INDUSTRY SPONSORED CHILD CARE: A STUDY OF

SERVICES, EMPLOYER SATISFACTION AND RATIONALE

by

JOELLEN TULLIS DOYLE

B.A., California State University at Northridge, 1969

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in parital fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1977

Approved by:

Ivalee H. McCord

Major Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to my committee members, Dr. Marjorie Stith and Dr. Carroll Kennedy for their guidance and encouragement, to my Major Professor, Dr. Ivalee McCord for her continuous support and availability, and to Dr. Stephan Bollman for his interest and assistance with the data.

My thanks also go to Kitzel, Sherry, Steve, Peg, Clay, Larry and Mom for their invaluable assistance with typing and copying; and to Les for being there to listen.

To my dear children, Audra and Laura, who displayed patience and understanding far beyond their years, I offer my loving thanks and a belief that the future will prove it has been worthwhile.

THIS BOOK CONTAINS NUMEROUS PAGES WITH THE ORIGINAL PRINTING BEING SKEWED DIFFERENTLY FROM THE TOP OF THE PAGE TO THE BOTTOM.

THIS IS AS RECEIVED FROM THE CUSTOMER.

List of Tables

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine what services are available in the child care programs sponsored by industry, to assess each industry's satisfaction with its program, and to determine why each industry became involved with child care.

There are 59 million children under the age of 14, six million of these six or under, who need some form of adult care while their parents work. In 1970 only one million spaces were available in child care centers (Young, 1971). The remaining children are cared for through informal arrangements. In one study (Chapman, 1973, p. 43) the child care arrangements of mothers who work were as follows:

Adults (18 and over) give care in child's own home	36.4%
Siblings (17 and under) give care in child's own home	9.1%
Adults give care in other home	15.7%
Child taken to work	13.0%
Mother cares for (works only while child in school)	15.0%
No supervision	8.1%
Child care facility	2.7%

Though surveys (Children's Bureau, 1965; Hutchinson, 1971; Westinghouse, 1971) have shown that many parents are satisfied with their present arrangements, this writer could find no data in these surveys indicating the number of parents who reported satisfaction based on the parent's assumption that there were no alternatives. Some of these same surveys also report that many parents would use formal child care facilities if they were available at a cost the parents could afford. There is a gap, then, between child care spaces available and those needed. With divorce, dual-career families, and the awareness of the value of social interaction at an early age on the increase; there is an ever-growing need to explore what alternatives are available to fill this gap.

The first five years of a child's life are the period of most rapid mental, physical and personality growth. Neglect in these early years can have a disastrous effect (Day Care and Child Development Council, 1972). Various arrangements have been tried to fill this crucial need for quality care in the early years. Private centers, parent co-operatives, various levels of government, and the business community have developed programs aimed at providing child care at a reasonable cost to the parents. The present research was developed to explore the various programs in which the industrial community has become involved.

This present survey was used to examine the services offered by the industry sponsored day care facilities, the rationale behind the industry's decision to sponsor a day care facility, and the industry's satisfaction with its program. It was believed that the sponsoring industry would be more satisfied with a child care facility designed to meet the needs of children and parents than with those programs designed to serve industrial needs only.

Significance to the Profession

With the gap between quality child care spaces available and those needed, an urgent concern for early childhood educators is to learn all they can about existing programs. This will help determine which programs are best able to fill this gap. The idea of industry sponsored child care has been present for several decades; yet today only a handful of industries have actually become involved. This study was done to examine programs rated both successful and unsuccessful by the sponsoring industry. Once successful programs are identified, steps can be taken to encourage additional involvement along the same lines. Industry cannot be expected to subsidize child care if no benefits have been demonstrated. If the child care profession is to serve children, then it must encourage the child care programs which are most likely to succeed. Only successful programs can meet the need and remain in operation. Child care professionals could use this information to assist industries in developing programs which are beneficial to both industry and the families they serve.

Definitions

For purposes of this study an industry was defined as an organization which provides a product or performs a service for the consumer. This included hospitals and national government agencies as well as business organizations. Child care referred to supplemental care for children provided outside their homes for part of a day (Urban Research Corporation, 1970). This care was described in terms of kind of support offered, number of children served, hours open, fees charged, director qualifications required, parental input allowed, government funds used, and ages of children served. Satisfaction was determined first by the industry's opinion of the program's effect on employer-employee relationships, public relations, turnover, recruitment, absenteeism, and tax breaks; second by continuing operation of the program; and finally by utilization of available spaces.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A search for studies done in this field revealed no material relating child care services to employer satisfaction. Sources used for the search were International Bibliography of Research in Marriage and the Family, 1900-1964 (Aldous, 1967); Research in Marriage and Family Vol. II, 1965-1972 (Aldous, 1974); Inventory of Marriage and Family Literature Vol. III, 1973-4 (Olson, 1975); Family Life Literature and Films: An Annotated Bibliography (Minnesota Council on Family Relations, 1972 and 1974 supplement); card catalogue for theses and dissertations, Kansas State University Library; and a computer search of Educational Resources Information Center documents.

Several related studies were found, however. These were Bulletin # 295: Survey of Hospitals with Child Care (Women's Bureau, 1970), Bulletin #296: Industry Sponsored Day Care (Women's Bureau, 1971), Child Care in Federal Agencies (Women's Bureau, 1975), Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals (Wells, 1976), Employer Subsidized Child Care (Ogilvie, 1972), and Dollars and Sense: Employee-supported Child Care (Douglas, 1976). In addition to these surveys, some related information was available from the evaluation reports conducted on the individual programs sponsored by Kaiser Industries (Slobodin, 1975), TRW, Incorporated (Rinaldo, 1974), Office of Economic Opportunity (Krug, 1972), and KLH Research Development Laboratories (Hawkins, 1970).

Industry has traditionally become involved with day care to meet a crisis. The Kaiser corporation in Portland, Oregon, recognizing the need to increase productivity in its shipyards during World War II, established child care facilities to free more parents to work. The government, too, saw the need for child care and passed the Lanham Act which provided funds for day care staff. Kaiser, however refused these funds in order to pay more to professionals for quality care. The centers were operated 24 hours a day, served three shifts and provided care for children 18 months and older with after school and vacation care for older children. The program began with 183 children and six months later served 680. Hot meals were available to be taken home by the parents at the end of a shift as well as being served at the child care facility. There was an infirmary, parent education pamphlets, and family child care consultants to aid families in finding care for their infants. Plans for expanding the centers to serve infants were under way when the centers were closed at the end of the war. At that time it was believed that women would return to the home so that child care facilities would no longer be used.

Since the closing of the Kaiser centers, industry has been drawn to providing child care to meet its own needs for recruitment, reduction of absenteeism and turnover. This is the rationale behind the opening of many centers and the criteria used for evaluation. However, one study (Ogilvie, 1972) done on such child care facilities reports there is no evidence that these needs are served through child care involvement. Ogilvie concluded, that in order to make child care economically justifiable by these criteria, the following conditions must be present:

1. A large female work force (1,000) in a close geographic area,

2. A sustained need for female employees,

3. Above average turnover and absenteeism costs.

These conditions traditionally exist in industries with a high percentage of low paying jobs for women such as those found in hospitals and textile industries.

The Women's Bureau (1970, 1971) conducted two studies which showed that centers in existence at that time largely fell into these categories. One study included 98 hospitals and the other 11 industries, 2 unions supported by industry contributions and some government agencies. A problem cited several times, especially by those organizations not meeting the three factors mentioned by Ogilvie, was non-use of facilities. Many employers noted that in order to justify the cost, the child care facilities needed to be operated at full capacity. All too often this was not the case. In the evaluation reports on their centers the Office of Economic Opportunity (Krug, 1973) and KLH (Hawkins, 1970) both noted "a lack of interest" as a factor in non-use of their facilities. Under-utilization was named as a major cause for closure in a follow-up study of the Women's Bureau survey (Wells, 1976). The hospital facilities were more readily used to capacity than the other industrial centers. A look at the services offered revealed some possible causes for their differences in use. Hospital child care facilities were generally open longer hours, charged lower rates and provided care for a wider age range of children. The non-hospital centers generally served only preschoolers aged two or three to five years. In the OEO evaluation (Krug, 1972) a survey of non-users found that 29 percent cited higher cost than present arrangements as a reason for non-use. No families with school age or infant children in addition to eligible preschoolers used the child care facility.

Industrial involvement is not limited to operation of on-site centers. The Women's Bureau survey (1971) found that industry's concern about child care has been expressed in alternative ways. Some companies have assumed a leadership role in helping their communities establish needed child care facilities. The Whirlpool Corporation and businessmen representing 25 industries in the Benton Harbor-St. Joseph, Michigan area developed a council to aid in community improvement. They loaned equipment and personnel for the establishment of a child care facility.

Another kind of child care involvement is illustrated by the Illinois Bell Telephone Company. The company has day care personnel representatives who interview parents to determine their needs and then match these needs to available resources. The company attempts to create new facilities when there is a gap between need and available services.

Other types of involvement include direct financial contributions to community child care facilities. Some industries have reserved slots in existing centers, agreeing to pay all or part of the costs. The Women's Bureau report (1971) noted that some interest had been shown, though no actual cases were known, in the idea of employers paying the employee directly for all or part of the day care costs arranged for privately by the employee.

A unique industrial sponsored program was begun in 1972 by TRW, Inc., in Houston, Texas (Rinaldo, 1974). TRW is a world wide conglomerate, building a variety of products including auto and television parts and spacecraft. The Houston plant is responsible for the establishment of the Urban Affairs Child Development Center in the city's poverty stricken Fifth Ward. The center is a developmental program run by professionals. Recipients are children from poverty stricken one-parent families. TRW sponsors the program by getting government funds, providing administrative assistance, and donating 30 percent of the operating costs through employee and corporate contributions. There is a basic difference between this and all other types of involvement. TRW was interested in child care to serve the societal rather than corporate need. The corporation feels there are the following sound business reasons for this venture as well:

1. A tax deductible contribution of $40,000 yielded a $120,000 program when government funds were added.
2. Good public relations resulted.
3. There were improved employee relations.
4. There was efficient use of funds.
5. The center served as an affirmative action program as local people were hired and trained as para-professionals. This helped meet EEOC guidelines necessary to maintain government contracts.
6. Benefits were provided to children, parents and the community through education, health and employment programs.

Statistics show that the need for child care exists. This review suggests that when industry tries and fails to meet this need, it may not be because there is no need, as non-use might suggest, but that the facility does not meet the needs of the families it serves. Therefore, it was determined to conduct a survey of industrial sponsored child care facilities which had closed, as well as those which were still operating, to determine factors contributing to success.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The purpose of this study was to determine what facilities are available in child care programs sponsored by industry, to assess each industry's satisfaction with its program, and to determine why each industry became involved with child care. Industry was defined as an organization which provides a product or performs a service for the consumer. This included hospitals and national government agencies as well as businesses. National government agencies responsible for administering child care programs conceived by legislation, such as Head Start, and the individual programs which resulted from such legislation were not included. These programs were viewed as being public rather than industry sponsored. State and local government agencies were also excluded because only a limited sample from a few states was available and it was often not possible to determine whether the child care programs involved were industry or publicly sponsored.

The list of subjects was obtained from the following sources: appendices of Women's Bureau Surveys of industry and hospital sponsored programs (1970, 1971), additions to these appendices gained by writing to the Women's Bureau (Appendix A), a list of involved industries compiled during the search of literature, and lists obtained from writing the agencies responsible for licensing child care facilities in each state and the District of Columbia (Appendix B). Forty-three of the 51 agencies written, responded. Information was incomplete from six states. Two states were not able to supply names due to policy or legislation prohibiting release of this information to the general public. Two states license by county and do not keep a central file at the state level. An additional state sent information for all areas excluding one county which kept separate files. The remaining states responding with incomplete information required fees for the release of such information. The additional information available from these last four states was not sought due to time and funding restrictions on this study.

Lists of industry sponsored child care facilities from eight states were compiled from official publications listing all licensed child care facilities in the states. In six of these publications, where licensed facilities were listed by the child care center's name, it was difficult to determine sponsorship of each child care facility as there was no indication as to what group or individual was sponsoring the center. The sponsoring individual or group was listed along with the facility's name in the publications from the remaining two states. Here, however, it was not always possible to determine if industry was involved. When the sponsoring group was listed as a corporation (ie: Community Development, Inc.), it was not possible to determine if any industry supported the organization. The industrial involvement of TRW, Inc. (Rinaldo, 74), for example, could not have been determined from such a publication as the sponsoring group would have been listed as Urban Affairs Development, Inc. For these reasons, the list of names for the survey sample cannot be considered exhaustive.

Questionnaire

As there was no instrument for measuring both employer satisfaction and child care services available, a questionnaire was designed for the purpose of this study (Appendix C). Sources used as guides for the questions used in the questionnaire were: appendices of Women's Bureau Bulletins 295 and 296 (1970, 1971), Survey Research Methods (Babbie, 1973), Foundations of Home Economics Research: A Human Ecology Approach (Compton, 1972), Research Methods in Behavioral Sciences (Festinger, 1973), Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development (Mussen, 1960), and Research Methods in Social Relations (Sellitz, 1959).

Questions on center location, number of children served, hours open, fees charged, director qualifications required, parental input allowed, ages of children served, government funds used, and kind of employer support offered were included to determine what child care facilities are available. Questions to determine employer satisfaction include employer evaluation of the program's effect on employer-employee relationships, public relations, turnover, recruitment, absenteeism and tax breaks; whether the program was still in operation; and the number of available spaces which were actually used. The above questions provided information on what industries are satisfied with their involvement, and what services these industries provide. A single question asked why the industries had become involved with child care. Space was also provided for respondents to comment on any additional reasons they felt their program was successful or unsuccessful.

The final form of the questionnaire was given to four faculty members in the Department of Family and Child Development at Kansas State University for evaluation. The final form of the questionnaire was then presented to a member of the University Human Subjects Committee to establish that the rights of the respondents would not be violated in any way.

Survey Sample

A selected sample of 125 was drawn from the compiled list of the 171 known industry sponsored child care programs. A sample rather than a total population was used due to restricted funds. All non-hospital programs and at least one industry from each state known to have industry sponsored child care programs were included in the sample. This accounted for 42 industries. Random sampling procedures were followed in selecting the remaining 83 subjects.

Survey Procedure

The questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix C) were sent with a self-addressed stamped envelope to the selected sample. A code number was written on each questionnaire and return envelope. Two weeks following the first mailing, 50 follow-up letters (Appendix D) were mailed to industries not responding to the first questionnaire. To increase the chance of return, another copy of the questionnaire and another self-addressed stamped return envelope were enclosed. Follow-up letters were sent using the same sampling procedures followed in determining the original sample.

Coding Procedure

To assure confidentiality, the final sheet of each questionnaire listing the name and address of the respondent was removed upon receipt of the completed questionnaire. The responses to the items on the questionnaire were then recorded using only the assigned code number as identification (Appendix E). The names and addresses of those industries requesting a summary of the final report were kept in a separate file. The final questionnaire sheet of those industries not wishing a report was destroyed. This writer was the only individual having access to the code number sheet identifying the code numbers with the industries. Comments made on open ended questions (#17 and #18) were too varied to be suitable for accurate coding. Responses to these questions were recorded on separate pages and used in the presentation of data wherever applicable.

Treatment of Data

Frequency tables were prepared for variables in the three areas (services offered, employer satisfaction and rationale for involvement) which served as guides for this study. Correlation tables were then established to determine if there were any significant differences between the rationale for involvement or services offered and employer satisfaction. The Chi-square test of significance was used.

Reports to Respondents

Copies of the abstract were mailed to each respondent requesting a summary of the results along with a letter expressing appreciation for the respondent's cooperation.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine what services are available in child care programs sponsored by industry; to assess each industry's satisfaction with its program; and to determine why the industry became involved in child care. Responses were received from 72 of the 125 industries which were sent questionnaires. Of these, two were received after the data had been analyzed and were not included in the presentation of data. The number of responses to each item on the questionnaire varied as each respondent did not complete every item.

Services Available

Number of Children Served

The number of children served varied from programs designed to serve as few as 20 children to those serving as many as 250 children. Table 9 shows the breakdown of centers by size.

Time Open

Industry sponsored child care programs were open as many as 24 to as few as 6 hours a day, for a total of 5, 6 or 7 days a week. Of the 20 centers open 7 days a week, one was open every day of the year and others varied from one day to two week vacation periods.

TABLE 1

Number of Days Child Care Facility Open (n-54)

Days Open	No. Reporting (PCT)
5	33 (61.1)
6	1 (1.4)
7	20 (37.0)
	54 (100.0)

TABLE 2

Number of Hours Open Per Day (n-55)

Hours Open	No. Reporting (PCT)
24	1 (1.8)
18-23	1 (1.8)
12-17	24 (43.6)
6-11	29 (52.8)

Fees Charged

There was a wide range in amount of fees charged for care. Many programs offered a sliding scale or special reduced rates for employees. In 71.4 percent of the programs reduced rates were offered when there was more than one child from the same family attending the child care programs (n-56). Table 3 shows the range of fees charged and the number of centers which charged by the hour, day, week or month.

TABLE 3

Fees Charged

No. Reporting	Period of Charge	Range
4	----	free
2	hour	\$ .50-\$ .70
29	day	\$ 1.00-\$ 8.30
14	week	\$20.00-\$ 60.00
4	month	\$25.00-\$130.00

Kind of Industrial Involvement

Table 4 indicates how many industries are involved in the various categories of child care invovlement listed on the questionnaire. In several cases, one industry offered child care support in more than one category so the total responses did not add up to 70. The most frequent kind of involvement was for industries to operate child care facilities for the children of their employees.

TABLE 4

Kind of Industrial Child Care Support Offered

Kind of Support	No. Responding
Runs center for employees	51
Runs center for community	17
Reserves spaces in other centers	2
Assists employee in finding child care	8
Contributes to other centers	3
Reimburses employee for child care costs	1*

*under consideration

Director Qualifications

A breakdown of the qualifications required for the position of director for the child care program indicates that the majority of programs are run by college graduates trained to work with children.

TABLE 5

Educational Qualifications Required of Child Care Facility Director (n-50)

Highest Educational Level Required	No. Responding	(PCT)
M.S. Child Development	11	(22)
M.S. Other Field	1	(2)
B.S. Child Development	16	(32)
B.S. Other Field	5	(10)
Some College in Child Development Courses	8	(16)
Experience with Children	6	(12)
Other	3	(6)
	50	(100)

Of the three responses marked "other", qualifications for one director was to be a practical nurse experienced with children and for the other two a B.S. degree was required but the respondent did not indicate any preferred field of study. The M.S. degree and four of the B.S. degrees not in child development were in nursing. The remaining B.S. degree was in administration.

Parental Input Allowed

Responses to the items on the questionnaire concerning the amount of employee input allowed indicate that employees are surveyed as to need for child care but few are involved in the hiring or policy making processes for the child care program after it has opened.

TABLE 6

Parental Input Allowed (n-70)

Response	Was a need survey conducted?	Do parents help hire the director?	Do parents help make policy?
yes	43	2	13
no	12	51	41
no response	15	17	16
total	70	70	70

Ages of Children Served

Child care programs surveyed served children from as young as 6 weeks to 12 years of age. Table 7 shows the breakdown of the ages of the children served. For those programs serving infants, the lowest age accepted varied from six weeks to six months. The preschool category includes children aged two or three to five years (or six when the child is not yet in public school). The school age category refers to children six to 12 years. No children over the age of 12 years were served in any child care program surveyed.

TABLE 7

Ages of Children Served (n-55)

Age category	No. Responding (PCT)
Infant - preschool	16 (29.1)
Infant - school	19 (34.5)
Preschool only	19 (34.5)
Preschool - school	1 (1.8)
	55 (100.0)

Government Funds Used

Responses to the item on the questionnaire concerning the use of government funds for operation of the child care program indicate that only

12 (21.4%) of the 56 industries responding to the item use any government funds. One respondent stated that loss of government funding was the reason for the closing of that center. The type of government funding used and who prepares the grants for these funds is shown in Appendix F.

Location of Child Care Facility

Of the 56 responses to the item asking location of the child care facility, 40 replied that facilities were on the same site as the industry, 12 that facilities were in the community and 4 had facilities in more than one location.

Satisfaction

Industrial Response to Satisfaction Scale

Employees were asked to indicate their opinion of how child care involvement has affected their companies in the areas of improved employee relations, improved public relations, reduced turnover rate, reduced absenteeism rate, increased recruitment potential, and increased tax benefits. The respondents expressed the greatest degree of satisfaction with categories on the questionnaire indicating improved employee and public relations and increased potential for recruitment. Respondents expressed satisfaction to a lesser degree with reductions in turnover and absenteeism rates. Only half as many responded to the item on tax breaks and these largely felt that their child care involvement had no real effect on tax savings.

TABLE 8

Employer Satisfaction with Child Care Involvement

	very satisfied	satisfied	no effect	very dissatisfied
Employee Relations (n-51)	24	23	3	1
Public Relations (n-50)	24	21	4	1
Turnover Reduction (n-49)	14	21	12	2
Absenteeism Reduction (n-47)	14	18	11	4
Recruitment Potential (n-51)	25	19	3	2
Tax Benefits (n-25)	4	3	16	2

Two respondents who responded that they were "very dissatisfied" with absenteeism and turnover reduction and increased recruitment potential stated their reason for opening was to effect changes in these categories. These centers were closed because they did not meet these objectives. The two additional respondents marking "very dissatisfied" in the absenteeism category were still operating centers and commented that the center needed facilities for ill children in order to accomplish this objective. One of the respondents stated the industry was in the process of acquiring such facilities.

Centers Open/Closed

Of the 70 industries responding, 47 still had centers in operation, 20 had closed, 1 had never opened as the initial survey taken indicated no interest, and 2 gave no indication as to the status of their centers. Some of the comments made by those industries which had closed are:

- -Failed to meet objectives (2)
- -Too expensive (4)
- -Not used (2)
- -Government standards too hard to meet (3)

-Lost government funding
-Too much competition
-No longer needed
-Bad management

Spaces Available/Spaces Used

Table 9 lists all the centers by the number of children it can serve, how many of these spaces are used, whether or not the center is closed and if closed, why, and what the respondents rating was on the employee relations scale. In a few instances the spaces used exceeds the spaces available. This is accounted for by the fact that the spaces available refers to the number of children the center serves per shift and the spaces used refers to the number of children the center serves in all shifts combined. Two of these respondents indicated that the day shift was near capacity while the later shift(s) served only a few children.

Rationale

Involvement has been initiated by industries primarily to aid with some personnel problem. Thirty-one of the respondents indicated that the industry became involved with child care to help with one or more of the following: reduce turnover rate, reduce absenteeism, increase recruitment potential. Of the 54 industries indicating the reason for their child care involvement, only 3 indicated they did so out of concern for the children. Meeting employee need was noted by 20 respondents as the reason for becoming involved in child care. All of these were hospitals, several of which noted that child care was not available in the community for the evening and night shifts. The employees needed the child care in order to work these later shifts. This is closely tied to the rationale of operating a child care facility to improve recruiting potential. It is also possible that some industries noting employee need as their

TABLE 9

Number of Spaces Available Which are Used Compared to Employer Satisfaction with Employee Relations and Open/Closed Status.

Spaces Available	Spaces Used	Employer rating for Employee relations	Open or closed	Reason for Closure
20	20	-	open	
20	15	S	open	
20	0	VD	closed	bad management
23	23	VS	open	
25	25	S	open	
25	20	S	open	
25	18	VS	open	
30	25	VS	open	
30	23	VS	open	
30	0	S	closed	no longer needed
30	0	S	closed	too expensive
32	32	S	open	
33	32	VS	open	
34	25	VS	open	
35	35	VS	open	
35	35	S	closed	could not meet Federal standards
38	28	VS	open	
40	40	S	open	
42	42	S	open	
42	35	VS	open	
45	70	S	open	
45	60	VS	open	
45	45	VS	open	
45	45	S	open	
45	45	S	open	
45	40	-	open	
48	33	S	closed	not used
49	49	-	open	
50	50	VS	open	
50	50	NE	open	
55	40	VS	open	
60	50	NE	closed	too expensive
65	39	VS	open	
66	55	VS	open	
75	75	VS	open	
79	70	S	open	
80	55	VS	open	
85	85	VS	open	
90	60	S	open	
95	100	S	open	
95	95	S	open	
100	100	VS	open	
100	92	S	open	
100	90	S	open	
120	120	S	open	
120	120	VS	open	
120	87	S	closed	did not meet objectives
122	120	VS	open	
125	110	NE	open	
126	120	VS	open	
240	240	S	open	
250	250	VS	open	

VS-very satisfied S-satisfied NE-no effect VD-very dissatisfied reason for becoming involved in child care might have done so out of concern for employees' family needs. This is closely tied to the rationale of operating a child care facility out of concern for the child. Clarification of rationale among those establishing child care programs to serve employee need would be helpful.

Child Care Services Offered as Related to Employer Satisfaction

There were no significant relationships found between size of center, ages of children served, time open, fees charged, kind of support given, or location of center and the employer's satisfaction with the child care involvement. There were, however, some significant relationships found between director qualifications required, parental input allowed, and government funds used and employer satisfaction.

Director Qualifications Required

A Pearson correlation coefficient of .32 which was significant at the .01 level was found between "director qualifications required" and the respondent's rated satisfaction with improved employee relationships. It was also found that of the 35 child care facilities studied, which were directed by college graduates, only one was closed and this was due to loss of financial support. This compares to 4 closures for the 15 centers directed by non-college graduates. Though this indicates centers are more likely to be successful when operated by college trained directors, no significant conclusions can be drawn from this trend as a large number of closed centers did not indicate what qualifications had been sought in their directors.

Parental Input Allowed

There were no significant relationships between employer satisfaction and whether or not a preliminary survey was conducted to establish needs. There were relationships noted between employer satisfaction and parental participation in hiring of the director and making policy decisions for the child care facility. Of the facilities which have parental input into the policy making or director hiring processes, only one expressed any dissatisfaction with their child care involvement. This dissatisfaction was with tax breaks in a facility which had parents involved in policy decisions. The facility was closed when federal standards imposed on the center became too difficult to meet. Two other facilities where parents had input into policy were closed. The respondent for one wrote that the parents were too demanding and did not appreciate the free child care. The other child care facility was closed because the industry thought it involved too great an expense.

Though results indicate there is satisfaction in those child care programs where parents have input into the hiring process and decision making process, the number of cases is too small for any conclusive statements to be made.

Government Funds Used

There were 12 child care facilities using government funds and none of these reported any areas of dissatisfaction and only one had been closed. This facility, which began as a center for employees, became a community run (4C Program) center and was closed for financial reasons. This compares to 12 centers in which dissatisfaction was expressed and with 8 centers having been closed among the 44 child care facilities which did not use government funds. There was no response to the question regarding use of government funds on 14 of the returned questionnaires.

Rationale as Related to Employer Satisfaction

Responding industries became involved in child care to serve industrial needs for increasing recruitment potential and decreasing absenteeism and turnover rates, to serve employee need or out of concern for the children. Satisfaction was expressed by respondents whose organizations had designed their child care programs to meet industrial or employee needs when these needs were met. However, when needs changed or were not met, the child care programs were closed.

Although the number (n-3) of centers established to serve children's needs is too small to determine any significant relationships to satisfaction, it was found that all three centers were open and no dissatisfaction was expressed with the programs. The respondents for each of these centers commented that the sponsoring industry was very pleased with its involvement in child care and recommended that other industries also help establish quality child care facilities in their communities.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine what services are available in child care programs sponsored by industry, to assess each industry's satisfaction with its program, and to determine the reason for the industry's involvement. It was believed that those industries sponsoring child care programs designed primarily to meet the needs of the children and parents would express greater satisfaction than those industries sponsoring child care programs designed to meet such industrial needs as reducing turnover or absenteeism rates and increasing recruitment potential.

Though the number of respondents who indicated that their child care programs were established to serve the needs of children was too small to provide conclusive evidence, there was a high degree of satisfaction expressed by industries in which child care programs were begun to provide quality care for the children and where parental input into the hiring and policy making processes was allowed. Nevertheless, the majority of those industries where programs were begun to serve an industrial need or a parental need also expressed satisfaction with their child care programs. These included hospitals or textile industries where there is a sustained need for women employees to fill low-paying positions. It seems probable then that when industries meet the criteria established in the Ogilvie study (1971) the industry will meet its objectives to recruit personnel or reduce absenteeism and turnover and thus will express satisfaction with their child care involvement.

What is evident to this writer is that few industries meet these criteria and with the need for child care facilities at a critical stage, some effort must be made to determine what variables contribute to satisfaction among those industries not meeting the Ogilvie criteria. Though only three of the industries responding to this survey indicated their involvement was begun primarily to provide quality care for children, these programs, along with the facility sponsored by TRW, Inc. (Rinaldo, 1974), are examples that industries can initiate child care programs beneficial to the children, their families and communities as well as to themselves.

These four programs were initiated as a result of attitudes which are notable exceptions to the prevailing one. A day care survey made in 1970 (Westinghouse, 1971) found employers are not interested in providing child care except when it meets the industry's need for women workers. This attitude was reflected by the President of Vanderbilt Shirt Co. at the 1970 National Conference on Industry and Day Care when he stated, "In a small company such as ours we can't afford to have a social conscience that will cost us a lot of money." He noted that the community doesn't expect day care and that [day care] is not the responsibility of industry (Urban Research Corporation, 1970, p. 11). Others at the conference disagreed. The manager of administration at AVCO, John Jones said they were "...committed to the premise that industry is in fact indebted to the community and the community to industry." He argued "if [industry] didn't pay for social services which build hope, they'd end up paying for it in welfare and on the police blotters" (Urban Research Corporation, 1970, p. 6). Stevanne Auerbach, involved in the OEO program, sums up these attitudinal differences in saying we "...can't look at day care simply from an economic standpoint...but also look at programs from the child's development. These educational and social benefits are not easy to measure." (Urban Research Corporation, 1970, p. 20).

The present survey showed that there was a correlation between director qualifications and the industry's expressed satisfaction with its child care program. It is this writer's bias that social and educational benefits will be more evident and produce greater satisfaction with the program when the staff is educationally prepared to work with children.

Industry was attracted to day care through the belief that it would pay dividends in increased recruiting power and decreased absenteeism and turnover. When such benefits have not been apparent interest subsides. The programs sponsored by TRW and three respondents in this study indicate that industry can benefit when the focus is on the child and community. These child care programs serve not a momentary financial crisis, but the crisis brought about by lack of quality child care. When a child care program is attached solely to an industrial or employee need, the program is liable to be discontinued when that need no longer exists. One respondent to this survey stated that a change in need was the cause for closure. An unstable environment for the children and, perhaps, uncertainty in the parents' minds may cause parents to seek other child care facilities they feel are more stable. This means the very children the industrial sponsored program was designed to serve may not attend, thus creating a situation where underutilization could lead to closure of the child care facility. In programs designed to serve the children, quality child care is viewed as a right; not a privilege, welfare luxury or industrial tool.

This is a pluralistic society. No one form of involvement can meet the needs of all children, families, communities and industries. Each industry must determine for itself how best to serve itself and the community. Industry can assess child care needs by employee, community meetings. If there is a critical need, then immediate plans can be made. If not, the industry can work with already established centers, women's organizations and community agencies to establish a plan designed for the long range needs of the community (Day Care and Child Development Council, 1972). Programs such as those offered by TRW and the three respondents in this study where concern for the child was the primary reason for establishing their child care facilities deserve widespread publicity. They show that when the children are the focus, day care and industry can team successfully. These companies utilized their own administrative expertise in gaining funds and organizing efforts, and the expertise of day care professionals to provide a service in which benefits to the community and the industry go far beyond what can be measured in turnover and absenteeism rate changes.

A high degree of satisfaction was noted among the twelve industries responding that government funds were used. This, along with the indications that few of the respondents believed there were any tax breaks from their involvement with child care, shows that there needs to be some effort by those concerned for quality child care to keep industry informed on legislation designed to encourage child care involvement.

There is room for improvement, however, and precautions need to be taken. One hazard with industrial involvement noted by one respondent is that of placing control of the center with the industry. This respondent thought that control must be with the parents and the community to insure that needs are met. Responses to this survey indicate a high degree of satisfaction in those programs which involved parents in the hiring and decision making process. Industrial control could set up a dangerous situation if the center were used as leverage in labor disputes. This would serve no purpose save to harm the children and the well being of the families. Additional comments made by respondents indicated that more programs need to expand to serve infants, school age, and ill children as well.

An additional effort which might encourage industrial participation would be to work for legislation to expand federal programs so that funds are available for more children. Quality day care is needed for children of parents at all income levels. At present most of the programs the government sponsors are for those near the poverty level. If industry is to offer its services in organizing and fund raising to provide services for all families, the government needs to broaden its regulations concerning eligibility for funds. Testimony before a senate hearing (Edelman, 1971) revealed that less than 10 percent of the budget and 2 percent of the Gross National Product is devoted to all expenditures for children under 21, although this group represents 40 percent of the population and 100 percent of our future. The following quote offers some guides for government direction in this matter: (Steinfels, 1973, p. 216)

> "The extent and nature of the impact of day care hinges on many decisions yet to be made about control, financing, administration and programming...The possibility that

these questions may never be resolved, that the present small, piecemeal and inadequate system will continue is in itself a decision, too, one that will have consequences for family life as powerful as those that could flow from a decision to expand day care services. The question is: Will day care support family and community or will it continue to be an instrument of government social policy offered and withdrawn solely in response to Washington's attitude on welfare and regulation of the poor?"

Once funding is expanded, industry can help obtain these funds to establish community centers. Need for industrial support is suggested by the fact that in 1969, states utilized only $4 million of the $22.6 million allocated for child care by Congress because not enough matching funds were generated (Breibart, 1974). Industrial support such as that offered by TRW can help prevent this loss of revenue.

The need for quality child care has been well documented. Industry can be successful in helping fulfill that need. The child care provided by a society is a reflection of that society's values and affects what that society will become (Edelman, 1971). Director of Corporate Relations at TRW, R.A. Newman states: (Rinaldo, 1974, p. 139)

"Big business, forward-thinking business, is now recognizing that its expanding role in society will include the commitment of corporate resources to help solve massive and seemingly hopeless problems facing America today - hard core unemployment, poor education, rising crime, to name a few. It's only a question of time, in my view, until all of business will have become involved to some degree in these problems in order to insure its own survival. Frankly, I don't think business really has a choice - we can go with enthusiasm, or quietly, or in legislative handcuffs."

This statement was made over nine years ago. Four years later Mr. Newman's company established the Urban Affairs Child Development Center in Houston. Quality programs take time to develop even when the attitude is positive. It is crucial that work begin now to publicize these successful industrial efforts designed to provide quality child care, so that more child care can be available before the serious consequences of our current neglect become uncontrollable.

Summary

Industry could provide support for much of the quality child care which is so urgently needed. This writer believes potential industrial support is lost when involvement is encouraged solely for the purpose of serving the industrial needs for increased recruitment or decreased absenteeism and turnover rates. This rationale worked in those industries where there was a sustained need for female employment; however, indications were that this rationale proved unstable for the children as the child care involvement was liable to end if the industrial needs changed or were not met.

This survey supports the premise that industrial support of child care can also be successful when offered because the children and their families need such programs. There was a significant relationship between director qualifications required and the employer's rated satisfaction with improved employee relations. Those industries which used government funds, allowed parental input into the hiring and decision making processes of the child care facility also showed a high degree of satisfaction with their child care programs. It was concluded that industries should be encouraged to establish child care facilities to meet the children's needs, to explore the possibilities of using government funds for such facilities, and to encourage parental input into their programs. This survey confirmed the view that quality child care provides benefits not only to the children and parents directly involved but to the industry and community as well.

Directions for Future Study

Further study related to this survey might discover additional relationships between child care services offered and employer satisfaction if the questionnaire included items on whether the services offered met the needs of the families being served. Information comparing fees charged by the industrial sponsored child care facilities and fees charged by other child care programs in the community could also prove meaningful. This writer believes valuable information was lost when industries which had terminated their child care programs returned incomplete questionnaires. Had time and money allowed, more extensive follow-up of these respondents would have been useful.

This survey included primarily industries known to have established child care programs for their employees' use. As the Women's Bureau survey (1971) noted, there are many other possible forms of involvement. It is not possible to learn about all of these various efforts from the sources used for this survey. A national poll of all child care facilities or all industries asking the nature of any industrial support offered to child care programs would be needed to discover the scope of industrial involvement in child care. Such information would be useful to industries interested in how they might best serve the children and families in their communities.

Case studies of successful industrial sponsored child care programs would also be useful to industries interested in developing their own programs. Such close study would help delineate what benefits are available to industries involved with child care. Many persons in idustry seem unaware of government programs available to them. With such information available industry and child care professionals could work together to establish child care programs that would be beneficial to children, their families and communities, as well as the industries. This wuold benefit society as a whole by helping to fill the gap that now exists between child care spaces needed and those available.

APPENDIX A

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Dear Ms. Maymi,

For my Master's Thesis I am conducting a survey of industry-related child care facilities. I would appreciate your help in accomplishing this goal.

I now have the list of industries and hospitals surveyed in the Women's Bureau publications 295 and 296. Would you please compile a list of the names and addresses of any industries, government agencies and hospitals you have since learned also operate child care facilities? Please return the information in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

JoEllen T. Doyle
Graduate Student

Ivalee McCord, Ph.D.
Major Professor
Dept. of Family & Child
Development

APPENDIX B

Dear Sir or Madam,

For my Master's Thesis I am making a survey of industry-related child care facilities. I need your help to accomplish this goal.

Would you please compile a list of names and addresses of all industries, government agencies and hospitals licensed to operate day care facilities in your state and return this in the enclosed envelope? If there are no such licensed facilities in your state, please indicate this and return as above.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Jo Ellen T. Doyle

Jo Ellen T. Doyle
Graduate Student

Ivalee McCord

Ivalee McCord, Ph.D.
Major Professor
Dept.of Family & Child
Development

JTD:jb

Enclosure

State Department of Pensions and Security
Division of Day Care and Child Development
64 North Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130

Division of Social Services
Department of Health and Social Servises
Pouch H
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Arizona Department of Health Services
Division of Planning and Resources
State Health Building
1740 West Adams Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Day Care Specialist
Department of Public Welfare
PO Box 1437 Little Rock, Arkansas 72202

Department of Health
Facilities Licensing Section
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95801

Licensing and Standards
Division of Welfare
1575 Sherman Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Coordinator
Child Day Care Licensing Program
Maternal and Child Health
State Department of Health
79 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Bureau of Child Development
PO Box 309
Wilmington, Delaware 19899

Child Care Specialist
Department of Human Resources
801 North Capitol Street, Room 501
Washington, D.C. 20001

Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services
1323 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (licensed by County)

Chief Licensing Services Unit
Division of Children and Youth
Department of Family and Children Services
618 Ponce DeLeon Avenue N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30338

State Department of Social Services
Assistant Program Development Administrator
Day Care
PO Box 339
Honolulu, Hawaii 96809

Director, Bureau of Family and Children's Services
State Department of Public Services
Box 1189
Boise, Idaho 83701

Office of Child Development
Department of Children and Family Services
623 East Adams
Springfield Illinois 62706

Department of Public Welfare
100 N. Senate Avenue, Room #701
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Day Care Supervisor
Department of Social Services
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Division of Child Welfare
State Department Of Social Welfare
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Department of Human Resources
Division of Licensing and Regulation
107 Bridge Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Department of Health and Human Services
Office of Family Services
PO Box 44065
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Licensing Supervisor
Department of Health and Welfare
State House
Augusta, Maine 04330

Child Day Care Center Coordinator
Department of Health and Mental Hyhiene
201 W. Preston Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Day Care Coordinator-Day Care Advisory Unit
Department of Public Health
88 Broad Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110

Department of Social Services
Division of Child Care Center Licensing
300 S. Capitol Avenue
Lansing, Michigan 48926

Day Care Supervisor
Child Welfare Division
Department of Public Welfare
Centennial Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Day Care Consultant
Division of Family and Children's Services
Department of Public Welfare
PO Box 4321
Fondren Station
Jackson, Mississippi 39216

Department of Social Services
Division of Family Services
Broadway State Office Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Social Services Bureau
Social and Rehabilitation Services
PO Box 1723
Helena, Montana 59601

Department of Public Welfare
Licensing Consultant
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Adoption and Licensing Specialists
Welfare Division
201 South Fall Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Bureau of Child and Family Services
Department of Health and Welfare
8 Loudon Road
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Department of Human Services
Division of Youth and Family Services
Child Care Licensing Section
1 South Montgomery Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Institutional Licensing Section
Health and Social Services Department
PO Box 2348
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Department of Social Services
State Day Care Licensing Supervisor
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12243

Division of Day Care
New York City Department of Health
350 Broadway
New York, New York 10013

Office of Child Day Care Licensing
PO Box 10157
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

Director of Social Services
Capitol Building
Bismark, North Dakota 58501

Bureau of Day Care Services
Division of Welfare Services
Oak and Ninth
Columbus,Ohio 43215

Director of Institutions
Social and Rehabilitative Services
PO Box 25352
Oklahoma City,Oklahoma 73125

Department of Human Resources
Children's Services Division
Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97301

Bureau of Child Development Programs
Health and Welfare Building
Harrisburg,Pennsylvania 17120

Department of Social an Rehabilitative Services
Family and Children's Services-Child Welfare
610 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Department of Social Services
Office of Child Development
PO Box 1520
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Department of Social Services
Division of Human Development
Office of Children and Youth
State Office Building,Illinois Street
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Program Specialist-Licensing
Department of Human Resources
State Office Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Director of Day Care Licensing
Department of Public Welfare
John H. Reagan Building
Austin, Texas 78701

Department of Social Services
Division of Family Services
Licensing Specialist
231 E. Fourth South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Day Care Operations Unit
Office of Economic Opportunity
43 State Street
Monpelier, Vermont 05602

Bureau of Licensing Management
Division of Licensing
Department of Welfare
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23288

Services to Child Care Agencies
Department of Social and Health Services
PO Box 1162
Olympia Washington 98501

Day Care Director
State Department of Welfare
1900 Washington Street East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Publication Specialist
Division of Family Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wiscosin 53702

Department of Health and Social Services - Children's Services Specialist
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002

LISTING OF FLORIDA COUNTIES WITH COUNTY SEATS:

Alachua	Gainesville 32601
Baker	Macclenny 32063
Bay	Panama City 32401
Bradford	Starke 32091
Brevard	Titusville 32780
Broward	Fort Lauderdale 33301
Calhoun	Blountstown 32124
Charlotte	Punta Gorda 33950
Citrus	Inverness 32650
Clay	Green Cove Springs 32043
Collier	Naples 33940
Columbia	Lake City 32055
Dade	Miami 33130
DeSoto	Arcadia 33821
Dixie	Cross City 32628
Duval	Jacksonville 32202
Escambia	Pensacola 32502
Flagler	Bunnell 32010
Franklin	Apalachicola 32320
Gadsden	Quincy 32351
Gilchrist	Trenton 32693
Glades	Moore Haven 33471
Gulf	Port St. Joe 32456
Hamilton	Jasper 32052
Hardee	Wauchula 33873
Hendry	LaBelle 33935
Hernando	Brooksville 33512
Highlands	Sebring 33870
Hillsborough	Tampa 33602
Holmes	Bonifay 32425
Indian River	Vero Beach 32960
Jackson	Marianna 32146
Jefferson	Monticello 32344
Lafayette	Mayo 32066
Lake	Tavares 32778
Lee	Fort Myers 33902
Leon	Tallahassee 32301
Levy	Bronson 32621
Liberty	Bristol 32321
Madison	Madison 32340
Manatee	Bradenton 33505
Marion	Ocala 32670
Martin	Stuart 33494
Monroe	Key West 33010
Nassau	Fernandina Beach 32034
Okaloosa	Crestview 32536
Okeechobee	Okeechobee 33472
Orange	Orlando 32801
Osceola	Kissimmee 32741
Palm Beach	West Palm Beach 33401
Pasco	Dade City 33525
Pinellas	Clearwater 33518
Polk	Bartow 33830
Putnam	Palatka 32077
St. Johns	St. Augustine 32084
St. Lucie	Fort Pierce 33450
Santa Rosa	Milton 32570
Sarasota	Sarasota 33578
Seminole	Sanford 32771
Sumter	Bushnell 33513
Suwannee	Live Oak 32060
Taylor	Perry 32347
Union	Lake Butler 32054
Volusia	DeLand 32720
Wakulla	Crawfordville 32327
Walton	DeFuniak Springs 32433
Washington	Chipley 32428

APPENDIX C

KSU KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Dear Sir or Madam:

As an early childhood educator and a graduate student in Family and Child Development at Kansas State University, I am requesting your assistance in completing a study in industry-related child care.

The study seeks to learn how industry and child care can team to provide a quality program beneficial to employers, employees and their children. As personnel director for an employer who has become involved in child care, you are in a unique position to know the effects of such a program on both employees and the organization.

The enclosed questionnaire has been designed to take as little of your time as possible. Your cooperation is essential if the study is to become a meaningful one. All answers will remain confidential.

Please complete the questionnaire even if your child program is not currently active. Kindly answer all the items as accurately and completely as possible; then return the questionnaire in the envelope provided no later than March 31, 1977. If you are not the proper person to fill out this questionnaire, would you please see that it gets to the right person?

I hope to make a summary of this study available for any organization interested in child care. If you would like a copy, please complete the information at the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Jo Ellen T. Doyle

JoEllen T. Doyle, Graduate Assistant
Infant and Child Care Center

Ivalee McCord

Ivalee McCord, Ph.D., Major Professor
Dept. of Family and Child Development

P.S. May I encourage you to fill in the questionnaire now, if you are able. It will only take a moment.

This survey is being conducted under guidelines established by Kansas State University. By cooperating, you will help the survey administrators find answers to important questions; however your participation is strictly voluntary. You should omit any questions which you feel unduly invade your privacy or which are otherwise offensive to you. Anonymity is guaranteed; your name will not be associated with your answers in any public or private report of the results.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In what way is your organization supporting child care?

_____ runs a center for _____ employees _____ community.

_____ reserves spaces in existing centers. Do you provide financial assistance? _____ yes, how much _____.
_____ no

_____ reimburse employees for child care expenses. How much _____

_____ assist employees in finding child care

_____ contributions to existing centers _____ financial
_____ other, please specify_____

_____ other, please specify _____

2. Were other forms of child care involvement considered?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes, what?_____

3. Why did your organization decide to assist with child care? _____

_____

_____

4. Was a survey conducted to determine need?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes: Were parents asked questions on their ability to pay.

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes: Were their answers helpful in establishing fees?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes: Were parents asked ages of their children needing care?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes: Were their answers helpful in establishing age limits?

_____ yes

_____ no

5. What ages does the center serve? ____________________

6. Where is the center located?

____ on organization site

____ in community

____ more than one location

____ other, please specify ____________________

7. How many children can you accommodate? ____________________

8. How many children do you accommodate? ____________________

9. During what days and hours does the center operate?

Days of week __________

Hours of day __________

10. What fee is paid per child? If sliding scale is used, please indicate parameters.

$ ______ per hour

$ ______ per day

$ ______ per month

11. Are different rates used if more than one child per family attends?

____ yes, please describe ____________________

____ no

12. Are government funds used for center operation?

____ yes, what funds? ____________________

____ no

If yes, who prepares grant application?

____ organization personnel, who? ____________________

____ center personnel, who? ____________________

____ other, who? ____________________

13. Who hires the director (head teacher if no director) for the center?

____

14. Who is involved in policy decisions for the center? ____________________

____

15. What qualifications are sought in the director (or head teacher if no director)?

- _____ M.S. What field (s) ______________________
- _____ B.S. What field (s) ______________________
- _____ College courses about children
- _____ Experience with children
- _____ other, please specify ______________________

16. What is your opinion of the effect of your organization's involvement in child-care in the following areas?

5 - very satisfied

4 - satisfied

3 - no effect

2 - dissatisfied

1 - very dissatisfied

	Circle				
employer-employee relationships	5	4	3	2	1
public relations	5	4	3	2	1
turnover	5	4	3	2	1
recruitment	5	4	3	2	1
tax breaks	5	4	3	2	1
absenteeism	5	4	3	2	1
other, please specify ______________	5	4	3	2	1

17. If your involvement has terminated, why do you feel this occurred? ______

____

18. Please use this space to add any comments you would like to make; satisfactions, problems, clarifications.

19. What is the position of the person completing this questionnaire? ____________

20. Would you like a summary of this study's results?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes: ______________________________ Organization name

______________________________ Address

______________________________ (Specific Individual)

APPENDIX D

KSU KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Family and Child Development
Justin Hall
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

April 7, 1977

Dear Sir or Madam:

A Questionnaire on industry-related child care was mailed to you 2 weeks ago. Your cooperation in completing and returning this questionnaire is essential if the study is to be meaningful.

Please take a moment now to answer the items on the questionnaire and return in the enclosed envelope. In event the questionnaire has been lost in the mail or misplaced, another copy has been enclosed for your convenience.

Your cooperation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

JoEllen T. Doyle
Graduate Student

Ivalee McCord, Ph.D.
Major Professor
Department of Family and
Child Development

kt

Enclosures

APPENDIX E

Code

Column #	Question #	Variable Name	Numerical Punching Position
1-4	-	Identification	code number
11	1	runs center for employees	1 no 2 yes
12	1	runs center for community	1 no 2 yes
13	1	reserves spaces	1 no 2 yes
14	1	pays employee for child care	1 no 2 yes
15	1	assists in finding	1 no 2 yes
16	1	contributes	1 no 2 yes
17	1	other	1 no 2 yes
18	2	other forms considered	1 no 2 yes
19	3	rationale	1 recruitment 2 turnover 3 employee need 4 concern for child 5 other
20	4	survey	1 no 2 yes
21	4	ability to pay	1 no 2 yes
22	4	help establish fees	1 no 2 yes
23	4	ages of children needing care	1 no 2 yes
24	4	help establish ages	1 no 2 yes
25	5	ages	1 infant-school age 2 infant-preschool 3 preschool-school age 4 preschool only 5 school age only 6 infant only
26	6	location	1 site 2 community 3 more than 1 4 other
27-29	7	can accommodate	number
30-32	8	do accommodate	number
33	9	days open	number
34	9	hours open	1 24 2 18-23 3 12-17 4 9-11 5 6-8 6 5 or less

Column #	Question #	Variable Name	Numeric Punching Position
35-36	10	fee charged	number
37	10	fee schedule	1 per hour 2 per day 3 per week 4 per month 5 other
38	11	different rates	1 no 2 yes
39	12	government funds	1 no 2 yes
40	12	prepares grant	1 industry 2 center 3 other
41	13	industry admin hires	1 no 2 yes
42	13	personnel hires	1 no 2 yes
43	13	parents hire	1 no 2 yes
44	13	others hire	1 no 2 yes
45	14	industry admin policy	1 no 2 yes
46	14	personnel policy	1 no 2 yes
47	14	parents policy	1 no 2 yes
48	14	center policy	1 no 2 yes
49	14	other policy	1 no 2 yes
50	15	director qualifications	1 MS child 2 MS other 3 BS child 4 BS other 5 some college 6 experience only 7 other
51	16	satisfied employee relations	1 very dissatisfied 2 dissatisfied 3 no effect 4 satisfied 5 very satisfied
52	16	satisfied PR	same as 51
53	16	satisifed turnover	same as 51
54	16	satisfied recruitment	same as 51
55	16	satisfied tax	same as 51
56	16	satisfied absenteeism	same as 51
57	17	closed	1 no 2 yes
58	19	respondent	1 personnel director 2 child care director 3 industrial admin. 4 other

APPENDIX F

Government Funds used in Industry Sponsored
Child Care Programs

Funds used	Who prepared grant for funds
1. School lunch program	Child care director and industry administration
2. School lunch program	No response
3. School lunch program, local social service funds	No response
4. Title XX	Community 4C program
5. Title XX, county revenue sharing	No response
6. State child care funds	No response
7. Federal grants for building	Child care director and industry administration
8. General city funds	None needed
9. School lunch program, Aid to Dependent Children (ADC)	No response

3 respondents using government funds did not specify what funds were used.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldous,J. and Dahl,N. Research in Marriage and The Family, Vol. II, 1965-1972. St. Paul, Minnesota:University of Minnesota Press,1974.

Aldous, J. and Hill,R. International Bibliography of Research in Marriage and the Family: 1900-1964. St. Paul,Minnesota:University of Minnesota Press,1967.

Arvin,C. and Sassen,G. Corporation and Child Care:Profit Making Day Care, Work Place Day Care and a look at the Alternatives. Cambridge, Massachusettes:Women's Research Action Project, 1974.

Babbie,E. Survey Research Methods. New York: Wadsworth Publishing Company,1973.

Breibert,V. The Day Care Book. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1974.

Chapman,J. et. al. The Realities and Fantasies of Industry Related Child Care:Symposium Proceedings. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 094 866,1973.

Children's Bureau. Spotlights on Day Care:Proceedings of National Conference of Day Care Services. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office,1965.

Compton,N. and Hall,O. Foundations of Home Economic Research: A Human Ecology Approach. New York: Burgess,1972.

Day Care and Child Development Council. The Women Question in Child Care. Washington D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council,1972.

Day Care Council of New York City. Employer Personnel Practices and Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in New York City. Washington D.C.: Peat,Marshall and Mitchell Company, 1973.

Douglas,J. Dollars and Sense:Employer-Supported Child Care. Carson City, Nevada: Department of Human Resources,1976.

Edelman,M. Testimony before the U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Joint Hearings before the sub-committee on Children and Youth, 92d Congress.

Fein,G.and Clarke-Stewart,A. Day Care in Context. New York: John Wiley and Sons,1973.

Festinger,L. and Kotz,D. (eds). Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Dryden Press,1963.

Grotenberg,E. (ed). Day Care:Resources for Decisions. Washington D.C.: Day Care and Child Development Council.

Hawkins,D.F. et.al. Industry Related Day Care: The KLH Child Development Center,Part I. Bethesda, Maryland: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 657,1970.

Hutchinson,S. (comp). Major Aspects of Day Care: Statements and Articles. Bethesda, Maryland:ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 078 890, 1971.

Keyserling,M. "Day Care:Crisis and Challenge", Childhood Education. 1971,48/2,pp.59-68.

Krug,D.,Palmer,V.,Bellassai,M. Evaluation of OEO Child Development Center. Maryland: Westat Incorporated,1972.

Levitan,S. and Alderman,K. Child Care and ABC's Too. Baltimore: John Hopkins,1975.

Mead,M. "Working Mother",Childhood Education,1970,47/2,pp.66-71.

Miklovich,G. and Gomez,L. "Day Care and Selected Employee Work Behaviors", Academy of Management Journal.1976,19/1,pp.111-115.

Minnesota Council of Family Relations. Family Life:Literature and Films: An Annotated Bibliography. Minneapolis: Minnesota Council of Family Relations,1972.

_____ Family Life:Literature and Films:An Annotated Bibliography. Supplement. Minneapolis:Minnesota Council of Family Relations,1974.

Mussen,P. Handbook of Research Methods in Child Development. New York: Wiley and Sons,1960.

National Institute of Education. Educational Resources Information Center. Washington D.C.:US Government Printing Office.

Ogilvie,D. Employer-Subsidized Child Care. Washington D.C.: Inner City Fund,1972.

Olson,D. and Dahl,N. Inventory of Marriage and Family Literature III, 1973-1974. St. Paul,Minnesota:University of Minnesota Press, 1975.

Rinaldo,D. "Education Teams with Industry", Childhood Education. 1974, 50/3,pp.139-142.

Roby,P.(ed). Child Care-Who Cares? New York:Basic Books,1973.

Schneider,H. Public Opinion Toward Day Care.Final Report:Part VI. Bethesda,Maryland:ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 068 194, 1971.

Sellitz,C.,Jahoda,M.,Deutsch,M., and Cook,S. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York:Holt,Reinhart and Winston,1959.

Simms,M. "Industry and Day Care", Children Today. 1972,1/1,pp.30-31.

Slobodin,C. "When the U.S. Paid for Day Care", Day Care and Early Education. 1975,3/1,pp.22-25 and 49.

Steinfels,M. Who's Minding the Children? New York:Simon and Schuster, 1973.

Stevenson,G. "Tender Love and Day Care",Manpower.1975,7/6, pp.16-20.

Urban Research Corporation. Proceedings of the Conference on Industry and Day Care. Chicaho: Urban Research Corporation, 1971.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971, Joint Hearings before the subcommittee on Employment,Manpower and Poverty and the sub-committee on Children and Youth. 92d Congress.

Wells National Services Corporation. Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals (an update of a study by the U.S. Department of Labor). New York: Wells National Services Corporation, 1976.

Westinghouse Learning Corporation. Day Care Survey,1970: Community Profiles. Bethesda,Maryland:ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 068 152,1971.

Women's Bureau. Bulletin #295:Survey of Hospitals with Child Care. Washington D.C.:US Government Printing Office,1970.

_____ Bulletin #296: Industry Sponsored Day Care. Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office,1971.

_____ Child Care in Federal Agencies. Unpublished position paper, 1975.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Young,D. and Nelson, R. Public Policy for Day Care of Young Children. Massachusettes: D.C. Heath and Company,1973.

Young,K. Testimony before the U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Comprehensive Child Development Act of 1971. Joint Hearings before the sub-committee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty and the sub-committee on Children and Youth. 92d Congress.

INDUSTRY SPONSORED CHILD CARE: A STUDY OF SERVICES, EMPLOYER SATISFACTION AND RATIONALE

by

JOELLEN TULLIS DOYLE

B.A., California State University at Northridge, 1969

-

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family and Child Development

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1977

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine what services are avaiable in child care programs sponsored by industry, to assess each industry's satisfaction with its program and to determine why the industry became involved with child care. It was believed that those industries sponsoring child care programs designed to meet the needs of the children and parents would express more satisfaction with their involvement than those industries sponsoring child care programs designed to meet such industrial needs as reducing turnover, reducing absenteeism or increasing recruitment potential.

A review of literature revealed no studies assessing services offered, employer satisfaction and rationale for industrial involvement. A survey questionnaire was designed and mailed to 125 industries selected from a list of 171 industries known to be involved in child care. Services offered were described in terms of days and hours open, fees charged, kind of industrial involvement, director qualifications required, parental input allowed, ages of children served, number of children served and government funds used. Satisfaction was measured by the employer's rating of the effect of child care involvement on employee relations, public relations, turnover rate, absenteeism rate, recruitment potential and tax breaks received; utilization of available space; and continued operation of the child care facility.

Data collected from 70 responses were used to establish frequency tables on services offered, employer satisfaction and rationale for involvement. Correlations were run on items relating service or ration-

ale to satisfaction items. There was a significant relationship between director qualifications required and employers rated satisfaction with employee relationships. Though the number of respondents in the following categories was too small to establish any significant correlations, those industries which used government funds, allowed parental input into the hiring and decision making processes of the child care facility, and initiated involvement through a concern for children's needs showed a high degree of satisfaction with their child care programs. Those industries which initiated involvement to serve an industrial need also showed satisfaction with their child care program when the industrial need was met. However, indications were that this rationale proved unstable for the children as the child care involvement was liable to end if the needs changed or were not met.

It was concluded that industries should be encouraged to establish child care facilities to meet the children's needs, to explore the possibilities of using government funds, and to encourage parental input into their programs.