses were generally well rated in the survey, in particular, coverage of practical aspects of childcare. But more ambivalence was expressed during in-depth interviews. The main criticism of courses concerned the inadequate range and flexibility of placements: students felt they could not get placements always in their preferred settings or could not get sufficient variety.
- Nearly a fifth of former students had studied for a further childcare-related qualification since completing their course.

Chapter Four (Emerging issues in recruitment and retention)

- Main methods of recruitment were local advertising, previous placements or employers and word of mouth.
- High demand does not guarantee a smooth transition into childcare employment. For some who wish to work in private nurseries, there are many opportunities available. For others with personal constraints, such as their own children's school hours or single parents, there are serious difficulties with pursuing a childcare career. The most severe difficulties (in all aspects of work) were experienced in nannying.
- There were high levels of commitment to working with young children, including among those not currently in childcare work, and of job satisfaction. The great majority of those working in (or who had been working in) childcare expected to be working in childcare in five years time, with over half hoping to work in the public sector. Around half of those who had not worked in childcare at all expected to at some point, but mainly not

for another 5 years or so. Nearly all those who had worked in childcare since leaving college viewed childcare as part of a longer term career. Most currently working felt settled in their jobs.

- Around half of the former students who had worked or were working in childcare or related fields found that the work was better than they had expected it to be.
- Pay and working conditions were the major reasons cited by those for whom the work was worse than expected, the main drawback cited in the in-depth interviews, and the most frequent reason for leaving childcare jobs. Other main problem areas are staff and organisational matters and family responsibilities and other personal issues.
- The known tension in childcare work, of high intrinsic value attached to the work but poor extrinsic conditions, is again demonstrated.
- Nearly half of those surveyed expected to have some time away from employment in order to care for children or other family members in the next five years. The predominant view from the women in the in-depth interviews was that at least while children were below school age, they themselves would not be employed. Family life and the demands it makes on women workers is a key factor in understanding entry, retention and loss among the childcare workforce.
- Former students interviewed in depth offered a variety of suggestions for policy changes that would encourage entry and retention.

Chapter Five - Following up nursery workers

- 190 nurseries screened for staff who had left; 145 leavers surveyed; ten leavers interviewed in-depth.
- Of the nursery staff present at nurseries in the Part One study, just over a quarter (27%) of childcare staff had left at the time of the follow up about a year later.
- Of the 145 nursery workers interviewed in the follow-up survey who had left the nursery where they were originally interviewed, almost two-thirds (65%) were currently working in childcare-related employment, predominately as nursery nurses in the private and public sectors. The remainder were working in non-childcare jobs (14%), unemployed (10%), studying (5%) or caring for their children (3%). Half of this group would like to work in childcare, but pregnancy, care of their own children or not being able to find suitable work are the main reasons why they are not.
- Overall, 86 percent of respondents expected to be working in childcare over the next five years.
- In-depth respondents with pre-school or school-age children are more likely to work part-time compared with those who have older children or no children who tend to work full-time.
- Low pay, poor working conditions and dissatisfaction with nursery management are the reasons driving workers to change childcare jobs or leave childcare altogether.
- In-depth respondents defined childcare work broadly to include working with children of all ages and in a wide range of settings

- Most who had worked in childcare since leaving their Part One nursery job saw childcare as a long-term career and were settled in their current job.
- The majority of those working considered that their current job was better than their previous job because of better pay and shorter working hours.
- Four employment groups, with different routes into and out of childcare work, can be discerned: qualified in childcare after leaving school, left childcare work when they had children and returned to childcare work at a later date - the entered, left and re-entered group; qualified after leaving school and have not left childcare - the continuous group; entered the work by chance and may have subsequently qualified for childcare work - the chance group; unqualified and come into the work seeing it as a stop-gap or a temporary position - the temporary group.
- In-depth respondents with pre-school or school-age children are more likely to work part-time compared with those who have older children or no children who tend to work full-time. The predominant view among these women is that young children need exclusive parental care. Half of survey respondents expected to take time away from employment for caring responsibilities in the next five years.
- In the follow-up survey and in-depth interviews, inadequate pay, dissatisfaction with management and finding another job in childcare were the most frequently cited reasons for wanting to leave a nursery job. Poor childcare and management practices and lack of respect for staff featured most prominently as sources of dissatisfaction with nursery management.

Chapter Six - Understanding retention

- As with the former students, nursery staff remain in childcare because of their love and commitment to children and the satisfaction that working with children can bring.
- Just over half of those who would be working in childcare over the next five years thought they would undertake qualification training in childcare or a related field.
- Suggestions were to improve training: easier routes into teacher training for the early years; increasing funding for training to make it more accessible.
- Higher salaries, a better career structure, improved nursery organisation and management, raising the status of childcare work, and introducing childcare refresher courses were suggested as measures for recruiting and retaining staff.

Chapter Seven - Wider issues in recruitment and retention

- Respondents defined in the study as having left the childcare field do not necessarily see themselves as having done so because, for them, childcare is defined very broadly to include working with children in a wide range of settings
- 50 percent of survey respondents expected to take time away from employment for caring responsibilities in the next five years.
- The predominant view among respondents is that young children need the exclusive care of parents, particularly mothers. However, some women with

young children are not averse to working if employment does not involve the use of non-parental childcare.

- In terms of pay and promotion, qualified staff were no more advantaged than unqualified staff.
- Half of those who would be working in childcare over the next five years thought they would undertake qualification training in childcare or a related field.

The main conclusions (Chapter Eight) are that:

- The study confirms previous findings of high levels of occupational commitment and job satisfaction, and also shows that over a 12-15 month period relatively few childcare students and nursery workers have been permanently lost to the field.
- But it does also show considerable short-term loss amongst students, high turnover among nursery workers and the adverse effects of low pay and other poor employment conditions.
- In addition to pay, the research points to two other factors which may adversely affect recruitment and retention: the reluctance of childcare workers to work full-time and to use childcare services when their own children are young; and the consequences of poor management.
- The workforce issue would benefit from being reconceptualised from 'entry, retention and loss' to 'employment careers' and from 'childcare services' to a broader view of work with children.
- Five main policy issues are identified: management training and policies; care responsibilities of the workforce; poor pay; diversifying the workforce; reviewing the sustainability and desirability of the current workforce.

Acknowledgements

The follow-up studies reported here were conducted with the help of a large number of people whom the authors would like to thank. First and most importantly, the studies depended on the continuing co-operation of hundreds of former childcare students and former and current childcare workers. We contacted some of them three times, and we are enormously grateful for the time and effort expended on our behalf.

We are also grateful to the social research company, System 3 Limited, who conducted the two large scale surveys for us, and to the involvement of the DfES (formerly the DfEE) in ensuring the report's publication.

Finally, within Thomas Coram Research Unit, we would like to thank Annabelle Stapleton, for tireless and sometimes tedious efforts to ensure accuracy, as well as other administrative staff and transcribers who have completed their work to schedule.

Material from the Labour Force Survey is Crown Copyright; has been made available by the Office for National Statistics through the Data Archive and has been used with permission. Neither the ONS nor the Data Archive bear any responsibility for the analysis or interpretation of the data reported here.

The Thomas Coram Research Unit was commissioned, by the DfES, to carry out this research. However, the views expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the DfES.

Chapter One - Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This report follows up studies of childcare students and workers completed in 1999 and 2000 and published in the companion volume *Entry, Retention and Loss: A study of childcare students and workers* (Cameron, Owen and Moss, 2001), hereafter referred to as the Part One study. In the Part One study, several studies were brought together. There was a survey of childcare students attending colleges of further education (with a supplementary sample of colleges including above-average numbers of students from minority ethnic groups); a series of focus groups with childcare and playwork students, including mature students and students not based in colleges; and a survey of independent day nurseries and the staff working in them. The aim overall was to examine what brings people into childcare training and work, what encourages them to or discourages them from staying in the work and how childcare employment fits into the other demands on workers' lives.

In Part Two, the current study, the aim was to conduct follow up surveys and in-depth interview studies of the original samples to see what kind of employment, training and personal decisions had been made and to see whether views about childcare work had changed in order to try and assess issues of change, supply and demand in the future childcare workforce. In a policy era of expansion of childcare services, and thus high demand for childcare staff, it is important to understand not just the training and employment of childcare workers, but the process of making a career in childcare, the diversions along the way and the pressing issues and needs of childcare workers themselves.

Part Two includes data from four sources: two surveys and two qualitative studies. The first survey, of former childcare students, tracks their lives around 15 months after completing their courses, and the first qualitative study consists of in-depth interviews with 14 of those surveyed. The second survey followed up the nurseries 12 - 14 months after the original contact, and then interviewed those staff who had left the nurseries' employment. This survey was also followed up, with ten in-depth interviews of former members of staff.

1.2 Structure of the report

The report is divided into six main chapters. After this introductory chapter, Chapters Two and Three present the findings from the follow up study of students. Focusing first on their characteristics and employment patterns, and then on recruitment and retention issues. A similar pattern is followed for the follow up study of day nursery workers in Chapters Four and Five. In each case the chapter is structured around the main themes - entry, retention and loss in the childcare workforce - but also around the issues raised by the in-depth interview respondents. Tables presenting the findings from the follow up surveys and comparing the findings from Part One and Part Two are used to contextualise the issues. Finally, the last chapter discusses the conclusions to the study. It includes a summary of the results, some policy recommendations and raises some issues for further research.

1.2.1 Background

This study design, in its coverage of types of student and worker, its dual focus on breadth and depth in respondents' views and experiences, and its ability to track changes over time is unique in studies of the UK childcare workforce. Previous studies of childcare students have been small scale (e.g. Penn and McQuail, 1996) and previous studies of childcare training have focused on the mapping of training courses (e.g. Cordeaux, Hall, Owen and Miles, 1999).

Previous studies of UK childcare workers have taken place, but have either been limited in coverage, such as Vernon and Smith (1994), where 95 nurseries and their managers involved in a particular subsidy scheme were studied, or provided only a snapshot view of nurseries and other childcare services with information reported by managers only (Moss et al., 1994; EO/IDeA, 1999). Munton and Mooney (2001) examined the characteristics of and working conditions for day nursery staff in 256 nurseries in a study about using self-assessment measures as a means of improving the quality of care provided. They found higher quality ratings in nurseries employing older staff, and those with more experience of working in early years settings, but neither of these characteristics of staff were significantly related to the successful implementation of change through using the self-assessment tools. Holding a relevant qualification was not related to either quality or the successful implementation of change, but experience of and access to in-service training was related to both dimensions. Finally, Munton and Mooney found that two working conditions related to poorer quality of care ratings: staff required to work longer hours per week and staff working in nurseries with no paid sick leave.

Scott, Brown and Campbell (2001) used focus groups and in-depth interviews with 'stakeholders' in childcare and early years provision such as providers, union and voluntary sector representatives, policy officers from government and independent sectors to examine childcare as a form of paid work expanding primarily in the independent sector. They concluded that while the job expectations of childcare workers are increasing, they receive low levels of organised support through trade unions or voluntary sector umbrella organisations, patchy and uncoordinated training, and low wages. They recommended 'partnership between unions, umbrella organisations, providers and economic development agencies at an early stage of the development of childcare initiatives' (Scott et al., 2000: 15).

These studies are also timely. The National Childcare Strategy launched in 1998 builds on and pushes forward a significant expansion of childcare and playwork services, mostly in the independent sector. Addressing both policies to facilitate parental employment and policies on social inclusion and eliminating child poverty, the expansion of the availability of childcare services presents many staffing challenges. There is a straightforward issue of supply: where are all the new workers to come from? There is also an issue of training: what kind and level of training is appropriate? Then there are issues of turnover and change in workforce supply: how is it possible to maximise the retention of workers in childcare? These studies combined begin to address these issues and raise further questions, particularly around the expectations and beliefs of those who

do the work, and the demographic characteristics of the workforce. The studies also lead to new questions about the conceptualisation of work by workers: what is the purpose of childcare work and how do we understand it?

1.2.2 Methods

The overall research design was for a longitudinal study of childcare students and workers that provided both a national picture¹ and a detailed examination of issues. The Part One study also included an overall picture of the characteristics of childcare workers (in the occupational categories 'nursery nurses', 'playgroup leaders' and 'other childcare occupations') drawn from secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey. It then analysed the situation in more detail for childcare students leaving colleges in the summer of 1999 and for focus group participants and nursery heads and workers in early 2000. The samples of both students and nursery workers were asked to supply contact details for the follow up studies, and it is from these groups that the Part Two data is drawn.

The Part Two follow up survey of former childcare students was conducted in September 2000 by a social research company (System Three Limited) on behalf of the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit. Former students who had finished a Level 3 (mostly diploma) course were contacted by telephone and asked to complete a short questionnaire about their employment history, their experiences of working and other responsibilities they had had and their views about their future career paths, both in childcare and outside it. The response rate was good at 56 percent, achieving a sample size of 372 (full details of the design are given in Appendix 1).

From this sample, 14 former students were identified for in-depth interviews that explored the survey topics in more detail (full details of the research instruments are given in Appendix 3). These students were derived from three groups identified in the survey: those who stayed in childcare work after training; those who had worked in childcare but were not at the time of interview doing so; and those who had not worked in childcare at all since leaving college. This means the in-depth study focuses on a particular section of the childcare workforce: those who studied for and/or hold a diploma level qualification, and it gives equal weight to those following a non-standard path through childcare training and employment.

For the follow-up study of day nurseries and workers a two-stage process was designed. All nurseries visited in Part One were contacted with the aim of finding out which members of staff had left since the original contact and the nursery head's understanding of why they had left. Additional information on any recruitment within the year was also sought to enable an overall turnover rate to be calculated. This first stage survey is referred to as the 'nursery screener'. Contact was made with 181 of the 245 nurseries visited in Part One (74 percent). Of those who were not contacted, some were known to have

¹ 'National' in this context refers to England as the study was funded by the DfES (formerly the DfEE), which covers England only.

closed, some could not be contacted (and may have closed) and a few refused to take part (see Appendix 1 for full details).

Heads in the participating nurseries were able to say whether the staff who had been interviewed for Part One were still employed in the nursery or had left. Where a member of staff had left, the head was asked the reason for them leaving. These nurseries had had a total of 1,273 employed staff (or 70 percent of the 1,809 staff interviewed for Part One): at follow up 933 (73 percent) of these were still in post, whilst 340 (27 percent) had left. Since the gap between the two interviews was about fifteen months, this is approximately equivalent to an annual turnover of staff of 22 percent.

The 340 leavers identified by the nurseries were telephoned for a short follow-up interview. Of these, 145 (43 percent) were contacted and interviewed: of the rest, 26 (8 percent) were contacted but refused to take part. The rest were not contacted, some of them were known to have moved (see Appendix 1 for full details).

From this sub-sample of interviewed 'leavers', ten were identified for in-depth interviews. These respondents were equally divided between those who had left the nursery but were still working in childcare or a related field and those who had left childcare work altogether (see Appendix 3 for the research instruments).

There are two main differences between the student derived sample and the staff derived sample. The former students all held diploma level qualifications, whereas the former staff group included unqualified staff. The former student group was also likely to be younger than the former staff group.

1.3 Main themes from Part One

The main themes to be discussed in this section are: key characteristics of the workforce; commitment; pay; status; retention; careers and the work-family balance; and ethnicity.

1.3.1 Description of the workforce

In all three studies, a very high proportion of the workforce and the student groups were female, making childcare work one of the most gender segregated occupations in England. Studying the childcare workforce is thus very largely a study of women in (a certain kind of) employment. Understanding workforce movement requires understanding the potential for multiple demands on women's working lives and their views about this multiplicity of roles.

Most of the students and workers were young: around 70 percent of the students were aged between 16 and 19; and the average age for nursery staff was 24 years and for nursery heads was 40 years. This age profile was also reflected in the household arrangements of students, workers and nursery heads. Whereas most nursery heads lived with partners and/or children, three-quarters of students and 40 percent of nursery staff lived with their parents or other relatives.

Ninety percent of the students and the workers surveyed were ethnically white, a slightly lower proportion than in the Labour Force Survey (where 95 percent of 'nursery nurses' were white). Finally, over half of the workforce had a diploma level qualification in childcare and/or early years (59 percent of heads and 52 percent of other staff), but 22 percent of heads and 33 percent of other staff were not qualified for their post.

1.3.2 Commitment to the work - job satisfaction and enjoyment

The Part One study showed that childcare students and day nursery workers share high levels of commitment to childcare and a comparatively high degree of job satisfaction. Having nearly finished the two-year course, ninety percent of childcare students still wanted to work with children. Among day nursery heads and workers, over 90 percent thought of childcare as a longer term career and around 80 percent were settled in their current post. Looking ahead five years, three-quarters of heads but just under half of other staff expected to be working in a day nursery, but over 80 percent of both groups thought they would be working in childcare of some kind. Liking to work with children was given as a main reason for feeling settled in nursery work, but even more important was liking the staff group and working within the organisation. Compared to studies in other occupations, day nursery workers and heads record one of the highest levels of job satisfaction. The findings on commitment and satisfaction, together with the findings from the focus groups reinforce the findings from other studies on the intrinsic value of childcare work to the workforce undertaking it: childcare work is done by people who see it as meaningful work, who see caring for children as a highly valued and valuable activity.

1.3.3 Low pay

Salaries in childcare work are low. The survey of day nursery workers found that on average, nursery staff worked a 35 hour week and earned £7,700 gross per annum. Nursery heads fared slightly better: they earned £13,400 gross per annum, worked an average of 39 hours per week, but in addition three-quarters of them also worked unpaid hours. If the analysis is restricted to those working full-time (30 hours or more per week), the mean annual salary for heads of nurseries was £14,900 and for other staff was £8,400. The hourly rate is thus £7.36 and £4.17 respectively.

Analysis of the occupational category 'nursery nurse' in the Labour Force Survey was also included in the Part One study. The occupational category of nursery nurse includes those working in private day nurseries, local authority day nurseries, family centres, and nursery and primary schools. It is unlikely to include heads of nurseries. This analysis found that nursery nurses worked an average of 30 hours a week, and earned an average of £142 gross per week. Assuming a year round (52 week) contract, this would accrue £7,384 per annum.

Simon et al. (forthcoming) conducted further secondary analysis of the LFS on the care and social care workforce. This found that nursery nurses were the best paid of the childcare occupations, and also worked the longest hours. The hourly pay was given as £4.85, working a 30 hour week, very similar to that of educational assistants (£4.76 per hour) who worked a shorter week (22 hours).

The analysis also separated out public and private sector pay. This found that the hourly rate for public sector nursery nurse jobs was £5.98, while in the private sector it was £3.59.

Comparisons were also made with other occupations that employed a) a high proportion of female workers and b) all women workers. The first group included hairdressers, beauticians, sales workers and clerical staff. The average hourly pay of this group was £5.18, with an average working week of 28 hours. The second group included all women workers in all jobs, manual and non-manual. The average hourly pay for this group was even higher, at £6.29 per hour, for a 31-hour working week. Finally, because the analysis from the LFS combines data from three years, 1997 - 1999, an overall figure for non-manual full-time working female employees was sought for 2000. The average gross annual full-time salary for women working in non-manual occupations, which would include working in childcare, was £19,193 (New Earnings Survey, p.c).

The data from various sources shows that childcare workers are poorly paid in comparison to the average for women. Nursery staff may be better paid than in some other childcare occupations such as playgroup leaders (who earn an average of £3.20 per hour), but they are still paid less than the average for highly gender segregated occupations, considerably less than women workers overall and less than twice that for the average non-manual woman worker.

The salary for nursery heads compares better with the average for women (£7.36 compared with £6.29). However, the comparative hourly figure for all *non-manual* female employees is £9.46 per hour, showing that nursery heads, who typically have 15 years of experience and manage an average of eight staff in a 40 place nursery, still earn £2 less per hour than their female equivalent in other workplaces.

1.3.4 Low value

Closely related to the issue of low pay is that of perceived low valuation. Childcare workers in the focus groups reported in Part One that they felt their work held little value. Low pay was part of the low valuation, but other indicators of low value were feeling 'taken for granted' or even 'unimportant' by some parents, employers and wider society. Included within this was a perception that caring for children was regarded as of less importance than earning a living in government policies such as the New Deal, and those who care for children for a living or help parents care for children were also thus not valued highly. Childcare work was being seen, they felt, as a 'vehicle' for the delivery of labour market objectives, and not as a valuable career in its own right.

These two issues of satisfaction and commitment alongside low pay plus low value, mark out the distinctive features of childcare workers raised in the Part One study. Other studies have arrived at similar conclusions, studying the childcare workforce, or sections of it, both in the UK and in other countries (Schryer, 1994; Whitebook et al., 1989; Mooney et al., 2001). Resolving this tension between intrinsic commitment and extrinsic reward poses serious

challenges for employers and policies designed to assist the growth in supply of childcare services. Nursery heads reported an already considerable recruitment burden in the Part One study, with a third of reporting vacancies that week, over three quarters of nurseries having recruited in the past 12 months and the time taken to replace staff and then introducing them to the nursery taking between one and six months.

1.3.5 Retention

Few measures to deliberately retain staff were reported in the Part One study. Two possibilities nurseries might adopt are investing in the staff skills through training, and part-time hours to facilitate combining employment with other commitments such as motherhood. The extent of in-service training was noticeable in the Part One study, with 70 percent of heads and 53 percent of other staff having done some kind of training course in the previous 12 months. The most common course topics concerned health and safety issues rather than curriculum issues. Furthermore, a similar proportion of staff would consider further study in the coming five years, mostly in education and management (nursery staff) and childcare, education and management (nursery heads).

On part-time hours, only 12 percent of heads and 23 percent of other staff worked fewer than 30 hours per week: nursery work is mainly full-time work. When we asked students what kind of pattern of childcare work they would prefer, many said they would like to work full-time, but school terms only. However, when the students were asked what pattern of work they would adopt when they had their own preschool aged children, the majority said they would work part-time, or not at all, or from home. Few (9 percent) said they would work full-time. It seems possible that child-rearing is a major point of departure from childcare employment, at least in the short term.

In addition, there are many possible employment options for those with a diploma in early childhood studies, and a growing market for their skills. Given the high degree of commitment to working with children in the longer term, but also the low salaries, movement within the childcare field, usually in search of better pay and conditions, is probably inevitable.

1.3.6 Careers and work-life balance

A further theme from the Part One study was the discussion of possibilities and constraints in childcare careers, particularly in the context of their own motherhood status. Focus group participants who were mothers tended to see themselves rather than their partners as responsible for care of their own children. This role and its responsibilities led some childcare students to view childcare as opening up new career possibilities, shifting direction with the advantage of new skills acquired as a mother, and searching for something that would offer the option of fitting in with school hours and holidays.

However this group also felt ambivalent about leaving their own children to be cared for by others, so, once they were mothers, the choice of career path narrowed considerably, leaving two main options. The first, school-based work, such as a nursery nurse or special needs work, was much the preferred option,

open to mothers once their youngest child was in school. However, some childcare workers went further and thought their own children needed them to be at home even when they themselves were at secondary school. This meant that virtually the only kind of childcare career open to them was childminding. But this work, with its low pay, lack of requirements for qualification or recognised progression was rarely seen as offering a 'career'.

1.3.7 Ethnicity and variation in perspective and experience

The Part One study included an analysis of the views and experiences of childcare students from a minority ethnic background. According to the Part One study, ten percent of the childcare student population and ten percent of the day nursery workforce are not ethnically white. This small minority is further divided. Three percent of the student survey were from Black African, Black Caribbean or Black Other backgrounds; while a further three percent were from Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi backgrounds and the remainder had 'other' backgrounds. Among the supplementary sample, however, 18 percent were Black (African, Caribbean or Other) and 30 percent Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi, with eight percent 'other'. All these students' replies were used to produce an analysis by minority ethnic background, which showed a distinctive profile for minority ethnic entrants to childcare work.

The minority ethnic sample were on average older than their white counterparts. Forty-five percent were aged 25 and over. They were also more likely to be mothers (41% compared to 19% of white students). Perhaps because of their age, minority ethnic students had more experience of employment, voluntary work, unpaid full-time caring at home and further education. Although minority ethnic students were equally satisfied with the academic content of their courses, they were less satisfied than the white students were with the practice placements (31% compared to 18% of white students). A higher proportion of minority ethnic students said they had 'no help' from colleges with careers advice (23% compared to 19%), and slightly fewer said they wanted to work with children (87% compared to 91%).

Considerably fewer ethnic minority students were employed while they were studying (43% compared to 70%). Again, this may be a reflection of the older age group and childcare responsibilities at home. Students from minority ethnic backgrounds wanted different types of childcare work when compared with white students. The first preference for all groups was working in schools as a nursery nurse, but the strength of preference was most marked for minority ethnic students (58% compared to 39% of white students). The employment setting ranked second by minority ethnic students was local authority day nursery work (25% compared to 18%). White students preferred private nurseries (31% compared to 19% of minority ethnic students) and nannyng (24% compared to 8% of minority ethnic students). These preferences were backed up by the preferences on pattern of employment: two thirds of minority ethnic students wanted to work school terms only compared to less than half of white students (66% vs 41%).

Minority ethnic students seemed to favour group care as a form of non-parental childcare at an earlier age than white students did. For children under one, 23 percent of minority ethnic students (compared to 12 percent of white students) favoured day nurseries over childminders and nannies, although as with other students, relatives were the preferred option. For children aged 1 – 2 years, 59 percent of minority ethnic students preferred day nurseries, while this was the case for 43 percent of white students. Even at age 3 years and over, a bigger proportion of minority ethnic students supported day nurseries (83% compared to 78% of white students). It seems that minority ethnic students are less likely to hold predominant views about non-parental childcare when compared with white students.

Also of note in the discussion of ethnicity was the finding from the day nursery survey that one of the main recruitment methods was through word of mouth. This may constrain the opportunities nurseries have to move away from a predominantly female and white workforce and ensure effective diversity in their recruitment.

In summary, what emerged from the Part One study was a somewhat different profile for minority ethnic students when compared to white students. They were older, more mature, with more experience. They were more critical of their courses, and were more likely to favour early education or group care workplaces both for themselves and for young children in general. At the same time, group care such as day nurseries did not seem to be employing recruitment methods that would capitalise on this preference and orientation.

1.3.8 Dependence on a declining group?

The picture of the childcare workforce so far is a largely homogenous one: the lack of men and the differences of perspective and background for those from minority backgrounds throwing into sharp relief the predominant views, experiences and characteristics of the young, female and white workforce. The Part One study discussed demographic trends for this group of people and argued that diversifying the workforce is not only useful in terms of helping to open up access to childcare services but is also an essential ingredient in addressing the labour shortages in childcare. Briefly, the Part One study predicted that the supply of young female white workers with a GCSE level education is not going to increase in sufficient numbers to satisfy the demands for childcare services.

The Part One study noted that in general, the level of women's educational achievements is advancing rapidly. Far fewer young women than a decade ago leave full-time education at the age of 16, and over 40 percent study for A-Levels, many of whom go on to university. Thus the pool of women for whom diploma childcare training at the age of 16 is an option is declining and is likely to continue to do so. One could argue that better educated women may still want to become childcare workers, but it is also likely they will seek better paid career options elsewhere. In addition, analysis shows that women aged 25 - 29 whose highest educational achievements are GCSEs, the group into which most childcare workers fall, are more likely than other groups to have their first child during this period. The main source of labour for childcare is thus likely to also

be entering the main child-rearing period. Given the finding that many of those who are thinking of working in nurseries (childcare students) would prefer not to work full-time when their own children are preschool aged, this indicates a likely continuing outflow of nursery workers as they reach the child-rearing stage.

In summary, the Part One study showed that the childcare workforce is highly committed to working with children but that commitment may well be undermined by factors such as: the low pay and status relative to other opportunities for young women; and reliance on a particular age profile, which in the main just precedes motherhood coupled with attitudes towards child-rearing which emphasises being at home with preschool aged children rather than full-time employment. In addition, demographic and educational change may well be reducing the available pool of young women's labour for training to work in childcare.

Chapter Two - Following up former childcare students

2.1 Introduction

The high degree of commitment to the childcare sector uncovered in the Part One study was confirmed in the follow up survey of former students. Approaching three-quarters of the former childcare students were working in childcare or a related sector when interviewed at follow up. The in-depth interviews revealed that some of those who were not working in childcare at the time of interview were temporarily between jobs and some of those who had not worked in childcare at all still considered themselves interested in working with children, should their circumstances change, or should the circumstances of childcare employment change.

Indications of employment patterns from Part One suggested that there would be three main employment statuses among the follow up group. First, a group of former childcare students would be currently working in the childcare sector. Second, there would be a group who had had at least one childcare job but were not currently working in childcare. Third, there would be a group who had not worked at all in childcare since leaving college. The aim of the follow up was to provide both a qualitative and a quantitative analysis of the employment paths of each group (referred to as Groups 1, 2, and 3 respectively) in order to identify any similarities and differences between the post-college paths of those who enter childcare and those who do not or do so only temporarily. The chapter begins by presenting three short portraits drawn from the in-depth sample, one from each of the analysis groups. These portraits each illustrate a different career path, but they share a commitment to and enjoyment of being and working with children.

Portrait One, Currently working in childcare

'When I was younger I just wanted to get married and have a family'

Sarah² grew up, got married, had her children, registered as a childminder, and travelled with her civil engineer husband, childminding wherever the family went. She came home, and with the children growing up, enrolled in a BTEC childcare course because she thought this would better equip her to work in a preschool. But, she said 'I haven't enjoyed my job'. She took the first job she applied for, as a preschool assistant on an armed services base. There were two main problems. First, the management of the preschool was not consistent, with supervisors leaving, and replacements ill-qualified for working with young children. Second, she found the bureaucratic culture of the services stifling her instinct to get on and take responsibility for the childcare services she was offering, a responsibility she had been used to through being a childminder. So, Sarah, now a single parent with three children at primary school, has taken the opportunity to re-open a preschool that has recently closed in her village. Her energy and commitment and planning convinced the local day care regulatory authorities she would manage this task successfully. She plans to continue working in the first preschool in the mornings, run her own preschool in the afternoons and, when custom and reputation is established, open full-time.

² All names are pseudonyms.

Portrait Two, Had worked in at least one childcare job since leaving college

‘Ever since I was tiny I’ve loved babies. When my aunt had a baby all I wanted to do was cuddle it and look after it and I wouldn’t let anyone else have it’.

Amanda never had any other ambitions at school but going to London to work as a nanny. She trained as an NNEB, and took every opportunity to look after other people’s children locally, including two families that she worked for regularly over some years. Then she took the first job she found through a nanny agency in London, as a live-in nanny. ‘But I couldn’t stand the parents’ she said, ‘they were probably really nice people but ... it was just, they had four children, I would have said they had none’.

‘I worked from seven in the morning ‘til half past seven at night, and then on Saturday, every other weekend. They had a weekend nanny as well. They never saw the children. The dad saw them about five minutes in the morning, every three days. The mum didn’t work or anything. I’d had enough of it after two months. Handed in my notice. It was a lovely job and the children were lovely but it was just too much that you are their mum. When the mum used to come down, they didn’t want to know her. I didn’t like the fact that they were calling me mum... the mum and dad drove me potty’.

Amanda continued that the agency she had used to get the job were ‘so rude’ when she was on the point of leaving. ‘For my first job in London, you learn what people are like out there. It’s changed the way I think about parents, made me think about people with money, do they look after children as well as people without money’. Amanda returned to her parents’ home, worked for the families she had originally worked for part-time, worked in a pub and a garage, and made plans with her boyfriend to move to Birmingham. She wants to get another nanny job, go back to college to train as a play specialist for hospital work, have her own children within a few years, and take time out of employment before they go to school.

Portrait Three: Not worked in childcare at all since leaving college

‘When I left school after GCSEs, in the summer I worked at a local nursery and I just loved being around kids’.

Kerry had to re-sit her GCSEs, due to stress and problems at home. When she neared the end of the re-sit year, her college tutors encouraged her to continue studying. She thought about A-Levels, but was attracted by her experience of enjoyment when volunteering in a nursery, and decided to do an NNEB, thinking she could do A-Levels in the evenings more easily than a childcare course. But getting a job in childcare was not easy. ‘When I first left college, I was going to go into childcare but nobody would touch me because I’d just left college, didn’t have any experience in it and the only places that were going to be taking me was like £3 or £3.50 an hour. I thought, “No, not doing it”’. At the same time, her sister miscarried twins, and a promised job caring for them fell through. The placement Kerry had enjoyed most was in primary school, but the prospect of going back to do teacher training was not what she wanted. She had

long harboured a dream of becoming a forensic psychologist so now plans to work in factories and warehouses in order to pay debts, save for a car, and next academic year study for A-Levels at evening classes and then apply to university.

2.2 Features of former childcare students

These portraits indicate some of the features of childcare students and workers that will be explored in this report. First, the commitment to working with children is often longstanding, derived from childhood experiences and sustained through their own motherhood, family responsibilities and difficulties in childcare employment. It is part of a 'way of life' or a 'habit of mind' to borrow an expression from Tronto (1993).

Second, there is a flexibility and breadth in childcare employment, encompassing childminding, pre-schools, nannying, nursery work, but it can be unstable and it does not necessarily offer a career structure. Some people with a childcare qualification are looking beyond employment to entrepreneurial enterprises and retraining in related areas in order to get more autonomy, better recognition for their skills or to secure higher wages. Third, financial problems posed by the low wages in the childcare sector prevent some of those qualified from working in the sector, particularly those who need to be financially independent.

2.3 Key characteristics of the former childcare students

The 372 former students in the Part Two study were drawn from Level 3 childcare and early years courses such as CACHE Diploma in nursery nursing (now known as the Diploma in Child Care and Education) and the BTEC diploma in early childhood (now known as the EdExcel National Diploma in Early Years). These courses were designed to prepare students for childcare work with job titles such as nursery nurse, nanny, pre-school and crèche leader and so on.

2.3.1 Gender and age

All but two (99%) of the former students were female, in line with the overall picture on gender in the childcare workforce reported in the Part One study. Of the two men, one was in Group 1, currently working in childcare, and one was in Group 2, having had at least one childcare job since leaving college.

Analysis of the age of the former students by employment groups shows that former students in the age band of 25 - 34 were more likely to be in employment Groups 2 and 3, those who had had a past job in childcare and those who had not worked in childcare at all since leaving college.

Table 2.1 Age of former students by employment group

		Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
16 - 19	Number	172	21	39	232
	<i>Percent</i>	74	9	17	100
20 - 24	Number	34	4	7	45
	<i>Percent</i>	76	9	16	100
25 - 34	Number	26	7	17	50
	<i>Percent</i>	52	14	34	100
35+	Number	32	1	7	40
	<i>Percent</i>	80	3	18	100
Total	Number	264	33	70	367
	<i>Percent</i>	72	9	19	100

2.3.2 Ethnicity

In the follow-up study, 88 percent of respondents were white, compared with 90 - 97 percent in the three surveys included in the Part One study³. Table 2.2 shows that a higher proportion of white (73%) and black (71%) students currently held a childcare or related job (Group 1). Students from Asian backgrounds and other minority groups were less likely to have a current childcare job (59% and 55%) and were more than twice as likely as white students to have had a past childcare job, suggesting that they had left childcare for some reason (although numbers are small).

Table 2.2 Minority ethnic status by employment group

		Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
White	Number	238	26	61	325
	<i>Percent</i>	73	8	19	100
Black (Caribbean, African, Other)	Number	12	1	4	17
	<i>Percent</i>	71	6	24	100
Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi	Number	10	3	4	17
	<i>Percent</i>	59	18	24	100
Other	Number	6	3	2	11
	<i>Percent</i>	55	27	18	100
Total	Number	266	33	71	370
	<i>Percent</i>	72	9	19	100

2.3.3 Household composition of former students

Most of the students, as might be expected from this age group, lived with their parents or other relatives. Relatively few lived independently. Analysis by employment group (Table 2.3) shows that those in a current childcare job were

³ Appendix 1 details the sampling strategy which may have a bearing on this finding.

most likely to be living with their parents or other relatives (71%), and within the other two employment groups, the proportions were split fairly evenly between living with parents and living independently or with a partner.

Table 2.3 Household arrangement by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
Live in independently, inc. shared household	12	1	6	19
	5	3	8	5
Live with partner and/or children	64	16	28	108
	24	48	39	29
Live with parents/other relatives	188	16	37	241
	71	49	52	65
Total	264	33	71	368
	100	100	100	100

Table 2.4 shows that 23 percent of former students had their own children. They were most likely to have two children who were of primary school age.

Table 2.4 Number and age of children of former students

Children	Number	%	Age	Number	%
1	26	30	0 - 4	26	15
2	39	45	5 - 11	80	45
3	15	17	12 - 16	45	25
4	7	8	17+	25	14
Total	87	100	total	177	100

Table 2.5 shows that when the employment status of those with and without current or past childcare jobs, those with a current childcare job (Group1) are less likely to have their own children and those who have not had a childcare job (Group 3) are more likely to have children.

Table 2.5 Children by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	total
Have children	54	9	24	87
	20	27	34	23
Do not have children	213	25	47	285
	80	74	66	77
Total	267	34	71	372
	100	100	100	100

Table 2.6 shows that only a third (32%) of those with a preschool age child currently have a childcare job. By contrast, more than three-quarters (80%) of those with a youngest child age 5 - 11 are currently working in childcare

compared to exactly a half (50%) of those with a youngest child aged 12 - 16. Over half (52%) of those with a preschool aged child had not held a childcare job since leaving college.

Table 2.6 Age of youngest child by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
0 - 4	8	4	13	25
	32	16	52	100
5 - 11	36	4	5	45
	80	9	11	100
12 - 16	6	1	5	12
	50	8	42	100
17+	4	-	1	5
	80		20	100
Total	54	9	24	87
	62	10	28	100

2.4 Approaches to Childcare work

The follow-up study gathered extensive information on the employment paths of former childcare students, which will be discussed in the next chapter and will demonstrate the extent to which the breadth of occupational options described in the Part One study was taken up. Before this, however, we will discuss the meaning of childcare work as reported by former students.

2.4.1 Enjoyment and commitment

A central feature of the in-depth interviews was the meaning attributed to the intrinsic nature of childcare work: the commitment to and enjoyment of working with young children. This high level of satisfaction with working with children was reflected in all the in-depth interviews with former childcare students, whether currently employed in the work or not. In particular, in-depth interview respondents referred to the 'good feeling' they get when seeing children acquire new skills, how their investment in a relationship with a child has helped them to learn, and enjoyment of sharing children's pride in their achievements. Other terms used to describe the rewards of working with young children were 'lovely, its my passion', 'making a positive contribution to family life', and 'children fascinate me'. The strength of feeling expressed in this study reinforces the findings from previous research (Cameron et al., 2001) which showed that childcare workers in day nurseries scored more highly on a standardised job satisfaction scale than most occupational groups (87 for nursery heads and 79 for other staff compared to 70 for all social services staff), and extends the evidence on job satisfaction to those fields related to day nursery work where our respondents were working, such as in schools and special schools, pre-schools, as nannies or in voluntary work with children and families.

The survey supported the findings of the in-depth interviews. Nearly all those (92%) who had worked in childcare at all (Groups 1 and 2) since leaving college

considered their work in the childcare and early years sector to be part of a longer term career, as Table 2.7 shows⁴.

Table 2.7 Consider childcare work a temporary or short term job or a longer term career

	N	%
Temporary job	25	8
Longer term career	276	92
Total	301	100

Of those respondents who were currently working in childcare or early education nearly all felt settled or mostly settled in their current jobs, as Table 2.8 shows. This suggests a high degree of current commitment to their work.

Table 2.8 Whether feel settled in current childcare or early education job

	N	%
Feel settled	237	89
Mostly feel settled	9	3
Do not feel settled	18	7
Total	267	100

The main reasons why former childcare students feel settled or mostly settled in their current jobs are set out in Table 2.9. Personal satisfaction and liking the children clearly account for the majority of responses, with pay and working conditions far less frequently mentioned as a reason for feeling settled.

Table 2.9 Reasons for feeling settled in current job

	N	%
Personal satisfaction – feel relaxed	145	59
Children care for – like them	130	53
Staff/organisational related	96	39
Working conditions	69	28
Own family/child related – hours etc suit	24	10
Pay	20	8
It's what I always wanted to do	5	2
Knowing routine	2	1
Other	3	1
Total	246	100

Note: multiple response item so percentage does not total 100

For the survey respondents the intrinsic content of the work outweighs the extrinsic conditions of the work as the reasons for feeling settled, a finding which has been supported by UK and international studies of the childcare workforce (see Cameron, 1997; Cameron et al., 2001; Chapter Five). The great advantage of this work, it can be concluded, is that it offers meaning in terms of

⁴ Respondents who had not worked in childcare since leaving college (Group 3) were not asked this question.

personal satisfaction and relationships with children and staff groups to the workers concerned.

Furthermore, around half of the former students who had worked or were working in childcare or related fields found that the work was better than they had expected it to be (Table 2.10).

Table 2.10 How childcare work compares with expectations

	N	%
Better than expected	126	42
Worse than expected	14	5
Neither better nor worse than expected	103	34
Some aspects better and some worse than expected	58	19
Total	301	100

While personal satisfaction and working with children and parents offered more satisfaction than had been expected, Table 2.11 also shows that of those for whom the work was worse than expected, pay and working conditions were the major reasons cited. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 4, but worth noting here is that the known tension in childcare work, of high intrinsic value attached to the work but poor extrinsic conditions (cf. Cameron et al., 2001) is amply demonstrated in this survey.

Table 2.11 Childcare work better and worse than expected

	Better than expected		Worse than expected	
	N	%	N	%
Personal satisfaction	119	65	2	3
Children and parents	58	32	5	7
Working conditions, hours, status, benefits	47	26	20	28
Organisational related, staff team or atmosphere	46	25	8	11
Pay	19	10	30	42
Amount of paperwork	-	-	3	4
Amount of planning	-	-	3	4
Some jobs asked to do are nasty	-	-	4	6
Stressful	-	-	4	6
Lack of jobs /looking for employment	-	-	4	6
Knew what to expect	1	.5	-	-
Nothing to complain about	-	-	2	3
Other	9	5	3	4
Total	184	100	72	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

A final positive endorsement given to childcare work by respondents in the survey was the high proportion that would recommend the work to others.

Ninety-one percent of those who had worked in childcare said they would recommend childcare work to a friend (Table 2.12).

Table 2.12 Former childcare students who would recommend childcare work to a friend

	N	%
Yes	274	91
No	15	5
Don't know	12	4
Total	301	100

The main reason for the recommendation was the personal satisfaction with the work, followed by the satisfaction to be gained from working with children and their parents (Table 2.13).

Table 2.13 Reasons for recommending and not recommending childcare work

	Recommending childcare		Not recommending childcare	
	N	%	N	%
Personal satisfaction, feel relaxed	214	78	-	-
Working with children /parents	105	38	1	4
Working conditions, status, benefits	27	10	5	19
Own family/child, hours suit	27	10	-	-
Staff/organisational, staff team or atmosphere	20	7	-	-
Pay	16	6	12	45
Depends if they like children/ if it's want you want to do	14	5	3	11
Good job prospects	10	4	-	-
Job satisfaction	-	-	2	7
Not enough jobs	-	-	4	15
Good way to meet people	2	1	-	-
Other	7	3	5	19
Total	274	100	27	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

Again, Table 2.13 also shows the main disadvantages of working in childcare, which will be discussed in more detail later. Of the small minority who would not recommend childcare work, the two main reasons are pay and working conditions.

2.5 Summary

In summary, the key characteristics of the former students are:

- 99 percent female
- 75 percent aged 25 or under
- 88 percent ethnically white
- 65 percent live with parents or other relatives

- 23 percent have their own children, with parents of primary school children most likely to be in a current childcare job and parents of preschool age children least likely to be.
- Former childcare students in childcare work get personal satisfaction from their work and are committed to it in the longer term. Working with children and parents, and working in a staff team are potential or actual sources of high job satisfaction.

Chapter Three - Employment paths after college

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on the experiences of employment or unemployment among the former childcare students. As noted above the aim of the study of former students was to discover what happens to those who do not work in childcare after leaving college as well as those who do. Analysis using the three employment groups identified in Chapter Two enabled any distinctive employment paths according to employment status at the time of interview to emerge. To reiterate, the majority of the respondents were in Group 1, those with a current childcare job (267 respondents, 72% of the total former childcare students). Group 2, those who had had a past childcare job was the smallest group, with 34 respondents (9% of the total), and Group 3, those who had not worked at all in childcare, had 71 respondents (19%). In this chapter we will look at the employment paths of these three groups since leaving college and consider what kind of work or other activity the former students had done. We will use the in-depth interview data, drawn from all three Groups, to explore employment moves in more detail.

3.2 Overall picture of employment

Of the 372 former students in the study, 97 percent (total = 360) completed their course and slightly fewer, 96 percent (total = 356) gained their childcare qualification. Nearly all, 94 percent (total = 348) had had some kind of employment since leaving college: just 24 had not worked at all. Of those who had done some kind of job, by far the majority, 86 percent, (total = 301) had worked in childcare, although 34 were not doing so at the time of interview. There are thus actually four groups in the survey: those currently in childcare work (total = 267); those with a past childcare job (total = 34); those who have worked but not in childcare (total = 47); and those who have not worked at all since leaving college (total = 24). The last two groups have been combined into Group 3⁵ for most of our analyses (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 Paid work and childcare work

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
Childcare work	267	34		301
	71	10		81
No childcare work			47	47
			13	13
No employment since leaving college			24	24
			6	6
Total	267	34	71	372
	71	10	19	100

⁵ Group 1 are those with a current childcare job, Group 2 are those who have had at least one childcare job since leaving college and Group 3 are those who have not worked in childcare at all since leaving college.

Table 3.2 shows that of those who had worked at all since leaving college, over half (54%) had had one job. Only 14 percent had had three jobs or more. When the analysis was done by employment group, those who had not worked in childcare at all were most likely to have had just one job, while those who had had a past childcare job were evenly split on the number of jobs they had had.

Table 3.2 Number of paid jobs held since leaving college by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
One job	141	11	37	189
	53	32	79	54
Two jobs	91	12	7	110
	34	35	15	32
Three or more jobs	35	11	3	49
	13	32	6	14
Total	267	34	47	348
	100	100	100	100

However, this table also shows that nearly half of Group 1 had had more than one job, so even within the first year after leaving college, there was considerable movement within the childcare field.

3.3 Employment Group 1 - Current childcare job

3.3.1 Jobs on leaving college

Of those currently working in childcare, almost all (91 percent) had work in childcare or related jobs as their first job on leaving college. Taking just their first childcare job, the most common job title was ‘nursery nurse’, and working in day nurseries accounted for around half of the newly qualified childcare workforce as Tables 3.3 and 3.4 show. Working as a nanny in a private family was also popular, as was working in schools or classroom settings, and in playgroups.

Table 3.3 Job title of first childcare or early education job on leaving college for those with a current childcare job

	Number	%
Nursery nurse, nursery assistant, nursery officer, room/group leader	141	53
Classroom assistant	9	3
Special needs support worker/assistant	13	5
Nanny	25	9
Childminder	2	.1
Playgroup supervisor/assistant/leader	11	4
Nurse	3	1
Crèche pre-school assistant	5	2
Managing director/manager	3	1
Other	9	3
Don't know	32	12
Total	267	100

Table 3.4 Types of employer/employment in first childcare or early education job after leaving college for those with a current childcare job

		N	%
Day nursery	Private	105	39
	Local authority	23	9
	College	5	2
Family Centre		1	-
School	Private	4	1
	Nursery class/school	18	7
	Primary school	13	5
Playgroup or preschool		13	5
Playwork/out of school care		8	3
Private family/nanny		20	7
Creche		4	1
Other		24	9
Don't know		29	11
Total		267	100

Over half (53 percent) of those who had childcare jobs had stayed in them over the follow-up period. Of those who did not (47%), Table 3.5 shows that second and subsequent jobs were still much more likely to be working in a day nursery or as a nanny than doing any other kind of childcare job.

Table 3.5 Settings for second jobs after leaving college for those with a current childcare job

		N	%
Day nursery	Private	47	47
	Local authority	13	13
	College	5	5
Family Centre		2	2
School	Private	4	4
	Nursery class/school	7	7
	Primary school	4	4
Playgroup or preschool		5	5
Playwork/out of school care		6	6
Private family/nanny		24	24
Other		8	8
Don't know		1	1
Total		100	100

Respondents may give more than one response: percentages do not sum to 100

3.3.2 Non childcare jobs

Thirty-seven (14 percent) of those who were working in childcare had also had non-childcare employment over the follow-up period. Table 3.6 shows that this was mostly likely to be as a barmaid or waitress followed by shop work and production/assembly work.

Table 3.6 Non-childcare related employment for those with a current childcare job

	N	%
Barmaid/waitress	11	32
Shop assistant	10	29
Production/assembly work	4	12
Administration	2	6
Care assistant	2	6
Farm worker	1	3
Crew member	2	6
Other	5	15
Don't know	1	3
Total	34	100

Respondents may give more than one response: percentages do not sum to 100

3.3.3 Types of childcare work

Turning to the kind of work in childcare, Table 3.7 shows that the pattern established so far predominates. Nearly half of all those currently working in childcare are working in private day nurseries. Around 20 percent are working in schools, in a range of roles and a further 11 percent are working in local

authority day nurseries. Eight percent are working for private families as a nanny.

Table 3.7 Types of employer/employment held by those in childcare work currently

		N	%
Day nursery	Private	126	49
	Local authority	28	11
Family Centre		2	1
School	Welfare assistant/learning asst	8	4
	Nursery class/school	19	7
	Primary school	17	7
	School/state school	5	3
Playgroup or preschool		14	5
Playwork/out of school care		2	2
Private family/nanny		21	8
Leisure centre		2	1
Childminder		1	-
Creche		4	2
Don't know		7	3
Total		267	100

The number of job titles held by former students in the childcare sector is formidable, reflecting a diverse range of settings and a fragmented childcare and early years field (Table 3.8) (Simon et al., forthcoming, discuss the complexity of the job titles and categories in more detail).

Table 3.8 Job titles held in current job for those with a current childcare job

	N	%
Nursery nurse	131	49
Nanny	20	8
Crèche pre-school assistant	3	1
Learning support assistant	14	5
Nurse	2	1
Nursery officer	13	5
Classroom assistant	12	5
Special needs support worker/assistant	12	5
Nursery assistant	11	4
Ocean adventure assistant	2	1
Playgroup supervisor/assistant/leader	11	4
Room/group leader	6	2
Managing director/manager	4	2
Supervisor	4	2
Childcare worker	4	2
Childminder	1	-
Total	267	100

3.3.4 Hours of work

For three-quarters of those currently employed in childcare, the post was full-time, as Table 3.9 shows.

Table 3.9 Full-time or part-time job

	N	%
Full-time	204	76
Part-time	63	24
Total	267	100

3.3.5 Future plans

The large majority (89%) of those currently with a childcare job still expected to be working in childcare in five years time, a quarter (28%) in a private day nursery. However, almost half (46%) expected to have some time away from childcare work during that five year period, mostly (43%) to look after their own children.

3.3.6 Employment paths - the in-depth interviews

In-depth interviews showed that there was considerable variation in the employment paths of those who held a current childcare job (Group 1). Two of the four respondents in Group 1⁶, currently working in childcare, had jobs in private day nurseries: one (Beth) got a job on the day she left college working in a nursery where she had done her practice placements; the other (Liz) had done temporary work over the first summer before finding a permanent position. A third (Sarah) worked part-time in a preschool and the fourth (Anna) worked as a learning assistant in a local authority secondary school. Employment in a secondary school is of course outside the definition of care work with young children, but was clearly seen by the respondent as childcare work, as opposed to formal teaching. This raises the question of diverging views of what exactly constitutes a childcare job: is it looking after young children in the absence of parents? Or working with children in general? Or is it facilitating learning? Or is it possible, in fact, to arrive at a definition to suit the entire range of current possibilities? This is an issue discussed further in the follow-up study of former day nursery workers (chapter 5) and in the conclusions (chapter 8).

3.4 Employment Group 2 – Past childcare job

3.4.1 Continuing commitment to childcare work

A striking feature of respondents in Group 2 was the continuing commitment to working with children, despite difficulties doing so. Eighty eight percent of this group considered childcare and early years work to be a longer term career rather than temporary or short term work for them. This was very similar to the proportion currently in childcare work that considered it to be a longer-term career. In addition, nearly all those in the survey in employment Group 2

⁶ Details of respondents in Groups 1, 2 and 3 are given in Appendix 2.

thought they would work in childcare in the future, mostly within the next year or two as shown in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10 Those with past childcare job: whether and when consider work in childcare or early related sector

	N	%		N	%
			In next year	23	72
Yes	32	94	Two years time	7	22
No	2	6	Five years time	2	6
Total	34	100	Total	32	100

3.4.2 Number of jobs

Former childcare students in this group were more likely than those in Group 1 to have had three or more jobs in the preceding year (32% had had 3 or more jobs, compared to 13% for Group 1). This group was just as likely to have had two jobs (35% compared to 34%) and less likely to have had one job (32% compared to 53%). Table 3.11 also shows that Group 2 respondents were less likely than those in Group 1 to have worked continuously since leaving college, and more likely to have periods when they did not work.

Table 3.11 Whether worked continuously since left college or periods not worked, by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
Worked continuously	218	16	34	268
	82	47	72	77
Periods not worked	49	18	13	80
	18	53	28	23
Total	267	34	47	348
	100	100	100	100

3.4.3 Periods out of work

A third point about the employment pattern of this group is that respondents in Group 2 were more likely than those in Group 1 to have had periods of four months or more out of employment (59% compared to 21%). Table 3.12 shows that the reasons respondents in Group 2 had not been working were broadly similar to those for respondents in other groups, but this group was more likely to be caring for their own children than those in Group 1 (although less likely than respondents in Group 3), and more likely to be undertaking further study, or to be sick or disabled.

Table 3.12 Reasons not been working by employment group

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare	Total
Unemployed	38	11	9	58
	78	62	24	56
Caring for own children	3	3	12	18
	6	17	32	17
Training/studying	2	3	12	17
	4	17	32	16
Sickness/disability	-	3	2	5
	-	17	5	5
Travelling	2	1	1	4
	4	6	3	4
Caring for others	2	-	-	2
	4	-	-	2
Voluntary work	-	-	2	2
	-	-	5	2
School holidays	2	-	-	2
	4	-	-	2
Other	2	-	1	3
	4	-	3	3
Total	49	18	37	104
	47	17	36	100

In addition, 23 Group 2 respondents were not currently working. The main reasons they gave for this were the same as the main reasons given for not working by those in the employment groups above: unemployment (8); caring for own children (8) and training or studying (6). Two of those doing further training were doing full-time teacher training leading to a QTS certificate, and two were doing full-time childhood studies at an unspecified level.

3.4.4. Employment paths - the in-depth interviews

The three nannies in the in-depth sample demonstrated the ongoing commitment held by those respondents who had had at least one childcare job since leaving college but were not currently working in childcare (Group 2) to childcare employment. They also revealed some of the reasons for interrupted employment records. All three reported clear difficulties with nannying as employment. Two of them, Sophie and Amanda, had sought employment as live-in nannies in London. Both had found and were finding the process of obtaining an appropriate post very difficult; and both had left unsatisfactory posts during the year. These respondents reported that nanny agencies were unreliable, inconsistent and often appeared to be acting for parents rather than in the interests of nannies. They appeared unsympathetic to the potential pitfalls of arriving in London for the first time, to find work, often unprepared for the interviews, the range of families and the variations in the demands of the posts. Sophie said she thought she ought to have been better prepared for interviews, in order to make clear that she expected a contract of employment, reasonable hours of work, and clearly set out responsibilities, including time off. A third

nanny (Louisa) had worked for two local families, obtained her jobs through word of mouth, never had a contract and was paid in cash. She said this arrangement worked very well until she became pregnant, whereupon she realised she was not entitled to any maternity pay, and her employers were not obliged to offer her any further work. She had agreed, however, to return to work for one family, part-time, taking her infant child with her.

The other two respondents in this group, Rachel and Serena, had both intended to work in childcare but had had difficulty finding a suitable post. Rachel applied for many jobs, but was told she was either inexperienced or too young or both. She did work for some months in an after school club, before turning to more secure, consistent and readily available work in airport security. She said she ‘did think it would be easier to get a job (in childcare) than it was. Even though I had experience, day nurseries were still asking for more experience. It put me off a bit’. But working in an after school club ‘wasn’t going to give me anything more, apart from the same routine, no promotion prospects or anything, there wasn’t really a lot after you could do, a bit dead end really’. Eventually Rachel decided that she would rather work full-time at the airport, where she had previously worked at weekends, and take her time in applying for childcare jobs as and when they come up. Serena also went for many interviews, without success, and did some agency work after finishing college. However, for health and family reasons, she decided to reduce her working hours to a minimum and had recently begun work as a school meals supervisor in a local school for one and a half hours a day.

3.4.5 Reasons for leaving jobs

Among those with a past childcare job, 40 percent left their jobs due to personal or family reasons (first five items on Table 3.13), while 45 percent left for work-related reasons such as short-term contracts ending (second six items on Table 3.13). The most frequently mentioned reason for leaving childcare jobs, since leaving college, was their short term contract ending (23%) followed by own children (including pregnancy) (18%).

Table 3.13 Reasons for leaving childcare jobs held since leaving college

	N	%
Short term contract ended	9	23
Own children (including pregnancy)	7	18
Study	3	8
Management	3	8
Travel	2	5
Workplace not local enough	2	5
Moving area	2	5
Working conditions	2	5
Staff group	2	5
Pay	1	3
Redundancy/dismissal	1	3
Other	6	15
Total	34	100

Respondents may give more than one response: percentages do not sum to 100

3.5 Employment Group 3 – Not worked in childcare

Seventy-one survey respondents had not worked in childcare at all since leaving college (Group 3). This group was composed of those who had not worked at all (24) and those who had worked but not in childcare (47). Data in this section will combine the two sub- groups.

3.5.1 What those not working are doing

Nearly 80 percent of the 24 respondents who were not employed said they had wanted to work in childcare since they left college. The two main reasons they had not were because they had continued studying full-time(20%) and because of family commitments(18%) such as pregnancy or jobs not fitting in with school hours. The majority of this group (88%) thought they would work in childcare in the future and of these, a third (33%) thought they would seek childcare or related employment within a year, and half (52%) thought they would do so in two to four years time. Only 3 (14%) thought they would put off employment for as long as five years (see Table 3.15). Of the five in-depth respondents who had not worked in childcare since leaving college, three had not done so due to childcare commitments or pregnancy. None of them considered they had left the childcare or early years sector altogether, although one planned to re-train in social work.

3.5.2 Reasons for not working in childcare

The main reasons given in the survey for not working in childcare were continued study, either at university or college. Pay was the next factor, followed by inability to find a job with their qualification in their area, family commitments and pregnancy, and by no longer wanting to work with children (Table 3.14).

Table 3.14 Reasons not worked in childcare

	N	%
Studying	15	20
Pay	10	13
No jobs available/Could not find job in childcare	9	12
Jobs did not fit in with family commitments/Pregnant	9	12
Didn't like working with children	9	12
Better job found	6	8
Not qualified	5	7
Inadequate preparation by college	4	5
Other	9	12
Total	76	100

Note: this table combines data from those who have worked but not in childcare, and those who have not worked at all since leaving college.

Among the five in-depth interview respondents in Group 3, the reasons for not working in childcare largely derived from responsibilities for their own children, and the economics of providing for them. Three respondents, Susan, Lesley and Hannah, either had or were expecting children. Susan and Lesley were both

single parents, each with three children at primary school. Susan lived in a market town and said there was no local childcare employment that would suit her available hours: 'The line of work I am qualified for doesn't really fit in with what I need to do at the moment. 'Cause I need to be at home for the children. I was looking for school work and those vacancies don't come up very often'.

Susan had wanted to follow up her childcare training by becoming a nurse, as she said this was 'definitely better paid than childcare', but she had been thwarted there, too. She felt her children needed to be older and more self-sufficient before she embarked on a demanding training programme, but her mother, on whom she would have to rely for childcare, was getting steadily older and less able to do this. Lesley, in a similar situation, was managing to resolve the problem of providing for her family and qualification in childcare. She had used the training, together with voluntary work experience, to access a diploma course in social work, with the prospect of earning substantially more as a social worker in two years time than she could as a childcare worker now.

Hannah was pregnant by the time she finished her course. Married and living in a sixth floor flat, she had had to suspend her studies during the second year due to financial difficulties. She worked as a nanny during that year and so completed the course only a few months before interview. A subsequent planned nanny job fell through, by which time Hannah felt she was unlikely to get another post before her expected delivery. She had hoped to register as a childminder in order to continue earning an income, but had been advised that she should wait until she had been rehoused, as the start-up costs were considerable. But this might be some years away.

The remaining two respondents, Kerry and Sally, both worked outside childcare with young children. Kerry had left college intending to work in childcare, but found difficulty in finding a job that would pay a competitive rate. Although she lived at home, she had to be financially self-supporting, and had debts from college. She could not afford to take a very low wage childcare job when there was other, better paid work available in factories and warehouses. She had plans for further studies and needed to earn sufficient to make these plans feasible. Sally was recruited from her course to work for a large organisation that cared for people with disabilities. She had done a practice placement there with young children, but was recruited to work with young adults (i.e. social care), which she now prefers, and plans to go into management in due course.

3.5.3 Aspirations in childcare work

Looking to the future, eighty percent of those in the survey who had not worked in childcare since leaving college thought they would do so at some point in the future. This is similar to the proportions in the other employment groups. Asked to identify when they might enter childcare or early years work, Group 3 respondents were evenly divided, as Table 3.15 shows.

Table 3.15 Whether and when consider work in childcare or related sector

	N	%		N	%
			In one year	18	31
Yes	59	83	Two years	22	37
No	12	17	Five years	19	32
Total	71	100	Total	59	100

3.6 Comparisons with other groups

Arguably Group 2 is a comparatively less stable group than the other groups, but it is important to remember that the numbers are small (only 34 in total in Group 2), making the validity of such comparisons difficult. At the time of interview, eleven of the Group 2 respondents had jobs outside childcare and early years. These jobs were similar to those done by Group 1 respondents when not working in childcare: administration (3); shop work (3); learning support or nursing assistant (3); barmaid (1) and other (1).

There were few differences between Groups 1 and 2 in terms of the kinds of jobs in childcare and early years done by each. As with Group 1, the most likely form of employment was in a private day nursery. Perhaps surprising is the proportion of respondents in Group 2 who had had jobs in nursery schools and classes and had left them, this being the preferred place of employment for students identified in the Part One study. This may be due to the use of short-term contracts for employment in schools.

Table 3.16 Comparison of Groups 1 and 2 on settings for first job in childcare

		Group 1: Current job in childcare		Group 2: Past job in childcare	
		N	%	N	%
Day nursery	Private	105	39	12	35
	Local authority	23	9	4	12
	College	5	2	-	-
Family Centre		1	-	-	-
School	Private	4	1	-	-
	Nursery class/school	18	7	7	21
	Primary school	13	4	1	3
Playgroup or preschool		13	5	-	-
Playwork/out of school care		8	3	1	3
Private family/nanny		20	7	3	9
Creche		4	1	-	-
Other		24	9	4	12
Don't know		29	11	2	6
Total		267	100	34	100

3.7 Summary

The survey and in-depth interview data provide a wealth of detail on the attitudes towards childcare employment and the employment paths undertaken. Dividing the survey sample into three groups on the basis of experience of

childcare employment enabled analysis that focused on minority pathways. This showed that the high level of commitment to childcare employment held by students in Part One continued once they had left college and was often sustained during periods without childcare employment. This level of commitment was also marked among those with an interrupted employment record or who had not worked in childcare at all since leaving college. Many of those who were not working in childcare thought they would return at some point. However, the discussion also raised various issues and difficulties with following a career in childcare. For example, the most frequently mentioned reasons for not working in childcare were not dislike of the work but further study and dissatisfaction with the pay. Those who had worked in childcare and left gave as their main reasons for leaving the end of a short-term contract and caring for their own children (including pregnancy). In the next section we discuss some of the recruitment and retention issues emerging from the analysis of employment paths.

Chapter Four - Emergent issues in recruitment and retention

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on issues in recruitment and retention that emerged from analysis of the survey and in-depth interview data. The main issues are some difficulties in finding jobs, relations with the employer, work-family balance, positive appraisal of courses and intentions for further training.

4.2 Recruitment methods

Students' performance in practice placements is a useful means of recruitment. In the survey, 20 percent of those with a childcare job had obtained it through a previous placement or employer as shown in Table 4.1, and a further 12 percent were in their first job having obtained it through a practice placement or previous employer. Being offered a job as the course ended may be a way into stable employment, with the prior knowledge of the worker a useful background for the employer. The three in-depth interview respondents who were offered posts in this way were all committed to their workplaces 15 months later and there were no examples of such posts where respondents had later become dissatisfied. In the survey, 54 percent of respondents had had one paid job since leaving college. It may even be that for those who want to work in nurseries, this is the most opportune moment for recruitment, but it obviously depends on the quality and suitability of the placement.

Table 4.1 Method of obtaining current job and first job

	Current job		First job	
	N	%	N	%
Local advertising	101	38	34	33
Word of mouth	37	14	13	13
Agency	15	6	4	4
National advertising	11	4	4	4
Local job centre	15	6	3	3
Previous employer/placement	52	20	12	12
College	27	10	19	18
Sent/took CV and letter to employers	4	2	2	2
Its my first job	-	-	4	4
Other	5	2	3	3
Total	267	100	103	100

Beyond practice placements, Table 4.1 shows that around a third of students found their jobs through local advertising, although finding jobs through word of mouth was also popular. This corresponds to the findings of the day nursery survey in Part One, where the most popular methods of recruitment used by day

nurseries were local advertising (86%) and word of mouth (51%) and agencies (29%).

4.3 Difficulties finding employment

Given the current high demand for childcare workers, we were surprised by the extent of difficulties faced by some students in finding employment after finishing courses. Some of the respondents reported taking the first job that they applied for, working in a preschool, a secondary school, a private nursery and as nannies. However, several other in-depth respondents reported difficulty in finding suitable posts. Rachel had childcare employment experience prior to her course, and was a mature student, but in interviews was repeatedly told she was too young or too inexperienced. Susan could not find work in a school, which she needed in order to fit in with her own children's needs, because there were virtually no nursery classes or other opportunities in schools in the local area. Nor were there any after school facilities for her children which might have enabled her to work longer hours. As a single parent with school aged children and a qualification she was theoretically in a very good position to move into employment and financial self-sufficiency but the poorly developed state of local services precluded this. Kerry's experience of trying to find childcare employment clearly showed the acute dilemma of requiring sufficient financial reward to enable independence versus the desire to use her qualification to work with young children.

In the survey, nannying was the second most commonly held job title among former students entering employment, representing 8 percent of former childcare students. However, the experiences among those interviewed in depth were that those choosing this job found the greatest difficulties in finding suitable employment. Both Amanda and Sophie found their posts through London nanny agencies, and took the first posts they were offered, after one or two short interviews. Amanda was signed up with six agencies, only two of which she rated as offering any kind of support during the job finding process. Sophie said she thought the 'agency should have said something to make sure that I knew the questions I was supposed to ask... the agency said "Oh, you don't need a contract, it doesn't matter"'. After Sophie lost the first job and had only an ambivalent reference, she tried another agency. This one refused to put her on the books because the previous employer gave another poor reference over the telephone. She then went to a third agency, and this one took the time to find out about her past references, her reports from college and gave her some work experience in order to give her the possibility of a better reference. This support was essential, as Sophie realised that 'if I didn't do anything about it (the poor reference), I wouldn't be getting another childcare position'. Sophie then went to dozens of interviews, being very conscious that she needed to find the 'right' family for her.

The contrast between the job finding process of those people who were recruited into organisations as they left courses, and those who chose to leave home and move to London to find live-in nanny work is clear. For the former group it is a fairly seamless transition into reasonably secure employment. For the latter, it can be a long and hazardous process for which they are ill equipped, offering unstable and short lived employment. The survey found that nannying was the

third most common form of childcare employment (8%) for former students, yet it remains a largely invisible form of employment, being unregistered and indistinguishable from other childcare occupations in statistics⁷. This makes it difficult to estimate the number of nannies nation-wide and trends in their use. A study of domestic labour in dual career households estimated that 'around 40 percent of such households with pre-school age children employ a nanny' (Gregson and Lowe, 1994: 50). However, secondary analysis of the Family Resources Survey for 1993 - 1996 shows that of employed parents whose occupations are in Social Class I or II and have preschool aged children, only about ten percent use nannies. Anecdotal evidence, however, suggests that employing a nanny is an increasingly cost effective form of childcare for families with more than one child.

Both Amanda and Sophie suggested that the process of finding a nanny job could be made easier by establishing a national, regulated service, perhaps through the Internet, with a database of employers and potential employees. One respondent also argued that the particular features of finding a nanny job were not recognised by the welfare benefits system, making any claim virtually impossible. No nanny jobs were advertised in her job centre, yet she was required to attend the centre to look for jobs three times a week. Better recognition of nannying as a legitimate form of employment would assist the process of job application, they said.

4.4 Relations between childcare employers and employees

A third issue the employment patterns bring to light is the relationship between employers and employees and the options available to childcare workers. Table 3.5 showed that in the survey, 39 percent of respondents cited the staff and the organisation as a reason for feeling settled in the workplace, the third most frequently mentioned aspect of the work. However (as we will show in a later section), 22 percent of those who were not settled also cited the same reason, second only to dissatisfaction with the pay. Clearly, feeling happy about the staff and organisational aspects of the working environment is a critical factor in retaining childcare workers both in their immediate jobs and in the childcare sector overall.

In the case of Sarah, her dissatisfaction with both the excessive bureaucracy of the organisation she was working within and the unsuitability of her immediate supervisor led her to re-open a recently closed preschool as her own business. Here, relations with employers had inaugurated a new period of skill development for Sarah and had renewed a rural early childhood service.

But for the two live-in nannies, relations with employers were far more personalised and their adverse consequences were the loss of accommodation as well as a job. For example, Sophie referred to a major argument during a three week holiday with her employers in which '(the employer) questioned all my skills about childcare, she questioned me as a professional childcarer and she

⁷ The Standard Occupational Classification (OPCS, 1990) does not include an occupational category for nannies; they are included within the 'Other Childcare' category.

questioned my upbringing with my family'. When working her notice after being sacked, her employer again questioned her skills. In an attempt to be professional, but feeling acutely vulnerable, Sophie moved all her belongings out so that 'if she came at me again with that, I would have said "fine, you can look after your children until your new nanny starts. I'm leaving now because I'm not here to be shouted at and abused"'. Relations between employers and employees are mediated through the type of employment and the context within which it takes place. Working as a nanny, or indeed as a childminder (Mooney et al., 2001), is a highly personalised and potentially isolated context where trust is an essential ingredient of the working relationship and sometimes replaces formal written contracts of employment. This in turn can leave the childcare worker in a relatively powerless position.

4.5 Relationship between employment and parenting responsibilities

A fourth emergent issue in the description of employment patterns is the relationship between employment and parenting responsibilities. The structuring of women's work around family and parenting is a well-documented feature of their entry into paid employment (Crompton, 1997), although the form that this inter-relationship takes is constantly evolving. Among childcare workers this accommodation of parenting is also clearly present, for both practical and ideological reasons. The next section will examine the issue of beliefs and expectations about parenting and employment held by this group, but here the practical constraints will be raised.

For Hannah, who was six months pregnant, and for Louisa, whose baby was two months old, motherhood was fairly all consuming for the immediate future. Louisa had said she would return to a family where she had been employed as a nanny for two days a week, but was concerned about how it would all work. Hannah would have liked to pursue childminding, but was unable to do this from a one-bedroom flat and would have to wait until the local authority rehoused her. The four in-depth respondents who were single parents all noted the difficulty of fitting childcare work into their available hours (i.e., school days and terms); even the one childcare worker who was married and worked in a school had had to find and pay for childcare for her own child before and after school. These examples give some indication of the complexity of organising parenting and work in childcare.

In summary, these emergent issues on recruitment and retention suggest that from the perspective of the workforce, high demand does not necessarily equate with a smooth transition into childcare employment. For some of those who wish to work in private nurseries, there are many opportunities available. But for others who have personal constraints such as their own children's school hours, or live in a rural area with limited availability of childcare employment, there are serious difficulties with pursuing a childcare career. The most severe difficulties were experienced by those in nannying, which can be described as a marginal form of employment. Nannying is not only an unregulated form of childcare, it is also invisible in statistics and under recognised by welfare and employment agencies. Furthermore successful nannying relies on trust relations

between employers and nanny, often with an uneven distribution of authority between the two parties.

4.6 Family life, prospective and actual

In the survey approaching a quarter (23%) of former students were parents. We have noted already that becoming a mother has implications for continued employment, and indeed there may be other family reasons that affect childcare workers' employment careers. In the Part One study we saw that among students, 53 percent foresaw time away from employment in order to care for their own young children, and 15 percent envisaged leaving employment for elder or disabled kin care responsibilities. Among day nursery staff around a third expected to have time away for family caring in the next five years (Cameron et al., 2001).

4.6.1 Time away from employment

In the Part Two study, former childcare students confirmed this finding. Table 4.2 shows that nearly half of those surveyed expected to have some time away from employment in order to care for children or other family members in the next five years.

Table 4.2 Whether expect to have time away from employment for caring responsibilities or other family reasons

	N	%
Yes	174	47
No	198	53
Total	372	100

The main purpose of this time away from employment was to care for children, as Table 4.3 shows, with ten percent identifying other relatives as the 'cared for'.

Table 4.3 Types of family related reason for leaving employment

	N	%
Children	165	95
Relatives	18	10
Go travelling	2	1
Don't know	3	2
Other	1	1
Total	189	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

Of the in-depth study group, six of the fourteen respondents had children and one was expecting a child. Moreover, we have noted elsewhere the high association between age of first child and educational qualifications which led us to conclude that childcare workers were very likely be having children just as their childcare careers were maturing (Cameron et al., 2001). Family life and the demands it makes on women workers is therefore a key factor in understanding entry, retention and loss among the childcare workforce.

4.6.2 Perspectives on combining motherhood and employment

As the portraits presented at the beginning of Chapter Two made clear, the very similarities between family responsibilities and childcare work is often what inspires people to become childcare workers in the first place. Indeed, Amanda said one of the good things about working with children was ‘you get to see how you affect children before you have your own’. In this sense, childcare work may be seen as preparation for motherhood. However, just as prospective motherhood brings people in, it also drives people out of the work. This is partly because of the practical difficulties noted above of finding, and paying for, suitable arrangements for their own children, but also underscoring these difficulties is a clear set of beliefs about the ideal care for young children.

While those in the in-depth study who were mothers or about to become mothers had given much more thought to the question of how to combine parenting and employment than those who were not, all but two of the respondents were able to give an indication of their approach. The predominant view of this group was that while children were preschool aged at least, they themselves would not be employed. This broadly concurs with views expressed in Part One, where childcare students were asked how they would prefer to combine employment and parenting responsibilities for preschool aged children. The predominant pattern was to prefer part-time employment (43%) followed by not working at all while their children were young (25%), working from home (21%) and, least preferable, working full-time (Cameron et al., 2001).

Among the in-depth respondents, Sally said ‘ideally you’d be staying at home if you have children, not for ever, to get them through the preschool years. I wouldn’t work while they were young. I’d stay at home and educate them as much as I could before they get to a preschool and then they’ve got a head start really’. The new mother in the group, Louisa, said ‘I wouldn’t want to give her to anyone else to look after just so I could go to work’. In a similar vein, Sophie said ‘I would want to look after my children myself. I think that if you have children you’re meant to be there for them’. Finally, Amanda said ‘if I had young children I wouldn’t work until they were at school... I prefer that the mum be with the child all the time, because then they are brought up to know their parents in a stable relationship rather than having a nanny’.

Among those with children, there was also a strongly held view that children, including school-aged children, should not be ‘left’. Annie said ‘once my two have had a full day at school, I don’t like the idea of them being in childcare till six o’clock, I think its too long... I feel that often kids are left for other people to look after... I’d like to see mums switching their hours around, shorter hours for three out of five days...’ Sarah said as her preschool was only three hours work ‘I still have time for the children...it fits in really’.

Hannah used the language of ‘choice’ about opting to use paid childcare, also noted among childminders (Mooney et al., 2001). She reported that she was hoping to be able to stay at home with her own children and be registered as a childminder ‘to give a service to someone who hasn’t got the choice of staying at home with their children ... but for me personally, I wouldn’t be able to leave

my child'. Liz also said she would combine motherhood with childminding should the situation arise.

For these former childcare students then, a particular model of childrearing is dominant. It is primarily a mother's responsibility, and it more or less excludes them from paid employment outside the home. Paid employment is demoted to a secondary activity to be fitted in around perceptions of children's needs to be at home and children's school hours. There is also selflessness about their perception of motherhood, which promotes children's needs over their own. As these are the very people who are trained to provide a non-parental childcare service there seems to be a tension between what is appropriate for one's own children, and what is appropriate for others' children. Sophie articulated this tension when she said 'being a nanny is really a contradiction of my beliefs about bringing up children'. Such contradictions have been previously noted among childminders (Bryant, Newton and Harris, 1980; Nelson, 1994) and among childcare workers more generally (Cameron et al., 2001).

The expectation that with young children mothers will ideally 'be there' is a normative one. But childcare workers are also the people who are trained to provide professional childcare services and they appeared to construct these services negatively, as 'leaving' one's children, rather than positively as 'giving' them an opportunity. This perspective, combined with practical difficulties in arrangements and finance, will arguably encourage qualified childcare workers to leave childcare work in order to provide the ideal, home based care for their own children. Thus the beliefs and expectations about motherhood will have implications for retention and loss of staff in formal childcare and early education services.

4.6.3 Sources of help in combining employment and motherhood

The in-depth study respondents were asked how they thought families with young children should be helped to combine employment and caring. Specifically who should provide help: government, employers and/or family members? The predominant view here was that government should help families with caring responsibilities. This concurs with the findings of a survey of parents (La Valle, Finch, Nove and Lewin, 2000: 294) which found that 'the overwhelming majority of mothers (around 90 percent) expected government and employers to do more to help working families'.

Various suggestions were noted by respondents, such as expanding financial support to enable formal childcare services to be used by those on childcare workers' wages, pension and sick pay for childcare workers, additional financial benefits for lone parents and poorer couple parents, in effect an allowance for staying at home to care for young children. One respondent also asked for registered babysitters and better information about childcare services. The need for more and better distributed childcare services was also noted.

Respondents thought employers, particularly large employers, should help families by providing on site, subsidised crèches, and flexibility in hours to suit workers' needs and to provide for emergencies such as illness. Last, in line with the findings on kinship and obligation reported by Finch and Mason (1993),

these respondents perceived a fine line between what childcare they would ask family, or rather mothers, to do, and what they could do. Several of the respondents said their mother would look after their children, but they wouldn't ask her to, as regular childcare to cover work was properly their own responsibility and it would be 'too much' to rely on family for this.

4.7 Perspectives on further education in childcare

The survey showed that 97 percent of former childcare students had completed their courses and 96 percent had gained the qualification. Table 4.4 shows that half of those in the survey who had worked in childcare said the course they completed had prepared them well for childcare work. Most of the remainder said the preparation was quite good while a few said the course had not prepared them very well at all.

Table 4.4 How well course prepared former students for work

	N	%
Very well	150	50
Quite well	128	43
Not very well	23	8
Total	301	100

Note: only asked of those who had worked in childcare.

Coverage of practical aspects of working with children was most highly rated by former students (Table 4.5, 84%), followed by theoretical aspects of the course and ideas for what works in classroom or nursery situations. Among those who thought there was inadequate preparation for childcare work, the coverage of subjects such as special needs, the National Curriculum, and parental issues was particularly criticised.

Table 4.5 Former childcare students' views on how courses prepared them for work

	Well		Not very well	
	N	%	N	%
Practical experiences	233	84	30	20
Coverage of certain subjects e.g., special needs, national curriculum, parental issues	-	-	54	36
Ideas of what works	86	31	19	13
Theory	125	45	3	2
Preparation for interviews	7	3	-	-
Good explanations	3	1	-	-
Good placements	3	1	-	-
Planning	-	-	2	1
Long hours	-	-	2	1
Lot of paperwork	-	-	4	3
Nothing in particular	-	-	15	10
Not aware	-	-	5	3
Was well prepared	-	-	14	9
Don't know/not stated	-	-	2	1
Other	8	3	12	8
Total	278	100	151	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

Furthermore, the former childcare students judged that having the qualification helped them to get their first jobs and to get better pay in that first job (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 Degree to which qualification helped obtain first job and better pay in first job

	Obtain first job		Better pay in first job	
	N	%	N	%
Helped a lot	253	84	274	91
Helped a little	33	11	15	5
Did not help at all	15	5	-	-
Don't know	-	-	12	4
Total	301	100	301	100

This endorsement of childcare courses was mostly reflected in our in-depth study, but with some qualifications added, as we will now discuss.

4.8 The course as preparation for work

In the survey, childcare work was rated as better than expected by 42 percent of respondents, while 34 percent thought it was neither better nor worse than expected (see Table 2.10). This might indicate that the courses gave a fairly realistic preparation for employment. However, the in-depth study revealed a lack of consensus on the adequacy of preparation for work in childcare given by courses.

4.8.1 Quality of placements

There were three broad aspects of courses mentioned by respondents. One aspect was the quality of placements. Some thought they were ‘brilliant’, and covered the whole range of settings and age groups, while others thought the exact opposite. Louisa said ‘none of my placements were with babies, all three and four year olds. Apart from my family, they had a six-month-old baby. It wasn’t a real challenge and ... if I’d had a family with a newborn baby I wouldn’t have know what to have done, apart from changing nappies’.

Kerry added that her college could have been more flexible with placements, as she found she was withdrawn from a placement in a school that she very much enjoyed, and made to go into a hospital, which she very much did not want to do. As noted above, the most frequently cited aspect of courses in the preparation for work in the survey was ‘practical experiences’; followed by ‘theory’ and ‘ideas of what works’ among respondents who said courses had prepared them very or quite well. This suggests that practice placements were perceived as a main element or even purpose of childcare courses. This was endorsed by the Part One study, which found that over 80 percent of students praised the practical element of the training (Cameron et al., 2001).

Several of the in-depth study respondents said they would like to see more time in practice placements and less time in college while on their courses. This evidence suggests that it is most important to get the balance, range, and suitability of practice placements right for each individual student.

4.8.2 Organisation of the course

A second aspect of courses was the organisation of the course. Here some comments were that deadlines were poorly co-ordinated between tutors, so that several would come at once, that rebuilding work caused paperwork to be lost between temporary moves and that careers advice was poorly integrated into the course. Rachel and Sophie both would have appreciated a more organised and supportive approach to careers advice. Sophie said: ‘they could have taken groups aside, if you were going to be a nanny or teaching course or nursing course, and given more focused careers advice...said a bit more about contracts, general paperwork’. Lastly, several of the older respondents raised the issue of how mature students fitted in with younger students. Beth suggested that courses could be better tailored to the needs of mature students, not just those with children, but also those who found it irritating to constantly wait for younger, less punctual students to arrive.

4.8.3 Tutors, support and suitability of courses

Third, there were some comments about tutors and support, and the suitability of the course for the individuals. Sarah said the course had not been at all suitable for her, and she felt the admissions process had not made it clear to her what would be involved in the course and both Annie and Sally said their courses had focused too much on pre-fives and not on the generality of childcare employment, with particular absences in special needs and ‘dealing with stroppy teenagers’. Kerry found that her personal tutor was not at all supportive: ‘Whenever I cried out for help, she was just “Well, tough” kind of attitude.

She'd fail my work; I'd take it to another tutor who would say it was fine. I think it was a personality clash'.

4.8.4 How useful is the qualification?

Once the qualification has been achieved, how useful is it in work? As noted above, former students reported that having a qualification had helped them 'a lot' in getting their first job in childcare (84%) and an even greater proportion said having a qualification had helped them get better pay in their first job (90%).

4.8.4.1 Qualification as invaluable

The predominant view in the survey was echoed by six respondents in the in-depth study who reported that the qualification had been 'invaluable' in helping them get jobs in childcare, helping them access further or higher education, and/or in dealing with their own children or children they look after. Amanda said 'I don't think, if people don't do the course, they realise how much in depth you can sort of teach children... you don't realise the little things you can do. Or how everything you do makes an impact'.

Sophie, a nanny, thought she could command better wages with a qualification, and it gave her a greater sense of authority in dealing with a parent over a child. She said: 'I refer to my study books and then I'll sit down with a parent and say, "Right, I think this needs to be done"'. Beth, a mature entrant to childcare work, said she wouldn't have got her job without the qualification: 'there's no way you can apply for ... unless you're lucky and you get maybe something from a school placement' and Lesley argued that the course had given her a 'really good grounding' and had helped her to get on a social work diploma course. She added that she had been able to show the social work course tutors that she already been studying at that level, and had experience of juggling study with the demands of the family.

4.8.4.2 Limitations of the qualification

Other in-depth respondents were not so unreservedly convinced of the value of the qualification. In particular respondents said that colleagues and acquaintances earned more than they did despite not having a qualification; that having a qualification was no guarantee of a job, with some saying they had had greater success getting employment prior to attaining their qualification. Louisa, a nanny, said nobody had ever asked to see her certificate, that she knew of people working as nannies without a qualification and earning more than her, although she conceded it might help if you wanted to work abroad or go on to do teacher training. Both Kerry and Sarah reflected that the choice of course had not, in the end been right for them. Sarah, an ex-childminder, wanted a course to prepare her for working in a preschool, and found the BTEC too academically oriented, although it had helped her access an Open University foundation course. Kerry thought it would be useful as something to fall back on, as 'no-one is going to stop having kids that need to be looked after', but it was not right for her as it did not help her long term aim to study psychology at university. Finally, Sally, who had taken the course because it offered the best available preparation for working with disabled children said 'it has been useful, but I think with the experience I'd had prior to going to college, I probably would

have got myself into that kind of job anyway'. Sally thought of the qualification as a 'nice stepping stone' as there are 'quite a few fields you can go into now with that qualification'.

When asked specifically if they thought having a qualification would give them greater access to promotion to senior positions, respondents were not convinced. Some respondents pointed out disadvantages of being qualified. Sarah said her boss in the preschool had not liked the fact that she knew more than the boss did, and Kerry reported that some employment agencies had refused to take her onto their books because they thought that possessing the qualification meant she should be too highly qualified for the work she was seeking. Working in a school, Annie said, meant there was no possibility of promotion: 'I'll always be a nursery nurse. Once you're here this is it. I did know that when I took the course on'. Amanda thought she would have to do another course to get access to senior posts: 'it gets you in as a nursery nurse or a nanny but if you want anything else you have to do another course'. Only one respondent, a nursery worker, saw a clear connection between having a qualification and promotion.

4.9 Studying in the future

In the survey, 18 percent of former students had studied for a further qualification in childcare, playwork or early education. Ten survey respondents who were not working gave studying as the reason: four of these people were studying to become a teacher or in childhood studies.

Plans and inclinations towards further study among the in-depth study group are summarised in Table 4.7. Three had definite plans, two had clear plans and six were considering further study in the medium to long term. Only three had no plans for further study. However, nearly all the study topics would eventually take the respondents out of working with young children in day nurseries and other care and education settings

Table 4.7 Whether and when planning to undertake further study, and obstacles to do doing so: in-depth study group

	Course(s)	When	Obstacles
Definite plans (3)	Diploma in Social Work	2001	None
	NVQs in Care Practices, Supervisory Management	2001	None
	Open University Foundation and then Degree	2001	None
Clear plans (2)	Hospital play specialist A Levels	9/2001 9/2001	Finding a suitable course Sufficient income to support study
Medium to long term plans (6)	HNC	In a few years	When children are older
	ADCE	In a few years	Finances, day release from work
	Nursing	In a few years	When children are older
	Midwifery/social work	In a few years	Finances
	Teacher training	Long term ambition	Finances
	Midwifery/speech therapy	A little further down the line	Infant child
No plans (3)	-	-	-

None of the in-depth study respondents had heard of the recently introduced Qualifications Framework⁸.

4.10 Future prospects in childcare work

Among all the employment groups identified, the majority of survey respondents thought that they would be working in childcare or related work in the future. This means that irrespective of the employment path chosen since qualifying there is a commitment to working with children. However, the strength of that commitment and the timescale for re-engagement in childcare employment varied.

For those who were or had been working in childcare, by far the majority expect to be working in childcare in five years time (89% and 62 respectively), as Table 4.8 shows. Most of those who had a previous childcare job, but did not currently have one (group 2), expected to have a childcare job within a year (68%). Over half of those who had not worked in childcare since leaving college (53%) also expected to be working in childcare in five years time, but only a minority expected to get a childcare job in the next two years (31%).

⁸ The Qualifications Framework is a 'national framework of accredited qualifications in early years education, childcare and playwork' (QCA, 1999). Its aim is to rationalise the 'confusing array' of vocational qualifications and training courses for those working in the field, and to provide 'clearer progression routes' (ibid.)

Table 4.8 Expect to be working in childcare in five years time

	Group 1: Current childcare job	Group 2: Childcare job in past	Group 3: Not worked in childcare
Yes	238	21	38
	89	62	54
No	16	1	9
	6	3	13
Don't know	13	12	24
	5	35	34
Total	267	34	71
	100	100	100

Those with a current childcare job were asked what kind of childcare or related employment they envisaged for themselves in five years time (Table 4.9). This shows that working in private day nurseries is the most commonly cited workplace setting. Combining all the preferences for public sector settings for childcare or related jobs shows that 60 percent of former childcare students envisaged working in the public sector. The Part One study also found that working in the public sector, particularly in local authority schools and classes, was a clear preference for childcare students. It seems this preference has been sustained over the initial experience in employment.

Table 4.9 Former childcare students' envisaged work settings in five years time

		Group 1: Current childcare job	
		N	%
Day nursery	Private	73	28
	Local authority	47	18
	College	-	-
	Type unspecified	1	-
Family Centre		5	2
School	Private	19	7
	Nursery class/school	58	22
	Primary school	20	8
	Type unspecified	5	2
Playgroup or preschool		17	7
Private family/nanny		17	7
Welfare assistant/learning assistant		14	5
Childminder		10	4
Special needs		8	3
Playwork/out of school care		8	3
Social services		5	2
Hospital special care baby unit		2	1
Other		19	7
Don't know		1	-
Total		259	100

Respondents may give more than one response: percentages do not sum to 100

Finally, among the twenty childcare workers who were actively thinking of leaving their childcare jobs, half expected to move to another childcare job (10),

while a third expected to leave childcare altogether (6) or travel (1), suggesting that even where there is dissatisfaction with a childcare post, it is change within childcare being looked for and not necessarily a complete move out of the childcare field.

The picture on future prospects is of sustained commitment to childcare work. However, it is also clear that some factors operate to draw people out of childcare employment and it is to these that we now turn.

4.11 Frustrations in childcare work: what drives people out?

Alongside clear commitment to childcare work in general, many respondents in both the survey and the in-depth study could identify negative aspects of the work. These negative aspects of the work tended to frustrate their careers or job satisfaction and may potentially drive them or other similarly trained people out of the work. Twenty (7 %) of the survey respondents in childcare work were actively thinking of leaving their posts. Of those currently thinking of leaving, the main reasons were management, pay and working conditions (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10 Former childcare students' reasons for thinking of leaving current posts

	N	%
Management	4	20
Pay	3	15
Working conditions	3	15
Staff group	2	10
Redundancy/dismissal	2	10
Dissatisfaction with children looked after	1	5
Own children (including pregnancy)	1	5
Moving area	1	5
Travel	1	5
Other	8	40
Total	20	100

Note: multiple response item so percentage does not total 100

Further exploration of likely decision making among this group led us to conclude that there are three main reasons why childcare workers leave the childcare jobs, despite their high levels of commitment and satisfaction. These are: pay and conditions, staff and organisational matters and family responsibilities and personal decisions. These are also issues for the former staff: see Chapter 6.

4.11.1 Pay and conditions

We have already noted that among survey respondents in childcare work pay and conditions are seen as a major reason for not recommending childcare work to a friend (Table 2.13) and was perceived as worse than expected by 42 percent of former childcare students moving into employment (Table 2.11). By contrast, of those who felt settled in their current posts, only 8 percent cited the pay as the reason (Table 2.9).

Although relatively few of those working in childcare were not settled in their current jobs, of these 33 per cent said that the level of pay was the reason (Table 4.11). Working conditions were also cited as a reason by 19 percent of respondents.

Table 4.11 Reasons for not feeling settled in current job

	N	%
Pay	9	33
Staff/organisational related	6	22
Working conditions	5	19
Personal satisfaction	5	19
Need a change of location	3	11
Not enough hours	2	7
Other	4	15
Total	27	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

Those former childcare students who did not enter the workforce were also aware of the poor pay in the field. For those students who had worked, but not in childcare, poor pay was cited as a major reason for not working in childcare. Table 4.12 shows that 'pay not adequate' was given as a reason by 10 respondents, the same as 'studying at university'. A further six said they had found a 'better job', which may be a proxy for a 'better paid job'.

Table 4.12 Reasons had not worked in childcare since leaving college, for those with other jobs

	N	%
Pay not adequate	10	21
Studying at university	10	21
Could not find job in childcare	7	15
Better job found	6	13
Not qualified	5	11
Inadequate preparation for work at college	3	6
None available	3	6
Jobs did not fit with family commitments	2	4
Didn't like working with children	4	9
Other	4	9
Total	47	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

The most commonly mentioned drawback to childcare work given by in-depth respondents was the pay and conditions. Ten of the fourteen respondents reported that the poor wages earned in childcare was a major negative aspect of the work. These comments are reported below and are separated into the three employment groups. In this way we can see that dissatisfaction with pay and conditions is not associated with particular employment decisions, but is almost universally felt as a negative aspect of childcare work. These comments give some reasons why respondents can or cannot afford to work in childcare.

Group 1 – currently working in childcare

“The pay is absolutely appalling. I don’t do it for the pay. What I’m earning now I was earning seven years ago before I left to have the first baby”. (Annie)

“The only bad thing I would say is the pay. Luckily I’ve got maintenance so I can manage. It’s really a part-time job for people who’ve got some money basically”. (Sarah)

“The pay. I don’t think I get paid enough for what I do. You don’t stop all day”. (Liz)

“Poor pay. Quite long hours and shifts too. I’m lucky I’m a single person, if you’ve got a family and got to consider childcare fees, it’s not necessarily a business you can be in”. (Beth)

Group 2 – had at least one childcare job

“The pay. A lot of people already said in college before we even started and were half way into it. It’s a lot of hard work and the pay is not so good. They tend to keep it at a certain amount. It doesn’t go up. It’s probably been like that for ten years. Things like that haven’t really improved”. (Rachel)

“The money is poor everywhere in childcare. I think a lot of people would go into it if it were better paid. The pay I had wasn’t brilliant but you couldn’t really go and ask for any more”. (Louisa)

Group 3 – not worked in childcare at all since leaving college

“The pay. There’s no salary. It’s an hourly rate, which wouldn’t be what I was looking for at all. Also long hours. Obviously if you’ve got children it doesn’t really fit it in”. (Susan)

“The biggest thing that’s bad about it is the pay. Most of the people who I’ve spoken to who work in schools and nurseries say that the pay isn’t very good. They feel very disgruntled about it. All that effort into training, two years, full-time, yet you’re earning £9,000 a year, which is really kind of rubbish”. (Lesley)

“The pay. Some of the places the pay is diabolical Like £3.50 an hour. You just couldn’t do anything. But the pay is terrible I think”. (Kerry)

“Pay. I mean it’s not too bad, I live at home, but if you’ve got a family it’s difficult”. (Sally)

In many ways these words from respondents speak for themselves. As we have seen through the report so far, these diploma level childcare graduates were all committed to and enjoyed working with children. But they were confronted by poor financial reward for what they saw as hard work, with long, sometimes

unsociable hours, or alternatively short and financially unviable hours. One nanny worked an average of 78 hours a week for £180, an hourly rate of £2.30, well below the National Minimum Wage (although she did get accommodation with the job). On the other hand, Rachel gave up working in an after school club because three hours a day, even on a reasonable hourly rate, was not sufficient to support herself.

One issue raised by the low wages is whether it is possible for a childcare worker to be financially independent on the wages offered. Several respondents cast doubt on this. Sarah pointed out that her work was not really viable unless you had money from someone else such as a husband or parents to support you. Annie reported that she didn't do it for the pay; and Sally said she could afford it because she was financially sheltered through living at home. Susan pointed out that the long hours combined with low pay on an hourly rate was not sufficient to lift her, a single parent, off welfare benefits, and therefore she was unable to use her training in the workplace. Kerry, also required to be financially independent, had been put off by the low wages.

As reported in Chapter One, the Part One study found that average salaries in day nurseries in 2000 was about £8,000 p.a. while the average annual salary for full-time non-manual female employees in Britain in 2000 was £19,193 (New Earnings Survey, p.c., 2000). Clearly, few childcare or early education workers could expect to be financially self-supporting, especially with regard to housing, on their salaries (c.f. Holmans et al., 2000).

Respondents also raised the issue of downward pressure on wage rates. Rachel said she thought the salary had stayed the same for ten years, and Louisa said as a nanny working for a local family on a cash in hand basis, she found it difficult to ask for any more money without causing offence.

4.11.2 Staff and organisational matters

A second negative aspect of working in childcare reported by in-depth respondents was the staff and organisational issues. Hannah reported that it was easy to feel undervalued in childcare jobs, and given all the jobs other members of staff didn't want to do. It all depended, she said, on how well you get on with the other staff, and whether problems are addressed or ignored. Sally and Liz both referred to staff shortages as being an ongoing problem in childcare work. Liz said 'I'm doing three jobs, like a catering assistant, a cleaner and look after children. Every day nursery I know is always short staffed'. Rachel reported that staff in nurseries often take time off sick and 'you're always covering for other people... you're left to cope with the (children) when you know they (management) could call in someone temporary, they don't do it because they want to save money... it makes me want to take a day off sick'.

Among those in the survey who had worked in childcare, staff and organisational related matters were raised as a reason for not feeling settled (22 percent of those not feeling settled in their present jobs, Table 4.11); a reason for leaving childcare jobs held since leaving college (15 percent of those who had left jobs, Table 3.13); and a reason for leaving current childcare jobs (30 percent of those thinking of leaving current childcare jobs, Table 4.10). The staff team

or atmosphere was also mentioned by 11 percent of those who said that working in childcare was worse than expected. This dissatisfaction with the staff groups, the management and the organisation of nurseries was also mentioned in the follow-up study of nursery staff, as discussed in Chapter Five.

4.11.3 Parents and children

A third negative aspect of childcare work was the parents of children they looked after and occasionally the children themselves. One respondent said the children bring a lot of illness into nurseries, spreading illness among the staff. Serena said the children often make simultaneous demands and ‘you don’t know who to give your attention to’. Sophie raised a major issue for live-in nannies, namely how well they get on with the parents. She said

“with live in positions, you can get a really nice family and have a really nice time, but on the other hand, you can get a family that maybe isn’t all that great and it can get worse. You know you can end up being like you’re living in a total nightmare. Which it was like for the last couple of months that I was there. Just a total nightmare”.

Louisa also said the mother arriving home was a problem when working as a nanny. ‘The (children) know they can get away with murder. They are completely different with their own parents’. Finally, Amanda again raised the difficult issue of the relationship between mothers and nannies, but this time in terms of whether and to what extent nannies replaced mothers and were appreciated for it. She said a negative aspect for her was the fact ‘that you’re doing it and not their mum. That the mum, parents, want someone else to try and do it... that you are not there all the time. Everything you do is for someone else who doesn’t seem to appreciate it that much’.

This is not an area that the survey covered in any detail, but seven percent of those who thought that childcare work was worse than expected identified working with parents and children as responsible for their view.

4.11.4 What makes people leave?

Following on from the discussion of negative aspects of childcare work, in-depth respondents thought the main reason for leaving the work was the pay. Poor pay was mentioned by nine of the 14, drawn from across the three groups, many of whom said that childcare workers would be tempted to take advantage of better paid work elsewhere in their localities. It was notable that poor pay alone did not stop some of the respondents from taking childcare jobs, but Sarah said that of her group of 12 in college, three did not go into childcare work because of the low pay. Related to pay is the issue of job security. A tenth respondent, working in a school on termly or two termly contracts, said it was not a very secure job if one wanted to get a mortgage for example. In addition, two respondents referred to the lack of a career structure in childcare, with few promotion prospects or built in benefits for longer service such as extra holiday days, or occupational pensions.

Beyond the pay and conditions, Susan said that there was a lack of respect for childcare workers, that ‘people don’t understand what it takes’ to work in

childcare. This echoes the views expressed in focus groups reported in Part One (Cameron et al., 2001) about a pervasive low valuation of childcare work. Sally, working with young people with disabilities said that the work was very hard, especially maintaining high standards in the face of chronic staff shortages. Similarly, working while short staffed was seen as a reason for leaving by some working in nurseries. Another reason for leaving was poor relations with others in the workplace, whether with management, with parent-employers, or with other staff.

4.12 Suggestions from former childcare students

In-depth respondents were asked to make suggestions for policy changes that would help people like themselves who held a qualification in childcare to stay in or return to childcare work. Many suggestions were made which are combined here.

Pay and conditions:

- Make the pay better; it is a matter of being valued. Place it alongside teaching or nursing for pay.
- Incentives to encourage loyalty to an employer, such as occupational pensions, more paid holiday.
- More nursery work that fitted around school hours, more nursery classes attached to schools but not playgroups as 'that's not really work'.
- The government should subsidise the salaries of childcare workers. Childcare workers should get maternity leave. If the money were better you would get better people working in childcare.

Training:

- Help to translate childcare qualifications into training for other better paid caring work such as nursing.
- Make it financially easier for married people to study full-time.
- Retraining for those who have had time out for families, so they return at the same level and can progress.

Entry and recruitment:

- National database system to help nannies and other childcare workers find work. Registration of nannies, internet based, regular mailing as reminder of work available.
- Much more systematic help in finding work from colleges, matching employers to students.

Welfare state support:

- Overhaul of unemployment benefits from point of view of childcare worker, especially nannies. Integration of nannies taxation with unemployment benefits system; integration of nanny vacancies with job centres.

It is clear that childcare workers have many ideas for improving the integration of childcare qualifications and childcare work into other areas of employment and into other areas of their lives such as being parents. It is also clear that there

is a demand for the professionalisation of childcare work among this group, with better regulation of some of the work, such as nannying, higher valuation of the work on a par with nursing and teaching was reported by participants during in-depth interviews. Further formalisation of employment was also requested in the structural conditions of childcare work, which might be expected in other forms of work, such as a career ladder and occupational benefits such as pensions or extra holidays. A role for government involvement in this process was clearly identified, for example, in order to finance higher salaries, where it is difficult for the private childcare market to incorporate substantial increases in workers' pay.

4.13 Summary

The views of the in-depth study group on childrearing and combining parenting and employment largely reflect the dominant discourse on these matters. Analysis of maternal employment trends shows that while mothers with preschool aged children doing paid work is increasing, much of it is still part-time. Where it is full-time, it is concentrated among particular socio-economic groups, mostly those with higher levels of education (Holtermann, Brannen, Moss and Owen, 1999). Moreover, usage of formal childcare services is still far outweighed by informal care provided by other family members while mothers work (Mooney et al., 2001). The employment patterns of mothers in general described fits in with the practices and aspirations of our in-depth study group, who wanted to not work at all, or else work from home or part-time when their children were small.

Of the survey respondents, while nearly half anticipated caring responsibilities that would take them away from employment, nearly all (89%) said they expected to be working in childcare in five years time. This begs the question of the 'family friendliness' of childcare employment, and in particular the flexibility of hours. In day nursery work, the main form of employment for newly qualified childcare students, relatively few jobs are part-time (Cameron et al., 2001), suggesting difficulties in matching the attitudes towards employment held by mother-childcare workers and the posts available in nurseries. However, it may be that while the beliefs about idealised home based childcare are still strongly held the actual practices of those with children are more diverse and fluid.

There was considerable ambivalence about the usefulness of the diploma childcare qualifications, both in terms of accessing the job market and in terms of qualifying for a higher salary on account of it. Sally summed up the erratic relationship between salary and qualification: 'Salary doesn't go on qualification, it goes on, you get paid a standard rate for the job you do. Someone could go in with no qualifications but answered the right criteria and get the same job as I've got'. Among those not working in childcare for young children and those that were, there were varying motivations for enrolling on the course to begin with which led in turn to varying degrees of satisfaction with the outcome. A marginal relationship between level of pay and level of childcare qualification has also been noted on a national scale in secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey (Simon et al., forthcoming).

In-depth interviews can create an opportunity to discuss any negative points in more detail than the positive, and many who raised complaints about their courses had also had positive experiences while qualifying, and had since kept in touch with colleagues and compared notes on employment. Detailed discussion here of comments about courses should bear in mind the generally positive view of diploma training in childcare and indeed most of the 14 respondents were planning or considering further study.

Emergent issues in recruitment and retention are:

- Practice placements are a significant source of employment for graduating students.
- There are particular difficulties for nannies: finding suitable work; matching employer and employee; sustaining good working relations. It can also have very long hours. The lack of regulation compounds these difficulties.
- Suitable work in nurseries can also be difficult to find.
- Childcare work is often not economically viable work for single parents. Often the hours are not possible for those with children who need to be collected from school.
- Relations with employers and employing organisations are critical to retention.
- Bringing up children and caring for family was seen as largely a private responsibility, with mothers undertaking most of the practical work. Government was seen as the main source of help with caring responsibilities. Employers should offer some help, while family members were not to be relied on to help care for young children while mothers worked.
- In-depth respondents saw employment taking second place to active parenting for young children in their own present or future lives. Forty seven percent of survey respondents saw themselves taking time off employment for caring responsibilities in the coming five years.
- 93 percent of survey respondents who had worked in childcare felt the college course had prepared them very well or quite well for childcare work.
- The childcare qualification had helped 84 percent of survey respondents who had worked in childcare ‘a lot’ to get their first job; and had helped 91 percent ‘a lot’ to get better pay in their first job.
- Practice placements were seen as a critical element of college courses: most criticisms of courses were about inadequate range or flexibility of placements, so that some students could not be placed in their preferred settings
- Support from college tutors was seen as vital to success of college experience.
- The links between colleges and employment should be made more explicit and more substantial, with better, more personalised careers advice
- Inadequate pay is a major negative aspect of childcare work. It does not reflect the skills and expertise necessary, the degree of responsibility undertaken, the hours completed, the qualification studied for, or the cost of living for those who need to be financially independent.

- Poor working conditions such as lack of employment benefits, difficulties with employers, organisations and other staff are also reasons why people leave the work.

Chapter Five - Following up nursery workers' employment patterns

5.1 Introduction

The follow-up studies of nursery workers focused on job mobility within childcare and early years work and job moves out of the childcare sector altogether. The studies revealed that although staff turnover is high, almost two-thirds of those surveyed continued to work in childcare related employment after leaving the nursery. Dissatisfaction with nursery management and poor pay are the main reasons why nursery workers leave for other jobs in childcare or out of childcare work altogether. Nevertheless, those who remained in childcare employment showed a high level of commitment to their work, confirming the findings from the Part One study (Cameron et al., 2001).

Three sources of data are used in this chapter. First, managers in 181 independent day nurseries drawn from the Part One study were screened for staff who had left their employment (the 'screener'). Telephone interviews were then conducted with 145 former members of staff (the survey). From this group of former staff, ten were interviewed in-depth (the in-depth interviews) (see Chapter One and Appendix One for details of methods and design).

This chapter first addresses staff turnover in the 181 nurseries screened in the follow-up study. Findings from the survey and the in-depth interviews are used to consider the reasons why nursery workers had left the nursery jobs they were in at the time of the Part One survey, what they had gone on to do, and how current employment compares with their previous nursery job. Since many workers who had left their previous work were still in childcare, consideration is given to the reasons for remaining in the childcare sector, while those who stayed in childcare are compared to those who left. Finally the views of respondents who had left their Part One nursery are explored on motherhood and childcare, sources of help for combining paid work and mothering, the importance of qualifications and training, and how to promote recruitment and retention.

5.2 Staff turnover

One of the main themes of this chapter is staff turnover in day nurseries. However, research about staff turnover in UK nurseries is limited. In her study of ten private nurseries, Penn reported an annual turnover rate of 29 percent (Penn, 1995). A survey of independent day nurseries conducted by the Employers Organisation/Improvement and Development Agency in England reported an annual turnover rate of 16 percent (EO/IDeA, 1999). Staff turnover among the nurseries participating in the current follow-up survey appears high. In early 2000 when they were first surveyed for the Part One study, these nurseries between them had 1,273 childcare staff. At the time of the follow-up survey, just over a quarter (27%) of these childcare staff had left the nursery, making an annual rate of 22 percent. Having identified this turnover rate,

reflecting considerable job movement in nurseries, it is important to understand the nature of this movement - are nursery workers leaving childcare work altogether, leaving temporarily and returning, or moving within the childcare sector?

5.3 Entering and leaving the childcare workforce

Evidence from the in-depth interviews found that four employment groups, characterised by differing paths through qualification, family life and employment, existed among those who had been working in day nurseries a year earlier⁹.

These are:

1. Qualified in childcare after leaving school, left childcare work when they had children and returned to childcare work at a later date - the entered, left and re-entered group (2 respondents);
2. Qualified after leaving school and have not left childcare - the continuous group (3);
3. Come into the work by chance and may have subsequently qualified for childcare work - the chance group (3);
4. Are unqualified and come into the work seeing it as a stop-gap or a temporary position - the temporary group (2).

The following portraits illustrate the different routes into childcare employment and how these different routes and employment patterns may affect whether nursery workers will remain in childcare employment or leave.

Group 1 - Entered, left and re-entered

The two respondents in this group both qualified after leaving school. Dee, married with children in their early twenties, had trained as a nursery nurse some 30 years previously after securing a job at a nursery by chance. At that time she worked with children because 'it saved me from having to communicate with adults, being honest. It was easier to communicate with children than it was to communicate with adults'. Although she left childcare employment when she had children, she remained involved in childcare while her children were growing up, working as a playgroup helper and doing some childminding for friends. She returned to childcare employment at the age of 44 when she went to work in the nursery. Her reasons for doing so were the enjoyment she derived from being around children and wanting to earn some 'pocket money'. She left after a year at the nursery and was now providing care for her niece and nephew during the day while their parents were at work and in the evenings worked as a care assistant at a unit for adults with mental health problems and physical disabilities. Leone had also taken a career break when her first child was born, but returned much sooner than Dee to paid childcare work. Leone was still working as a nursery nurse, but at a different nursery.

⁹ Because the structure of the survey was different, it was not possible to see if these 'career' patterns were present in the full sample.

Group 2 - Continuous childcare employment

The three respondents in this group were younger, without children and living with their parents. Kate had been working continuously as a nursery nurse since gaining her NNEB when she was 20. She said: 'I've always been interested in children ... babysitting for my neighbour ... helping my mum look after friends' children'. Although Kate started an 'A' level course, she gave up after a couple of terms and, at her mother's suggestion, went to help out at a playgroup ran by her mother's friend. 'I did it for a couple of months and really, really enjoyed it ... and applied for my NNEB'. All three in this group had a childcare qualification and had moved from the original nursery to another nursery to work.

Group 3 - Entered by chance

The three respondents in employment group three had come into the work more by chance than design. All had children and had been parent helpers at their children's nursery and/or school before working in the nursery. They had been involved in other careers before having children. For example, Zoë, 46 years old, was a qualified children's nurse. She stopped work when she had children. When they were older, she found nursing difficult to return to because of the hours and the fact that her husband was away a lot. She became a parent helper at the nursery her youngest child attended and, just as he was starting school, a vacancy arose which she applied for. The nursery was open during school hours only, which suited Zoë who did not want to work outside school hours. During the five years that Zoë was at the nursery her job changed and with it her interests: 'to begin with it was just very much as a sort of a helper. And then nursery education became more important ... the emphasis changed ... I started going on courses and became more interested in the way children learned'. The opportunity arose for Zoë to work towards qualifying for a degree in early years education. Having done the qualifying modules she found she enjoyed it so much she decided to continue with the degree, which she did part-time while working at the nursery. She was now taking a post-graduate teaching certificate with a view to teaching 3-6 year olds. Zoë illustrated how some women come into the work believing at the time of entry that they will not continue with the work in the long-term, but subsequently decide to make it their career.

Group 4 - Temporary position

Both of the women in the fourth group came into nursery work through a friend's suggestion. They were untrained and viewed their entry into childcare as a stop-gap or temporary position in their employment career. Nicky alternated work as a nanny with office work before having children had since trained as a beautician. She was self-employed working very part-time hours during evenings and weekends. Financial reasons led her to take a job at the nursery, which her daughter attended part-time. Her husband was off work and she wanted the security of a reliable income that self-employment could not guarantee. By taking a part-time job at the nursery, she had the added bonus of securing a reduced fee for her daughter. This meant she could afford to continue sending her daughter to the nursery. She left the nursery to concentrate on her work as a beautician. Mary on the other hand was using a gap year before University to save some money towards her studies. Her mother was a nursery worker and Mary had always had some involvement with children, helping out

at her mothers' group and babysitting. After 10 months in the nursery she left to take up her place at University.

Having described the kinds of employment paths the former nursery workers had undertaken, the next section will discuss their employment status at follow-up a year after original interview.

5.4 Employment after leaving the nursery and future employment intentions

Of the 145 nursery workers interviewed in the follow-up survey who had left the nursery where they were originally interviewed, almost two-thirds (65%) were currently working in childcare-related employment (Table 5.1) predominately as nursery nurses in the private and public sectors. The remainder were working in non-childcare jobs (14%), unemployed (10%), studying (5%) or caring for their children (3%).

Table 5.1 Employment after leaving the nursery

	N	%
Full-time in childcare related work	69	48
Part-time in childcare-related work	25	17
Full-time not in childcare/early years	11	8
Part-time not in childcare/early years	9	6
Full-time study	4	3
Part-time study	3	2
Unemployed	15	10
Full-time caring for own children	5	3
Other	4	3
Total	145	100

Twenty three of the 51 respondents who were not currently working in childcare (Table 5.2) said they would want to, but not being able to find employment or pregnancy and caring for their own children were the main reasons for not doing so (Table 5.3).

Table 5.2 Former nursery staff who had wanted to work in childcare

	N	%
Yes	23	45
No	14	28
Not stated	14	28
Total	51	100

Table 5.3 Reasons for not working in childcare though wanted to

	N	%
No jobs available	5	22
Caring for own children	3	22
Pregnant	3	13
Better job found, but not in childcare field	1	1
Other	9	39
Total	23	100

Pay and preference for another type of work were the most frequent reasons given by the 14 respondents who did not want to do childcare work (Table 5.4). Thus, the majority (81%) of these nursery workers who had left the nursery were either still working in the childcare and early years sector or wanting to do so. This is similar to the findings of the follow up survey of former students reported in earlier chapters.

Table 5.4 Reasons for not wanting to work in childcare

	N	%
Dissatisfied with pay	6	43
Prefer another kind of work	4	29
Dissatisfied with working conditions, status	2	14
Too much paperwork	2	14
Dissatisfied with management or staff group	2	14
Other	1	7
Total	14	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

5.5 How current employment compares with previous nursery employment

The majority of those working considered that their current job was better than their previous job because of better pay (28%) and shorter working hours (17%) (Tables 5.5 and 5.6).

Table 5.5 How current job compares with previous job in the nursery

	N	%
Better	86	75
Worse	3	3
Same	19	17
Not stated	6	5
Total	114	100

Table 5.6 Reasons why current job is better or worse than previous job in the nursery

	N	%
Better pay	32	28
Shorter hours	19	17
Better Management	9	8
Less stressful	7	6
Get on better with colleagues	6	5
More of a challenge	6	5
Treated with more respect	6	5
Enjoying the work	6	5
More job satisfaction	5	4
More time spent with children	5	4
Gaining more experience	4	3
More holiday leave	4	3
More responsibility	4	3
Better atmosphere	4	3
Bad management at previous job	4	3
Not much difference between workplaces	4	3
Part of a team now	3	3
More use of training	3	3
Own boss now	3	3
Same routine	3	3
More stimulation	2	2
Same nice atmosphere	2	2
Other better comments	45	40
Other worse comments	3	3
Don't know	17	15
Total	114	100

Note: multiple response item so percentage does not total 100

Of the ten in-depth respondents two were full-time students and eight were working, three full-time and five part-time. All those employed considered their current job was better than their previous nursery job. A variety of reasons accounted for their increased satisfaction. Kate considered that her current job with a chain of nurseries gave her greater job security and more opportunities for promotion than when she was working for an individual nursery. Harriet commented that staff turnover was low in the school where she was working compared with the nursery. This meant she and her colleagues could work more effectively as a team than had been possible before. However, better pay (6), promotion or better career prospects (4) and more responsibility (4) were the reasons most frequently mentioned for their increased satisfaction. Nevertheless, despite better pay being the reason for greater satisfaction in their current jobs, the average annual salary for those still working in childcare-related employment was.

5.5.1 Reasons for leaving the nursery

According to nursery heads interviewed for the nursery screener¹⁰, around a third of staff leaving over the previous year had left for a new job in childcare (Table 5.7). Heads reported that only five percent left because they were dissatisfied with working conditions or pay, while 30 percent left for a new job in childcare.

Table 5.7 Main reason why staff left according to nursery heads

	N	%
New job in childcare	95	30
New job not in childcare	44	14
Study	24	8
Pregnancy/looking after own children	23	7
Travelling distance	14	5
Dismissed/fired	13	4
Personal reasons	10	3
Moved away	10	3
Dissatisfied with working conditions	8	3
World travel	8	3
Dissatisfied with pay	7	2
Was only employed on temporary basis	4	1
Retired	4	1
Health problems	3	1
Left to get married	2	1
Moved to another site	2	1
New management	2	1
Other	13	4
Not stated	26	8
Total	312	100

However, it is quite possible that the heads were not aware of the real reasons staff were leaving: when the former nursery workers in the follow-up survey were asked for their reasons for leaving their original nursery, inadequate pay, dissatisfaction with management and finding another job in childcare were the most frequently cited (Table 5.8). It is clear that for some reasons the views of the head were consistent with those of the ex-staff: e.g. pregnancy and childcare was mentioned by heads for 7 percent of staff and by 8 percent of the staff themselves; the percentage dismissed was given as 4 percent and 3 percent respectively. For some other, more personal, reasons the heads would seem to have been unaware of the extent of staff dissatisfaction. For example, heads thought that 3 percent of the ex-staff had left because they were dissatisfied with the working conditions, whereas 14 percent of the staff gave dissatisfaction with management as their main reason for leaving (Table 5.9). Heads noted dissatisfaction with pay in just 2 percent of cases, whereas 11 percent of the staff gave that as their main reason for leaving the nursery.

¹⁰ The screener interview simply checked, with someone in charge, which of the staff interviewed for Part One were still in post.

Table 5.8 Reasons for leaving the nursery

	N	%
Inadequate pay	23	16
Dissatisfied with management	23	16
Got another job not in childcare	17	12
Inadequate status	14	10
Got another job in childcare	12	8
Moving area	8	6
Pregnancy	8	6
Short-term contract ended	7	5
Wanted a change in direction	7	5
Study	6	4
Dissatisfied with hours	6	4
Dissatisfied with opportunities for progression	5	3
Prefer another kind of work	5	3
Dismissed	5	3
Dissatisfied with staff group	4	3
Caring for own children	3	2
Did not like working with children	1	1
Other	15	10
Total	145	100

Note: multiple response item so percentage does not total 100

Asked to give their main reason, dissatisfaction with management was most frequent, followed by inadequate pay and finding another job not in childcare (Table 5.9).

Table 5.9 Main reason for leaving the nursery

	N	%
Dissatisfied with management	20	14
Inadequate pay	16	11
Got another job not in childcare	16	11
Inadequate status	14	10
Got another job in childcare	12	8
Pregnancy	8	6
Moving area	7	5
Wanted a change in direction	7	5
Study	6	4
Dissatisfied with opportunities for progression	5	3
Prefer another kind of work	5	3
Short-term contract ended	5	3
Dismissed	5	3
Dissatisfied with staff group	3	2
Caring for own children	3	2
Did not like working with children	1	1
Dissatisfied with hours	1	1
Other	10	7
Missing	1	1
Total	145	100

The discrepancy between the two sources of information suggests that either nursery workers are reluctant to tell their employer they are leaving for reasons

of pay and poor management, possibly because they do not want to upset their employer while working out their notice, or nursery heads are reluctant to reveal that staff are leaving because they are dissatisfied with management and pay.

The data from the in-depth respondents shed further light on the issues of dissatisfaction with management and poor pay and other working conditions. Inadequate pay and dissatisfaction with nursery management were mentioned in seven of the ten in-depth interviews as reasons that had contributed to them wanting to leave the nursery. Other reasons mentioned were the need for a more challenging job, and wanting more responsibility or promotion.

5.5.1.1 Dissatisfaction with nursery management

What does dissatisfaction with nursery management mean in reality? Poor childcare and management practices and lack of respect for staff featured most prominently. Harriet whose training was as a children's librarian, was unable to tolerate not having a clearly defined role within the nursery: 'One minute you were having to teach children, I mean some of the new curriculum, the next minute you were told that you had to change babies nappies. I was supposed to be a playgroup worker [within the nursery] ... but if you were told to wash dishes after dinner you washed dishes'. This respondent contrasted her situation in the nursery where she had no contract and no job description, with her previous job as a librarian where it was very clear what her role was and what she was expected to do. Dee on the other hand could not continue working with a nursery owner who, according to Dee did not treat children fairly and constantly undermined her decisions about children's activities. Several respondents mentioned feeling unhappy by the way children were sometimes treated at the nursery: 'I wasn't that pleased with how they'd try and get children to ... force children to eat and things [qualified staff who had] been there years and years'.

Individual staff may find it difficult to challenge such practices, particularly since they are in a vulnerable position in terms of their employment. Two nursery workers had taken up their dissatisfaction with management to little avail. Nicky disliked the fact that non-childcare staff were counted in the ratios in the nursery where she had worked: 'When they say they're supposed to be looking after 4, but they've got a group of 8. That group of 8 is not getting the attention that they actually need. ... And it's hard on them [nursery workers], especially if they're working 8 till 6, a 5 day a week.' She complained about the poor adult: child ratios and was reprimanded by her managers. Such situations combined with poor working conditions including long hours and poor pay sooner or later push some workers to look for other jobs.

5.5.1.2 Pay and other working conditions

Poor pay is also a significant factor influencing people to find other jobs offering a better salary. All but two of the in-depth sample earned significantly more in their current job, or had the potential to do so once they had finished studying, than they had in their previous nursery job. This is illustrated by Camilla who moved from the private to the public sector: 'At the private day nursery I was on £4 an hour for 44 hours a week, and here [LEA nursery class] I'm on £7.80 an hour for 32 hours a week'. Indeed the public sector compared to

the private sector not only offered a higher salary, but also better working conditions including a pension, 12 weeks paid holiday, and paid sick leave. It was for these reasons, together with the belief that the public sector offered a higher standard of care and education that another respondent wanted to work in this sector. She was currently not working in childcare, but hoped to do so in the future if she secured a job in the maintained education sector. The survey of childcare students in the Part One study also found that the maintained education sector was the preferred setting for childcare employment.

Poor pay and working conditions were the main reasons for driving people out of the profession according to the in-depth respondents. Referring to co-workers who had left, Harriet said 'they mainly left because one, it was a stressful job, it was a hard job. The money, they thought it was absolutely useless for what they were doing, they were working some long hours'. Kate, who had left the nursery she had been at in January 2000, but had moved to another nursery, provides an example of the low pay and long hours that many day nursery workers experience. Her annual gross salary was £14,000 for working 45 hours a week¹¹.

Such low wages can make it difficult for those working in childcare to become financially independent of their parents. Almost half the respondents (49 percent) were living with parents, as Table 5.10 shows. Whilst co-residence does not necessarily imply financial dependence, some of the comments made by the in-depth sample made it clear that this was often the case.

Table 5.10 Household status

	N	%
Live with Parents and other relatives	71	49
Live with Partner	27	19
Live with partner and child	27	19
Live alone	10	7
Live in shared household	7	5
Live with children	2	1
Other	1	1
Total	145	100

'I've got a kind mam and dad' said Kharis who lived with her parents. Looking to the future Kharis predicted how difficult it was going to be, 'I'm 26 so I'm wanting to buy a car, I'm wanting to buy a house ... a nice holiday ... starting my own family ... but on that sort of money it's not something you can do. I've always had to be very careful with my money'.

Camilla suggested that the income from work in a nursery could only sustain those who were young and without financial responsibilities and that they leave when they are older and take on more financial responsibility. Those living with a partner explained how they could only work in childcare because their partners were earning a reasonable salary: 'because my husband's got a good job....I was there to fill up my time basically, so it really didn't matter very much. But I mean people that I worked with were struggling. Some of them had two jobs.'

¹¹ Although pay was felt to be low, all but 5 of the nursery heads, in Part One, reported that they paid above the national minimum wage before it became a legal requirement.

Zoë had three children and explained that when her husband was unemployed their financial situation was very tight, 'There's no way that I could do it working on that salary if I was a single parent.' These findings replicate those from the Part One study, and as concluded then, childcare work is not for those who want to be financially independent.

5.5.1.3 Dissatisfaction with childcare work

When the in-depth sample were asked what they disliked about childcare work, issues concerned with pay and nursery management were most frequently voiced. Nine of the ten respondents referred to the organisation and management of the nursery, particularly not working as a team and the stress caused by staff shortages. Lesley summed up her frustrations as follows: 'Obviously some didn't really want to work as a team, whereas when I've worked in schools you very much work as a team and are very much all involved. Whereas in a private nursery there's a lot of people wanting to power push and - not really knowing needs for the child, the children, which is what you're there for. And also when you're trying to - they didn't have enough staff meetings, getting together, deciding, putting plans together, all your ideas in one pot.'

Pay was also mentioned by the in-depth sample as one of the aspects of childcare work that caused dissatisfaction. Kharis, who had moved from the private sector to a maintained nursery class, disliked the fact that there was such a large differential between the salaries of teachers and those of nursery nurses. 'For all they've trained for four years, we've trained for two years. And there's a vast difference in wage from a teacher to a nursery nurse. And we do the same hours and the same planning'. One cannot equate the post-18 four-year teaching degree with the post-16 two-year vocational qualification that many nursery workers hold. However, given that nursery workers are now expected to deliver the early learning goals curriculum and the boundaries between nursery teachers and nursery workers are becoming ever more blurred, one can understand how the pay differential is a cause for tension among nursery workers.

5.6 Summary

- Three sources of data: a screener¹² of 190 nurseries involved in the original staff survey for those who had left since January 2000; a survey of 145 respondents who had left; and in-depth interviews with 10 respondents, 5 of whom left childcare-related employment and 5 who had remained in childcare-related work.
- The in-depth respondent group suggested that there are four different employment patterns in childcare work.
- In-depth respondents with pre-school or school-age children are more likely to work part-time compared with those who have older children or no children who tend to work full-time.

¹² The screener interview simply checked, with someone in charge, which of the staff interviewed for Part One were still in post.

- Low pay, poor working conditions and dissatisfaction with nursery management are the reasons driving workers to change childcare jobs or leave childcare altogether.
- It is difficult for nursery workers to be financially independent on the salaries that they earn.

Chapter Six - Understanding Retention in Childcare

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will look more closely at those who continue to work with children and their reasons for doing so. The studies show that understanding retention in childcare has much to do with recognising childcare work as meaningful work, with great intrinsic value for the workers concerned.

6.2 Reasons for remaining in childcare employment

6.2.1 Close relationships with children

Evidence presented so far has demonstrated low levels of pay in childcare work and this is a main source of dissatisfaction with the work. Given poor pay and other working conditions widespread in childcare, why do many continue to work with children? As with the findings presented in the follow up studies of former students, those day nursery workers who remain within the childcare profession do so because of their love and commitment to children and the satisfaction that working with children can bring. One said:

'I'm looking after someone's children, I'm preparing the adults of the future practically and I'm being paid an absolute pittance for it. I think it's only because I'm passionate about my job that I've actually stayed with it for as long as I have. I've known people go out of childcare because they can't afford to live on the money.'

Nicky considered that employers used the fact that nursery workers became attached to children as a means to exploit childcare workers 'You get attached to them [children] and although you want to leave because the money's so bad, you think of the children and then you - can't. I think in private nurseries ... the bosses know they've got you that way so they can pay you as little as they want to'.

Some of the in-depth sample did mention that they had delayed their decision to leave because of the children: 'I kept thinking 'I'm leaving. I'm leaving' and then I thought 'Oh no, but I really like working with the children'. Previous research has drawn attention to the tension between a strong emphasis on the affective relations, so important in the care of children, and the need to generate an adequate income from the work (Ferri, 1992; Mooney et al., 2001; Vincent and Ball, 1999). In a study of childminders, for example, Mooney et al. report parents and childminders describing a good childminder as one who is motivated by a love of children and not for financial reasons. Thus, childcare workers may feel they are unable to ask for more money because this is interpreted as having a greater interest in income than in children.

6.2.2 Job satisfaction

The Part One study found a high level of job satisfaction among nursery workers (Cameron et al., 2001), higher than in other occupational groups that

have used the same measures (Rose, 1999).¹³ Although satisfaction with their work was not measured again in the follow-up survey, respondents were asked if they would recommend childcare work to a friend. The fact that the majority (81%) would recommend childcare work suggests the satisfaction and positive attitude that respondents have towards the work (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 Would recommend childcare work to a friend

	N	%
Yes	118	81
No	21	15
Don't know	6	4
Total	145	100

The joy of working with children and the satisfaction that it brings were the reasons most likely for making the recommendation (Table 6.2). Pay and working conditions were the reasons why a minority said they could not recommend this work to anyone.

Table 6.2 Reasons for recommending and not recommending childcare work

	Recommending childcare		Not recommending childcare	
	N	%	N	%
Personal satisfaction, feel relaxed	77	65	-	-
Working with children /parents	44	37	2	7
Staff benefits	13	11	4	15
Staff/organisational, staff team or atmosphere	8	7	5	19
Job satisfaction	7	6	3	11
If they like children/ it's what they want to do	6	5	-	-
Own family/child, hours suit	6	5	-	-
Diversity/variety of job	5	4	-	-
Status	3	3	2	7
Pay	2	2	15	56
Working conditions (workload and hours)	-	-	12	44
Other	8	7	5	19
Total	118	100	27	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

The in-depth sample were asked what they liked about childcare work and their responses give an insight into what might bring about the joy and satisfaction which respondents refer to. In talking about what they liked about the work, all ten respondents referred to children's development, particularly watching children move from one stage to the next. Their role in children's development and witnessing children's achievements were the most satisfying aspect of working in childcare, 'It's the enjoyment of seeing the child go through the different stages' or 'It is satisfying to see a change in a child due to something that you've done'. Also mentioned was the variety of their work 'I just enjoy

¹³ Rose's (1999) analysis of the British Household Panel Survey found that childcare workers were among those groups of workers most satisfied with their jobs.

sort of not having the same thing happen every day' as another aspect of the work that they liked.

6.3 Commitment to childcare work

Most who had worked in childcare jobs since leaving the nursery saw it as a long-term career rather than a temporary or short-term job (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3 How childcare work is perceived in career terms

	N	%
Temporary job	12	12
Longer term career	85	85
Not stated	3	2
Total	100	100

Those currently working in childcare-related jobs considered they were settled in their current job (Table 6.4).

Table 6.4 Feel settled in current childcare or early years job

	N	%
Feel settled	84	89
Mostly feel settled	3	3
Do not feel settled	3	3
Don't know	1	1
Not stated	3	3
Total	94	100

The staff or organisation of the nursery, personal satisfaction, the children they care for and working conditions, though not pay, were the reasons most frequently mentioned for feeling settled in their job (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5 Reasons for feeling settled in current childcare or early years job

	N	%
Personal satisfaction – feel relaxed	45	54
Staff/organisational related	35	42
Children care for – like them	29	35
Working conditions	24	29
Job security	17	20
Pay	15	18
Own family/child related – hours etc suit	9	11
More respect	2	2
More responsibility	2	2
Other	5	6
Total	84	100

Note: multiple response item so percentage does not total 100

The majority of respondents (86%) considered they would be working in childcare over the next five years, mainly in the private and maintained education sector (Table 6.6).

Table 6.6 Whether expect to be working in childcare over the next five years

	N	%
Yes	82	87
No	6	6
Don't know	3	3
Not stated	3	3
Total	94	100

6.4 Expectations of childcare work

Less than a third of survey respondents (29%) considered that childcare work, either overall or some aspects of it, was worse than they had expected (Table 6.7). However, it was pay, hours and organisational factors that were the most likely reasons for respondents to say that the work was worse than expected (Table 6.8). Kate, working 45 hours a week and largely positive in her response to this question, ended by saying, 'They never told me this at college, that I was going to have to work hours like this. Yeah - yeah, it's definitely lived up to my expectations.'

Table 6.7 How childcare work compares with what was expected

	N	%
Better than expected	52	36
Worse than expected	9	6
Neither better nor worse than expected	50	35
Some aspects better and some aspects worse than expected	34	23
Total	145	100

Respondents cited personal satisfaction, liking the children and parents, and organisational factors, such as liking the staff team, as the reasons why childcare work was better than expected (Table 6.8).

Table 6.8 Reasons why childcare work is better or worse than expected

	Better than expected		Worse than expected	
	N	%	N	%
Personal satisfaction	51	59	5	12
Children and parents	38	44	3	7
Working conditions, hours, status, benefits	27	32	23	33
Organisational related, staff team or atmosphere	19	22	12	28
Pay	15	17	14	33
More responsibilities	2	2	-	-
Other	6	7	9	21
Don't know	2	2	3	7
Total	86	100	43	100

Note: Multiple response item so percentages do not total 100

Those in the in-depth sample who had gone into the work by chance or as a stop-gap, initially had no real expectations of the work, their belief being that they were going to be doing it for only a short time. Several respondents referred to the fact that it was neither better, nor worse but different to what they had anticipated, either because they had not expected the responsibility they were given or the standards of care were different to their expectations. Three respondents described how their expectations had changed over time. For example, Leone said there was more administrative responsibility now than had once been the case, whilst Nicky said that there was less time for children because staff now had increased domestic responsibilities.

6.5 Distinguishing between those who remain in childcare employment and those who leave

As already noted in Chapter 5, of the 145 nursery workers interviewed in the follow-up survey who had left the nursery where they were originally interviewed, the majority (65%) were currently working in childcare-related employment (Table 5.1). The remainder were working in non-childcare jobs (14%), unemployed (10%), studying (5%) or caring for their children (3%). This section will focus on the comparison of those who had left the nursery for another childcare job with those who had left childcare, at least temporarily.

The answers that the nursery workers gave in their first interview were all examined to find ways in which those had left the nursery but were still working in childcare differed from those who had left the nursery but were not working in childcare. This was in order to see what were the characteristics of people who were leaving the field. However, these comparisons were not straightforward. Firstly, the numbers are quite small (94 and 51 respectively), making any statistical comparisons difficult. Secondly, the 51 not currently working in childcare may not be lost to the field, but may be only temporarily doing something else. As Table 5.1 shows, seven were studying, five were caring for their own family and 15 were unemployed. Of course, even the 20 in non-childcare jobs might return to childcare work later.

Table 6.9 Comparison of staff who had left the nursery but had another childcare job with those who did not have a childcare job

	In childcare job	Not in childcare job	Statistical significance
Hours worked per week	36	37	0.7
Days of paid holiday	20	17	0.06
Permanent post	84%	84%	0.95
Gross annual pay	£9,153	£7,357	0.2
Hourly pay	£4.82	£4.36	0.6
Had previous childcare job	62%	57%	0.5
Had previous non-childcare job	65%	78%	0.08
Age	25	27	0.3
Have own children	16%	31%	0.03
Have child aged 16 or over	3%	14%	0.02
Have childcare qualification	77%	57%	0.01
Studying for childcare qualification	22%	18%	0.6
See childcare as temporary	12%	16%	0.5
Expect time away for family in next 5 years	38%	35%	0.8
Total	94	51	

Statistical significance was tested using a chi-square test for percentages and a t-test for means

As can be seen from the few key questions included in Table 6.9, those with a new childcare job and those without a childcare job were remarkably similar. They worked almost identical hours, although those with another childcare job had had slightly more paid holiday. There was quite a large difference in gross annual pay, with those in another childcare job having earned £1,800 a year more than the others, although this difference was not statistically significant. Hourly pay for the two groups was very similar. Just over half of each group had previous childcare jobs; most had also had non-childcare jobs, with those now not in a childcare job (78%) slightly more than those in a new childcare job (65%).

The average ages of the two groups of staff were very similar (25 and 27 years), but an important difference was whether they had children of their own: those staff with a new childcare job were much less likely (16%) to have children of their own than were those without a childcare job (31%). The difference was particularly marked for those with one or more children aged 16 or over.

Another big difference was the possession of a qualification relevant to childcare. Those staff with a new childcare job were more likely (77%) to have a childcare qualification than those without a childcare job (57%). However, there was no difference between the two groups in whether they had been studying for a childcare qualification when first interviewed. Nor was there any difference in whether they had said they saw childcare as a temporary or short-term job as opposed to a long-term career, nor in whether they expected to take time off work for family reasons in the next five years.

In the next section we look at the differences between those nursery workers in the in-depth sample who remained working in the childcare sector when they left the nursery and those who left childcare employment, and examine the implications for retention.

6.6 Nursery workers who move within the childcare and early years sector

Three of the five in-depth respondents remaining in childcare-related work had worked in childcare continuously since gaining a childcare qualification (employment group 2). They had been at the nursery they were at when interviewed for Part One for four years on average before changing jobs. Two moved to another private nursery, and one to the maintained education sector. They had no children and were working full-time as nursery nurses. The other two respondents still within the childcare and early years sector were older, had children and worked part-time. Harriet had no childcare training, though she did have a post-graduate qualification. She had left the nursery after about a year and was now working as a classroom assistant in a primary school. Leone had moved from one private nursery to another because it was a more convenient location for her.

Questioned about the future and their intentions of staying within childcare employment, there was some uncertainty. Only Kate was certain she would never leave, though would take a career break when she had children. In five years time she wanted to be managing a nursery and talked in the long-term about having her own nursery, though realised that capital for such an enterprise might be a problem. Camilla also wanted promotion within the next five years. If unsuccessful, she thought she might have to leave this type of employment, since as she grew older she believed her financial responsibilities would increase and she would therefore need a higher income. Kharis found it difficult to project herself into the future 'I'm happy at what I'm doing at the minute. I can't see me changing anything in the foreseeable future'. Leone oscillated between leaving, on a bad day thinking she would get another job that paid much the same, but had less stresses, while on a good day thinking that she enjoyed what she did and pay was not important. Leone had no ambitions to further her career in childcare 'At the end of the day it's just something to keep me occupied.' Harriet now working as a classroom assistant was unsure as to whether she would return to her former career as a children's librarian or, as a graduate, train as a teacher while working in a school. She considered she would not continue with childcare work in the future.

6.7 Nursery workers who leave the childcare and early years sector

Interestingly, two of the five leavers did not consider they had left childcare and a third, a PGCE student, was planning to teach 3-6 year-olds. All three had a childcare qualification compared to the other two leavers who were unqualified. Before leaving the nursery, Dee was already working as an evening care assistant for a Health Authority managed unit for the mentally handicapped. She continued in this job when she left the nursery, but at the same time started

caring for her sister's children full-time. Although she was unpaid for the childcare she provided for her sister, she saw this as her main job, rather than her paid job as a care assistant. If and when she was no longer needed as an informal carer (she was quite keen to look after any future grandchildren) she would not return to paid childcare work, but would prefer to train as a psychiatric nurse.

Lesley likewise did not consider she had left childcare. She took a job as a children's swimming coach immediately upon leaving the nursery, where she found her childcare qualification useful, particularly as she was working with children with special needs. Asked if she would return to childcare she answered 'I probably will go back to it, but I'm still kind of in childcare. Cos we have to look after the children'. Lesley wanted to work as a nursery nurse in a maintained nursery class, which had always been her ambition since qualifying. Despite having made several applications over the previous year she had so far been unsuccessful due to intense competition for such places in her area, where the supply and demand for childcare staff was not well matched.

Finally, Zoë who had studied for a degree whilst working at the nursery had left to do a Post Graduate Certificate in Education with the intention of teaching three to six year-olds. She would not consider a return to childcare, even if she could not secure a permanent teaching post, since supply teaching paid more than childcare work. Nor would Nicky or Mary consider working in childcare again, which is perhaps not surprising since their entry into this work was temporary. Nicky who worked as a self-employed beautician said 'I've got flexibility, I can work when I want, with whom I want and I earn in an hour what would take me a week to earn in the nursery.' On leaving the nursery, Mary had taken up her place on a graphics degree course at University, and could not envisage a return to childcare.

Thus, five of the ten respondents saw no possibility of a return to childcare employment. Those who seemed most committed to staying in this work were younger, qualified and without children. However, as we discuss in the next chapter, they are likely to stop work when they have children and possibly in the future move into the employment group who enter, leave when they become a parent, possibly moving back into the work at a later date.

6.8 Summary

- The satisfaction and joy that working with children brings nursery workers is the primary reason why people stay in the work.
- Satisfaction with the work is reflected in the fact that 81 percent of survey respondents would recommend the work to a friend.
- Sixty-five percent of survey respondents are currently working in childcare-related jobs approximately 12 months after leaving the nursery.
- Those not currently working in childcare were significantly more likely not to have a childcare qualification.

- A further 17 percent would like to work in childcare, but pregnancy, care of their own children or not being able to find suitable work are the main reasons why they are not.
- Eighty-six percent of survey respondents expected to be working in childcare over the next five years.

Chapter Seven - Wider issues in recruitment and retention

7.1 Introduction

Chapter six explored the ways in which childcare work is meaningful work and the strength of commitment to working in the childcare sector. It also showed that the definitions of the boundaries of 'childcare' work are fluid, with some of the in-depth respondents defining working with children as the defining characteristic of childcare work, and not necessarily restricting it by age group, registration status or overall purpose such as looking after children while parents work. In this chapter we shall be considering some of the wider issues in recruitment and retention of childcare workers, continuing debates begun in Part One of the study about the importance of viewing childcare workers from a life course perspective.

7.2 Motherhood, employment and childcare

The Part One study found a high level of preference among childcare students for reducing working hours on becoming mothers of preschool children (Cameron et al., 2001). In the Part Two survey around a third of respondents were parents and a half of the total sample expected to have some time away from employment in the next five years for caring responsibilities, mostly for children (Tables 7.1 and 7.2).

Table 7.1 Expect to have caring responsibilities in the next five years which will take them away from employment

	N	%
Yes	75	52
No	59	41
Don't know	11	8
Total	145	100

Table 7.2 Future caring responsibilities

	N	%
Children	71	87
Elderly and disabled relatives	2	2
Both	5	6
Other	1	1
Not stated	3	4
Total	82	100

Six of the in-depth respondents had children, though only one currently had a child of pre-school age. We have seen how among this group, women with pre-school and school-aged children worked part-time rather than full-time. The in-depth respondents provide evidence that women may be willing to work when their children are young if their employment does not necessitate the use of non-parental childcare.

Only one of the six mothers had returned to work when her children were young and used non-parental childcare. This was a woman with a post-graduate

qualification, who, evidence would suggest, would be most likely to return since it is among women with higher educational qualifications where maternal employment has risen most sharply in recent years (Holtermann et al., 1999). She had returned to work part-time following maternity leave and her mother, who was also a registered childminder, cared for her children. Three more had worked when their children were of pre-school age, but either their partners cared for their children or they took their children with them to work. Leone returned to nursery work part-time when her daughter was a year old, but was able to take her daughter with her to the nursery. She stopped working when she had her son, but returned to work in a playgroup part-time taking him with her 'I mean in that respect work has fitted in very nicely with them cos I've still worked'. Thus, only two of the six women had not undertaken paid employment when their children were young.

The four workers without children, and the follow-up study of former students, confirmed the broader picture from the Part One study: they would choose not to work if and when they had children. They were of the opinion that children should not be in nursery care before around the age of two and then only part-time. Their rationale for this view was that children needed their mothers and mothers were missing out on their children's development. 'If ever I have children I would like to be in a position that I would give up work, maybe until they were in full-time school so that you could have a job that fitted into the middle of the day so that you could be there [before and after school]'.

The desire to be available during out-of-school hours was a common theme among women with children. For Harriet, who stopped working when her children were two and three, it was important that any work that she did once they started school fitted around school hours. Harriet tried to express her reasons for this: 'I suppose it's just being around for the children. I mean they are not going to be young forever. I mean (my son's) going to secondary school next year, but even then ... I mean I still feel that he needs support ... I'm hardly every sitting down in the house, so it's not that I just want to be a housewife, but I really do feel that I need to be with my children'. This was the same for Zoë who returned to work when her youngest child started school. Although acknowledging that it depended on the family and some children might be better being in a nursery, Zoë believed that, overall, 'children learn best within the family unit' because the child gets individualised attention in a way that cannot be provided in a nursery because of the number of children to adults.

There was a view prevalent among some of the women that there seemed little point in having children if you were not going to be there for them. Dee, who had worked in the evenings so her husband was there to take care of the children said, 'What was the point of having children to farm them out on somebody else ... I wouldn't have gone and left them'. Nevertheless, there was the recognition that not everyone was in a position to stop working, 'Anybody that has children should be able to stay at home and look after them, but I appreciate that in today's day and age parents can't afford to. Therefore, they should be able to put their children into a satisfactory facility where that child should be looked after properly and there shouldn't be any qualms or doubts as to how the child was going to be cared for'.

7.3 Sources of help for parents combining work with childcare

As with the former students, the in-depth respondents were asked whether government, employers and/or family members should provide help to families combining employment and caring responsibilities. The view was that government should help families, as found previously (La Valle et al., 2000). Suggestions were made along two lines: providing parents with more time at home with their young children and extending affordable, high quality childcare provision. Thus, it was felt that parents should have reduced working hours during their children's pre-school years, although the difficulties of offering this option were highlighted by one respondent: 'It'd be very hard even in nursery work to sort of progress to higher levels if you couldn't work full-time.' In fact, another respondent remarked that promotion was not an option that she could consider because she was not prepared to work full-time. More job-share options were suggested as a way around this situation.

Providing financial help for parents who wanted to stay at home or extending maternity leave to a minimum of two years were other ideas put forward '[children] do everything in those first two years and mams miss out on so much in those first two years'. With respect to extending provision, the general view was that there should be more state -run nurseries with subsidised or free places. Two respondents said that the government should be more involved in guaranteeing high standards of childcare, including more unannounced visits to childcare settings and raising professional standards.

Employers could, it was suggested, subsidise childcare and provide more on-site childcare facilities as well as introducing more family-friendly policies such as flexible working hours. So far as help from family members was concerned, respondents said that although it was good if family members could help out, for example by providing parents with a break, they were not always available to do so, nor were they necessarily suitable as childcare providers as the comment from this respondent illustrates: 'I mean I've got one sister who would be great, the other one would be absolutely useless. I'd love to help them out, but we're in different areas'. Furthermore, family members may not have the energies to care for young children. One respondent caring for her sister's children commented: 'I do feel at times that I'm maybe a bit too old to have little ones running around me now'.

7.4 The importance of qualifications and training

Views on the importance of a childcare qualification were explored in the in-depth interviews. Views differed between qualified and unqualified respondents. Those with a qualification considered it was important for childcare staff to be qualified. They had found their qualification particularly useful in their work, both in terms of theory and practice, 'A lot of people can look after children but perhaps they need to be taught the right way to bring them on and help them to develop ... I've learnt about how children develop and what helps them to develop which has helped me to provide activities and things for children.'

Furthermore, having a qualification provided a knowledge base, which gave them greater authority and the ability to justify their practices to parents and unqualified staff.

Those who were not qualified were less convinced of the need for nursery workers to have a childcare qualification. From their experience in nurseries, it appeared to them that there was little difference between qualified and non-qualified staff. 'I kind of felt that they'd been trained and they should know better than me, but sometimes I felt that I could do a better job than those that had been trained.' Harriet, without any qualifications and little experience was appointed special needs specialist in her nursery. She said she would have welcomed training in this area and found it disturbing that unqualified staff were not distinguishable from those that were qualified 'I really don't know what the quality of the courses were like that some of these people went on.'

Having qualifications was seen as important for securing jobs and for senior positions. However, situations were described where qualifications were not valued in the way that respondents felt they should. In Lesley's current nursery, promotion rested on whether a member of staff could work long hours rather than upon their qualifications or experience. Most considered that qualified staff should be paid more than unqualified staff because they had taken the time and effort to gain the qualification. Yet, it seemed that there was little differential in the salaries of the two staff groups. In Kharis' nursery there was a ten pence difference in the hourly rate of those who had an NNEB and untrained nursery assistants. Mary said she would like to see the introduction of pay scales upon which trained and untrained workers could be placed to reflect their qualifications and experience.

7.4.1 Perspectives on future training and/or education in childcare

Of the 94 survey respondents who expected to be still be working in childcare in the next five years, a half (51%) thought that within that time they would study for a qualification in childcare or a related sector (Tables 7.3 and 7.4), 10 percent of whom (5) thought they would study for a teaching qualification. None of the in-depth sample mentioned training to be a teacher.

Table 7.3 Whether those currently working in childcare or related sector expect to study for a relevant qualification within the next five years

	N	%
Yes	48	51
No	38	40
Don't know	5	5
Not stated	3	3
Total	94	100

Table 7.4 Qualifications will be studying for

	N	%
Managerial qualification	6	13
NVQ Level 4	6	13
Special needs qualification	5	10
Teaching qualification	5	10
Degree in child psychology	3	6
Diploma in childcare	3	6
Any sort of development	2	4
Other	13	27
Not stated	5	10
Total	48	100

Three of the five in-depth respondents working in childcare said they would or may study in the future. These three were younger and working full-time, whereas the other two who were older and working part-time were uncertain about future training. No doubt the younger full-time workers saw childcare work as a career in which they wanted to progress, more so than the older, part-time workers. Kate had already looked into the possibility of an NVQ4, having gone as far as sending an application form off, but not getting a reply. This respondent was already looking ahead. Not only did she think that management training would be useful if she wanted to move into nursery management, but that the skills acquired through such training would if be transferable to other areas of work.

7.4.2 Improvements in training

Ways in which training could be improved for childcare workers was addressed in the in-depth interviews. Respondents discussed career progression, access, refresher courses and the supervision of trainees. In talking about career progression, three respondents pointed to the parallels between their own work and the work of a teacher: 'I find that frustrating sometimes that I feel like I am really doing the same as a nursery teacher - in my last nursery I was head of pre-school.' It was suggested that to further a career in childcare or early years there should be easier routes into pre-school teaching: 'Even if you could only qualify to be a nursery or reception teacher at the lower end of the school. If there was an easier step than having to go and do a degree and do your teacher training'.

Respondents were also of the opinion that there needed to be improvements in accessing further training. Examples were cited of workers unable to attend courses because they could not be released from their jobs or because they had to meet the costs themselves. With nursery workers already on a low income, it is unlikely that they will have the financial resources to fund further training. Wendy, who had benefited from undertaking foundation modules for a degree, felt this opportunity should be extended but raised the issue of funding: 'A lot of places [nurseries] couldn't afford to fund people. Some people on the course were finding it very difficult'.

Other suggestions put forward by respondents included more refresher courses for those returning to the profession after a career break and a greater emphasis on practical experience during training. Harriet who had not had any training

herself observed in the nursery where she had worked that 'some that had been to college didn't have any ideas of activities to do with children'. This of course raises questions about the level and duration of qualification training and how it matches the work that students will be expected to undertake. Historically, there has been a diverse mix of training and qualifications varying in their range and level. Several initiatives have been implemented since the advent of the National Childcare Strategy, which are aimed at improving the coherence of training and qualifications in the childcare sector, for example the Early Years Education, Childcare and Playwork Framework (QCA, 1999).

Finally, Kate raised the problems associated with the supervision of staff undertaking an NVQ qualification in the nursery. She highlighted the additional stress it places upon the supervisor who has to fulfil her role in the nursery too 'You're trying to find time to guide them and sit down and talk to them about what you are doing and why so that they're learning ... you're also trying to do the planning ... something with the children.' For the additional work Kate received no recognition in terms of pay or non-contact time: 'I was being paid £10,500 to run the room and to train somebody at the same time'. There are obvious benefits in offering workplace-based qualification training, not least of which is that a worker can gain a qualification whilst at the same time earning an income. However, the experience of this respondent raises issues about the quality of supervision when it is being undertaken by staff who are expected to fit it in around their existing commitments.

7.5 Suggestions for recruitment and retention

7.5.1 Higher salaries

The in-depth respondents, who included both existing and former nursery workers, were asked what could be done to encourage more people into the profession and to retain those working in it or encourage those who had left to return. Not surprisingly perhaps, given that pay and working conditions had featured so prominently in the reasons why people left childcare, nine of the ten in-depth respondents said that there needed to be higher salaries. Three referred to the fact that their earnings were more when they left childcare work to have children, than when they returned some years later. Two went on to say that there should be recognised national pay scales. A result of raising salaries could be passing the cost on to parents through increased fees. Nicky felt that the cost of higher salaries should not be borne by parents. The fact that men are poorly represented within the childcare workforce was considered by Kate to be due to low wages, 'A lot of the reason why a lot of men don't do it is because they want to provide for their family and they can't do it.'

7.5.2 A better career structure

The view was voiced that with little scope for promotion, nursery workers were forced to move or leave childcare in search of advancement. A better career structure for childcare workers was considered a factor, which would help in recruitment and retention. Two respondents were of the opinion that there should be an easier route in to early years teaching, which recognised the childcare qualification and experience that nursery workers often had. Raising

awareness among students on childcare courses and among the childcare workforce of the different jobs available within the childcare sector would also help.

7.5.3 Better nursery management and organisation

Dissatisfaction with management was cited by fourteen percent of the survey respondents and most of the in-depth respondents as the main reason why people left nursery employment or left childcare. One in-depth respondent believed that better management, which included staff supervision providing staff with feedback about their job performance, would make a difference, 'Often people don't feel that they've been managed really that well'. She contrasted her experience in the nursery with her previous job where staff had regular supervisory sessions and clearly knew what they were doing well and in which areas they needed to improve. Another respondent talked about the increasing amount of paperwork that childcare workers were now required to do, particularly for the pre-school age group. She was of the opinion that if having lower ratios (i.e. fewer children for each adult to care for) reduced staff's workload, childcare workers would be less likely to leave the profession.

7.5.4 Raising the status of the work

There was a feeling among some that there needed to be more publicity and information about what childcare work involved. That it was more than 'looking after children'. Not only would this help people to see that it was a proper job, but it would raise awareness among potential childcare workers of what the job entails, 'A lot of girls who qualify, they're not really aware of what they are going into. They think it's all hunky dory and sitting down playing with children all day'. Increasing people's awareness in this way would, according to Diana, help to prevent young girls entering the profession only to find that it did not live up to their expectations. However, as we have already reported above, very few respondents considered that their childcare work had fallen short of their expectations.

7.5.5 Childcare refresher courses

Finally, some women with a childcare qualification return to childcare work after taking a break to have children. In the years in which they are not working, childcare knowledge and practice can change. Offering refresher courses, in the way that teachers who have not practised for some time are offered such a course, was thought to be a good idea for encouraging some who had left the profession to return. However, it was stressed that the government should pay for the costs of a refresher course.

7.6 Summary

- In-depth respondents defined in the study as having left the childcare field do not necessarily see themselves as having done so because, for them, childcare is defined very broadly to include working with children in a wide range of settings
- 50 percent of survey respondents expected to take time away from employment for caring responsibilities in the next five years.

- The predominant view among in-depth respondents is that young children need the exclusive care of parents, particularly mothers. However, some women with young children are not averse to working if employment does not involve the use of non-parental childcare.
- Government was seen as the main source of help for parents combining work and care.
- In-depth respondents who were qualified considered childcare qualifications important for their work. Unqualified respondents were less convinced of the value of qualifications.
- In terms of pay and promotion, qualified staff were no more advantaged than unqualified staff.
- 54 percent of those who would be working in childcare over the next five years thought they would undertake qualification training in childcare or a related field.
- Suggestions were to improve training: easier routes into teacher training for the early years; increasing funding for training to make it more accessible.
- Higher salaries, a better career structure, improved nursery organisation and management, raising the status of childcare work, and introducing childcare refresher courses were suggested as measures for recruiting and retaining staff.

Chapter Eight - Conclusions

8.1 Key messages from the research

8.1.1 A fluid workforce

The main messages from the studies reported on here bring good news and bad news. The good news is confirmation of previous findings of high levels of occupational commitment and job satisfaction. Most nursery workers enjoy working with young children and want to continue doing so. Most see childcare work as a long-term career and the great majority expect to be working in childcare in the future, whether or not they are currently doing so. Relatively few, over the 12-15 month period between Parts One and Two, have left the childcare field.

The not so good news is that more than a quarter of former students were not working in childcare just 15 months after completing their course, and that more than a quarter of the nursery workers interviewed for Part One had within 12 months moved from the nursery job that they then occupied. While most had not been lost to the childcare sector as such, this fluidity within the childcare workforce brings costs and disruption to nurseries and has worrying implications for the quality of childcare services. Research has shown that quality of childcare is significantly associated with staff stability. For example, more stable caregivers provide children in their care with more appropriate, attentive and engaged interactions (Raikes, 1993; Whitebook, Howes and Phillips, 1989). As the authors of a recent review of US research evidence note: “it is not a coincidence that the high-quality intervention programs that have generated strong experimental evidence of positive developmental effects have employed highly qualified staff and experienced virtually no teacher turnover” (National Research Council Institute of Medicine, 2001: 315).

8.1.2 Pay and status

Another area of concern is the continuing and adverse impact of low pay, which represents both limited income for childcare workers and a symbolic statement of the low social valuation placed on their work. As in the Part One study, low pay is consistently cited as a main drawback of the work and is seen as the primary reason for driving people out of the work or moving them on (Cameron et al., 2001). Not only does poor pay drive people out, but also it does not attract new entrants. That respondents, in the qualitative studies, referred to the fact that their pay has remained largely unchanged over several years further devalues the work. It is also significant that so many, in both Parts One and Two, aspire to work in the public sector; one reason may be the better pay and conditions compared to the private sector (Simon et al., forthcoming).

Pay has been emphasised here, but it is associated with other poor employment conditions. For example the Part One study revealed that few nursery workers had occupational pensions. They are likely to be in that group of low paid earners who are unable to fund a significant private or stakeholder pension and

would be better off at retirement relying on the Government's minimum income guarantee (Field, 2001; Toynbee, 2001). In its current conditions, childcare work does not permit childcare workers to assume the responsibility expected of citizens in an advanced liberal society to manage old age and other risks faced by themselves and their families.

8.1.3 Nursery workers' own care responsibilities

At present, it seems likely that the intrinsic content of the work may outweigh the extrinsic conditions, at least for most childcare workers. Despite the poor working conditions, most stay in the work and there is a flow of new entrants – though not necessarily in sufficient numbers to meet growing demand. It may be that the current balance will change, a point to which we shall return. In addition to pay (and other poor employment conditions), the research points to two other factors which may adversely affect recruitment and retention.

First, there is the issue of the attitudes of childcare workers towards mothering in general and their own mothering in particular, and the practices they adopt in the care of their own children. While there have been major changes in recent years among women with young children, marked not only by more employment, but also by more full-time employment and early resumption of employment after childbirth, these changes have not been uniform. Mothers who undertake full-time employment when they have very young children are much more likely to be highly educated and work in higher status and higher paid jobs, than other mothers of young children. Women who do most of the caring work (i.e. nursery workers and childminders) are more likely to have lower levels of education and to work in lower status and lower paid jobs (e.g. childcare of various kinds).

The evidence from Parts One and Two shows a consistent reluctance amongst the latter group of women to work full time, and to use non-parental care, when their own children are young. While a strong preference to work part time rather than full time is expressed by nursery workers, most nursery work is full time. Even those who return to childcare work when children are of school age or come into the work through chance when their children are older seem from the in-depth respondents often reluctant to work full time, but want childcare work that fits in with school hours.

This suggests that care responsibilities are likely to take a substantial number of nursery workers out of the childcare field, at least for a period of time. Not only is it likely that their views on non-parental childcare will deter a return to work when their children are young, but their working conditions - long hours and poor pay – do not make a return to work an attractive option. From this perspective, it is significant that half (52%) of all former students with children under 5 years were not working at the time of the follow up, compared to only 16 percent who had no children. There were also instances from the in-depth interviews that pointed to additional problems faced by some women who want to work but have children, for example lone mothers.

8.1.4 Management

The second factor concerns management. The follow-up survey shows the significant role that poor nursery management and organisation can play in the movement of nursery workers between childcare settings and out of childcare altogether. Dissatisfaction with management was one of the three main reasons given for leaving a nursery, mentioned as often as dissatisfaction with pay (both 16%: Table 5.8). Similarly, in the in-depth interviews, pay and nursery management were the main dislikes about childcare work. Some of the nursery practices described in this study are indeed disquieting, not just in terms of what they mean for nursery workers but also in terms of quality and the experience of children.

Dissatisfaction with management may be linked to a finding from the survey of nursery workers for the Part One study. Over half of nursery heads had not done any management or business skill training, and of those that had, the most popular course was the NVQ in customer services or similar (Cameron et al., 2001).

8.1.5 Nannies

A final point concerns the situation of nannies. These results are tentative and should be treated with caution: nannying was not a primary focus of this work, and we rely heavily on a small number of in-depth interviews. The experiences of the former students who became nannies suggest a number of problems. They suggest, however, that more attention needs to be paid to this type of childcare work, which unregulated, and therefore invisible, may leave young women, who have only recently completed training, unsupported and vulnerable to poor or unacceptable standards of employment.

8.2 Conceptualising the issue

Both Part One and Part Two of this study have been undertaken within a conceptual framework of 'entry, retention and loss' within 'childcare work'. This framework may, however, be too narrow and mechanistic to capture the complexity of what is happening and for the development of future policy and research.

First, there is the question of what the childcare sector is. As already noted, from a policy view 'childcare' is defined in terms of services providing care for children aged up to 14 years while parents are at work (or, if including a slightly wider Children Act perspective, for children who are defined as 'in need'). However, some workers in the study understood 'childcare' to cover most or all work with children, in a wide range of settings including schools. From their perspective, they are not lost to childcare if, for example, they move from working in a nursery to being an educational assistant in a secondary school. There is therefore a mismatch between a particular policy definition of the sector of work and workers' understandings of their sector of work.

‘Entry, retention and loss’ also fails to capture what is actually going on in people’s working lives. As we have seen, there are a number of ways of entering into the work. A substantial number of workers come into childcare when they are in their late teens, having usually pursued no other employment path. Because of the belief strongly held by childcare workers that young children should not be in non-maternal care, these entrants are likely to leave when they have children. Some will return to childcare work later, usually when their children are older and at school. A smaller group enters this work at a later stage in their lives. They tend to have children who have started school and they do not want, or are unable to pursue, the employment they had before starting a family though may return to it later. Some of the women in this group may go on to become qualified and make childcare their new career. There is a trend for those in this group to come into the work by chance or accident. This accidental or chance route tends to be taken by women who are already mothers, since their introduction to the work is often through their children’s use of pre-school services. In the focus groups with students on childcare and playwork courses in the Part One Study (Cameron et al., 2001) there were those who had taken an accidental route into the work as well as those where it had been planned.

‘Loss’ is also too simple and pejorative. Women may leave nursery work when they have children, to return later. Or they may move away from nursery work into another related sector – ‘related’ either in policy terms or in terms of how workers themselves understand the ‘childcare’ field. Or they may take the skills acquired as a childcare worker into an entirely different field, such as nursing or social work, so enriching their new occupation.

Issues of retention (i.e. cutting job turnover) are important from the perspective of supporting continuity of care for children. Stability is widely acknowledged as important for children. But too much stability may be problematic, indicating too limited opportunities for career progression or movement into other related areas of work (e.g. from nursery nurse to nursery teacher). In future, rather than conceptualising the issue as ‘entry, retention and loss’, it may be more accurate and useful to conceptualise the issues as ‘employment careers’ followed by childcare workers. This would include the routes into the work and the nature and reasons for subsequent changes.

8.3 Policy issues

1. One can understand workers who question the point of training and qualifications if there is little difference between trained and untrained staff in their pay and promotional prospects. This is an area to which the new national accreditation system currently under development should give serious consideration. Despite high levels of job satisfaction and commitment reported by nursery workers, poor pay (and other employment conditions) is cited as a main reason for moving within the childcare sector as well as leaving it altogether. Present levels of pay deter new entrants and lubricate the present fluidity within the workforce: but for the strong intrinsic benefits of the work, poor pay might have even more adverse consequences. However, this balance is not stable. Decreasing numbers of young women with lower level educational qualifications (the main source

of nursery workers and childminders) and increasing alternative job opportunities for this group are likely to make poor pay an increasingly significant influence on entry and retention.

The issue is unlikely to be addressed by the National Minimum Wage (since, as the Part One report showed, most nursery workers earn slightly above), or the Working Families Tax Credit (since most nursery workers do not have children, and many will leave childcare work or become self-employed childminders when they have children). Nor does the Childcare Tax Credit as presently operating seem to offer much boost to earnings, since it benefits only a minority of parents using formal childcare services and pays out on average just £35 per week per case (Inland Revenue, 2001: Table 8.1). A survey of parents for the Daycare Trust (2000) reported that 70 percent chose trained and experienced staff as the key factor contributing to high quality childcare and approximately two-thirds thought that childcare staff were poorly paid.

In response to the Daycare Trust survey, the National Day Nurseries Association (NDNA) argued that childcare salaries would not improve unless nurseries are able to charge more, but parents are unable or unwilling to 'foot the bill'. "If we are to pay nursery staff in the private and voluntary sector a basic salary of just £13,000 then NDNA predicts a rise in cost of provision to above £200 a place per week". (Nursery World, 2001).

2. The occupation of childcare, because of the gender and relatively young age of its workforce, faces a particular challenge in creating a work climate and employment practices that recognise the *care responsibilities of the workforce*. More attention is needed to this issue, which also takes account of the critical attitude of many carers towards the use of childcare services for their own children.
3. There is an urgent need for more *management training and clear policies* within the nursery that address staffing issues. Nursery owners need support and training for being a good employer with advice on contracts for example and proper pay scales linked to qualifications and experience. Improvement in the working conditions of staff and management practice in general is not only likely to improve retention of staff, but also benefit the quality of care provided. In a recent study investigating quality assurance in group day care, day nurseries with lower ratings of quality were more likely to require staff to work longer hours (Munton and Mooney, 2001). This study further provided evidence of a clear link between organisational and staff characteristics in nurseries and the quality of childcare provided by nurseries.
4. Current policy emphasises the importance of *diversifying the workforce* by recruiting more men, and more men and women from minority ethnic groups, over 40 years of age and with disabilities. Our experience both researching men working in nurseries (Cameron, Moss and Owen, 1999) and analysing the situation of minority ethnic childcare students in this study points to the need for more attention to be paid to identifying and

understanding the differences between groups, and the implications of these differences for shaping policy and practice with respect both to training and employment. Men, for example, tend to follow different entry paths to women, arriving at a later stage of the life course. Minority ethnic students are older, more likely to have children and less likely to have a job while training than white students. There is a need here for research linked closely to practice, geared to making diversity a central assumption of childcare work, and not an add on.

5. Childcare and early education services have clearly climbed the policy agenda since 1997, with many government initiatives aimed at supporting both young children's education and play as well as parents' need for childcare services during employment. Current policy goals include expanding the number of places in childcare services by one million in the next three years, which will require a substantial increase in the number of staff. But this study has shown that expecting to build a new staff group on the existing 'bricks' of long-term commitment and intrinsic enjoyment of working with children is unlikely to be sufficient to either draw enough people into the work or to keep them there in the face of wider change.

8.4 Conclusion

By questioning the sustainability of the current childcare workforce, in the context of changing demand and supply conditions, and seeing childcare as just one part of a wider incipient crisis across the whole childcare sector, we ask the strategic question: who will do the caring work in the future? But this question is not just about the sustainability of the present system. It is also about the desirability of perpetuating the current situation – even if this were to prove possible.

With the integration of childcare and education, is there a need to conceptualise a new 'core' early years worker, as has been the case in other countries which have sought to develop an integrated early years service? Or should we follow some of the women in this study, and think even more broadly, of a new worker trained to work with groups of children in many settings, from nurseries to youth clubs, from schools to residential institutions for children and young people? Such a worker would not only draw on new theories and practices for working with children, with a higher level training and commensurate salary, but would also have wider opportunities for work and career advancement.

One 'model' for such a new type of worker, the social pedagogue, is widely established in Continental Europe. While the pedagogue already exists, there may be other more 'home-grown' possibilities for a new type of worker. Either way, we conclude that there is a need to review the future of work with young children, preferably within a wider context of work with children more generally and in relation to other fields of care work, and as a 'joined-up' exercise involving a range of government departments and non-governmental organisations.

References

- Brannen, J. and Moss, P. (1991) *Managing Mothers: Dual earner families after maternity leave*. London, Unwin Hyman
- Cameron, C. (1997) A review of staffing in childcare centres in six countries, *Early Child Development and Care*, 137, 47 - 67
- Cameron, C. (1999) *Child Protection and Independent Day Care Services: examining the interface of policy and practice*, unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Education University of London
- Cameron, C., Moss, P. and Owen, C. (1999) *Men in the Nursery: gender and caring work*, London, Paul Chapman Publishing
- Cameron, C., Owen, C. and Moss, P. (2001) *Entry Retention and Loss: A study of childcare workers and students*, DfES Research Report Series No. 275, London, DfES
- Cordeaux, C., Hall, B., Owen, S. and Miles, R. (1999) *HERA2 Final Report, Child Care Training in the United Kingdom*. Ipswich, Suffolk County Council
- Crompton, R. (1997) *Women and work in modern Britain*, Oxford University Press
- Daycare Trust (2000) *Childcare Choice, Childcare Voices: MORI survey commissioned by the Daycare Trust*, London, Daycare Trust
- Employers Organisation/Improvement and Development Agency, (1999) *Independent Day Nursery Workforce Survey 1998*, London, EO/IDeA
- Field, F. (2001) 'Why Mr Blair should rethink his pension', *The Guardian*, August 17, 2001
- Holmans, A., Kiddle, C. and Whitehead, C. (2000) Housing Need in the South East and London: An Update Research Report Series III, Department of Land Economy, Cambridge, University of Cambridge
- Holtermann, S., Brannen, J., Moss, P. and Owen, C. (1998) *Lone Parents and the Labour Market: Results from the 1997 Labour Force Survey and Review of Research*, Employment Service, Sheffield
- Inland Revenue (2001) Working Families' Tax Credit Statistics: Quarterly Enquiry February 2001, www.inlandrevenue.gov.uk
- Mooney, A. Knight, A. Moss, P. and Owen, C. (2001) *Who Cares? Childminding in the 1990s*, York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Munton, A. and Mooney, A. (2001) *Integrating Self-Assessment into Statutory Inspection Procedures: The Impact on the Quality of Group Day Care Provision (Research Report RR285)*, London, Department for Education and Skills
- Moss, P., Owen, C., Statham, J., Bull, J., Cameron, C. and Candappa, M. (1995) *Survey of day care providers in England and Wales*, a working paper from the TCRU Children Act project, Institute of Education University of London
- Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (1990) *Standard Occupational Classification*, London, HMSO
- Penn, H. and McQuail, S. (1996) *Childcare as a Gendered Occupation*. DfEE Research Report No. 23. London, DfEE
- Phoenix, A. Woollett, A. and Lloyd, E. (eds) (1991) *Motherhood: meanings, practices and ideologies*, London, Sage

- Ritchie, J. and Spencer, L. (1994) 'Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research' In A. Bryman and R. Burgess (eds) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London, Routledge
- Scott, G., Brown, U. and Campbell, J. (2000) *Visible Childcare: Invisible Workers*. Glasgow. Trade Union Research Unit: Occasional paper No.1
- Schryer, M. (1994)) *The Relationship Between Center Size and Child Care Workers' Level of Job Commitment and Job Satisfaction*, Master of Education thesis, National College of Education, National Louis University
- Simon, A., Owen, C., Moss, P. and Cameron, C. (forthcoming) *Mapping the Care Workforce: Supporting joined up thinking. Secondary analysis of the Labour Force Survey for childcare and social care work*. London: Institute of Education
- Toynbee, P. (2001) 'Prudent Parveen is the chancellor's fictitious saver', *The Guardian*, April 11, 2001
- Tronto, J. (1993) *Moral Boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*, New York, Routledge
- Vernon, J. and Smith, C. (1994) *Day Nurseries at a Crossroads*, London, NCB
- Whitebook, M., Howes, C. and Philips, D. (1989) *Who Cares? Child care teachers amd the quality of care in America*, Oakland, CA, National Child Care Staffing Study, Final Report
- Whitebook, M., Howes, C. and Philips, D. (1993) *National Child Care staffing study revisited: Four years in the life of Center-based Child Care*, Child Care Employee Project, Oakland, CA.

Appendix One - Research design

Student follow-up survey

Sample selection

In the original survey there were 1,094 completed questionnaires, of which 775 were completed with students on diploma level courses. This group of 775 formed the sample frame for the follow-up survey, drawing on students in both the main sample and the supplementary samples of colleges¹⁴. Table A1.1 shows that half of those in the main sample took part in the follow up. Among those in the supplementary sample, a slightly greater proportion did not take part than did.

Table A1.1 Participation in the follow-up study from main and supplementary samples of colleges

	No	Yes	Total
Main	327	321	648
	50	50	100
Supplementary	76	51	127
	60	40	100
Total	403	372	775
	52	48	100

Response rates

Excluding pilot interviews, full interviews were conducted with 67 percent of students whose phone numbers were known. This represents 56 percent of those students who agreed to be contacted and 48 percent of all students on diploma (Level 3) courses that completed a questionnaire.

Table A1.2: Outcome of sample

	N	Percent
Completed full interviews	372	66.5
<i>Pilots</i>	19	
Not known at the address	20	3.6
No new contact details for respondent	7	1.3
Refused	13	2.3
Away during fieldwork	18	3.2
Number unobtainable/no response	67	12.0
Wrong number	21	3.8
Fax/modem	1	0.2
No appointment	40	7.2
Total (not including pilots)	559	100

The Part One study included a weighted sample of colleges from areas with higher than average populations of people from minority ethnic backgrounds. The proportion of minority ethnic students in these colleges was 45 percent, compared with 10 percent in the main sample. All the students from diploma level courses were included in the follow-up, including both the main and the

supplementary samples, so it is possible that we have an overrepresentation of former students from minority ethnic backgrounds in the Part Two study.

Comparison of participants and non-participants at follow-up

Comparing those students who took part in the survey and those who did not, there are no major differences, but some variations, which the following tables will demonstrate.

On age distribution, participants and non-participants were more or less evenly balanced in each age group, with a slightly higher proportion of those in the 25 - 34 age group participating and slightly fewer of the 20 - 24 and 35+ age groups participating.

Table A1.3 Age group of participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
16 - 19	251	232	483
	52	48	100
20 - 24	58	45	103
	56	44	100
25 - 34	42	50	92
	46	54	100
35 +	48	30	88
	55	46	100
Total	399	367	766
	52	48	100

On ethnicity, while participation in the follow-up was evenly divided in the white group, those from ethnic minorities were more likely not to have participated in the follow up study.

Table A1.4: Ethnic group of participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
White	326	320	646
	51	50	100
Ethnic minority	70	45	115
	61	39	100
Total	396	365	761
	52	48	100

Among those living with parents at first contact, participation and non-participation at follow-up are divided evenly. However, among those living with a partner or independently, non-participation was more likely than participation.

Table A1.5 Household arrangement at first contact of participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
Parents	280	273	553
	51	49	100
Partner	74	68	142
	52	48	100
Live independently	40	27	67
	60	40	100
Total	394	368	762
	52	48	100

Turning to parenthood, those with children at first contact are equally well represented in the follow-up study as those without children at first contact.

Table A1.6 Presence and absence of own children at first contact among participants and non-participants

	No	Yes	Total
Yes	84	82	166
	51	49	100
No	313	285	598
	52	48	100
Total	397	367	764
	52	48	100

There were no major differences in the ages of children represented in the participants and non-participant groups, except that those with primary age children were more likely to be represented and those with children aged 17 and over were less likely to be represented.

Table A1.7. Age of children among participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
Preschool 0 - 4	19	20	39
	49	51	100
Primary age 5 - 11	54	61	115
	47	53	100
Secondary 12 - 16	30	29	59
	51	49	100
Older 17 +	16	13	29
	55	45	100
Total	80	80	160
	50	50	100

Turning to characteristics of former students' approach to their training and career, there were no significant differences between participants and non-participants on the age left full-time education: both those who left at age 16 or under and those left after the age of 16 were equally likely to participate.

Among those who began their courses between the ages of 18 and 20, non-participants were more likely to be represented than participants were.

Table A1.8: Age started course, participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
15 - 17	236	220	456
	52	48	100
18 - 20	49	41	90
	54	46	100
21+	73	79	152
	48	52	100
Total	358	340	698
	51	49	100

Among those who had done voluntary work, slightly more were not in the follow-up than were, and among those who had done unpaid full-time caring work at home, participants at follow up were evenly divided (49% had said no to follow up; 51% said yes to follow up). So this kind of background is not a predictor of participation or non-participation in follow-up. Among those who had worked while studying, there was equal representation at follow-up. Among those who hadn't, slightly fewer participated in the follow-up study.

Table A1.9: Employed while studying, participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No	Yes	Total
Yes	263	259	522
	50	50	100
No	126	106	232
	54	46	100
Total	389	365	754
	52	48	100

Among those who want to work with children at first contact, there was equal representation in the follow-up study. Among those who don't want to work with children, a greater proportion did not participate, but the numbers are very small. Among those who were not sure, a bigger proportion was not represented than were.

Table A1.10 Want to work with children after qualifying: participants and non-participants at follow-up

	No		Yes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	348	88	347	94	695	91
No	8	2	3	1	11	1
Not sure	39	10	19	5	58	8
Total	395	100	369	100	764	100

In summary, the characteristics of participants and non-participants were similar. The only factors that show a marginal difference are: ethnicity - white participants more likely than minority ethnic participants; age - 25 - 34 year olds were more likely to participate, and where they had children, mothers of primary age children were more likely to participate than not participate at follow-up.

The questionnaire for the follow-up study of former childcare students is reproduced in Appendix 3.

Former student in-depth interviews

Sample selection

The in-depth study used the sample details from the 372 completed interviews. An initial breakdown of the sample according to their experiences of childcare employment showed that nearly three-quarters of former students were currently employed in childcare, while a further nine percent had had a childcare job since leaving college and 19 percent had not worked in childcare at all since leaving college¹⁵, as Table A1.11 sets out.

Table A1.11 Former students grouped by experiences of childcare employment

	N	%
Group 1: Currently in childcare job	267	71.8
Group 2: Had past childcare job	34	9.1
Group 3: Not worked in childcare	71	19.1
Total	372	100

In order to achieve the sample of in-depth interviews, contact details on the three groups of students were retrieved from the survey data. So as to maximise the information gathered from the minority not currently working in childcare, five students each were randomly selected from Groups 2 and 3, and four students from Group 1, with replacements identified in case of refusals. In the event there were two refusals: one person said she did not have anything to contribute and didn't want to discuss her work and life and the second failed to show at the agreed time and place for interview.

¹⁵ Twelve (three percent) had not completed the course and a further four (four percent in all) had not gained the qualification.

In the main, the respondents were very keen to take part in the research and many asked to be kept informed of the results. The 14 interviews took place in November and December 2000, mostly face to face, but some on the telephone. Seven key areas that were identified through the previous stage of the research (Cameron, et al., 2001) structured the format of the interview. The tapes were fully transcribed and analysis then proceeded using the 'Framework' method (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994). The topic guide used is reproduced in Appendix 3.

Staff follow-up survey

Contacting nurseries

In Part One of the study an interviewer had gone to each participating nursery for a face-to-face interview with each member of staff. All these nurseries were telephoned an average of 15 months later, and the person in charge was asked if those staff were still employed by the nursery. Of the 245 nurseries to be contacted, 223 were contacted (91%). The others had wrong or unobtainable numbers or never answered, even after at least 15 calls at different times of day, or were known to have closed. However, not all of those contacted agreed to take part: 23 (9%) refused. The number of nurseries contacted and completing an interview was 181 (74%). More detail is given in Table A1.12.

It was possible to compare the nurseries that were contacted with those that were not using the answers to questions in Part One. No statistically significant differences were found. It was possible to compare the answers of staff from contacted and the non-contacted samples in terms of their replies to questions in Part One, to check if the staff from nurseries for which we had data differed in important ways from staff in nurseries for which we had no follow-up data. There were only two statistically significant differences between the staff in the two groups of nurseries, and these are of no importance: staff from nurseries which were not re-contacted were slightly more likely to have had careers advice about working in childcare (55 percent compared to 50 percent) and slightly more likely to have a pre-school aged child (11 percent vs 8 percent). The lack of differences gives us confidence that those nurseries who were contacted for follow-up do not differ from those who were not, so that conclusions based on the sub-sample of nurseries who were re-contacted can safely be generalized to all nurseries.

Table A1.12 Nursery response to telephone follow-up

		N	%
Contacted and interviewed		181	74
Contacted but not interviewed		13	5
Not contacted		28	11
<i>Of which</i>	<i>Wrong number/unobtainable</i>	19	8
	<i>No answer</i>	6	2
	<i>Known to have closed</i>	3	1
Refused		23	9
Total		245	100

When a nursery was contacted, the person in charge was read out the names of the staff interviewed in Part One and asked if they still worked in the nursery; if not, they were asked if they knew the reasons why the ex-member of staff had left. (See Appendix 3 for this screening interview schedule.) The interviewed nurseries had, between them, 1,274 staff who had been interviewed for Part One: of these 934 (73%) were still in post.

Contacting ex-staff

The nurseries identified 340 staff who had been interviewed but had since left the nursery. An interviewer then tried to telephone each of these ex-staff to conduct a short telephone interview, using the telephone number given at the first interview. Of these, 145 were contacted and re-interviewed (43%). A few (8: 2%) were contacted but did not want to be interviewed at that time, and were subsequently not contacted. Some were contacted but refused to be interviewed (26: 8%). However, the biggest problem was the very large number who were not contacted at all (162: 47%), amounting to almost half of those known to have left. (See Table A1.13.)

Table A1.13 Ex-staff response to telephone follow-up

		N	%
Contacted and interviewed		145	43
Contacted but not interviewed		8	2
Not contacted		161	47
<i>Of which</i>	<i>Wrong number/unobtainable</i>	85	25
	<i>No answer</i>	35	10
	<i>Known to have moved</i>	41	12
Refused		26	8
Total		340	100

Some of those not contacted were known to have moved address. However, many more had a wrong phone number or a number unobtainable: it is likely that many of these were also people who had moved.

It was possible to compare the answers from Part One given by those ex-staff who were contacted and interviewed and those who were not, to check if those ex-staff who were interviewed differed in important ways from those who were not. The interviewed and non-interviewed leavers did not differ in terms of age, having children of their own, childcare qualifications, hours worked, pay or length of time they had worked in the nursery. There were just a few differences: staff from a minority ethnic group were more likely not to be interviewed than white staff (17 percent vs 8 percent); non-interviewed staff were more likely to be doing a modern apprenticeship (12 percent vs 5 percent) and not to have qualifications from school (9 percent vs 3 percent). Again, there are very few differences and the ones that were found are not major. We, therefore, also have confidence that the re-interviewed leavers do not differ in important ways from the non-interviewed leavers, so that conclusions based on those staff who left the nurseries and were re-interviewed can safely be generalized to all staff who left nurseries.

Staff in-depth interviews

From the survey respondents, five who had left the nursery but remained in the childcare field and five who had left childcare were to be selected for the in-depth interviews. Names were selected randomly within these two categories and telephoned to arrange a longer interview. Three refused, and these were replaced by other randomly selected ex-staff. Reasons for refusal were lack of time and not wanting to participate again. Interviewees were selected from areas covering London, the Midlands, the South West and the North of England. Some characteristics of the interviewees are shown in Table A2.1 in Appendix 2. Seven of the interviews were face-to-face and three were conducted by telephone. The interviews were on average one hour in length. Interview topics included: reasons for taking up childcare work; employment and training history since leaving the nursery; reasons for leaving; views about combining work and family life; and views about retention and loss of nursery workers. The topic guide is in Appendix 3. The interviews were transcribed and analysed using the 'Framework' method (Ritchie and Spencer, 1994).

Appendix Two - Membership of Groups

Some characteristics of the groups used in the in-depth study of former childcare students.

Group 1

Annie school	Married, two children, working in local authority secondary
Beth	Married, no children, working in private day nursery
Sarah	Divorced, three children, working in private preschool and about to start another preschool
Liz	Single, no children, working in private day nursery

Group 2

Amanda	Single, no children, nanny looking for work
Serena	Single parent, two children, working as a school meals supervisor
Rachel	Single, no children, working in airport security
Louisa	Cohabiting, infant child, nanny returning to work shortly
Sophie	Single, no children, nanny looking for work

Group 3

Susan	Single parent, three children, not working
Lesley	Single parent, three children, not working, about to begin social work training
Kerry	Single, no children, working in factory
Hannah	Married, pregnant, not working
Sally adolescents	Single, no children, working in a care home with disabled

Table A2.1 Some characteristics of the in-depth sample of former nursery staff

	Age	Children	Childcare qualification	Employment group	Hours worked in childcare	Left childcare	Employment now
Zoë	46	School age	BA(Early Yrs)	3	Part-time	Yes	PGCE student
Lesley	41	School age	NNEB	3	Part-time	Yes	Swimming instructor
Nicky	29	Pre-school	None	4	Part-time	Yes	Beautician
Mary	19	None	None	4	Full-time	Yes	BA student
Dee	44	Adult	NNEB	1	Full-time	Yes	Care Asst
Leone	34	School-age	NNEB	1	Part-time	No	NN – private
Harriet	43	School-age	None	3	Part-time	No	Classroom asst
Kate	26	None	NNEB, HNC	2	Full-time	No	NN – private
Camilla	25	None	NVQ Level 3	2	Full-time	No	NN – private
Kharis	25	None	NNEB	2	Full-time	No	NN – LEA

Employment group:

1. Qualified in childcare after leaving school, left childcare work when they had children and returned to childcare work at a later date - the entered, left and re-entered group (2);
2. Qualified after leaving school and have not left childcare - the continuous group (3);
3. Come into the work by chance and may have subsequently qualified for childcare work - the chance group (3);
4. Are unqualified and come into the work seeing it as a stop-gap or a temporary position - the temporary group (2).

Table A2.1 shows that those in employment group 3 (the chance group) are more likely to have school-age children. Respondents with pre-school or school age children work part-time compared with those with no children or adult children who work full-time. It would seem that nursery workers who fall into the chance and temporary position groups (3 and 4) are more likely to leave childcare-related employment compared with those in group 2. However, those in group 2 are likely in the future to move to group 1 if they leave to have children with a possible return at a later date. Furthermore, nursery workers falling into the chance group may not necessarily leave childcare work permanently, but again may return at a later date. This suggests a great deal of fluidity in the movement in to and out of childcare work.

Appendix Three- Research Instruments

Topic guide used with former childcare students

THOMAS CORAM RESEARCH UNIT INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ENTRY RETENTION AND LOSS

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS WITH FORMER CHILDCARE STUDENTS

Intro/Confidentiality

Thank you for agreeing to take part for a third time in our study of what happens to people who train in childcare. Today I want to talk about what you have been doing since doing your childcare course in a little more detail, just to find out about your views and experiences on work and related issues. I will use a tape recorder, so as to have a complete record of the interview. As before, all information you give us is confidential: we will not identify you in any publication, nor will we pass your details on to anyone outside the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit.

TOPIC GUIDE

1. *What made you think about going into childcare/early years to begin with?* [ensure cover original inspiration, other ambitions, whether expectations changed now, whether college course affected expectations]
2. *What has the year since leaving college been like?* [ensure cover employment, unemployment, reasons for changes in work within childcare/early years or from childcare/early years into something else, second jobs, financial difficulties]
3. *How useful has the qualification been?* [ensure cover whether qualification made any difference to jobs/seniority/wages available, whether college course adequate preparation, whether/why plan/benefits of further study]
4. *What is good and/or bad about working in childcare and/or early years?* [ensure cover what is rewarding/frustrating, what makes people leave and/or stay in the work, how significant others view their work choices]
5. *I'd like to ask about how you think looking after children or other people at home should fit in with paid work.* Do you have any caring responsibilities at home? How do you manage? What do you think would be the ideal arrangement? [cover help from employers, government, family members]
6. *How do you see the next five years going for you?* [cover employment, caring responsibilities/pregnancy, training, promotion, likely difficulties].
7. *Policy issues/suggestions.* [ensure cover ideas for retaining qualified workers and for encouraging qualified returners (e.g., what would encourage you to return once left?), ideas for improving childcare courses, whether heard of/views on Qualifications Framework]

Thank you very much for your time. Any questions or issues you want to discuss. Any expenses?

Topic guide used with follow up study of day nursery workers:

THOMAS CORAM RESEARCH UNIT INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ENTRY RETENTION AND LOSS

FOLLOW-UP IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS WITH DAY NURSERY WORKERS

Intro/Confidentiality

Thank you for agreeing to take part for a third time in our study of what happens to people who work in childcare. Today I want to talk in more detail about what you have been doing since System 3, or PAS as it was then known, first interviewed you, just to find out about your views and experiences on work and related issues. I will use a tape recorder, so as to have a complete record of the interview. As before, all information you give us is confidential: we will not identify you in any publication, nor will we pass your details on to anyone outside the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit.

TOPIC GUIDE

8. *What made you think about going into childcare/early years to begin with?* [ensure cover original inspiration, other ambitions, careers advice, whether expectations changed now]
9. *What has the year since you were interviewed in the nursery been like?* [ensure cover employment, unemployment, reasons for changes in work within childcare/early years or from childcare/early years into something else, prospects and consequences of changes in terms of wages/seniority/job satisfaction, any second jobs, relevance of nursery experience to subsequent jobs or responsibilities held, financial difficulties]
10. *What is good and/or bad about working in childcare and/or early years?* [ensure cover what is rewarding/frustrating, whether reality of childcare/early years work matched expectations, any preferences in type of childcare work, what makes people leave and/or stay in the work, how family and friends view their work choices]
11. *How useful do you think childcare qualifications are?* [ensure cover whether/what qualification held, how qualifications been useful in work, whether qualifications do or should make any difference to jobs/seniority/wages available, whether/why plan/benefits of further study]
12. *I'd like to ask about how you think looking after children or other people at home should fit in with paid work.* Do you have any caring responsibilities at home? How do you manage? What do you think would be the ideal arrangement? [cover help from employers, government, family members]
13. *How do you see the next five years going for you?* [cover employment, caring responsibilities/pregnancy, training, promotion, whether likely to stay in or return to childcare/early years work and what would make a difference to your decision, any likely difficulties]
14. *Policy issues/suggestions.* [ensure cover ideas for retaining workers and for encouraging returners (e.g., what would encourage you to return once left?), ideas for improving childcare courses or training more generally]

Thank you very much for your time. Any questions or issues you want to discuss. Any expenses?

Interview Schedules

The follow-up surveys of staff and former students were both conducted using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). Interviewers are presented with the sequence of questions on a computer screen and the respondents' answers are typed directly into the computer. Consequently, there is no paper questionnaire. However, the outlines from the CATI system have been included with this report. They include a lot of extraneous information, but they do indicate the question wording and the routing through the questionnaires.

Nursery Screener Interview

nursesp

Page 1 Card: 1

Serial:	_____	(1-5)
Card:	01	(6-7)

INTRO Good morning/ afternoon. May I speak to %RNAME%?

	(8)	Card: 16 (6-7)
Yes - continue.....	1	SP
Not available - make appointment.....	2	GO TO INTRO1
Person no longer works there.....	3	
No - switchboard refusal.....	4	GO TO REFSW

IF(INTRO='Person no longer works there'){

QX Can I speak to the current head of the centre?

	(9)	SP
Yes continue.....1		GO TO INTRO1
Not available - make appointment.....2		
No - switchboard refusal.....3		GO TO REFSW

}
STOP 'stop'
UNSET INTRO
GOTO INTRO

INTRO1

My name is %INT% and I am calling from System Three Social Research, an independent research company which was previously known as Public Attitude Surveys Ltd. We are carrying out a survey on behalf of Thomas Coram Research Unit at the Institute of Education, London. In %PMONTH% last year you may remember we visited your nursery and interviewed members of your staff.

PAUSE

INTRO2 We said at the time we would like to contact you again and today we are ringing on behalf of the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit to ask a few questions to update the information about the nursery and the staff. After we have spoken to you, we will be contacting all those members of staff who are not in post and who have previously given us permission to contact them. As before, all information is confidential, we will not identify you in any publication, nor will we pass your details to anyone else outside the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit. Would you be willing to answer a few question?

	(10)	SP
Yes - continue.....1		GO TO PQ1
No - refusal2		GO TO REFRESP
Yes - but not now - make an appointment.....3		

STOP 'stop'
UNSET INTRO2
GOTO INTRO

PQ1

I have a list of names of members of staff (including the head of the centre), who took part in the previous survey. When I read out each name, could you tell me whether they are still in post, whether they have left or whether they are on long term sick or maternity leave?

```

PAUSE
UNSET ITERS
SET TXT1='Firstly'

```

```

SET ITERS=ITERATION

```

Q1

```

%TXT1%
....

```

	[+ name1+]	[+ name2+]	[+ name3+]	[+ name4+]	[+ name5+]	[+ name6+]	[+ name7+]	
	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	SP
Still in post.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Left nursery.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Sick.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Maternity Leave...	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Don't know person.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

	[+ name8+]	[+ name9+]	[+ name10+]	[+ name11+]	[+ name12+]	[+ name13+]	[+ name14+]	
	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	SP
Still in post.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Left nursery.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Sick.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Maternity Leave...	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Don't know person.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

	[+ name15+]	[+ name16+]	[+ name17+]	[+ name18+]	[+ name19+]	[+ name20+]	[+ name21+]	
	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	SP
Still in post.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Left nursery.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Sick.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Maternity Leave...	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Don't know person.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	

	[+ name22+]	
	(32)	SP
Still in post.....	1	
Left nursery.....	2	
Sick.....	3	
Maternity Leave...	4	
Don't know person.	5	

```

IF(Q1(ITERS)='Left Nursery'){

```

Q1A Which year was this?

	[+ name1+]	[+ name2+]	[+ name3+]	[+ name4+]	[+ name5+]	[+ name6+]	[+ name7+]	
	(33-36)	(37-40)	(41-44)	(45-48)	(49-52)	(53-56)	(57-60)	
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	
	[+ name8+ (52)	[+ name9+ (54)	[+ name10+ (56)	[+ name11+ (58)	[+ name12+ (60)	[+ name13+ SP	[+ (48)	[+ (50)
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

	[+ name8+]	[+ name9+]	[+ name10+]	[+ name11+]	[+ name12+]	[+ name13+]	[+ name14+]	
	(62)	(64)	(66)	(68)	(70)	(72)	(74)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(63)	(65)	(67)	(69)	(71)	(73)	(75)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	(62)	(64)	(66)	(68)	(70)	(72)	(74)	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	[+ name15+]	[+ name16+]	[+ name17+]	[+ name18+]	[+ name19+]	[+ name20+]	[+ name21+]	
	(76)	(78)	18/8	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(77)	(79)	(9)	(11)	(13)	(15)	(17)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	(76)	(78)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

```
                [+
name22+
                ]

                (18)
Jan..... 1
Feb..... 2
March..... 3
April..... 4
May..... 5
June..... 6
July..... 7
August..... 8
Sept..... 9
                (19)
Oct..... 0
Nov..... 1
Dec..... 2
                (18)
Don't know..... Y
```

SP

SP

SP

```
UNSET ANQ1A
SET ANQ1A=NBIT(Q1B(ITER))
IF(PMONTH='February'.AND.ANQ1A=1.AND.Q1A(ITER)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITER)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF(PMONTH='March'.AND.ANQ1A<=2.AND.Q1A(ITER)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITER)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF(PMONTH='April'.AND.ANQ1A<=3.AND.Q1A(ITER)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITER)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF(PMONTH='May'.AND.ANQ1A<=4.AND.Q1A(ITER)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITERS)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF (PMONTH='June'.AND.ANQ1A<=5.AND.Q1A(ITERS)=2000) {
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITERS)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF (PMONTH='July'.AND.ANQ1A<=6.AND.Q1A(ITERS)=2000) {
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITERS)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF (PMONTH='August'.AND.ANQ1A<=7.AND.Q1A(ITERS)=2000) {
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITERS)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF (PMONTH='September'.AND.ANQ1A<=8.AND.Q1A(ITERS)=2000) {
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q1B(ITERS)
GOTO Q1B
}
IF (PMONTH='October'.AND.ANQ1A<=9.AND.Q1A(ITERS)=2000) {
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

	[+ name8+]	[+ name9+]	[+ name10+]	[+ name11+]	[+ name12+]	[+ name13+]	[+ name14+]	
	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)	SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fixed term.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Temporary.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Casual.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	18/27	18/28	18/29	18/30	18/31	18/32	18/33	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	[+ name15+]	[+ name16+]	[+ name17+]	[+ name18+]	[+ name19+]	[+ name20+]	[+ name21+]	
	(34)	(35)	(36)	(37)	(38)	(39)	(40)	SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fixed term.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Temporary.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Casual.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	18/34	18/35	18/36	18/37	18/38	18/39	18/40	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	[+ name22+]							
	(41)							SP
Permanent.....	1							
Fixed term.....	2							
Temporary.....	3							
Casual.....	4							
Other (specify)...	0							
	18/41							SP
Don't know.....	Y							

Q1E5 What is the main reason left?

	[+ name1+]	[+ name2+]	[+ name3+]	[+ name4+]	[+ name5+]	[+ name6+]	[+ name7+]	
	25/68	(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
World travel.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	25/68	25/69	25/70	25/71	25/72	25/73	25/74	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	[+ name8+]	[+ name9+]	[+ name10+]	[+ name11+]	[+ name12+]	[+ name13+]	[+ name14+]	
	(75)	(76)	(77)	(78)	(79)	(80)	26/8	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
World travel.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	25/75	25/76	25/77	25/78	25/79	25/80	26/8	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

	[+ name15+]	[+ name16+]	[+ name17+]	[+ name18+]	[+ name19+]	[+ name20+]	[+ name21+]	
	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
World travel.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	26/9	26/10	26/11	26/12	26/13	26/14	26/15	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	[+ name22+]							
	(16)							SP
Moved away.....	1							
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2							
Study.....	3							
New job in childcare.....	4							
New job not in childcare.....	5							
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6							
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7							
Travelling distance.....	8							
World travel.....	9							
Other (specify)...	0							
	26/16							SP
Don't know.....	Y							
	}							
	SET TXT1='Next'							

	8	9	10	
	(30)	(32)	(34)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	
	(31)	(33)	(35)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	
	(30)	(32)	(34)	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	

```

UNSET ANQ2C
SET ANQ2C=NBIT(Q2C(ITERS))
IF(PMONTH='February'.AND.ANQ2C=1.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='March'.AND.ANQ2C<=2.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='April'.AND.ANQ2C<=3.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='May'.AND.ANQ2C<=4.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='June'.AND.ANQ2C<=5.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='July'.AND.ANQ2C<=6.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='August'.AND.ANQ2C<=7.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='September'.AND.ANQ2C<=8.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='October'.AND.ANQ2C<=9.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='November'.AND.ANQ2C<=10.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(PMONTH='December'.AND.ANQ2C<=11.AND.Q2B(ITERS)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2B(ITERS)
GOTO Q2B
}
IF(Q2B(ITERS)=2001.AND.ANQ2C>2){

```

THE YEAR CHOSEN WAS 2001 - MONTH CHOSEN WAS(%ITERS%) - THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q2C(ITERS)
GOTO Q2C
}

```

Q2E4 Can you tell me what kind of contract(%ITERS%) held?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(36)	(37)	(38)	(39)	(40)	(41)	(42)	SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fixed term.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Temporary.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Casual.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	(36)	39/37	39/38	39/39	39/40	39/41	39/42	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

	8	9	10	
	(43)	(44)	(45)	SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1	
Fixed term.....	2	2	2	
Temporary.....	3	3	3	
Casual.....	4	4	4	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	
	39/43	39/44	39/45	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	

Q2E5 What is the main reason(%ITERS%) left?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	42/68	(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
World travel.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	42/68	42/69	42/70	42/71	42/72	42/73	42/74	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

	8	9	10	
	(75)	(76)	(77)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	
World travel.....	9	9	9	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	
	42/75	42/76	42/77	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	

Q2D Have any other members of staff left?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	46/28	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	(33)	(34)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(35)	(36)	(37)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

SET TXT2='next'

OUTLOOP2 CONTINUE

PQ3 Since we visited in %PMONTH% 2000, has the nursery recruited any new members of staff (excluding students or volunteers), and if so can you tell me for each one whether they are still with you or not?

(38) SP
Yes - recruited.....1
No.....2 GO TO PQ4

UNSET ITERS

 SET ITERS=ITERATION

Q3 Can you tell me , one by one, the names of the new members of staff?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(0)	(0)	(0)				
.....	_____	_____	_____				

FXNEW3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(39-68)	47/8-37	(38-67)	48/8-37	(38-67)	49/8-37	(38-67)
.....(%ITERS%).....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	50/8-37	(38-67)	51/8-37				
.....(%ITERS%).....	_____	_____	_____				

Q3A In which year did you recruit(%ITERS%)?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(38-41)	(42-45)	(46-49)	(50-53)	(54-57)	(58-61)	(62-65)
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(66-69)	(70-73)	(74-77)				
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____				

Q3AX And in which month

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(78)	52/8	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(18)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(79)	(9)	(11)	(13)	(15)	(17)	(19)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	(78)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	(18)	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	8	9	10					
	(20)	(22)	(24)					SP
Jan.....	1	1	1					
Feb.....	2	2	2					
March.....	3	3	3					
April.....	4	4	4					
May.....	5	5	5					
June.....	6	6	6					
July.....	7	7	7					
August.....	8	8	8					
Sept.....	9	9	9					
	(21)	(23)	(25)					SP
Oct.....	0	0	0					
Nov.....	1	1	1					
Dec.....	2	2	2					
	(20)	(22)	(24)					SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y					

```

UNSET ANQ3
SET ANQ3=NBIT(Q3AX(ITER))
IF(PMONTH='February'.AND.ANQ3=1.AND.Q3A(ITER)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITER)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='March'.AND.ANQ3<=2.AND.Q3A(ITER)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='April'.AND.ANQ3<=3.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='May'.AND.ANQ3<=4.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='June'.AND.ANQ3<=5.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='July'.AND.ANQ3<=6.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='August'.AND.ANQ3<=7.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='September'.AND.ANQ3<=8.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='October'.AND.ANQ3<=9.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='November'.AND.ANQ3<=10.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(PMONTH='December'.AND.ANQ3<=11.AND.Q3A(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
GOTO Q3A
}
IF(Q3A(ITERS)=2001.AND.ANQ3>2.AND.Q3AX(ITERS)<>DK){
```

```
THE YEAR CHOSEN WAS 2001 - MONTH CHOSEN WAS .....(%ITERS%) - THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE
- GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3AX(ITERS)
GOTO Q3AX
}
```

Q3B Is(%ITERS%) still with you?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(33)	(34)	(35)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

Q3C In which year did(%ITERS%) leave?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(36-39)	(40-43)	(44-47)	(48-51)	(52-55)	(56-59)	(60-63)
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(64-67)	(68-71)	(72-75)				
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____				

IF (Q3A(ITERS)=2001.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000) {

PERSON WAS RECRUITED IN 2001 AND LEFT IN 2000? - THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND REASK

PAUSE
 UNSET Q3A(ITERS)
 UNSET Q3AX(ITERS)
 UNSET Q3B(ITERS)
 UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
 GOTO Q3A
 }

Q3D And in which month?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(76)	(78)	53/8	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(77)	(79)	(9)	(11)	(13)	(15)	(17)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	(76)	(78)	(8)	(10)	(12)	(14)	(16)	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	8	9	10					
	(18)	(20)	(22)					SP
Jan.....	1	1	1					
Feb.....	2	2	2					
March.....	3	3	3					
April.....	4	4	4					
May.....	5	5	5					
June.....	6	6	6					
July.....	7	7	7					
August.....	8	8	8					
Sept.....	9	9	9					
	(19)	(21)	(23)					SP
Oct.....	0	0	0					
Nov.....	1	1	1					
Dec.....	2	2	2					
	(18)	(20)	(22)					SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y					

```
SET ANQ3D=NBIT(Q3D(ITERS))
```

```
IF(PMONTH='February'.AND.ANQ3D=1.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
```

```
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
```

```
GOTO Q3C
```

```
}
```

```
IF(PMONTH='March'.AND.ANQ3D<=2.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='April'.AND.ANQ3D<=3.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='May'.AND.ANQ3D<=4.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='June'.AND.ANQ3D<=5.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='July'.AND.ANQ3D<=6.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='August'.AND.ANQ3D<=7.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='September'.AND.ANQ3D<=8.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='October'.AND.ANQ3D<=9.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='November'.AND.ANQ3D<=10.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(PMONTH='December'.AND.ANQ3D<=11.AND.Q3C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3C(ITERS)
GOTO Q3C
}
IF(Q3C(ITERS)=2001.AND.ANQ3D>2){
```

```
THE YEAR CHOSEN WAS 2001 - MONTH CHOSEN WAS .....(%ITERS%) - THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE
- GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q3AX(ITERS)
GOTO Q3AX
}
```

Q3E4 Can you tell me what kind of contract(%ITERS%) held?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Fixed term.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Temporary.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Casual.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	(24)	(25)	53/26	53/27	53/28	53/29	53/30	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	8	9	10					
	(31)	(32)	(33)					SP
Permanent.....	1	1	1					
Fixed term.....	2	2	2					
Temporary.....	3	3	3					
Casual.....	4	4	4					
Other (specify)...	0	0	0					
	53/31	53/32	53/33					SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y					

Q3E5 What is the main reason(%ITERS%) left?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	56/48	(49)	(50)	(51)	(52)	(53)	(54)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	(48)	56/49	56/50	56/51	56/52	56/53	56/54	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

	8	9	10	
	(55)	(56)	(57)	SP
Moved away.....	1	1	1	
Pregnancy/ looking after own children.....	2	2	2	
Study.....	3	3	3	
New job in childcare.....	4	4	4	
New job not in childcare.....	5	5	5	
Dissatisfied with pay.....	6	6	6	
Dissatisfied with working conditions eg benefits, hours, job security.....	7	7	7	
Travelling distance.....	8	8	8	
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	
	56/55	56/56	56/57	SP
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	

Q3E Any other members of staff recruited (excluding students and volunteers)?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	59/68	(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(75)	(76)	(77)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

OUTLOOP CONTINUE

PQ4 CONTINUE

Q6 Since we visited you in %PMONTH% 2000, has the nursery recruited any volunteers or students to work with children for a month or more ?

	(78)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	GO TO OUTLOOP6
Don't know.....	Y	GO TO OUTLOOP6

Can you give me the names of these people one by one?

```
PAUSE
UNSET ITESR
UNSET TXT2
SET TXT2='first'
```

```
SET  ITERS=ITERATION
```

Q6A Please can you tell me the %TXT2% name

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(0)	(0)	(0)				
.....							

Q6FX

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	60/8-37	(38-67)	61/8-37	(38-67)	62/8-37	(38-67)	63/8-37
..... (%ITERS%)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(38-67)	64/8-37	(38-67)				
..... (%ITERS%)	_____	_____	_____				

Q6B Are they still in the post?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(68)	(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(75)	(76)	(77)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

Q6C Can you tell me which year they left?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	65/8-11	(12-15)	(16-19)	(20-23)	(24-27)	(28-31)	(32-35)
2000 TO 2001.....							

	8	9	10	
	(36-39)	(40-43)	(44-47)	
2000 TO 2001.....				
Q6D	And which month?			
	1	2	3	4
	(48)	(50)	(52)	(54)
Jan.....	1	1	1	1
Feb.....	2	2	2	2
March.....	3	3	3	3
April.....	4	4	4	4
May.....	5	5	5	5
June.....	6	6	6	6
July.....	7	7	7	7
August.....	8	8	8	8
Sept.....	9	9	9	9
	(49)	(51)	(53)	(55)
Oct.....	0	0	0	0
Nov.....	1	1	1	1
Dec.....	2	2	2	2
	(48)	(50)	(52)	(54)
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	Y
	8	9	10	
	(62)	(64)	(66)	
Jan.....	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	
	(63)	(65)	(67)	
Oct.....	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	
	(62)	(64)	(66)	
Don't know.....	Y	Y	Y	

```

UNSET ANQ6
SET ANQ6=NBIT(Q6D(ITER))
IF(PMONTH='February'.AND.ANQ6=1.AND.Q6C(ITER)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```

PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITER)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='March'.AND.ANQ6<=2.AND.Q6C(ITER)=2000){

```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='April'.AND.ANQ6<=3.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='May'.AND.ANQ6<=4.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='June'.AND.ANQ6<=5.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='July'.AND.ANQ6<=6.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='August'.AND.ANQ6<=7.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='September'.AND.ANQ6<=8.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='October'.AND.ANQ6<=9.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='November'.AND.ANQ6<=10.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(PMONTH='December'.AND.ANQ6<=11.AND.Q6C(ITERS)=2000){
```

```
INTERVIEWER - MONTH OF INITIAL INTERVIEW WAS %PMONTH% SO OPTION CHOSEN IS
IMPOSSIBLE - GO BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6C(ITERS)
GOTO Q6C
}
IF(Q6C(ITERS)=2001.AND.ANQ6>2){
```

```
YEAR CHOSEN WAS 2001, MONTH CHOSEN WAS .....(%ITERS%) - THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE - GO
BACK AND RECODE
```

```
PAUSE
UNSET Q6D(ITERS)
GOTO Q6D
}
```

Q6E Have you recruited any others?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(68)	(69)	(70)	(71)	(72)	(73)	(74)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(75)	(76)	(77)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

SET TXT2='next'

OUTLOOP6 CONTINUE

Q7 Could you confirm how many full-time places you are currently registered for?

1 TO 100 _____ (78-80)

Q8 Can you confirm your current opening hours? -OPEN AT?

Card: 66 (6-7)

6 TO 12 _____ (8-13)

Q8B CLOSE AT

12 TO 21 _____ (14-19)

PREMAIN CONTINUE

PRECLOSE CONTINUE

Thank you very much for your time and help. All your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence.

nurset

Page 1 Card: 1

Serial: _____ (1-5)
Card: _____ 01 (6-7)

```

(9)      SP
Yes - continue.....1      GO TO Q1
No - refused.....2      GO TO REFRESP
Have not left nursery.....3      GO TO EXIT1
Make appointment to call back.....4

```

2000 TO 2001 (10-13)

	(14)	SP
Jan.....	1	
Feb.....	2	
March.....	3	
April.....	4	
May.....	5	
June.....	6	
July.....	7	
August.....	8	
Sept.....	9	
	(15)	SP
Oct.....	0	
Nov.....	1	
Dec.....	2	

Q2

Please can you tell me why you left that job?
 PROMPT FULLY BY ASKING WHAT ELSE, CODE ALL MENTIONS

	(16)	MP
Inadequate pay.....	1	
Inadequate status.....	2	
Study (specify course title)^o.....	3	
Did not like working with the children.....	4	
Dissatisfied with staff group.....	5	
Dissatisfied with management.....	6	
Dissatisfied with the hours.....	7	
Dissatisfied with job security.....	8	
Dissatisfied with opportunities for progression..	9	
	(17)	MP
Prefer another kind of work not in childcare/ early years.....	0	
Moving area.....	1	
Short term contract ended.....	2	
Pregnancy.....	3	
Caring for own children.....	4	
Other1^o.....	5	
Other2^o.....	6	
Other3^o.....	7	
	(16)	MP
Other (specify)	0	
	(18-37)	
Specified Other		

Q3

What was the main reason?

	(38)	SP
Inadequate pay.....	1	
Inadequate status.....	2	
Study (specify course title)^o.....	3	
Did not like working with the children.....	4	
Dissatisfied with staff group.....	5	
Dissatisfied with management.....	6	
Dissatisfied with the hours.....	7	
Dissatisfied with job security.....	8	
Dissatisfied with opportunities for progression..	9	
	(39)	SP
Prefer another kind of work not in childcare/ early years.....	0	
Moving area.....	1	
Short term contract ended.....	2	
Pregnancy.....	3	
Caring for own children.....	4	
[+q2oth(1)+].....	5	
[+q2oth(2)+].....	6	
[+q2oth(3)+].....	7	

Can you tell me what you have done since leaving this job, beginning with the first job you did after leaving , and , if possible, can you give me the dates when you started and finished each thing?

Please include any jobs, caring for others full-time, voluntary work and studying. Please also include your current job

Q4A Please start with the %TXT1% job you had since leaving the nursery

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(40)	(42)	6/44	6/46	6/48	6/50	6/52	SP
Childcare/ early years job.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Agency or temporary work in childcare.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Unemployed.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Caring full-time (own children)....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Caring full-time (family).....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Volunteer.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Full-time study...	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Part-time study...	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Not childcare/ early years job...	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(41)	(43)	(45)	(47)	(49)	(51)	(53)	SP
Other^o.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	(40)	(42)	(44)	(46)	(48)	(50)	(52)	SP
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	8	9	10					
	6/54	6/56	6/58					SP
Childcare/ early years job.....	1	1	1					
Agency or temporary work in childcare.....	2	2	2					
Unemployed.....	3	3	3					
Caring full-time (own children)....	4	4	4					
Caring full-time (family).....	5	5	5					
Volunteer.....	6	6	6					
Full-time study...	7	7	7					
Part-time study...	8	8	8					
Not childcare/ early years job...	9	9	9					
	(55)	(57)	(59)					SP
Other^o.....	0	0	0					
	(54)	(56)	(58)					SP
Other (specify)...	0	0	0					

Q4B When did this start - YEAR

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	(68-71)	(72-75)	(76-79)	10/8-11	(12-15)	(16-19)	(20-23)
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	8	9	10				
	(24-27)	(28-31)	(32-35)				
2000 TO 2001.....	_____	_____	_____				

Q4C And in which month did this start?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(36)	(38)	(40)	(42)	(44)	(46)	(48)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(37)	(39)	(41)	(43)	(45)	(47)	(49)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(50)	(52)	(54)					SP
Jan.....	1	1	1					
Feb.....	2	2	2					
March.....	3	3	3					
April.....	4	4	4					
May.....	5	5	5					
June.....	6	6	6					
July.....	7	7	7					
August.....	8	8	8					
Sept.....	9	9	9					
	(51)	(53)	(55)					SP
Oct.....	0	0	0					
Nov.....	1	1	1					
Dec.....	2	2	2					

Q4D When did this end - YEAR

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(56)	(57)	(58)	(59)	(60)	(61)	(62)	SP
2000.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
2001.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Present job.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
	8	9	10					
	(63)	(64)	(65)					SP
2000.....	1	1	1					
2001.....	2	2	2					
Present job.....	3	3	3					

Q4E When did this end - MONTH

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(66)	(68)	(70)	(72)	(74)	(76)	(78)	SP
Jan.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Feb.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
March.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
April.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
May.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
June.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
July.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
August.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Sept.....	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(67)	(69)	(71)	(73)	(75)	(77)	(79)	SP
Oct.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nov.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Dec.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	11/8	(10)	(12)					SP
Jan.....	1	1	1					
Feb.....	2	2	2					
March.....	3	3	3					
April.....	4	4	4					
May.....	5	5	5					
June.....	6	6	6					
July.....	7	7	7					
August.....	8	8	8					
Sept.....	9	9	9					
	(9)	(11)	(13)					SP
Oct.....	0	0	0					
Nov.....	1	1	1					
Dec.....	2	2	2					

YEAR CHOSEN IS 2001 - WE ARE ONLY IN JANUARY - CANNOT BE(%ITERS%)

Q4F What was the course name ?
 RECORD VERBATIM UNDER Q4F AND PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	SP
Continue.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	8	9	10					
	(21)	(22)	(23)					SP
Continue.....	1	1	1					

Q4G Can you tell me the job title?
 RECORD VERBATIM UNDER Q4E AND PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	SP
Continue.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
	8	9	10					
	(31)	(32)	(33)					SP
Continue.....	1	1	1					

Q4H Are there any other jobs you have done since leaving the nursery?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	(34)	(35)	(36)	(37)	(38)	(39)	(40)	SP
Yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	8	9	10					
	(41)	(42)	(43)					SP
Yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

Q5 So can I just confirm the details of what you are doing now?
READ OUT

	(44)	SP
Full-time work in childcare/ related.....	1	
Part-time work in childcare/ related.....	2	
Full-time work not in childcare/ early years....	3	
Part-time work not in childcare/ early years....	4	
Full-time study.....	5	
Part-time study.....	6	
Unemployed.....	7	
Full-time caring for own children.....	8	
Full-time caring for family.....	9	
	(45)	SP
Volunteer in childcare/ early years.....	0	
	(44)	SP
Other (specify)	0	

(46-65)

Specified Other

Q6 Have you ,since you left %NURSE% nursery, wanted to work in
childcare or related fields?

	(66)	SP
Yes.....	1	GO TO Q9
No.....	2	

Q7 What are the reasons you do not want to work in childcare or related
fields?
PROMPT USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

	(67)	MP
Dissatisfaction with the pay in childcare/ related work.....	1	
Dissatisfaction with status in childcare/ related work.....	2	
Study (specify course)^o.....	3	
Do not like working with children.....	4	
Dissatisfaction with staff groups in childcare/ related work.....	5	
Dissatisfaction with management in childcare/ related work.....	6	
Dissatisfaction with working conditions in childcare/ related work.....	7	
Dissatisfaction with opportunities for progression in childcare/ related work.....	8	
Prefer another kind of work not in childcare/ related.....	9	

(continued on next page)

Q7 (continued from previous page)

Other (specify)

0

Card: 12 (6-7)

Specified Other

(8-27)

YOU MUST ENTER AN ANSWER IN OTHER

GO BACK AND RE-ENTER

Q8 Can you say why you would prefer another kind of work?

(28) MP

Dissatisfaction with the pay in childcare/
related work.....1
Dissatisfaction with status in childcare/
related work.....2
Do not like working with children.....3
Dissatisfaction with staff groups in childcare/
related work.....4
Dissatisfaction with management in childcare/
related work.....5
Dissatisfaction with working conditions in
childcare/ related work.....6
Dissatisfaction with opportunities for
progression in childcare/ related work.....7
Other (specify) 0

(29-48)

Specified Other

(28) MP

Don't know.....Y

Q9 Can you say why you haven't worked in this field even though you wanted to? (CODE ALL MENTIONS AND PROMPT FOR ALL REASONS BY SAYING "WHAT ELSE"?)

(49) MP

No jobs available.....	1
Made redundant.....	2
Better job(s) found not in childcare or related fields.....	3
Could not find job in childcare/ early years.....	4
Jobs did not fit in with family commitments.....	5
Caring for own children.....	6
Pregnant.....	7
Other (specify)	0

(50-69)

Specified Other

Q10 In what way is the job you found better than the one in childcare or related fields

(71) MP

Pay.....	1
Hours of work.....	2
Job security.....	3
Status.....	4
Opportunities for progression.....	5
Other (specify)	0

Card: 13 (6-7)

(8-27)

Specified Other

Q11 Do you think you will work in childcare or related fields in the future?

(28) SP

Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	GO TO PQ13
Don't know.....	Y	GO TO Q32

Q12 When do you think you will seek employment in childcare or related fields?

READ OUT

(29) SP

In the next year.....	1
Two years.....	2
Five years.....	3
More than five years.....	4
Don't know.....	Y

Q13 Why do you think you won't seek childcare or related employment? CODE EACH MENTION AND PROMPT FOR ALL REASONS BY SAYING "WHAT ELSE"?

	(30)	MP
Dissatisfaction with the pay in childcare/ related work.....	1	
Dissatisfaction with status in childcare/ related work.....	2	
Study (specify course title)^o.....	3	
Do not like working with children.....	4	
Dissatisfaction with staff groups in childcare/ related work.....	5	
Dissatisfaction with management in childcare/ related work.....	6	
Dissatisfaction with working conditions in childcare/ related work.....	7	
Dissatisfaction with opportunities for progression in childcare/ related work.....	8	
Prefer another kind of work not in childcare/ related work.....	9	
	(31)	MP
Caring responsibilities for children.....	0	
Caring responsibilities for kin.....	1	
	(30)	MP
Other (specify)	0	
	(32-51)	
Specified Other		
	(30)	MP
Don't know.....	Y	

Q14 Thinking about your first job after leaving %NURSE% , what type of employer or self-employment was it?

	(52)	SP
Private day nursery.....	1	
Private school (nursery nurse).....	2	
Local authority day nursery.....	3	
Local authority school or class.....	4	
Welfare assistant/ learning assistant/ one to one assistant (special needs).....	5	
Playgroup/ Preschool.....	6	
After school club/ holiday scheme.....	7	
Playwork (eg hospital playwork, creche work).....	8	
Family centre.....	9	
	(53)	SP
Childminder.....	0	
Nanny.....	1	
	(52)	SP
Other (specify)	0	

(54-73)

Specified Other

Q15 Thinking about your current job, what type of employer or self-employment is it?

	(74)	SP
Private day nursery.....	1	
Private school (nursery nurse).....	2	
Local authority day nursery.....	3	
Local authority school or class.....	4	
Welfare assistant/ learning assistant/ one to one assistant (special needs).....	5	
Playgroup/ Preschool.....	6	
After school club/ holiday scheme.....	7	
Playwork (eg hospital playwork, creche work).....	8	
Family centre.....	9	

(continued on next page)

Q15 (continued from previous page)

	(75)	SP
Childminder.....	0	
Nanny.....	1	
	(74)	SP
Other (specify)	0	
		Card: 14 (6-7)
	(8-27)	
Specified Other		

Q16 Also thinking about your current job, how many paid hours did you work last week?

0 TO 99	_____	(28-29)
Don't know.....	Y	

Q17 Did you work any unpaid hours, for example, the end of shifts to attend staff meetings or parents evenings, or take written work home or for any other reasons?

	(30)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q18 Do you work shifts

	(31)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q19 How many days paid holidays do you get or give yourself per year?

0 TO 30	_____	(32-33)
Don't know.....	Y	

Q20 Do you get, or provide yourself, with an occupational pension?

	(34)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	
Don't know.....	Y	

Q21 Do you get, or provide yourself, with any paid sick leave?

Card: 12 (6-7)
(70) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2
Don't know.....Y

Q22 Is your current job a permanent, fixed term or some other kind of contract?

Card: 14 (6-7)
(35) SP
Permanent.....1
Fixed term.....2
Temporary.....3
Casual.....4
Self-employed manager.....5
Self-employed other.....6
Other (specify) 0

(36-55)
Specified Other

Q23 On balance, would you say your current job was better than the one you had at %NURSE% , or is it worse or about the same?

(56) SP
Better.....1
Worse.....2
Same.....3

Q24 What makes you say that?
RECORD VERBATIM UNDER Q24 AND PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE

(57) SP
Continue.....1

Q25 Do you consider work in childcare and early education to be a temporary or short-term job or longer-term career?
LONGER TERM MEANS 5 YEARS OR MORE

(58) SP
Temporary, short term.....1
Longer term.....2

Q26 Do you feel settled in your current work?

(59) SP
Yes.....1
Mostly.....2 GO TO Q28
No.....3 GO TO Q28
Don't know.....Y GO TO Q29

Q27 What is it about the work that makes you feel settled?
PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(60) MP
Own family/ child related (eg. hours fit in with
family).....1
Staff/ organisational related (eg. like working
in staff team or for organisation).....2
Pay.....3
Job security.....4
Working conditions (eg status, staff benefits....5
Personal satisfaction (eg feel relaxed).....6
Children care for (eg like the children, parents
work with).....7
Other (specify) 0

(61-80)
Specified Other
(60) MP
Don't know.....Y

Q28 What are the reasons you don't feel settled in your current work?
PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

Card: 15 (6-7)

(8) MP

Own family/ child related (eg hours don't fit in
with family).....1
Staff/ organisational related (eg. don't like
working in staff team or for organisation).....2
Pay (eg. too low).....3
Job security inadequate.....4
Working conditions (eg low status, poor staff
benefits).....5
Personal satisfaction (eg don't feel relaxed)....6
Children care for (eg don't like the children,
parents work with).....7
Other (specify) 0

(9-28)

Specified Other

Q29 Are you thinking of leaving your job?

(29) SP

Yes.....1
No.....2 GO TO Q32
Don't know.....Y GO TO Q32

Q30 For what reasons are you thinking of leaving your job?
PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(30) MP

Caring for own children or pregnant.....1
Dissatisfaction with the staff groups.....2
Dissatisfaction with management.....3
Dissatisfaction with the pay.....4
Dissatisfaction with the hours of work.....5
Dissatisfaction with opportunities for
progression.....6
Dissatisfaction with children cared for.....7
Job too stressful.....8
Moving area.....9

(continued on next page)

Q30 (continued from previous page)

	(31)	MP
Short-term contract ended.....	0	
Full-time study.....	1	
	(30)	MP
Other (specify)	0	
	(32-51)	
Specified Other		
	(30)	MP
Don't know.....	Y	

Q31 If you leave this job, what will you do next?
DO NOT READ OUT

	(52)	SP	
Other childcare job (specify job title)^o.....	1		
Other job, not childcare (specify job title)^o...	2		
Travel.....	3		
Study (specify course)^o.....	4		
Other (specify)	0		
			Card: 16 (6-7)
	(8-37)		
Specified Other			
			Card: 15 (6-7)
	(52)	SP	
Don't know.....	Y		

Q32 Thinking about your experience of childcare and related work, how
does it or did it compare with what you expected when you started?
READ OUT

			Card: 16 (6-7)
	(38)	SP	
Better than expected.....	1		
Worse than expected.....	2		
Neither better nor worse than expected.....	3		
Or were some aspects better than expected and some aspects worse than expected.....	4		

Q33 In what ways was/ is the work better than expected?
PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(39) MP

Organisation related (eg better staff team, atmosphere).....	1
Better pay.....	2
Better hours.....	3
Better status.....	4
Better staff benefits.....	5
More personal satisfaction.....	6
Children and parents better than expected.....	7
Other (specify)	0

(40-59)

Specified Other

Q34 In what ways was/ is the work worse than expected?
PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(60) MP

Organisation related (eg worse staff team, atmosphere).....	1
Worse pay.....	2
Worse hours.....	3
Poorer status.....	4
Worse staff benefits.....	5
Less personal satisfaction.....	6
Children and worse better than expected.....	7
Other (specify)	0

(61-80)

Specified Other

Q35 In light of your experience, would you recommend childcare work to a friend?

Card: 17 (6-7)

(8) SP

Yes.....1

No.....2 GO TO PQ37

Don't know.....Y GO TO PQ37

Q36 What are the reasons for recommending childcare or education work to a friend?

PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(9) MP

Own family/ child related (eg hours fit in with family).....1

Staff/ organisational related (eg working in a staff team or with organisation).....2

Pay.....3

Good status.....4

Good staff benefits.....5

Personal satisfaction (eg. feel relaxed).....6

Children care for (eg like the children, parents work with).....7

Other (specify) 0

(10-29)

Specified Other

Q37 Why not / why are you uncertain?
 PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY, CODE ALL MENTIONS

(30) MP

Pay.....	1
Status.....	2
Working conditions (hours).....	3
Working conditions (benefits).....	4
Working conditions (workload).....	5
Low job satisfaction.....	6
Staff team, organisation.....	7
Children, parents work with.....	8
Other (specify)	0

(31-50)
 Specified Other

Q38 Thinking ahead five years, do you think you will still be working in childcare?

(51) SP

Yes working.....	1	
Not working.....	2	GO TO Q40
Don't know.....	Y	GO TO Q40

Q39 In what sort of setting do you expect to be working?
 RECORD ALL MENTIONS

(52) MP

Private day nursery.....	1
Private school (nursery nurse).....	2
Local authority day nursery.....	3
Local authority nursery school or class.....	4
Welfare assistant/ learning assistant/ one to one assistant (special needs).....	5
Playgroup/ Preschool.....	6
After school club/ holiday scheme.....	7
Playwork (eg hospital playwork, creche work).....	8
Family centre.....	9

(continued on next page)

Q39 (continued from previous page)

	(53)	MP
Childminder.....	0	
Nanny.....	1	
	(52)	MP
Other (specify)	0	
	(54-73)	
Specified Other		

Q40 Thinking ahead five years, do you think you will be studying for a qualification in childcare or related fields?

	(74)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	GO TO Q42
Don't know.....	Y	GO TO Q42

Q41 What qualification do you think you will be studying for?
RECORD VERBATIM UNDER Q41 AND PRESS 1 TO CONTINUE

	(75)	SP
Continue.....	1	

Q42A Thinking ahead five years, do you expect to have time away from employment to care for your own children or other family or caring reasons?

		Card: 43 (6-7)
	(43)	SP
Yes.....	1	GO TO Q43
No.....	2	
Don't know.....	Y	

Q42B Thinking ahead five years, do you expect to have reduced your
working hours to care for your own children or other family or
caring reasons?

Yes.....1
No.....2 GO TO Q44
Don't know.....Y GO TO Q44

Q43 Do you think this will be for children, elderly or disabled
relatives, both or for some other reason?

Card: 17 (6-7)
(77) MP
Children.....1
Elderly and disabled relatives.....2
Both.....3
Other (specify) 0

Card: 18 (6-7)

Specified Other (8-27)

Q44 Finally now, we would like to ask a few questions about you. Do you have any children of your own?

Yes.....	1	(28)	SP
No.....	2		

Respondent has said cares for your own children yet says have none - go back and recode

Q45 How many children do you have?

1 TO 10 (29-30)

Q46 Can you tell me the age of your child?
FOR BABY UNDER 1 USE 0 - YOU WILL BE ASKED ABOUT MONTHS NEXT

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
	(31-32)	(33-34)	(35-36)	(37-38)	(39-40)	(41-42)	(43-44)
0 TO 40.....							

	8th	9th	10th
	(45-46)	(47-48)	(49-50)
0 TO 40.....			

Q46B How many months old is your baby?

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
	(51-52)	(53-54)	(55-56)	(57-58)	(59-60)	(61-62)	(63-64)
1 TO 11.....							

	8th	9th	10th
	(65-66)	(67-68)	(69-70)
1 TO 11.....			

Q47 What household arrangement best describes your position?
READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

	(71)	SP
Live alone.....	1	
Live in shared household.....	2	
Live with partner.....	3	
Live with partner and child.....	4	
Live with children.....	5	
Live with parents and other relatives.....	6	
Other (specify)	0	

Card: 19 (6-7)

Specified Other (8-27)

Q48 Lastly, can you tell me approximately how much you are paid before tax

 READ OUT - PLEASE REMEMBER THAT ALL OUR INFORMATION COLLECTED FROM YOU IS CONFIDENTIAL

 AMOUNT TO BE ENTERED IN WHOLE POUNDS

```

1 TO 40000                                _____ (28-32)
Don't know.....Y      GO TO PRECLOSE
Refused.....{      GO TO PRECLOSE

```

Q48B Is that per week , per month or per year?

	(33)	SP
Week.....	1	
Fortnightly.....	2	
Every 4 weeks.....	3	
Month.....	4	
Year.....	5	
Other (specify)	0	

Specified Other (34-53)

Thank you very much for your time and help. All your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence.

Ex-Childcare Student Follow-Up Interview

childm

Page 1 Card: 1

Serial:	_____	(1-5)
Card:	01	(6-7)

DIAL Hello, may I speak to %CONTACT%?

	SP
Continue.....[]	GO TO PREQ1
RNA - make appointment.....[]	
RNA duration[]	GO TO EXIT6
Refused.....[]	GO TO EXIT1
Respondent known but no longer at this address...[]	
Respondent unknown.....[]	GO TO EXIT6

PREQ1 PROTECT' Interview number is <<< '+ID+' >>>@'

INTRO Good %POD%. My name is %INT% and I am calling from PAS, an independent research company.
We are carrying out a survey of people who have done childcare courses on behalf of the Thomas Coram Research Unit at the Institute of Education London. Last year, you may remember filling in a questionnaire while you were in your last few weeks at college conducted by the Thomas Coram Research Unit. They said at the time they would like to contact you again in a year's time, so today we are ringing on their behalf to ask some questions about what you have been doing. As before, all information you give us is confidential: we will not identify you in any publication, nor will we pass your details to anyone outside the research team at Thomas Coram Research Unit.
May I interview you?

	(34)	SP
Yes - continue.....1		GO TO AFINTRO
Yes - but make appointment.....2		
No.....3		GO TO EXIT5

Q1 First, can I check a couple of things about your college course. Did you complete the course?

	(35)	SP
Yes.....1		
No.....2		

Q2 Did you gain the qualification?

(36) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2

Now I want to ask some things about your employment since leaving college.

Q4 Have you had any paid jobs since you left college?
Please include all jobs including part time ones, and jobs you have
done at the same time as others

(37) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2

Q4B How many paid jobs have you had since you left college?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE RECORD NUMBER OF JOBS

1 TO 999 _____ (38-40)
Don't know.....Y

Q5 Have you worked continuously since you left college or have there
been any periods when you have not been working?

(41) SP
Worked continuously.....1
Periods not worked.....2

Q5B So, since you left college, how long have you not been working for?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE FOR NUMBER OF MONTHS

0 TO 999 _____ (42-44)
Don't know.....Y

Q6A What are the reasons you have not been working?

(45) MP
Unemployed.....1
Caring for own children.....2
Caring for others.....3
Sickness/disability.....4
Training/Studying.....5
Travelling.....6
Voluntary work.....7
Other (specify) 0

(46-55)
Specified Other

Q6B What courses are you studying or have you been studying for?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE - WRITE ON VERBATIM SHEET, MAKE A NOTE
OF THE RESPONDENT NUMBER (%ID%) AND CONTINUE WHEN COMPLETE.

continue.....1

Q6C What voluntary work have you done?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE - WRITE ON VERBATIM SHEET, MAKE A NOTE OF THE RESPONDENT NUMBER (%ID%) AND CONTINUE WHEN COMPLETE.

continue.....1

Q7 Have you, over the time since you left college, wanted to work in childcare or related fields, such as early education or playwork?

	(58)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q8 Can you say why you didn't work, even though you wanted to?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE CODE EACH MENTIONED AND PROMPT FOR ALL REASONS
BY SAYING 'ANYTHING ELSE?'

	(59)	MP
No jobs available.....	1	
Better job(s) found not in childcare or related fields.....	2	
Could not find job in childcare.....	3	
Jobs did not fit in with family commitments.....	4	
Inadequate preparation by college.....	5	
Other (specify)	0	

Specified Other (60-69)

Q9 Do you think you will work in childcare or related fields in the future?

(70) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2

Q10 When do you think you will seek employment in childcare, playwork or early education?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT)

(71) SP
In a year's time.....1
In two to four year's time.....2
In five years time.....3
In over five years time.....4

Q11 Why do you think you won't seek childcare employment?
PROBE AND CLARIFY WHICH - WRITE ON VERBATIM SHEET, MAKE A NOTE OF THE RESPONDENT NUMBER (%ID%) AND CONTINUE WHEN COMPLETE.

(72) SP
continue.....1

Now I would like to ask you about each job you have had since leaving college

Q12A Are you currently working?

(73) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2

Q12B Is it a childcare or early education job. This includes working in nurseries, schools, playgroups, family centres or hospitals, as a nanny or childminder, or in creches, after school clubs or holiday schemes

(74) SP
 Yes.....1
 No.....2

Q12C What type of employer is it?

(75) SP
 Private day nursery.....1
 Local authority day nursery.....2
 Playgroup/preschool.....3
 Playwork/after school club/holiday scheme.....4
 Family centre.....5
 Childminder.....6
 Nanny.....7
 Local authority nursery school or class.....8
 Welfare assistant/learning assistant/one to one assistant (special needs).....9
 (76) SP
 Private school (nursery nurse).....0
 (75) SP
 Other (specify) 0

Card: 09 (6-7)

(8-17)
 Specified Other

Q12C2 Please tell me your job title
 INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE

(18-47)

Q12D What is the job title of your current job?
 INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE

(48-77)

Now about other jobs you have had, that is not your current job, including all part time ones and jobs you have done at the same time as others

Q13A %Q13ATXT% it a childcare or early education job?

This includes working in nurseries, schools, playgroups, family centres or hospitals, as a nanny or childminder, or in creches, after school clubs or holiday schemes

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
	(78)	(79)	(80)	10/8	(9)	(10)	(11)	SP
yes.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
No.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
	Eight	Nine	Ten					
	(12)	(13)	(14)					SP
yes.....	1	1	1					
No.....	2	2	2					

Q13B What was the job title of the %Q13TXT%?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
	(15-44)	(45-74)	11/8-37	(38-67)	12/8-37	(38-67)	13/8-37
.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	Eight	Nine	Ten				
	(38-67)	14/8-37	(38-67)				
.....	_____	_____	_____				

Q13C What type of employer was it?

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	
	(68)	14/70	14/72	14/74	14/76	14/78	(8)	SP
Private day								
nursery.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Local authority								
day nursery.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Playgroup								
/preschool.....	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Playwork/after								
school								
club/holiday								
scheme.....	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Family centre.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Childminder.....	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
Nanny.....	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	
Local authority								
nursery school or								
class.....	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	
Welfare								
assistant								
/learning								
assistant/one to								
one assistant								
(special needs)...	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	
	(69)	(71)	(73)	(75)	(77)	(79)	(9)	SP
Private school								
(nursery nurse)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	(68)	(70)	(72)	(74)	(76)	(78)	(8)	SP
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

	Eight	Nine	Ten	
	15/10	15/12	15/14	SP
Private day nursery.....	1	1	1	
Local authority day nursery.....	2	2	2	
Playgroup /preschool.....	3	3	3	
Playwork/after school club/holiday scheme.....	4	4	4	
Family centre.....	5	5	5	
Childminder.....	6	6	6	
Nanny.....	7	7	7	
Local authority nursery school or class.....	8	8	8	
Welfare assistant /learning assistant/one to one assistant (special needs)...	9 (11)	9 (13)	9 (15)	SP
Private school (nursery nurse)...	0 (10)	0 (12)	0 (14)	SP
Other (specify)...	0	0	0	

Q13D What was the job title of that job?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven
	(48-77)	17/8-37	(38-67)	18/8-37	(38-67)	19/8-37	(38-67)
.....	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	Eight	Nine	Ten				
	20/8-37	(38-67)	21/8-37				
.....	_____	_____	_____				

Q15 What are the reasons you have not worked in childcare or early
education since leaving college?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(38) MP

None available.....	1
Does not want to work in childcare/education.....	2
Better job(s) found.....	3
Could not find job in childcare.....	4
Jobs did not fit in with family commitments.....	5
Inadequate preparation for childcare/education work from college.....	6
Other (specify)	0

(39-48)

Specified Other

YOU MUST ENTER IN OTHER FOR QUESTION 15

PLEASE GO BACK AND ENTER

Q16 What are the reasons you do not want to work in childcare or early
education?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(49) MP

Pay.....	1
Working conditions (eg., hours, job security)....	2
Status.....	3
Do not like working with children.....	4
Other (specify)	0

(50-59)

Specified Other

Q17 Do you think you will work in childcare or related fields in the future?

(60) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2

Q18 When do you think you will seek employment in childcare, playwork or early education?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY)

(61) SP
In the next year.....1
Two years time.....2
Five years time.....3

Q19 Why did you leave the childcare/education job(s)?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(62) MP
Own children (including pregnancy).....1
Dissatisfaction with staff group.....2
Dissatisfaction with management.....3
Dissatisfaction with pay.....4
Dissatisfaction with working conditions.....5
Dissatisfaction with children cared for.....6
Moving area.....7
Short-term contract ended.....8
Did not like working with children.....9
(63) MP
Redundancy/dismissal.....0
Travel.....1
Sickness/disability.....2
(62) MP
Other (specify) 0

(64-73)
Specified Other

Q20 What are the reasons you are not currently working?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

	(74)	MP
Unemployed.....	1	
Caring for own children.....	2	
Caring for others.....	3	
Sickness/disability.....	4	
Training/Studying	5	
Travelling.....	6	
Voluntary work.....	7	
Other (specify)	0	

Card: 22 (6-7)

Specified Other (8-17)

Q200TH5 What training or studying are you doing?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE AND RECORD VERBATIM

(18-47)

Q23

What is the course title?

PROBE - WRITE ON VERBATIM SHEET, MAKE A NOTE OF THE RESPONDENT
NUMBER (%ID%) AND CONTINUE WHEN COMPLETE.

(48) SP

continue.....1

Q23A

Can you tell me the qualification or award you will be given at the end?

PROBE - WRITE ON VERBATIM SHEET, MAKE A NOTE OF THE RESPONDENT
NUMBER (%ID%) AND CONTINUE WHEN COMPLETE.

```

(49)  SP
continue.....1

```

Q24

Is the course full-time or part-time?

	(50)	SP
Full-time.....	1	
Part-time.....	2	

Q200TH7

What voluntary work are you doing?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROBE AND RECORD VERBATIM

(51-80)

Q21

Do you think you will work in childcare or related fields in the future?

Card: 23 (6-7)

	(8)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q22 When do you think you will seek employment in childcare, playwork or early education?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY)

(9) SP
In a year's time.....1
In two to four year's time.....2
In five years time.....3
In over five years time.....4

Q25 Thinking about your current, main childcare and education job, is it full-time or part-time?

(10) SP
Full-time.....1
Part-time.....2

Q26 How did you get this job?
INTERVIEWER:- PLEASE DO NOT READ OUT, BUT PROMPT FULLY - CODE ONE ONLY

(11) SP
Local advertising.....1
Word of mouth.....2
Agency.....3
National advertising.....4
Local job centre.....5
Previous employer/placement.....6
College.....7
Other (specify) 0

(12-21)
Specified Other

Q27 How did you get your first job, if it isn't your current job, in childcare or early education after leaving college?

(22) MP
Local advertising.....1
Word of mouth.....2
Agency.....3
National advertising.....4
Local job centre.....5
Previous employer/placement.....6
College.....7
It's my first job.....8
Other (specify) 0

(23-32)
Specified Other

Q28 Do you consider work in childcare and early education to be a temporary or short-term job or a longer-term career?
(LONGER TERM MEANS FIVE YEARS OR MORE)

(33) SP
Temporary, short term.....1
Longer term.....2

Q29 Do you feel settled in your current work?

(34) SP
Yes.....1
Mostly.....2
No.....3

Q30 What is it about the work that makes you feel settled?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(35) MP
Own family/child related (eg, hours fit in with family).....1
Staff/organisational related (eg., like working in staff team or for organisation).....2
Pay.....3
Working conditions (eg., status, staff benefits).4
Personal satisfaction (e.g., feel relaxed).....5
Children care for (eg., like the children, parents work with).....6
Other (specify) 0

(36-45)
Specified Other

Q31 What are the reasons you don't feel settled in your current work?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(46) MP

Own family/child related (eg, hours don't fit in with family).....	1
Staff/organisational related (eg., don't like working in staff team or for organisation).....	2
Pay (e.g, too low).....	3
Working conditions (eg., low status, poor staff benefits).....	4
Personal satisfaction (e.g., don't feel relaxed).	5
Children care for (eg., don't like the children, parents work with).....	6
Other (specify)	0

Specified Other (47-56)

Q32 Are you thinking of leaving your job?

	(57)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q33

What are the reasons you are thinking of leaving?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

	(58)	MP
Own children (including pregnancy).....	1	
Dissatisfaction with staff group.....	2	
Dissatisfaction with management.....	3	
Dissatisfaction with pay.....	4	
Dissatisfaction with working conditions.....	5	
Dissatisfaction with children cared for.....	6	
Moving area.....	7	
Short-term contract ended.....	8	
Did not like working with children.....	9	
	(59)	MP
Redundancy/dismissal.....	0	
Travel.....	1	
Sickness/disability.....	2	
	(58)	MP
Other (specify)	0	

(60-69)

Specified Other

Q34

If you leave this job, what will you do next?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE DO NOT READ OUT - CODE ONE ONLY

	(70)	SP
Other childcare job.....	1	
Other job, not childcare.....	2	
Travel.....	3	
Study.....	4	
Other (specify)	0	

(71-80)

Specified Other

Q340TH1 Please specify Other childcare job title.
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE TYPE IN VERBATIM

Card: 24 (6-7)
(8-37)

Q340TH2 Please specify Other job, not childcare, job title.
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE TYPE IN VERBATIM

(38-67)

Q340TH4 Please specify course to study.
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE TYPE IN VERBATIM

Card: 25 (6-7)
(8-37)

Q35 How %Q35TXT1% childcare work compare to what you expected -.
Overall, %Q35TXT2% it?
INTERVIEWER:- PLEASE CODE ONE ONLY

(38) SP

Better than expected.....	1
Worse than expected.....	2
Neither better nor worse than expected.....	3
Or were some aspects better than expected and some aspects worse than expected.....	4

Q36 In what ways %Q36TXT% the work better than expected?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(39) MP

Organisation related (e.g. better staff team, atmosphere).....	1
Better pay.....	2
Better working conditions (e.g., hours, status, benefits).....	3
More Personal satisfaction	4
Children and parents better than expected.....	5
Other (specify)	0

(40-49)

Specified Other

Q37 In what ways %Q36TXT% the work worse than expected?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(50) MP

Organisation related (e.g. worse staff team, atmosphere).....	1
Worse pay.....	2
Worse working conditions (hours,status,benefits).....	3
Less personal satisfaction.....	4
Children and parents worse than expected.....	5
Other (specify).....	0

(51-60)

Specified Other

Q38 Looking back at your college course, how well do you think you were
prepared for work - very well, quite well or not very well?

(61) SP

Very well.....	1
Quite well.....	2
Not very well.....	3

Q38B In what ways did the college course prepare you well for work?

(62) MP

Practical experience.....	1
Ideas of what works in the class room.....	2
Theory.....	3
Other (specify).....	0

(63-72)

Specified Other

Q39 In what ways did the college course not prepare you so well for the work?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

Not enough practical experience.....1
Inadequate coverage of certain subjects/issues...2
Not enough ideas of what works in the classroom..3
Other (specify) 0

(73) MP

Card: 26 (6-7)

Specified Other (8-17)

Q390TH Please specify inadequate coverage of certain subjects or issues

(18-47)

Q40 How much did your childcare qualification help you to get your first
 job in childcare or related work?
 (INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT)

	(48)	SP
A lot.....	1	
A little.....	2	
Not at all.....	3	

Q41 How much did your childcare qualification help you to get better pay
in your first childcare job?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT)

	(49)	SP
A lot.....	1	
A little.....	2	
Not at all.....	3	

Q42 In the light of your experience, would you recommend childcare work to a friend?

	(50)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	
Don't know.....	3	

Q43 What are the reasons for recommending childcare or education work to a friend?

INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

(51) MP

Own family/child related (eg, hours fit in with family).....	1
Staff/organisational related (eg., working in a staff team or with organisation).....	2
Pay.....	3
Working conditions (eg., status, staff benefits).....	4
Personal satisfaction (e.g., feel relaxed).....	5
Children care for (eg., like the children, parents work with).....	6
Other (specify)	0

Specified Other (52-61)

Q44 Why not/why are you uncertain?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE PROMPT FULLY USING PRECODES ONLY IF NECESSARY.
CODE ALL MENTIONS

	(62)	MP
Pay.....	1	
Status.....	2	
Working conditions (eg., hours, benefits, workload).....	3	
Low job satisfaction.....	4	
Staff team, organisation.....	5	
Children, parents work with.....	6	
Other (specify)	0	

Specified Other (63-72)

Q46 Thinking ahead five years, do you think you will be working in
childcare and early education?

	(73)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	
Don't know.....	3	

Q47 In what sort of setting do you expect to be working?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE CODE EACH MENTIONED)

	(74)	MP	
Private day nursery.....	1		
Local authority day nursery.....	2		
Playgroup/preschool.....	3		
Playwork/after school club/holiday scheme.....	4		
Family centre.....	5		
Childminder.....	6		
Nanny.....	7		
Local authority nursery school or class.....	8		
Welfare assistant/learning assistant/one to one assistant (special needs).....	9		
	(75)	MP	
Private school (nursery nurse).....	0		
	(74)	MP	
Other (specify)	0		

Card: 27 (6-7)

(8-17)
Specified Other

Q45 Have you studied for a further qualification in childcare, playwork or early education since your childcare course?

	(18)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	

Q48 Thinking ahead five years, do you expect to have time away from employment to care for your own children or for other family or caring reasons?

	(19)	SP
Yes.....	1	
No.....	2	GO TO Q50

Q49 Do you think this will be for children, elderly or disabled
relatives, both or for some other reason?
(INTERVIEWER: PLEASE CODE EACH MENTIONED)

(20) MP
Children.....1
Relatives.....2
Other (specify) 0

(21-30)
Specified Other

Q50 Last, we would like to ask a few questions about you. Do you have
any children of your own?

(31) SP
Yes.....1
No.....2 GO TO Q52

Q50A How many children do you have

1 TO 20 _____ (32-33)

Q51X1 Can you tell me the age of your %Q51TXT% child?

0 TO 50 _____ (34-35)

Q51X2 Can you tell me the age of your next eldest child?

0 TO 50 _____ (36-37)

The age given for the next eldest child is higher. Please may I re-check your
answers

Q51X3 Can you tell me the age of your next eldest child?

0 TO 50 _____ (38-39)

The age given for the next eldest child is higher. Please may I re-check your answers

Q51X4 Can you tell me the age of your next eldest child?

0 TO 50 _____ (40-41)

The age given for the next eldest child is higher. Please may I re-check your answers

Q51X5 Can you tell me the age of your next eldest child?

0 TO 50 _____ (42-43)

The age given for the next eldest child is higher. Please may I re-check your answers

Q52 What household arrangement best describes your position?
INTERVIEWER: PLEASE READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY

(44) SP
Live alone.....1
Live in shared household.....2
Live with a partner.....3
Live with a partner and children.....4
Live with children.....5
Live with parents or other relatives.....6
Other (specify) 0

(45-54)
Specified Other

THAT WAS VERY HELPFUL, THANKYOU VERY MUCH

Thank you very much for your time and help. All your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence...
