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ABSTRACT

Utah Employer Attitudes Towards Sponsoring Day Care for Employees

by

Diane Hart, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1980

Major Professor: Dr. Carol A. Bocan
Department: Home Economics and Consumer Education

The purposes of this study were to: 1) examine and contrast hospital administrator attitudes and manufacturing company president (or manager) attitudes in relation to the possibility of having more Utah employers establish organized day care facilities on sites of employment, and 2) determine which factors of employee composition and available facilities and services affect employer attitudes towards day care involvement.

Information from the questionnaire developed for the study was statistically analyzed by the Pearson r correlation coefficient and one-way analysis of variance. Many factors proved to be statistically significant.

Overall, it was found that hospitals were more interested in day care involvement for their employees' children than were manufacturing companies. Large agencies with many female professional, supervisory, and skilled employees tended to be most interested in employer-sponsored day care. The existing presence of facilities and services that could
be used for a day care center helped increase employer willingness to become involved in sponsoring day care for their employees' children.

In general, employers were not sure that employer-sponsored day care would result in significant benefits either to their agency or to the parents. However, the interest of employers in day care involvement increased as they perceived greater employer and parental benefits as a result.

It is recommended that benefits from employer-sponsored day care be further documented for use in educating employers. Further, it is recommended that the attitudes of school district superintendents and other employers with large numbers of female professional employees be analyzed in relation to employer-sponsored day care.

(121 pages)
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Statement of the Problem

In the contemporary United States women are increasingly confronted with the dual roles of mother and labor force participants. In March 1978, 57% of all women with children under age 18 were in the labor force, and 42% of all mothers with children under age 6 worked (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1979). Although the Utah labor force participation rate from 1900 to 1940 indicated that women in the country as a whole were about 1.5 times as apt to be employed as Utah women, the Utah rate has essentially been the same as national rates over the past decade (Bahr, 1979).

The woman's involvement in the labor force has become necessary to maintain family needs in many homes because of the high divorce rate. Also, the 1970's were marked by the deepest recession since the 1930's with the highest rates of inflation since World War II (Sargent, 1978; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1979). Simultaneously, bearing and rearing children continues to be centrally important in the lives of most women. This duality of expectations is confronting, and will continue to confront women in future years. There is evidence that mothers of preschool children find workplace satisfaction to be related to their satisfaction with child care facilities utilized (Manpower Research Monograph No. 30, 1974). Purnell (1977) reported that 95% of the women in industries with high turnover rates indicated that child care responsibilities were the major or secondary reasons for leaving.
Employer-sponsored day care centers allow parents to spend more time with their children than do other modes of child care while fulfilling their employment responsibilities. Not only can the children ride to and from work with their parents, but lunch and coffee breaks provide additional times they can be together. If a child becomes ill or injured, the parent may be immediately called off the job to help with the situation (Perry, 1978).

Other benefits parents may experience by using employer-sponsored day care centers are: 1) missing fewer work days because the day care center provides a steady, reliable form of child care, 2) no extra transportation time is needed to drop off and pick children up at on-site centers (Perry, 1978; Purnell, 1977), and 3) lower cost of child care due to subsidies by the sponsoring organization (Perry, 1978).

There are benefits for the employer as well. Employers sponsoring day care centers have reported: 1) that the job turnover rate has decreased, 2) easier recruitment or the ability to attract superior employees, 3) a more positive attitude of employees toward the sponsoring organization, 4) decreased absenteeism, 5) financial incentives, and 6) an improvement in community relations due to favorable publicity about the employer-sponsored day care center (Perry, 1978; Purnell, 1977; Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Wells National Services Corporation, 1976; "Realities," 1973; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1971; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1970).

Although over half of Utah mothers whose youngest child is six or over, and one-third of those having preschool children are presently employed (Bahr, Chadwick & Albrecht, 1980), the University of Utah Medical Center is the only employer in the State of Utah presently
offering subsidized day care for their employees (Child Care Offered for Employees, 1980).

In summary, the background and problem are:

1) Women are increasingly working outside the home, combining employment and motherhood.

2) The Utah labor force participation rate for women is essentially the same as the national rate.

3) There are advantages for both the employer and employees with children in an employer-sponsored day care center.

4) The problem is that only one employer in the State of Utah provides day care for their employees and it is not known why more employers are not providing such a service.

Purpose

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the possibility of having Utah employers establish organized day care facilities on their sites of employment to help alleviate the inherent conflict in this dual role expectation of employee and mother. This study was directed toward employers to:

1) Determine the attitudes of Utah hospital administrators towards sponsoring day care for their employees.

2) Determine the attitudes of major Utah manufacturing company presidents (or managers) towards sponsoring day care for their employees.

3) Determine which specific factors of employee composition and available facilities and services affect employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care for their employees.
4) Compare and contrast these employer attitudes, and
5) Educate employers about the benefits to be realized from sponsoring day care for their employees.

Hypotheses

It was expected that employer attitudes would coincide with previous findings. Perry (1978) found that day care centers sponsored by industries in the United States account for a small proportion of currently running employer-sponsored centers. In contrast to the 9 centers in the United States sponsored by industry, hospitals sponsored 75 day care centers.

For these centers, some of the situations which have allowed for successful employer-sponsored day care centers are:

1) The enrollment of children whose parents are working at skilled or professional positions,
2) The presence of a facility and/or services at the sponsoring agency which are used by the day care center,
3) A mean (for all the civilian centers) of 2,454 total full-time employees, with a mean low (for the industry-sponsored centers) of 603 employees, and
4) A mean of 67% full-time female employees working for the sponsoring organization.

Therefore, the following null hypotheses were chosen for this study:

1) There is no significant difference between the responses of hospital administrators to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire and the responses of industry presidents (or
managers) to the questionnaire.

2) There is no significant difference between the responses of employers with 100-599 employees to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire and the responses of employers with 600 or more employees to the questionnaire.

3) There is no significant difference between the willingness scores on the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire of employers with over 50% of their female employees in unskilled positions and the willingness scores on the questionnaire of employers with over 50% of their female employees in skilled and professional positions.

4) There is no significant difference between the responses on the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire of employers with the existing presence of facilities and services needed for a day care center within the surveyed agency and the responses on the questionnaire of employers lacking facilities and services needed for a day care center within the surveyed agency.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are presented to facilitate the understanding of this study:

Child Care Arrangement

Any plan the parent has made for the care of the child while the parent is working and is not in the home. This may include market care, informal market care, nonmarket care, or any combination of these arrangements.
Formal Market Care

Modes of child care licensed by the state and purchased in the market by the parent or paid for by another state agency.

Informal Market Care

All arrangements that are not licensed by the state for which a regular fee is charged. This mode describes primarily unlicensed babysitting services as well as housekeepers and maids.

Nonmarket Care

Nonmarket care is distinguished from market care because no regular fee is charged for the child care service. The care is provided by siblings, fathers, grandparents, or self-care.

Within the above categories are several more specific types of child care:

Center Based Day Care

A formal market care provided in facilities devoted to the care of young children in group settings where at least 10 or more children are supervised in organized activities.

Employer-Sponsored Day Care

A center based (formal market) day care which is sponsored by an industry, hospital, labor union, government agency, or a military installation primarily for the use of employees who work for the sponsoring agency. Day care centers sponsored or supported by colleges or universities are excluded from this definition because in most cases these centers primarily serve students rather than employees of the institution. (Military installations are not included in discussions concerning civilian-sponsored day care.)
**Family Day Care**

Care and supervision are provided for by a fee in lieu of parental care to one or more children under the age of 16, in a facility located outside the home of the child's parents or legal guardian for a part of a 24 hour day. This care may be formal or informal market care—depending on whether it is licensed by the state.

**In-Home Care**

Supervision is provided in the child's own home by a relative or non-relative who may or may not be paid. (The care is informal if the babysitter is paid and nonmarket if not paid.)

**Latch Key Children**

Small children left to take care of themselves for extended periods of the day. This is considered a nonmarket care.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were made in order to conduct this study:

1) It was presumed that employers would respond honestly to the questionnaire, and

2) The questionnaire would assess basic employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care for their employees.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In contemporary United States women are increasingly confronted with the duality in their roles as mothers and labor force participants. Because 42% of all mothers with children under 6 years old were employed in March 1978 (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1979), quality day care is needed to help lessen the conflict between family life and labor force participation for mothers with young children.

The review of literature covers five main areas: 1) the work roles of women including family roles of women as well as the role conflict of employed mothers, 2) types of child care arrangements that working mothers may use, 3) benefits and problems associated with employer-sponsored day care, 4) characteristics associated with employer-sponsored day care operations, and 5) requirements for establishing a day care center in the State of Utah.

Work Roles of Women

The labor force participation rate of women in Utah has increased faster than in the nation during the last 27 years. Now, the overall participation rate of women in the labor force in the United States and in Utah is approximately equal (Bahr, 1979; Sargent, 1978). National figures in March 1978 indicate that 57% of mothers with school-age children work and 42% of mothers with children under age 6 work (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1979). Most of these women are working out of economic necessity (Keyserling, March 4, 1971).
Family Roles of Women

Although more women are working outside the home than ever before, it makes little difference in how they perceive their family responsibilities. Most Utah women, regardless of employment status, believe it is primarily the woman's responsibility to take care of preschool children and do the housework (Bahr, Chadwick, & Albrecht, 1980). About 90% of the full-time housewives and those women employed part-time felt that wives should be mainly or entirely responsible for the care of preschool children, while the figure was 81% for the women employed full-time. Cohn (1978) cites Bardwick who suggests that the traditional roles for women are their true source of gratification and self-definition, that even among women who do work, the work role and their commitment to work are of secondary importance. Albrecht (1978) found that large percentages of women in the labor force consider work as "only a job" rather than a significant activity throughout much of their lives. Ellis and Petchesky (1972) quote Mitchell who states:

Women are brought up to think of themselves primarily as mothers and wives; yet finding themselves despite this nevertheless out at work, it is this family identification that determines their relationship to their job and their companions... (p. 25)

Role Conflict of Employed Mothers

Employers should be very interested in the relationship of work to nonwork. Rousseau (1978) surveyed 139 employees from an electronics firm and a broadcasting company. Measures of physical and psychological stress were compared with measures of nonwork and job satisfaction. Absenteeism data were derived from company records. It was found that stress and absenteeism were more highly related to the nonwork score
than the work score.

In a study of women workers, Hulin (1968) found the turnover rate in female clerical positions could be predicted from knowledge about the level of job satisfaction. This implied that women workers in jobs which have characteristics that are satisfying to them are more likely to remain on the job. Wild (1970) studied 2,150 female workers and 236 female ex-workers associated with several British electronics firms. He reported that 21% of the workers and 36% of the ex-workers were dissatisfied with their jobs. This difference in levels of dissatisfaction might be explained by the fact that ex-workers could have left their jobs because of dissatisfaction, which would then be reflected in a higher level of turnover. Of the women who voluntarily left their jobs, only 36.1% were satisfied with the job.

Since most women indicate that familial responsibilities are more important than their employment, it would seem tremendously important for a mother to ease her role conflicts by being satisfied with child care arrangements. Ferrar (1978) studied 324 working women in central and southeastern Pennsylvania—208 women without children or children over six years of age and 116 women with preschool-age children. The questionnaire results suggested a negative relationship between job satisfaction and the presence of preschool children. Guilt feelings the mother harbors for leaving children, and the extra demands both mentally and physically for working, may contribute to this high level of dissatisfaction (Manpower Research Monograph No. 30, 1974). Ferrar's investigation then supported a secondary hypothesis relating levels of job satisfaction with the level of satisfaction with child care arrangements.
Types of Child Care Arrangements

There are three major types of child care arrangements (Ayers, 1978). Formal market care includes center based care and licensed family day care. A new innovative type of center care involves employers (such as hospitals, industries, labor unions, government agencies, or military installations) sponsoring day care centers for their employees. A second mode of child care is informal market care. Unlicensed family day care homes and in-home care by babysitters fit into this category. The third type of child care is called nonmarket care. In-home care, often by a sibling or father, is considered nonmarket if no regular fee is charged. Some children, called latch key children, receive no care for extended periods of the day.

Findings vary considerably on what types of child care arrangements are considered most satisfactory by the childrens' mothers. However, there are some general trends. Because many state legislatures (including Utah) have passed laws prohibiting the care of infants--children from birth to two years--in group programs, in-home care and care in a neighbor's or relative's home have become popular choices for parents with children below the age of two. Parents of school age children often prefer this setting for children before and after school and during school holidays because their children can associate with neighborhood friends (Bender, Flatter, Hass & Ayers-Linville, 1974). However, several reports found the arrangements most frequently mentioned as being "poor" were in-home care by relatives or informal market care in or out of the home (Keyserling, 1973; Keyserling, March 4, 1971; Keyserling, 1971; Strand, 1970).
The forms of care that were rated as the most satisfactory by the Day Care Survey (1970) were a day care center and out-of-home care by a nonrelative (family day care). Both groups were 90% satisfied. Of the 37.1% of mothers who desired to change their child care arrangements, 68.7% preferred to change to a day care center. Parents indicated a preference for center based care because it included an educational component (Keyserling, 1972). Because only approximately 6% of the children of working mothers are in day care centers (Keyserling, March 4, 1971), the majority of children do not get the opportunity to be enrolled in the mode of care that is generally found to be most satisfactory by mothers who use day care centers for their children (Keyserling, 1973; Keyserling, 1971; Strand, 1970). However, families of higher socio-economic status expressed more dissatisfaction with group care than others and tended to use it less (Ruderman, 1968).

Auerbach (1974) conducted a survey of child care use in San Francisco and found that transportation to and from child care centers consumed a large percentage of time and money for parents. Ferrar's (1978) investigation suggested the importance of transportation to child care facilities to the mother's job satisfaction calculations. Aurebach concluded that parents selected care on recommendation, convenience, and because they had no alternative. This is partially due to the fact that there are a great number of mothers who are ineligible for subsidized day care, but whose incomes are too low to buy good private care (Keyserling, March 4, 1971). Ferrar (1978) notes that children are often placed and remain in poor care arrangements because mothers do not know how to find or cannot find more satisfactory child care situations. Therefore, there is a need for more adequate child care.
Benefits and Problems Associated with Employer-Sponsored Day Care

If employers are interested in the retention of women workers, then one solution would be the formation of child care centers at the workplace. The availability of quality child care results in higher levels of satisfaction from the job (Ferrar, 1978). The Urban Research Corporation (1973) found that there were definite positive outcomes from the operation of a business and industry day care center for the company, employees, and children served.

Employer Benefits

There are six major areas in which an employer may benefit from sponsoring a day care center. One frequently reported change employers have mentioned is the increase in the ability of the sponsoring company to attract more employees and build a superior workforce (Perry, 1978; Purnell, 1977; Schonberger, 1975; Ogilvie, 1972; U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1970).

A second major benefit to employers sponsoring day care facilities for their employees' children may be a lower job turnover rate. Studies have reported that child care responsibilities are a major reason that many companies lose high numbers of employees (Purnell, 1977; Maxwell, 1972). This cost of losing employees and subsequently training new workers may be reduced. Numerous studies indicate that employers who sponsor day care for their employees have a better retention of employees (Perry, 1978; Purnell, 1977; Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Schonberger, 1975; Ogilvie, 1972).

A third benefit for employers sponsoring day care services for their
employees may be an increase in productivity. Many employers have noted that their companies have experienced fewer lost work hours due to decreased absenteeism (Purnell, 1977; Milkovich & Gomez, 1976; Schonberger, 1975).

Improved labor relations may be a fourth area of benefit to the employer who sponsors a day care center. The development of more positive attitudes toward the employer and increased morale have been reported by employers (Perry, 1978; Purnell, 1977; Ogilvie, 1972).

A fifth benefit to employers who sponsor day care for their employees' children may be an improved community image. Perry (1978) and Purnell (1977) indicate that because employer-sponsored day care is a new and innovative idea, much positive publicity through articles on employer-sponsored day care centers have resulted.

The employer may experience financial incentives as a sixth benefit to sponsoring day care for their employees. As inflation continues to escalate, the workers' demands for increased pay will be more vocal but more difficult to deliver. If employers provide low cost, quality day care, however, the workers' real income would increase while decreasing the actual cost to the employer. The Federal government has provided tax incentives and funding for many day care programs. A corporation's payments to provide care for the preschool children of its employees while they are at work are tax deductible under IRS ruling (section 162-Rev. Rul. 73-348, 1973-2, C.B. p. 31). The 1967 Amendment to the Social Security Act (Title IV-A Amendment of the Social Security Act) provides financial incentives—allowing 75% federal funding for many day care services—mostly for low income families, migrants, or families located in a public housing area (Urban Research Corporation, 1973; U.S. Dept. of
Labor, 1972). The Talmadega Amendment of the Work Incentive Program ensures a company 90% federal funding for eligible employees. These incentives have been provided because it is the feeling of most child care experts that employers should be encouraged to assume a greater responsibility in assisting in the provision of child care services (Panel Workshops, 1979).

Parental Benefits

Parents may benefit as well as employers from day care centers provided on sites of employment. Perry (1978) reported four main benefits to parents from the operation of an employer-sponsored day care center. One, the parents could spend time during the day with their children at the center. Two, parents pay a lower cost for child care due to subsidies by the sponsoring organization. Three, because care at a day care center is a steady, reliable form of child care, parents may benefit by missing fewer work days. Four, with on-site centers, parents are able to stay with their children all the time except working hours and a few minutes travel time from the center to the workplace. No extra transportation time is needed to drop off and pick up children at day care centers.

Other advantages reported (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1970) were that employer-sponsored day care centers were close and convenient, breast-feeding children were able to continue after their mothers returned to work, and the center relieved many mothers of worry concerning their children when they knew they were in the same building and could be contacted at once in case of emergency. Accommodations in employer centers could also be made for in-home care for sick children by an
organization such as the Visiting Nurses Association.

Employer Problems

Although employer-sponsored day care centers provide many benefits for both employers and parents, costs present some serious difficulties that may hinder employers from becoming involved in offering day care for their employees. Purnell (1977) reported that 52% of those industries responding to the survey regarded the cost of such an operation as a major hurdle in implementing child care for employees. The remaining 48% mentioned insurance and state regulations as possible problem areas; these, too, are related to cost. In the survey conducted by Perry (1978), the high cost of subsidies forced nine employer-sponsored day care centers to close. The Urban Research Corporation (1973) found that employer-subsidized day care centers were under-enrolled, but per capita costs increased with decreased size of enrollment (Ogilvie, 1972). Transportation of children to and from school—for before and after school care—was also a big consideration. In reality, though, this service may be too expensive to provide, thereby eliminating those who require transportation to use the center (Ayers, 1978).

The major obstacles found to hospital operation of child care centers were expense, lack of adequate space or facilities, meeting appropriate safety and sanitation standards and other requirements, difficulty of providing services during the evening and night shifts, and the availability of other child care facilities (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1970).

Parental Problems

Although employers face some serious problems in sponsoring day care for their employees, the literature suggests only one problem parents
Parents who used public transportation to reach work found transporting children to an on-site center to be inconvenient (Stein, 1973).

**Characteristics Associated with Employer-Sponsored Day Care Operations**

Despite any problems associated with employer-sponsored day care centers, the employer was reported as an initiator in the development of the industry-sponsored and hospital-sponsored centers in more than 50% of the responses gathered by Perry (1978). The study conducted by the Urban Research Corporation (1973) indicated there was a discernable trend in the instances of industry initiating day care centers, but profit was not a direct underlying cause for industry to operate day care centers. Initially, most of these employers conducted a survey of the industry, employees and community to establish the need for providing child care services for their employees.

**Necessity of Surveys**

The Texas Industrial Commission (Purnell, 1977) recognized how important it is for employers to conduct appropriate surveys before establishing a subsidized day care center. The following recommendations were made:

**Study the Industry**
- How much production time is lost to absenteeism and turnover?
- Are night shifts causing problems for employees with children?
- How much absenteeism and turnover can be attributed to child care responsibilities?

**Survey the Employees**
- How many children are represented?
- What are the ages of the children?
- What kind of care are they presently receiving?
- What economic levels do the employees represent?
In how many households do both parents work?
How many are single heads of household?
How many attribute to child care responsibilities absenteeism?
Are the employees content with the care the child is now receiving?

Study the Community
Do child care facilities already exist?
Are existing facilities adequate to the need?
What do the existing facilities charge per week?
What local, state or federal programs exist that could assist with starting up a child care facility?
Could other industries in the area be talked to about a joint effort?
Does a Junior College in or near the area provide training for Child Development Associates?
Do the high schools in the area offer vocational homemaking education programs?
Are retired persons with expertise in teaching child development or health matters available to assist?
Are free health care facilities available for children in your community?
Are there volunteer organizations in your community to assist?
(p. 14)

Using these types of surveys, Ayers (1978) found that a fairly accurate prediction could be made as to whether an employee with children below the age of 13 will use employer-sponsored child care on the basis of background information, current child care choices, and program preferences.

Typical Characteristics of a Successful Operation

Even though an employer may take surveys to help make plans and predictions, a limited amount of information is available about employer-sponsored day care centers that may also be useful. Perry (1978) found that day care centers sponsored by industries, labor unions and government agencies in the United States accounted for a small proportion of currently running employer-sponsored centers. Industries sponsored 9 centers, labor unions sponsored 7, and government agencies sponsored 14. In contrast, hospitals sponsored 75 day care centers and military...
installations sponsored 200. All industry-sponsored centers were in the East and the South.

For these centers, the situations which have allowed for employer-sponsored day care can be reflected by the following characteristics:

1) Location of center close to workplace,
2) Enrollment of children whose parents are working at skilled or professional positions,
3) Flexible operating hours that match employee working hours,
4) The use of automobile transportation by parents in transporting children to the center,
5) Fees for services that are lower than alternative centers, and
6) The presence of a facility and/or services at the sponsoring agency which are used by the day care center.

Specifically, Perry (1978) summarized characteristics of companies and their employees that have been involved in successful employer-sponsored day care programs. The companies reported that the mean number of total full-time employees was 2,454 for the civilian centers, ranging from a low of 603 for three industry-sponsored centers to 10,150 employees for four government agency centers. The mean percentage of full-time employees who were women was 67% for civilian employers. Industry-sponsored centers reported that 36% of company employees were women and employed from 550 to 700 employees. Hospital centers reported that 74% of hospital employees were women and ranged in size from 344 to 6,400 with a mean of 1,483 full-time employees. One of the characteristics reported about the employees was that 97% of the parent-employees used a car to transport their children to the centers. Also, 68% of the parents visited their children during the day in civilian centers. This
makes a mean of 11 parental visits each week.

In addition to company and employee characteristics, there are typical costs and fees that have contributed to successful employer-sponsored day care centers. Perry (1978) reported that the mean start-up cost was $115,680 per center, ranging from $500 to $615,000. The average total operating budget for all the centers that reported was $107,260. For the civilian centers, 36% received outside funding. Besides these employer costs, Ayers (1978) found that fee concerns were the greatest factors influencing parental intention to use an employer-sponsored day care center. Employees seemed to prefer that space be provided by the employer rent free to reduce weekly cost to parents with the remainder of the cost paid by parents on a sliding fee scale. In contrast to this desire, however, a minimum employee charge on a flat fee schedule was the prevailing method utilized to receive employee contributions rather than a sliding fee scale according to employee ability to pay (Urban Research Corporation, 1973). Perry (1978) reported that the mean fee for five days of care in a civilian center was $24.21.

In addition, generalizations can be made about the actual physical set-ups of employer-sponsored day care centers that have been successful. Employer-subsidized day care sites are generally located at or near the place of employment (Ogilvie, 1972). Of the civilian day care centers, only 13% were farther than one block from the parents' workplace (Perry, 1978). The mean total enrollment for civilian centers was 71.75 and for military centers 133.89. All employer-sponsored centers reported enrollment of children aged 3 to 6. In the civilian centers, infants under one year were enrolled in 64% of the centers, and children aged 1 to 3 were enrolled in 89% of the centers. However, fewer school age children
were enrolled in the centers. Of the civilian centers, 34% enrolled a mean of 14 children between 6 and 10 years of age per center, and 6% enrolled a mean of 38 children between 10 and 13 years of age. Most civilian day care centers were open from 9 to 12 1/2 hours, long enough to service one shift of employees. Military day care centers often remained open for "drop-in" child care on Friday evenings, Saturday evenings, and Sunday mornings as well as remaining open for one or two shift periods during the regular five day work week. The mean square feet of classroom space for the total group of employer-sponsored centers was 3,260, and the mean square feet of playground space was 13,065 (Perry, 1978).

Alternative Ways of Employer Involvement

Although most of these characteristics refer to centers that employers have established on their own, there are many other ways in which employers can help alleviate child care problems. Listed in the proceedings of the Second National Conference on Industry and Day Care are 17 ways business can become involved in child care (Urban Research Corporation, 1973):

1) Open your own center.
2) Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center.
3) Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center.
4) Develop a company-union day care center partnership.
5) Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes.
6) Donate money to a community center.
7) Donate expertise--your lawyers, architects, public relations department--to a community center.
8) Donate services--make repairs, do the accounting--to a community center.
9) Donate space and facilities for a day care center.
10) Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children.
11) Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program.
12) Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces.
13) Develop training programs for para-professionals and professionals in cooperation with your community college or university.
14) Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert—in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency—whose services your local center needs, but can't afford.
15) Underwrite day care research.
16) Join—or initiate—a group to push for more day care in your community.
17) Lobby—for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc. (p. 12)

Purnell (1977) recommends additional ways for employers to become involved in opening a day care center and cut day care costs. One cost saving factor would be parent participation in the child care services. If on a rotating basis parents could spend two half-days a month working in the center, it would reduce cost and improve the staff-child ratio. Secondly, in areas where several industries are in close proximity, industries could form a joint venture to institute child care for their employees. Thirdly, industries could set up a child care facility as a non-profit corporation. This encourages donations because of the tax exempt status and the tax deductions available to donors. Many of the start-up costs could be ameliorated in the form of grants in the case of a non-profit corporation.

An innovative example involving private and public resources, volunteer organizations, large employers, and employees in providing quality day care for their children is the Georgetown Day Care Center in Washington, D.C. It is jointly sponsored by a large hospital and private non-profit organization (O'Farrell, 1970). The center offers day care services to a small number of the children whose parents work at the hospital and also functions as a halfway house for children with
observable or potential handicaps. A unique combination of use of private and public resources is demonstrated in the center. The hospital provides the physical facilities, health care, and food services; the National Council of Jewish Women provides teachers, substitutes, volunteers, indoor equipment and supplies; and the parents pay on a sliding scale based on income. Parents are regularly involved on advisory committees.

**Unsuccessful Employer-Sponsored Centers**

Sometimes innovative ideas prove unsuccessful and employers are forced to close their day care center for employee use. Perry (1978) received information from 10 respondents on reasons contributing to the closing of their day care centers. Sixty percent of the respondents stated that the company felt the subsidies cost too much, 40% felt the company did not need a day care center to attract and keep a steady work force, and 40% felt there were administrative problems. Thirty percent of the respondents stated that there were not enough employees' children eligible, parents preferred alternate forms of child care, and the company needed the center for other uses. Twenty percent of the companies stated that parents were not willing to pay the fees for the service. Ten percent of the respondents mentioned the following problems: outside funding discontinued, parents demanded more services but were unwilling to pay more, the company needed to expand center services but expansion was too costly, the company felt the center benefitted only a few employees but not all employees, government regulations were a problem for the company, and the center did not serve real needs for second shift and weekend care.
Requirements for Establishing a Day Care Center in the State of Utah

In order for Utah employers who are investigating the feasibility of establishing a day care center under their sponsorship to understand Utah regulations, employers may write to the Division of Family Services in Salt Lake City for Utah licensing standards for child care centers.

Utah requires all day nurseries, persons, associations, corporations, institutions or agencies to be licensed if they provide care and supervision for three or more children under fourteen years of age for periods of more than four but less than 24 hours in one day, with or without charge. No children under age two shall be cared for in a center.

Included in the Utah licensing standards are requirements for:
child care services policy statement; parent participation; security; communication; records maintenance; administrative records; fatality and hospitalization statements; reporting of child abuse; report of legal action; children's records; enrollment; personnel required for group size and age; child care personnel qualifications; health requirements for all child care personnel; building site; building plans and construction; heat, light, ventilation; plumbing and toilet facilities; drinking water; food preparation area and equipment; office facilities; isolation area; sleeping area and equipment; storage; equipment; sanitation and safety requirements; health examination for children; immunizations; personal hygiene; rest time; discipline; medication; food service; minimum meals and nutritional standards for hours in care; program activities; program equipment and materials; use of space; transportation; nighttime care of children; drop-in care; and licensing procedures.
The review of literature and the findings of previous research indicated the following:

1) The labor force participation rate of mothers with young children has increased dramatically in Utah over the last 27 years and is now essentially the same as national statistics.

2) Regardless of employment status, women still hold the primary responsibility to care for preschool children and do the housework.

3) In general, employed mothers with preschool children feel a role conflict and are therefore less satisfied with working.

4) A mother's level of job satisfaction is related to her satisfaction with child care arrangements.

5) The modes of child care most frequently considered poor are in-home care by relatives or informal care in or out of the home.

6) Care in a day care center is considered satisfactory by many parents.

7) Employers may benefit from sponsoring a day care center for their employees by having the ability to attract a superior workforce, a lower job turnover rate, decreased absenteeism, improved labor relations, improved community image, and financial incentives from the Federal government.

8) Parents may benefit from an employer-sponsored day care center by paying lower fees due to subsidies from the sponsoring organization; missing fewer work days because the day care
center is a steady, reliable form of child care; spending less transportation time, which in turn provides more time to spend with their children (lunch, breaks, etc.); breastfeeding children may continue after mothers return to work; and by relieving the worry of parents for the safety of their children.

9) Employers consider the major obstacles to sponsoring day care for their employees to be cost, insurance, and state regulations.

10) Parents who use public transportation to reach work find transporting children to an on-site center to be inconvenient.

11) Employer conducted surveys to study the industry, employees, and community are necessary before opening a day care center to determine the need for child care.

12) Situations which have allowed for employer-sponsored day care centers to be successful are: location of center close to workplace, enrollment of children whose parents are working at skilled or professional positions, flexible operating hours that match employee working hours, the use of automobile transportation by parents in transporting children to the center, fees for services that are lower than alternative centers, and the presence of a facility and/or services at the sponsoring agency which are used by the day care center.

13) There are at least 17 ways in which business can become involved in child care for their employees.

14) Some employer-sponsored centers have been closed due to various problems.

15) The State of Utah has many specific requirements for establishing a day care center.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

This study was directed toward employers to: 1) determine the attitudes of Utah hospital administrators towards sponsoring day care for their employees, 2) determine the attitudes of major Utah manufacturing company presidents (or managers) towards sponsoring day care for their employees, 3) compare and contrast these employer attitudes, 4) determine which specific factors of employee composition and available facilities and services affect employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care for their employees, and 5) educate employers about the benefits to be realized from sponsoring day care for their employees.

Sample

According to Perry (1978), day care centers have been sponsored in the United States by various types of employers--military installations (200 centers), hospitals (75 centers), government agencies (14 centers), industries (9 centers) and labor unions (7 centers). However, since this survey was limited to Utah, it was decided to survey the two most feasible categories.

It was decided that military installations, government agencies, and labor unions were not appropriate as samples because of the small number located in Utah. Hill Air Force Base is Utah's only major military installation (3 other minor bases are located in Utah). Hill Air Force Base was considered an industry in the study, however. In
addition, Utah has a limited number of government agencies and labor unions suitable for this study and would therefore yield too small a sample size for statistical analysis.

Therefore, the populations for this study were composed of two major groups. Group one was composed of all the hospital administrators (as listed in a current directory of hospitals) in the State of Utah \((n=41)\). Group two was composed of all major Utah manufacturers--those with at least 100 employees \((n=169)\). The president, personnel director, or general manager was surveyed in these manufacturing companies as indicated by a mailing list supplied by the Utah Industrial Development Division. When more than one name was listed, the priority of the person to be surveyed was 1) president, 2) personnel director, and 3) general manager because of the positions' respective authority in determining company policy. For the sample, 100% of both populations were utilized.

Administration of the Questionnaire

A survey questionnaire was adapted, pilot tested, and mailed to all Utah hospital administrators and presidents (or managers) of all major Utah manufacturers on May 13, 1980. The questionnaire used is included in Appendix A. The questionnaire was mailed instead of conducted as an interview for two reasons: 1) postage is much less expensive than travel or phone calls for a study throughout Utah, and 2) mailed questionnaires allowed employers time to seek information and think through questions without being forced to make an immediate answer. The questionnaire was printed in booklet form with eight total pages \((6" \times 8\:1/4")\). The first page of the booklet was a cover letter with Utah State letterhead, explaining the purpose of the study and requesting
that the questionnaire be returned by Friday, May 23, 1980 (approximately 6 to 7 working days after receiving the questionnaire). Enclosed with each questionnaire was a business-reply envelope addressed to the Home Economics and Consumer Education Department, Utah State University. Those who did not respond initially were mailed a reminder letter on Friday, May 23, 1980. Reminder letters are included in Appendix B. This second letter reminded the administrators about the questionnaire, thanked early responders, explained why all those in the sample were important to the study, and offered to send a second questionnaire if necessary. A third follow-up was mailed Tuesday, June 3, 1980. This follow-up was very effective and essentially doubled the response rate. A cover letter explaining the importance of their response to the study and my situation as a graduate student, another questionnaire (requesting a return within five working days), and a business reply envelope were included. (Only the first and third mailings included questionnaires and business-reply envelopes.)

Employers were asked to identify themselves, but they could choose to keep their identity confidential in the report of results. A summary of results was mailed to all hospital and industry personnel who participated in the study.

The Instrument

The instrument (Appendix A) was adapted from Perry's (1978) survey and took information from the Urban Research Corporation (1973). The questionnaire focused on the following topics:

"Sponsoring Day Care" included two main questions to measure the attitudes of employers towards becoming involved in sponsoring day care
for their employees. The questions included ways employers were willing to become involved and to what degree. Question 1 asked whether the company or organization was willing to make an assessment of day care needed for the children of their employees, and if so, what would they like the survey to include. Question 2 measured responses with a summated (mean) rating scale, offering alternatives of: 1) "not interested," 2) "somewhat interested," 3) "very interested," and 4) "currently doing." The question included 17 different methods of becoming involved in child care (as listed by the Urban Research Corporation, 1973, p. 12).

"Benefits and Problems of Employer-Sponsored Day Care" measured the perceived benefits for the employer and parents, and drawbacks for the employer. Question 3 offered eight areas of benefits according to Perry's findings (1978). The scale included three levels of change that employers foresee as benefits to their company as a direct result of opening a day care center for their employees. 1) "Foresee no change," 2) "not sure," and 3) "yes, foresee a change" served as the categories for the summated (mean) rating. Question 4 assessed how much employers felt parents would benefit if their company or organization sponsored an on-site center for their employees' children. Six possible categories of parental benefits (that Perry found) were assessed on a summated (mean) scale of three possible responses: 1) "parents would not benefit," 2) "not sure," and 3) "yes, parents would benefit." Question 5 asked the employers the degree that twelve possible drawbacks posed for their agency. The following summated rating of three choices was used: 1) "no problem," 2) "somewhat of a problem," 3) and "great drawback."

"Company and Employee Composition" investigated the type of
employer and the number, professional status, and shifts of employees at each firm according to gender. In addition, types of transportation employees used to travel to work was assessed. Question 6 asked the respondents to describe the company or organization as a manufacturing company, hospital, military installation, or "other--describe." Questions 7 and 8 asked for the total number of employees and the number of female employees in both full-time and part-time positions. Question 9 dealt with types of jobs that employees held and number of male and female employees in each of five categories (supervisory and/or professional positions, "other" white collar positions, skilled blue collar positions, unskilled blue collar positions, and "other--describe"). Question 10 asked what shifts employees worked and the approximate number of male and female employees in each category (day shift, swing shift, graveyard shift, "other--describe"). Question 11 investigated the kinds of transportation employees used to travel to work (according to an estimated percent).

"Existing Facilities and Services" compared characteristics that have allowed for successful employer-sponsored day care centers in the past to the present situations of employers. Question 12 asked employers to identify all the building facilities which were available to operate a day care center (with moderate changes). The scale included three choices: 1) "no," 2) "don't know," and 3) "yes." Question 13 asked employers to identify the services existing within their agency that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center. Responses for the seven items were coded only as "no" (0) or "yes" (1).

Confidentiality was addressed in question 14. The respondents marked whether or not they consented to have their agency identified in
relation to specific questionnaire items.

Any additional information was asked for in question 15. Approximately two-thirds of a page was allowed for open-ended written comments.

The questionnaire was completely precoded. Codes were listed to the right of each page and boxed off with the caption "for office use only" to avoid confusing the respondents.

Pilot Study

A preliminary pilot study was conducted on Perry's (1978) adapted instrument to assess its content, clarity, and format. Four agencies were asked for suggestions. Pepperidge Farms (Manager of Human Resources, Catherine Cleeremans), Hyde Park Bag Company (Co-owner and Manager, Eileen Brocking), Logan Hospital (Personnel Director, Teri Chase-Dunn), and Utah State University (Manager of Compensation, Terry L. Hodges) were asked to pilot test the questionnaire. As a result of the pilot testing, the questionnaire format was revised. Reasons for revisions included precoding; problems apparent in pilot testing due to questions answered incorrectly, questions left blank, or questions with response categories written in. The order of the questions was changed for the final form of the questionnaire because it was felt that more time consuming questions about company and employee composition should be located near the end instead of at the beginning of the questionnaire.

Objectives

The following objectives were utilized for the employer survey:

1) Obtain permission from the Utah State University Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects to survey hospital
administrators and major manufacturing company presidents (or managers) in the State of Utah.

2) Refine the instrument through a pilot test.

3) Send the questionnaire with a cover letter and business-reply envelope to each employer in the sample.

4) Follow up with a reminder letter to non-respondents.

5) Conduct a third follow-up with a cover letter, questionnaire, and business reply envelope.

6) Use the following two methods of statistical analysis: one-way analysis of variance and the Pearson r correlation coefficient.

7) Compare selected variables relating to employer attitudes towards sponsoring various types of day care, benefits and problems of employer-sponsored day care, company and employee composition, and existing facilities and services that have helped companies in the past sponsor successful day care centers.

Treatment of Data

The questionnaire information was key punched directly from the returned precoded questionnaires. Statistical analysis was conducted to determine whether or not a statistically significant difference existed in the overall attitudes of the sample groups. Attitudes towards sponsoring day care were analyzed in relation to the following:

1) responses of hospital administrators to manufacturing company presidents (or managers); 2) size of agencies; 3) number of female professional, supervisory, and skilled employees in comparison to number of unskilled employees; 4) existing building facilities useable for a day care center (with only moderate changes); 5) the availability of services existing
within the agencies that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center; and 6) other aspects relating to perceived benefits and drawbacks.

Five summated (mean) scales were used in analyzing the data. These scales were: interest in day care involvement (question 2), perceived employer benefits (question 3), perceived parental benefits (question 4), perceived drawbacks (question 5), and number of available services (question 13). Additional comparisons were made to individual items within several questions.

Two statistical methods were used to analyze the data. The first method was selected from Utah State University's collection of statistical computer programs (USU STATPAC). Analysis of variance (ANOVA), tested the hypotheses involving the means of two or more groups (Welkowitz, Ewen & Cohen, 1976). Specifically, a one-way analysis of variance table was used to compare discrete variables to continuous variables (Snedecor & Cochran, 1971). The criterion of significance was established at the .05 level. The second method was an SPSS (Statistical Program for the Social Sciences) computer program. It involved the use of the Pearson r correlation coefficient to compare continuous variables. Correlation refers to the co-relationship between two variables. Statistical significance at the .05 level was determined using a table listing the critical values of the Pearson r for the appropriate degrees of freedom (Snedecor & Cochran, 1971).
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare hospital administrator attitudes and manufacturing company president (or manager) attitudes in relation to the possibility of having more Utah employers establish organized day care facilities on the sites of employment. Another purpose of the study was to determine which factors of employee composition and available facilities and services affect employer attitudes towards day care involvement.

Data were obtained and key punched from the questionnaire developed for the study entitled, "Survey: Employer-Sponsored Day Care in Utah." Computer analysis was conducted on the 65 completed questionnaires returned (32% of the total sample).

Two methods of statistical analysis were used to analyze the variables in relation to the four null hypotheses. One-way analysis of variance compared discrete variables to continuous variables, while the Pearson r correlation coefficient compared continuous variables. Additional information was also analyzed and reported on perceived benefits and drawbacks.

Characteristics of Sample

The sample was composed of two major groups. The first group was composed of all the hospital administrators in the State of Utah as
supplied in a current directory of Utah hospitals (n=41). The second group consisted of manufacturing company presidents (or managers) in Utah as listed on a mailing list supplied by the Utah Industrial Development Division with at least 100 employees (n=169). Therefore, the total population consisted of 210 agencies. The entire population was used for the sample.

On the first mailing, 210 questionnaires were sent out. Five questionnaires to manufacturing companies were undeliverable and returned due to wrong addresses. Therefore, the possible sample was reduced to 205 agencies--41 hospitals and 164 manufacturing companies.

From the sample of 205 agencies, 65 agencies (32%) completed and returned the questionnaire. Information from these questionnaires was key punched and used for statistical analysis. A total of 18 hospitals and 47 manufacturing companies completed and returned the questionnaire--44% of the hospitals and 29% of the manufacturing companies.

In addition to the 65 agencies which completed the questionnaire, an additional 21 agencies (3 hospitals and 18 manufacturing companies) responded by one of the following methods: 1) returning their uncompleted questionnaire with a written comment, 2) circling "No" to question 1 and leaving the rest of the questionnaire blank, or 3) telephoning to explain why they would not be returning the questionnaire. These agencies composed 10% of the total sample.

By adding the 65 agencies (32%) who completed the questionnaire to the 21 additional agencies (10%) who responded as to why they were not filling out the questionnaire, a total of 86 (42%) of the sample responded. Bailey (1978) stated that mailed studies sometimes receive
response rates as low as 10%, but 50% is considered "adequate." Therefore, the overall response rate of the study (42%) was about adequate.

From the 65 completed and key punched questionnaires (32%), two methods of statistical analysis were conducted. The first method used Utah State University's collection of statistical computer programs (USUSTATPAC) to conduct analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests. Analysis of variance was used to test the hypotheses comparing the means of discrete variables to continuous variables. The second method used the Pearson r correlation coefficient to determine the co-relationship between two continuous variables. The criterion of significance for both methods was established at the .05 level.

In addition to this data analyzed by the computer (for the agencies completing the questionnaire), useful information was provided by those agencies who explained why they were not answering the questionnaire.

Reasons for Unanswered Questionnaires

Comments explaining reasons for not completing the questionnaire are included below by type of agency.

Military Installation

Only one military installation was included in the sample. The questionnaire was not answered for the following reason:

I am returning your questionnaire unanswered. Day care centers are currently the subject of a contract negotiability dispute between
this installations' parent command; HQ Air Force Logistics Command; Wright-Patterson AF Base, Ohio; and the National Office of the American Federation of Government Employees. Therefore, it is not considered advisable to express an opinion on any aspect of day care centers at this time.

Hospitals

Three hospitals returned unanswered questionnaires with the following explanations:

I cannot answer because we have just become a part of Advanced Health Systems and do not know their policy or feelings about this.

Because our community is so small, 4,500 population total area, I feel the questionnaire is not applicable at the present time. It is my opinion that employers would be reluctant to become involved from both the financial and legal liability standpoint. I am reluctant to speak for other hospitals and other communities, inasmuch as I am sure that needs vary as to community size and location.

I am sorry we did not respond to your questionnaire earlier. It was lost and just found its way to my desk. I am sure it is too late to respond now.

Manufacturing Companies

Eleven manufacturing companies wrote the following comments on their unanswered questionnaires:

Our corporation is no longer located in Utah. Our corporate offices are in Kennewick, Washington. Under the circumstances, our responses to your questionnaire would be inappropriate and have no bearing.

Because we no longer carry on business in the state, the questions asked in the questionnaire would not apply to us.
We will not be responding to the above questionnaire. Maybe you could select another sample.

Our plant is permanently closed in about two weeks. Therefore, I am returning the unanswered questionnaire.

I am unalterably opposed to any employer involvement in day care centers.

Not interested.

Employees have no need.

95% of our employees are male. For day care, wives in most instances take care of this.

Do not feel the questionnaire applies.

Most of the people at Clearfield work rotating shifts--days, graveyard, swing--7 days on then 2 off, 7 days on then 1 off, 7 days on then 4 off. They work Saturdays and Sundays except on the 4 day off time. It would be difficult--or more likely impossible--to have a day care center with this work schedule. I'm sorry we couldn't be more helpful.

Our people car pool from Salt Lake, Granger, Ogden, Bountiful, Brigham City, etc., so that would limit the number of people who could take advantage of a day care center.

In addition to these written comments, two manufacturing companies phoned to explain why they would not answer the questionnaire. Their reasons were:

1) The corporation is located outside of Utah. They were given corporate directions not to respond.

2) The company had an extremely busy work load. They could not take the time to fill out the questionnaire.

Besides these reasons for non-response, data from the completed questionnaires were analyzed for each null hypothesis. Additional information was analyzed and reported in respect to perceived benefits and drawbacks from sponsoring day care.
Hypothesis 1

Stated in null form, hypothesis 1 is, "There is no significant difference between the responses of hospital administrators to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire and the responses of industry presidents (or managers) to the questionnaire."

Each question and most sub-questions on the questionnaire were compared to the variable of hospital or manufacturing company. Results are summarized below within the four major headings on the questionnaire.

Sponsoring Day Care

Both hospitals and manufacturing companies were in agreement to question 1, "Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees?" (Table 1). Hospitals and manufacturing companies both indicated that they had already assessed the day care needs of employees' children and recognize that employees have a need for additional day care services. (Possible responses were: 1) "No," 2) "Already have. Employees have no need for additional day care services," 3) "Already have. Employees have a need for additional day care services," and 4) "Yes." )

Question 2 was analyzed in two ways. As shown in Figure 1, hospital and manufacturing company responses were compared to the mean scale of scores in question 2, interest in day care involvement. (Possible responses included: 1) "Not Interested," 2) "Somewhat Interested," 3) "Very Interested," and 4) "Currently Doing.") It was found that a
Table 1
Comparison by Agency of Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs of Employees' Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to assess</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

statistically significant difference existed between hospitals and manufacturing companies in their interest in day care involvement. Hospitals had a mean of 1.56 while manufacturing companies had a mean of 1.26. Therefore, the average hospital administrator was "somewhat interested" in day care involvement while manufacturers were closer to "not interested."

The second method of analysis compared each specific part of question 2 (types of child care involvement) to type of agency. On only three of the seventeen factors analyzed did hospitals and manufacturing companies significantly differ, and one additional type of child care involvement approached significance. These four types of child care involvement are summarized in Table 2. A total list of results for all seventeen types of involvement (by agency) is included in Table 17 (Appendix C). For the types of child care involvement with significant differences between hospitals and manufacturing companies, hospitals were "somewhat interested" while manufacturing companies were "not interested." Hospitals were significantly more interested than manufacturing companies in: 1) opening their own day care center, 2) subsidizing employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program, and 3) paying the salary or
Scale of Interest in Day Care Involvement (Question 2)

"Currently Doing" 4.0
"Very Interested" 3.0
"Somewhat Interested" 2.0
"Not Interested" 1.0

Hospital (n=18) Manufacturing Company (n=43)

Figure 1. Comparison by agency to mean scale of interest in day care involvement. (Significant at the .05 level.)
Table 2

Comparison by Agency of Interest in Four Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital M</th>
<th>Hospital n</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company M</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company n</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open your own day care center</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services their local center needs but cannot afford. Hospitals were almost significantly more interested than manufacturing companies in developing their own training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with their community college or university.

Table 18 (Appendix C) is a complete table comparing agency to the seventeen types of day care involvement—a mean rating for both hospitals and manufacturing companies from greatest interest to least interest. The separate ratings for hospitals and manufacturing companies are included along the right column. On the average, both agencies were most interested in: 1) starting a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children, and 2) developing a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center. Hospitals and manufacturing companies were least interested in developing a company-union day care center partnership.

Benefits and Problems of Employer-Sponsored Day Care

Both hospitals and manufacturing companies were "not sure" if employers would benefit from sponsoring day care (question 3). However, on one variable (Figure 2), hospitals perceived publicity due to positive articles appearing in newspapers and other periodicals as a significantly greater employer benefit resulting from sponsoring a day care center than did manufacturing companies.

Comparisons by agency were made for perceived benefits for parents resulting from an employer-sponsored day care center (question 4). Overall, both hospitals and manufacturing companies were "not sure" if
Scale of Perceived Employer Benefit--Positive Publicity (Question 3)

"Yes, Foresee a Change" 3.0

"Not Sure"

"Foresee No Change" 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Comparison by agency of perceived benefit to employer because of publicity due to positive articles in newspapers or other periodicals. (Significant at the .05 level)
parents would benefit as a result of employer-sponsored day care.

Question 5 involved perceived drawbacks to opening an employer-sponsored day care center. Hospitals and manufacturing companies perceived all drawbacks on the questionnaire as "somewhat of a problem" except for one factor (Figure 3). Manufacturing companies felt that parents prefer alternate forms of day care (such as a babysitter at home or care in another person's home) rather than employer-sponsored day care significantly more than hospitals.

Company and Employee Composition

A comparison by agency was made to questions 7 through 11. Comparisons made that were not directly related to the hypothesis are not summarized. Since many of these questions were left blank by respondents, only sketchy information was available in many cases. On the variables directly related to the hypothesis, hospitals and manufacturing companies did not differ except on three items. It was found that hospitals had significantly more: 1) part-time employees, 2) female supervisory and/or professional employees, and 3) female "other" white collar positions than did manufacturing companies (Table 3). (The grand mean of full-time employees for both agencies was 344.)

Existing Facilities and Services

A comparison by agency was made to questions 12 and 13--facilities and services presently available for operating a day care center. None of the items were significantly different on question 12 between hospitals and manufacturing companies. Overall, both agencies were "not sure" if they had available facilities. The responses on question 13 indicated that on the average, hospitals and manufacturing companies both had
Figure 3. Comparison by agency of the drawback that parents prefer alternate forms of day care (such as a babysitter at home or care in another person's home) rather than employer-sponsored day care. (Significant at the .05 level)
Table 3
Comparison by Agency of Significant Aspects of Employee Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number part-time employees</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number female supervisory and/or professional positions</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number female &quot;other&quot; white collar positions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

three types of available services that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center.

Hypothesis 2

Stated in null form, hypothesis 2 is, "There is no significant difference between the responses of employers with 100-599 employees to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire and the responses of employers with 600 or more employees on the questionnaire."

One-way analysis of variance tests were computed to compare the means of employers with over 600 employees (n=3) to the means of employers with 100-599 employees (n=56) against the following mean scales: 1) interest in day care involvement (question 2), 2) perceived employer benefits (question 3), 3) perceived parental benefits (question 4), and 4) available services (question 13). Also, comparisons were made to the
location and availability of facilities (question 12). Since the computed value of $F$ was less than 1.00 for all variables, null hypothesis 2 must be retained.

By breaking the size of the agencies into two arbitrary sizes (as was stated in hypothesis 2), information tends to be lost. Therefore, other statistical tests were conducted which suggested that the general size of an agency did affect employer attitudes about sponsoring day care.

Size in General

Willingness to assess the day care needs of employees' children (question 1) was compared to numerous factors of employee composition. Responses of willingness to assess day care needs was unrelated to the total number of full-time employees (averaging 370 employees for all responses). Only two factors of employee composition were significantly different between the responses of willingness to assess the day care needs of their employees' children, and a third factor approached significance (Table 4). Employers who had already assessed the day care needs of their employees' children had significantly more part-time, female part-time, and (almost significantly more) female full-time employees.

The data in Table 5 shows that interest in day care involvement (question 2) was positively correlated to the total number of full-time employees and number of full-time female employees. Although the results were statistically significant at the .05 level, the correlations were only .31 and .30 respectively.

Additional comparisons dealing with employee composition were made, but employee numbers did not significantly differ with the scales of
Table 4
Comparison of Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs of Employees to Mean Number of Employees in Each Response Category

"Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Already Have.</th>
<th>Already Have.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Have No Need</td>
<td>Have a Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number part-time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number female part-time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number female full-time</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 5
Correlations Between Mean Interest in Day Care Involvement and Number of Full-Time Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in Day Care Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number full-time employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number full-time female employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
perceived benefits, perceived drawbacks, available facilities, or services. For all comparisons, though, perceived drawbacks was negatively correlated with number of employees.

**Hypothesis 3**

Stated in null form, hypothesis 3 is, "There is no significant difference between the willingness scores on the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire of employers with over 50% of their female employees in unskilled positions and the willingness scores on the questionnaire of employers with over 50% of their female employees in skilled and professional positions."

Computations were insufficient to directly address hypothesis 3. So many scores were missing from question 9 (types of jobs that employees hold and number of male and female employees in each category) that data was very difficult to use for comparisons. It was necessary to use an SPSS (Statistical Program for the Social Sciences) computer program. For this program, the ratio to give the percent of female employees in unskilled positions was computed by adding the number of female blue collar positions and dividing this number by the sum of female full-time and part-time employees. This ratio was not significant on all correlations. No ratio was computed for the percent female supervisory, professional and white collar positions. So, if an agency filled in information for female white collar positions but left the number of females in blue collar positions blank, their information was not used at all because the ratio for the computer program depended only on the blue collar position data. Therefore, this ratio (which computed percent female employees in unskilled positions but disregarded a direct
computation of percent female employees in professional and skilled positions) cannot be considered reliable.

However, other comparisons showed that attitudes of employers (interest in sponsoring day care and perceived drawbacks) were affected by the number of female supervisory, professional and skilled employees.

Sponsoring Day Care

Question 1, willingness to assess day care needs of employees' children, had some significant results summarized in Table 6. Those agencies who had already made an assessment of the day care needs of their employees' children had significantly more female supervisory and/or professional employees and female skilled blue collar employees than those employers unwilling to assess the day care needs of their employees' children. Note on Table 6 that when the agency was willing to make an assessment of day care needs of employees' children, the number of male unskilled blue collar employees was significantly lower. Therefore, there was a negative correlation between the number of male unskilled blue collar employees and willingness to assess day care needs of employees' children.

Question 2 dealt with interest in day care involvement. Each part of question 9 (types of jobs employees hold and number of male and female employees in each category) and question 10 (number of male and female employees in each shift) were correlated to question 2. Because of the large number of comparisons made, only the comparisons significantly and directly related to hypothesis 3 were summarized (Table 7). There were significant correlations between two factors of employee composition and interest in day care involvement. One, the number of
Table 6
Comparison of Mean Number of Employees in Categories of Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs by Aspects of Employee Composition

"Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Already Have. Employees Have No Need</th>
<th>Already Have. Employees Have a Need</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (n=12)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female supervisory and/or professional positions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of female skilled blue collar positions</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number male unskilled blue collar positions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
female supervisory and/or professional positions was positively related to interest in day care involvement. Two, the number of female "other" white collar positions was positively correlated with interest in day care involvement. It may be stated that there was a significantly greater interest in day care involvement as the number of female supervisory, professional, and "other" white collar positions became larger.

Benefits and Problems of Employer-Sponsored Day Care

Employers perceived benefits and drawbacks to employer-sponsored day care in essentially the same ways. In relation to the number of female professional, skilled, or unskilled positions, employers agreed that they were "not sure" of employer or parental benefits. Employers also felt that the drawbacks would present "somewhat of a problem."

However, as shown in Table 8, there was a negative correlation between the number of female supervisory and/or professional positions and perceived drawbacks. In contrast, a positive relationship existed
Table 8
Correlations Between Perceived Drawbacks to an Employer-Sponsored Day Care Center and Number of Female Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Drawbacks</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number female supervisory and/or professional positions</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number female unskilled blue collar employees</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

between the percent female unskilled blue collar positions and the number of perceived drawbacks. Therefore, more drawbacks were perceived by employers with lower numbers of female supervisory or professional employees but higher numbers of female unskilled employees.

Hypothesis 4

Stated in null form, hypothesis 4 is, "There is no significant difference between the responses on the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire of employers with the existing presence of facilities and services needed for a day care center within the surveyed agency and the responses on the questionnaire of employers lacking facilities and services needed for a day care center within the surveyed agency."

Many factors were considered in determining the effect that available facilities and services had on employer attitudes. An in-depth analysis was made on location and availability of facilities that could be used
for an employer-sponsored day care center. The three possible locations of available facilities listed on the questionnaire (question 12) were correlated with perceived employer benefits, perceived parental benefits, and other factors. Availability of services was analyzed in light of employer willingness to assess day care needs of employees and perceived employer benefits.

### Available Facilities

Tables 19, 20, and 21 (Appendix D) summarize employer interest in seventeen types of involvement in day care according to the location of available facilities. These facilities were to be available for a day care center with only moderate changes.

**Room in building where parents work.** Table 19 (Appendix D) compares the availability of a room in the building where parents work and how this affected employers' interest in various types of day care involvement. In summary, it may be stated that employers responding that they had a room in the building where parents work (that could be used for a day care center with only moderate changes) were on the whole "somewhat interested" in day care involvement. In contrast, those without a room in the building where parents work were "not interested." Therefore, increased interest in day care involvement was related to the presence of an available room in the building where parents work.

For the following types of day care involvement, employers indicated significantly more interest when a room was available in the building where parents work:

1) Open your own day care center ("somewhat interested"),
2) Develop a coalition of business to start a center ("very interested"),
3) Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center ("very interested"),

4) Develop a company program which involves the training and licensing of family day care homes ("somewhat interested"), and

5) Donate space and facilities for a day care center ("very interested").

A significant positive correlation existed between perceived employer benefits and the availability of a room useable for a day care center in the building where parents work (Table 9).

Table 9

Correlation Between Availability of a Room Useable for a Day Care Center in the Building Where Parents Work and Perceived Employer Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room Available in Building</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived employer benefits</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Building within one block of where parents work. Table 20 (Appendix D) is a comparison between the availability of a building within one block of where parents work and how this affected employers' interest in seventeen types of day care involvement. Employers were essentially "not interested" in day care involvement whether or not there was an available building within a block from where parents work that could be used for a day care center.
Four categories of day care involvement showed significantly more interest ("somewhat interested") if the employers answered "don't know" to whether they have an available building within a block of where parents work than those responding "yes" they have a building ("not interested"). These categories were:

1) Develop a coalition of business to start a center,
2) Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center,
3) Donate money to a community center, and
4) Join—or initiate—a group to push for more day care in your community.

Building in the community where parents live. Table 21 (Appendix D) is a comparison between the current availability of a building in the community where parents lived (that could be used for a day care center making only moderate changes) and how this affected employers' interest in seventeen types of day care involvement. For each of the following types of day care involvement, employers were significantly more interested ("somewhat interested") if they had a building available in the community where parents lived that could be used for a day care center than those responding "no," they did not have a building ("not interested"): 

1) Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center,
2) Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center,
3) Develop a company-union day care center partnership,
4) Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center,
5) Start a company child-care service to help employees find day
care for their children,
6) Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program,
7) Join—or initiate—a group to push for more day care in your community, and
8) Lobby—for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.

For the following three types of day care involvement, employers who did not know if they had an available building in the community where parents live (that could be used for a day care center) were "somewhat interested" while all other respondents were "not interested":

1) Donate money to a community center,
2) Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center, and
3) Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university.

Overall, there was a significant positive correlation between an available building in the community where parents live that could be used for a day care center and an employer's interest in day care involvement (Table 10).

Two additional positive correlations existed between the availability of a building in the community where parents live useable for a day care center and perceived benefits (Table 11). Perceived employer benefits and perceived parental benefits increased when there was an available building in the community that could be used for a day care center.

Available Services

There was a positive relationship between the number of services presently available to an agency and their willingness to assess day care
### Table 10

**Correlation Between an Available Building in the Community Where Parents Live to Mean Interest in Day Care Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Building in Community</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in day care involvement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

### Table 11

**Correlations Between the Availability of a Building in the Community Where Parents Live Useable for a Day Care Center and Perceived Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Building in Community</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived employer benefits</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived parental benefits</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level*
needs of employees (Table 12). These employers who were not willing to assess the day care needs of their employees' children had significantly fewer available services. The employers who had the greatest number of available services had already assessed the day care needs of their employees--finding that employees had a need for additional day care services.

A positive correlation existed between number of available services and perceived employer benefits (Table 13). However, this correlation was only 0.29.

**Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks**

Willingness to assess day care needs of employees' children and interest in day care involvement were affected by the employers' perceived benefits and drawbacks.

**Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs**

Employers were in agreement about the perceived employer benefits despite their response to question 1 (their willingness to assess the day care needs of employees' children). The employers essentially foresaw no employer benefits (Table 14). Possible responses included: 1) "Foresee No Change," 2) "Not Sure," and 3) "Yes, Foresee a Change."

Employers who were willing to make an assessment of day care needed by employees' children were significantly different in their perceived parental benefits than those not willing to make an assessment (Table 14). Employers willing to make an assessment were essentially "not sure" of parental benefits while employers not willing to make an assessment essentially foresaw no benefits. Therefore, the acknowledgement that there may be parental benefits as a result of employer-sponsored day care tended to increase employers' willingness to assess the day care needs.
Table 12
Comparison of Responses of Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs of Employees' Children by Mean Number of Services Useable on a Limited Basis for a Day Care Center

"Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Already Have. Employees Have No Need</th>
<th>Already Have. Employees Have a Need</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of services available</td>
<td>1.08 (n=22)</td>
<td>1.20 (n=4)</td>
<td>1.85 (n=6)</td>
<td>1.47 (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n=22</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

Table 13
Correlation Between Available Services Useable on a Limited Basis for a Day Care Center and Perceived Employer Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived employer benefits</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Comparison of Response Categories of Willingness to Assess Day Care Needs of Employees' Children by Degree of Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks

"Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No Already Have. Employees Have No Need</th>
<th>Yes Already Have. Employees Have a Need</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived employer benefits</td>
<td>1.39 (n=18)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=6)</td>
<td>1.42 (n=24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived parental benefits</td>
<td>1.41 (n=17)</td>
<td>1.50 (n=6)</td>
<td>2.09 (n=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived drawbacks</td>
<td>1.46 (n=13)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=4)</td>
<td>2.00 (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n=23</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

of their employees' children.

In Table 14, those employers who responded "yes," they are willing to make an assessment of the day care needed by children of their employees felt that the drawbacks were significantly greater ("somewhat of a problem") than those not willing to make an assessment, who essentially felt that the drawbacks were "no problem."

Interest in Day Care Involvement

Table 15 summarizes the correlations between interest in day care involvement and perceived benefits and drawbacks to sponsoring a day care center. Perceived employer benefits and perceived parental benefits were both positively related to interest in day care involvement. Therefore,
Table 15
Correlations Between Interest in Day Care Involvement and Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in Day Care Involvement</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived employer benefits</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived parental benefits</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived drawbacks</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

The greater the perceived benefits, the greater the interest in day care involvement. The perceived drawbacks were negatively related to interest in day care involvement. Therefore, the less drawbacks perceived, the greater the interest in day care involvement.

Other Correlations

Perceived employer benefits was positively correlated with perceived parental benefits and negatively correlated with perceived drawbacks (Table 16).

Table 16
Correlations Between Perceived Employer Benefits and Parental Benefits and Drawbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Employer Benefits</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived parental benefits</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived drawbacks</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
Additional Comments

Question 15 was open-ended, asking respondents if there was anything else they would like to add about employer-sponsored day care. Listed by agency, these were the comments received.

Hospitals

Three hospitals that returned the completed questionnaire made the following comments:

We have some centers in the community but they are incompatible with the 24 hour hospital shifts.

I currently see little or no need for a day care center for my employees. However, if in the future the necessity arises, I would be willing to look at this as a benefit.

I would like a copy of the results.

Manufacturing Companies

Ten manufacturing companies completed the questionnaires and made the following comments:

Legal obligations are not worth company directly sponsoring. We would consider percent support.

I do not think this questionnaire particularly applied to us. I do not think one single employee would use a day care center, even if we had one.

I am sorry not to be of more help. However, I do not feel there is a need for a day care center and we do not have any facilities which could be used. New buildings and property would be required.

We see no need for a day care center because of the type of work force we employ.

I would refer employees to known day care centers.

We have three women employees with children that need this service. The rest are single or their children are raised. With so few we can't justify this service.
We are a manufacturing company with a very young average age (19-21). Over 60% of our employees have no children or are not parents. The office staff is comprised of women who are either single or have completed the rearing of their children. I am sorry that there is not much interest in child care here, but our circumstances do not require child care.

Fringe benefits such as a day care center must:
1) Be funded by an outside source—government, or
2) Decrease the employees' wages as a source of funds, or
3) Create increased production as a source of funds, or
4) Increase the percent of the sales dollar allocated to personal expenses. This means decreasing profits unless prices are raised.

Solution #1 implies increased taxes, solution #2 is unacceptable to the employee, solution #3 historically doesn't happen, and solution #4 is unacceptable in a world of inflation and disasterously low profit. Therefore, the best solution is privately funded day care outside the workplace.

You can tell by the size of our organization that we are not in a position to make sizeable contributions or subsidies in this area. However, if the benefits were shown to be demonstrably substantial, we would give the matter further consideration.

We have no problems with child care in the day. At night there is occasionally someone who has problems getting a babysitter.

One additional company mailed me a brochure and cover letter put out by Western Child Care, Inc. on July 6, 1979. Western Child Care (located in Orem, Utah) advertised to provide a pre-school child care program for business and industry.
Mothers across the nation and specifically Utah mothers are increasingly working outside the home, combining employment and family responsibilities. Over one-half of Utah mothers whose youngest child is six or over, and one-third of those having preschool children are presently employed (Bahr, Chadwick & Albrecht, 1980). To help alleviate the inherent role conflict of employee and mother, employer-sponsored day care offers many possible benefits. Employers as well as parents may benefit significantly. However, only one Utah employer is currently sponsoring day care for their employees' children.

Therefore, the purpose of this research project was to: 1) study the attitudes of Utah hospital administrators towards sponsoring day care for their employees' children, 2) study the attitudes of major Utah manufacturing company presidents (or managers) towards sponsoring day care for their employees' children, 3) compare and contrast these employer attitudes, and 4) determine which specific factors of employee composition and available facilities and services affect employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care for their employees.

Data were obtained by the questionnaire developed for the study, "Survey: Employer-Sponsored Day Care in Utah", after permission was granted from the administration of Utah State University to survey 41 hospital administrators and 169 manufacturing company presidents (or managers) in Utah. Comments written on the questionnaires were summarized for those agencies who returned the questionnaire unanswered and those completing the questionnaire. From the 65 completed questionnaires (32%),
data was key punched and analyzed by computer at Utah State University.

The methods of statistical analysis used included one-way analysis of variance (to compare discrete variables to continuous variables) and the Pearson r correlation coefficient (to compare continuous variables). Specific variables were comparatively analyzed to test the four null hypotheses. Additional information was analyzed and reported in respect to "perceived benefits and drawbacks" from sponsoring day care.

Findings

The major findings of this study were related to the four null hypotheses and perceived benefits and drawbacks to sponsoring a day care center.

Hypothesis 1

Null hypothesis 1 was rejected because there were significant differences at the .05 level between the responses of hospital administrators and manufacturing company presidents (or managers) to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire. Findings included:

1) Many hospitals and manufacturing companies have already assessed the day care needs of employees' children and recognize that employees have a need for additional day care services.

2) Hospitals were "somewhat interested" in day care involvement while manufacturing companies were significantly less interested in all types of day care involvement.

3) Hospitals were "somewhat interested" in the following types of day care involvement while manufacturing companies were essentially "not interested":
   a) Open your own day care center,
   b) Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition aid program;
c) Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs but can't afford.

4) Hospitals and manufacturing companies indicated most interest in starting a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children, and developing a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center.

5) Hospitals and manufacturing companies were least interested in developing a company-union day care center partnership.

6) Hospitals and manufacturing companies were generally "not sure" of employer and parental benefits resulting from employer-sponsored day care.

7) Hospitals were more likely than manufacturing companies to foresee the employer benefit of positive publicity due to articles appearing in newspapers and other periodicals as a result of employer-sponsored day care.

8) Hospitals and manufacturing companies perceived most drawbacks as "somewhat of a problem."

9) Manufacturing companies perceived parents as preferring alternate forms of day care (such as a babysitter at home or care in another person's home) rather than employer-sponsored day care as a significantly greater problem than did hospitals.

10) Hospitals had significantly more: a) part-time employees, b) female supervisory and/or professional positions and c) female "other" white collar positions than did manufacturers.

11) Both hospitals and manufacturers were "not sure" if they had available facilities usable for a day care center.

12) On the average, both hospitals and manufacturing companies had
three available services that could be used on a limited basis for an employer-sponsored day care center.

Hypothesis 2
Null hypothesis 2 was not rejected because there were no significant differences between the responses of employers with 100-599 employees and the responses of employers with 600 or more employees to the employer-sponsored day care questionnaire. However, other significant findings, listed below, indicated that the number of employees in an agency did affect employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care:

1) Interest in day care involvement was positively correlated to the total number of full-time employees and number of female full-time employees.

2) Employers who had already assessed the day care needs of their employees' children had significantly more total part-time, female part-time, and (almost significantly more) female full-time employees.

3) Perceived drawbacks to employer-sponsored day care was negatively related to number of full-time and part-time employees.

Hypothesis 3
Null hypothesis 3 was not rejected because the ratio used to compute the percent of female unskilled employees was not reliable. However, many significant results indicated that the willingness scores of employers to sponsor day care for their employees' children were more positive as the number of females in supervisory, professional or skilled positions increased and the number of female employees in unskilled positions decreased.

1) The number of female supervisory and/or professional positions and the number of female skilled blue collar positions was
significantly greater for the agencies who indicated that they
had already made an assessment of the day care needs of employees.

2) The greater the number of male unskilled blue collar workers,
the less likely the agency would be willing to make an assess-
ment of the day care needs of employees' children.

3) The number of female supervisory and/or professional positions
was positively correlated to interest in day care involvement.

4) The number of female "other" white collar positions was posi-
tively correlated with interest in day care involvement.

5) The greater the number of female supervisory and/or professional
employees, the less drawbacks were perceived by the employer to
day care involvement.

6) A positive relationship existed between percent female unskilled
blue collar positions and number of perceived drawbacks.

Hypothesis 4

Null hypothesis 4 was rejected because there were significant differ-
ences at the .05 level between the responses of employers with the exist-
ing presence of facilities and services needed for a day care center
within the surveyed agency and the responses of employers lacking facili-
ties and services.

Room in the building where parents work. The findings indicated:

1) Those employers with the presence of a room in the building where
parents work were on the whole "somewhat interested" in day care
involvement for their employees' children.

2) Those employers without the presence of a room in the building
where parents work were on the whole "not interested" in day
care involvement.

3) Increased interest in day care involvement for employees'
children was positively related to the presence of an available room in the building where parents work.

4) Employers expressed significantly more interest in the following types of day care involvement when a room was available in the building where parents work:
   a) Open your own day care center ("somewhat interested"),
   b) Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center ("very interested"),
   c) Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center ("very interested"),
   d) Develop a company program which involves the training and licensing of family day care homes ("somewhat interested");
   e) Donate space and facilities for a day care center ("very interested").

5) There was a positive correlation between perceived employer benefits and the availability of a room in the building where parents work that could be used for a day care center. Building within one block of where parents work. It was found that:
   1) Employers were essentially "not interested" in day care involvement whether or not there was an available building within a block of where parents work useable for a day care center.

Building in the community where parents live. The following significant results were found:
   1) Employers who responded "yes," they have a building in the community where parents live that could be used for a day care center, were generally "somewhat interested" in day care involvement.
   2) Employers who responded "no," they did not have a building in
the community where parents live, were generally "not interested" in day care involvement for their employees' children.

3) Therefore, there was a significant positive correlation between an available building in the community where parents live that could be used for a day care center to employers' interest in becoming involved in day care for their employees' children.

4) There was a significant positive correlation between perceived employer benefits and the availability of a building in the community where parents live that could be used for a day care center.

5) There was a significant positive correlation between perceived parental benefits and the availability of a building in the community where parents live that could be used for a day care center.

Services. The following significant results relate to the number of services presently existing within agencies that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center:

1) Those employers who were not willing to assess the day care needs of their employees' children had the least number of available services useable on a limited basis for a day care center.

2) The employers who had the greatest number of available services had already assessed the day care needs of their employees—finding that employees' children had a need for additional day care services.

3) A positive correlation existed between the number of available
services that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center and perceived employer benefits.

Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks

The perceived employer benefits, parental benefits, and drawbacks were correlated to willingness to assess day care needs of employees' children and employer's interest in day care involvement.

Willingness to assess day care needs. Employer responses lead to these findings about their willingness to assess the day care needs of their employees' children:

1) Employers essentially foresaw no employer benefits as a result of day care involvement despite their willingness to assess the day care needs of their employees' children.

2) Employers willing to assess the day care needs of employees' children were "not sure" of parental benefits while those not willing to make an assessment saw no parental benefits.

3) Therefore, the acknowledgement that there may be parental benefits as a result of employer-sponsored day care tended to increase employers' willingness to assess the day care needs of their employees' children.

4) Those employers willing to make an assessment of the day care needs of employees' children perceived that the drawbacks were significantly greater ("somewhat of a problem") than employers not willing to make an assessment--who on the whole perceived the drawbacks as "no problem."

Interest in day care involvement. Perceived benefits and drawbacks were related to interest in day care involvement in the following ways:


1) Perceived employer benefits was positively related to interest in day care involvement.

2) Perceived parental benefits was positively related to interest in day care involvement.

3) Therefore, the greater the perceived benefits from sponsoring day care, the greater the interest of employers in day care involvement.

4) Perceived drawbacks to employer-sponsored day care was negatively related to employer interest in day care involvement.

Other correlations. Two additional correlations were significant in respect to perceived benefits and drawbacks from an employer-sponsored day care center:

1) Perceived employer benefits was positively correlated with perceived parental benefits.

2) Perceived employer benefits was negatively correlated with perceived drawbacks.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that Utah employer attitudes coincide closely with the findings in Perry's (1978) study of employers currently sponsoring day care in the United States. In general, the presence of the following factors tends to favor employer interest in day care involvement:

1) An employer such as a hospital rather than a manufacturing company,

2) A large number of total employees,

3) A large number of female professional, supervisory, and skilled employees,
4) Available facilities and services within the agency that could be used for employer-sponsored day care.

Even though many employers realize their employees have a need for additional day care services, employers on the whole were not very interested in sponsoring day care. This may be partially due to the fact that employers were not sure that benefits would result either to their agency or to the parents. It would seem that most employers would not be willing to commit the resources necessary for involvement in day care unless they were convinced that there would be significant benefits as a result.

Implications

Not every employment situation is one in which an employer-sponsored day care center is needed or could function without being a financial burden to the employer. Since little has been published in the past about the development and operation of employer-sponsored day care centers, employers and labor representatives have little guidance in decisions on day care services. Therefore, this study may benefit employers, parents, children and educators by giving necessary background information. As more useful information about employer-sponsored day care becomes available, there is the possibility that more employers will become involved in providing day care services needed by increasing numbers of women in the labor market today. It is of primary importance to further document and educate employers about the significant benefits that may result from employer-sponsored day care involvement.
Limitations

The study was limited because Utah does not have many employers with 600 or more employees. Because it is most feasible for companies with at least 1,000 employees to sponsor a day care center, it would have been beneficial to have a greater number of extremely large employers in the sample.

The study was also limited to the hospitals and manufacturing companies in Utah. A larger sample size—especially of hospitals—would help give a clearer picture of hospital administrator attitudes.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made for further study concerning employer-sponsored day care:

1) Assess the attitudes of school district superintendents.
2) Determine the effect community size has on employers' interest in day care involvement for their employees' children.
3) Determine how important and feasible it is to have flexible day care operating hours that match employee working hours.
4) Conduct a cost analysis for operating a day care center in order to predict employer subsidies for the day care operation.
5) Because costs of center operation are highly sensitive to underenrollment (Perry, 1978), further study for specific agencies should include:
   a) An assessment of the number of children of day care age who would want to use the day care center for estimated fees, and
b) Determine the availability of community children or children of employees in neighboring companies to fill slots in the center in the case that employees' children do not fill the center to capacity.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Questionnaire
Dear Administrator:

I am currently conducting a survey of Utah employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care for their employees' children. Questionnaires are being sent to hospital administrators and manufacturing company presidents or managers throughout Utah.

From the survey, information will be gathered about the characteristics of the employer, employees, and the work situation that affect employer attitudes towards the development of an employer-sponsored day care operation. A summary of the survey results will be mailed to all survey participants as a guide for employers in planning programs to meet the day care needs of employees.

I am requesting that you complete this questionnaire booklet and return it to me within five working days. The individual questionnaires will be held in strictest confidence, and I will not share them with any other person or agency. Unless you give permission for me to identify your organization with specific questionnaire items, identification of your organization will not go beyond stating that your organization participated by returning the questionnaire.

Your informed consent to participate in this survey will be demonstrated by your sending me the completed questionnaire. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Utah State University Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

I sincerely hope that you will return the questionnaire within five days since very little information has been reported about employer attitudes towards sponsoring day care. If you have any questions about the project, feel free to call me at (801) 750-1565.

Sincerely,

Diane Hart, B.S.

Carol A. Bocan, Ph.D.
Home Economics and Consumer Education Department Head
SURVEY: EMPLOYER-SPONSORED DAY CARE IN UTAH

Name of company/organization: __________________________________________

Address: ____________________________________________________________

City: _______________ State: ___________ Zip: ___________

Job title of person completing questionnaire: ____________________ Phone: ___________

SPONSORING DAY CARE

1. Is your company/organization willing to make an assessment of day care needed by children of your employees? Please circle response.

   1  No

   2  Already have. Employees have no need for additional day care services.

   3  Already have. Employees have a need for additional day care services.

   4  Yes

   → If yes...what would you like it to include? (Circle 0 for No, 1 for Yes.)

   No  Yes

   0  1  Questionnaire to employees

   0  1  Survey of available day care in the area

   0  1  Cost analysis to open and operate a day care center

   0  1  "Task force" to evaluate day care situation

   0  1  Other. Describe: ____________________________

Office Use Only

Card 1

(1-3)001

(4) 1

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)
2. In what ways would your company/organization consider becoming involved in child care? For each of the following, circle the degree of interest.

1 = Not Interested
2 = Somewhat Interested
3 = Very Interested
4 = Currently Doing

1 2 3 4 Open your own day care center. (11)
1 2 3 4 Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center. (12)
1 2 3 4 Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center. (13)
1 2 3 4 Develop a company-union day care center partnership. (14)
1 2 3 4 Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes. (15)
1 2 3 4 Donate money to a community center. (16)
1 2 3 4 Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center. (17)
1 2 3 4 Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center. (18)
1 2 3 4 Donate space and facilities for a day care center. (19)
1 2 3 4 Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children. (20)
1 2 3 4 Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program. (21)
1 2 3 4 Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces. (22)
1 2 3 4 Underwrite day care research. (23)
1 2 3 4 Develop training programs for paraprofessionals in cooperation with your community college or university. (24)
2. (Continued) Circle interest your company/organization has in becoming involved in day care.

1 = Not Interested
2 = Somewhat Interested
3 = Very Interested
4 = Currently Doing

Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford.

Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care in your community.

Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.

BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS OF EMPLOYER-SPONSORED DAY CARE

3. Many companies who have sponsored day care centers in the past have found the following benefits. If your company/organization opened a day care center for your employees, what changes do you foresee occurring as a direct result. Circle responses.

1 = Foresee No Change
2 = Not Sure
3 = Yes, Foresee a Change

Lower job turnover rate
Lower absenteeism of "parent-employees"
More positive attitude of employees toward employer
Increase in the ability of sponsoring company to attract new employees
Increase in the ability of sponsoring company to attract minority employees
More positive attitude of "parent-employees" toward their work experience
Improvement in relations between the sponsoring organization and the community
Publicity about the sponsoring company due to positive articles appearing in newspapers and other periodicals
4. Circle how much you feel parents would benefit if your company/organization sponsored an on-site day care center for your employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parents would not benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, parents would benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1: Parents may spend the lunch break with their children.
- 2: Parents may spend coffee breaks with their children.
- 3: Parents pay a lower cost for child care due to subsidies by the sponsoring organization.
- 4: Parents miss fewer work days because a day care center is a steady, reliable form of child care.
- 5: Parents may spend less travel time.
- 6: Other. Describe: __________________

5. For each of the following drawbacks to opening an employer-sponsored day care center, circle the degree each problem poses for your company/organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat of a Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Great Drawback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 1: Not enough employees have children who need day care.
- 2: Parents are not willing to pay the fees for day care services.
- 3: Parents prefer alternate forms of day care such as a babysitter at home or care in another person's home.
- 4: Company has no building-facilities for a day care center.
- 5: Company is not eligible for outside funding.
- 6: Administrative problems.
- 7: Start-up costs.
- 8: Subsidy costs.
- 9: Day care center is not necessary to attract and keep a steady work force.
- 10: State regulations.
- 11: Insurance.
- 12: Other. Describe: __________________
COMPANY AND EMPLOYEE COMPOSITION

6. Describe your company or organization. Circle the best response.
   1 Manufacturing Company
   2 Hospital
   3 Military Installation
   4 Other. Describe: __________________________________________

7. How many employees are there in your company or organization? List the total number of employees:

   Full-time          Part-time
   ___________________ ____________________
   (55-58)(59-62)

8. List the number of female employees:

   Full-time          Part-time
   ___________________ ____________________
   (63-66)(67-70)

9. Types of jobs that employees hold and number of male and female employees in each category.

   Number Male Number Female
   Supervisory and/or professional positions

   Number Male Number Female
   Other white collar positions

   Number Male Number Female
   Skilled blue collar positions

   Number Male Number Female
   Unskilled blue collar positions

   Number Male Number Female
   Other. Describe: __________________________________________

10. Shifts employees work and approximate number of male and female employees in each category.

   Number Male Number Female
   Day Shift (Approx. 8 a.m.-5 p.m.)

   Number Male Number Female
   Swing Shift (Approx. 3 p.m.-11 p.m.)

   Number Male Number Female
   Graveyard Shift (Approx. 11 p.m.-7 a.m.)

   Number Male Number Female
   Other. Describe: __________________________________________

   Office Use Only

   (54)

   Card 2

   (1-3)(001)

   (4) 2

   (5-8)(9-12)

   (13-16)(17-20)

   (21-24)(25-28)

   (29-32)(33-36)

   (37-40)(41-44)

   (45-48)(49-52)

   (53-56)(57-60)

   (61-64)(65-68)

   (69-72)(73-76)
11. What kinds of transportation do employees use to travel to work? Please estimate the percent who use each type of transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Transportation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Subway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe: __________________________

EXISTING FACILITIES AND SERVICES

12. If your company/organization sponsored a day care center for your employees, circle all the facilities presently available for operating such a center (making only moderate changes).

1 = No
2 = Don't Know
3 = Yes

1 2 3 Room in the building where parents work

1 2 3 Building within one block of where parents work

1 2 3 Building in the community where parents live. (If Yes...indicate distance between work location and building: miles.)

1 2 3 Other location. Describe (include distance from work):

13. If your company/organization sponsored a day care center for your employees, circle all the services presently existing within your agency (that could be used on a limited basis for a day care center). (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Card 3
(1-3)001
(4) 3
(5-7)
(8-10)
(11-13)
(14-16)
(17-19)
14. In my report may I identify your company/organization in relation to specific questionnaire items? (Even if you choose No, please return this questionnaire for it is important that your information be included in the survey results.) Please circle response (0 = No, 1 = Yes).

0 = No
1 = Yes

15. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about employer-sponsored day care? If so, please use this space!
Appendix B

Reminder Letters
May 23, 1980

Dear Administrator:

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about employer-sponsored day care was mailed to you. Your name was drawn from the sample of Utah hospital administrators and manufacturing company presidents or managers.

If you have already completed and returned it to us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today to save our troubling you again with reminder letters. Because it has been sent to only a small sample of Utah companies and organizations, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Utah hospitals and manufacturing companies.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me right now, collect (801) 750-1565 and I will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Diane Hart
Project Director
Dear Administrator:

About three weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your opinion about sponsoring day care for your employees' children was mailed to you. In case you have misplaced the questionnaire, a new copy is enclosed.

If you have already completed and returned the original questionnaire, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please fill out this questionnaire—even if you feel your agency is totally uninterested in sponsoring a day care center or you do not feel it applies to your agency (because of a high percent of male employees, etc.). All factors contributing to employer attitudes must be analyzed in order to collect enough data to complete my thesis. Because the questionnaire has been sent to only a small sample of Utah hospitals and manufacturing companies in Utah, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study.

I am aiming to finish my Master's degree by August, but your help is needed. Please return this questionnaire as promptly as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to call collect (801) 750-1565.

Sincerely,

Diane Hart

Project Director

dh

Enclosure
Appendix C

Tables of Comparison by Agency of Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement
### Table 17
Appendix C

Comparison by Agency of Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open your own day care center</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company-union day care center partnership</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate money to a community center</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate space and facilities for a day care center</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (continued)
Appendix C
Comparison by Agency of Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital M</th>
<th>Hospital n</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company M</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company n</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwrite day care research</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care in your community</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (continued)
Appendix C

Comparison by Agency of Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hospital M</th>
<th>Hospital n</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company M</th>
<th>Manufacturing Company n</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Type of Day Care Involvement</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children (m=1.77)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center (m=1.62)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care in your community (m=1.50)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center (m=1.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program (m=1.44)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Open your own day care center (m=1.41)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc. (m=1.38)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center (m=1.37)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces (m=1.37)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center (m=1.36)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Donate money to a community center (m=1.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes (m=1.31)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university (m=1.28)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18 (continued)

**Appendix C**

Mean Rating of Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement from Greatest to Least Interest (and Separate Ratings by Hospitals and Manufacturing Companies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Type of Day Care Involvement</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford (m=1.28)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Donate space and facilities for a day care center (m=1.19)</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Underwrite day care research (m=1.16)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Develop a company-union day care center partnership (m=1.01)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Tables of Comparison of the Location and Availability of Facilities Useable for a Day Care Center
# Table 19

Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Room in the Building Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Availability of a Room</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open your own day care center</td>
<td>1.26 (n=49)</td>
<td>2.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center</td>
<td>1.45 (n=47)</td>
<td>2.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center</td>
<td>1.58 (n=8)</td>
<td>2.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company-union day care center partnership</td>
<td>1.02 (n=47)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes</td>
<td>1.21 (n=48)</td>
<td>2.00 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate money to a community center</td>
<td>1.42 (n=48)</td>
<td>1.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center</td>
<td>1.33 (n=48)</td>
<td>1.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center</td>
<td>1.36 (n=47)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate space and facilities for a day care center</td>
<td>1.08 (n=48)</td>
<td>2.50 (n=2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 (continued)
Appendix D
Comparison of the Availability of a Room in the Building
Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types
of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of a Room</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start a company childcare service to help employees find day care for their children</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwrite day care research</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19 (continued)
Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Room in the Building Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of a Room</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care in your community</td>
<td>1.47 (n=47)</td>
<td>1.50 (n=2)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=1)</td>
<td>1.33 (n=9)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.</td>
<td>1.32 (n=48)</td>
<td>1.50 (n=2)</td>
<td>1.00 (n=1)</td>
<td>1.11 (n=9)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=51</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=2</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=1</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
### Table 20
Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Building Within One Block of Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No (n=36)</th>
<th>Don't Know (n=12)</th>
<th>Yes (n=3)</th>
<th>Non-Response (n=12)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open your own day care center</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company-union day care center partnership</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate money to a community center</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate space and facilities for a day care center</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (continued)
Appendix D
Comparison of the Availability of a Building Within One Block of Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwrite day care research</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 (continued)
Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Building Within One Block of Where Parents Work and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Within a Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
Table 21
Appendix D
Comparison of the Availability of a Building in the Community Where Parents Live and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building in Community</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open your own day care center</td>
<td>1.25 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of businesses to start a center</td>
<td>1.20 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a coalition of business and community groups to sponsor a center</td>
<td>1.20 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company-union day care center partnership</td>
<td>1.00 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a company program which involves training and licensing of family day care homes</td>
<td>1.10 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate money to a community center</td>
<td>1.30 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate expertise such as your lawyers or public relations department to a community center</td>
<td>1.10 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate services such as making repairs or doing the accounting for a community center</td>
<td>1.10 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate space and facilities for a day care center</td>
<td>1.05 (n=20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 21 (continued)

### Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Building in the Community Where Parents Live and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start a company child-care service to help employees find day care for their children</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize employees' day care costs with a tuition-aid program</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage new day care centers by guaranteeing a local entrepreneur that employees' children will fill a specified number of spaces</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwrite day care research</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop training programs for para-professionals in cooperation with your community college or university</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay the salary or consulting fee of an expert (for example, in learning disabilities, child psychology, cost efficiency) whose services your local center needs, but can't afford</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (continued)
Appendix D

Comparison of the Availability of a Building in the Community Where Parents Live and Interest in Seventeen Types of Day Care Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building in Community</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Non-Response</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join--or initiate--a group to push for more day care in your community</td>
<td>1.15 (n=20)</td>
<td>1.71 (n=21)</td>
<td>1.71 (n=7)</td>
<td>1.27 (n=11)</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby--for new day care legislation, a higher level of funding, more help for low- and middle-income families, etc.</td>
<td>1.05 (n=20)</td>
<td>1.52 (n=21)</td>
<td>1.57 (n=7)</td>
<td>1.25 (n=12)</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n=21</td>
<td>n=22</td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level