To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Patricia Lynn O'Connor entitled "A Comparison of Employer's and Employee's Perceptions of Their Corporate-Sponsored Child Care Center". I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Child and Family Studies.

Connie Steele

Connie Steele, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Deborah W. Tegano

Joseph O. Rentz

Accepted for the Council:

CWMinkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

Signature Patricia Lynn O'Connor

Date 12-3-93

A COMPARISON OF EMPLOYER'S AND EMPLOYEE'S PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR CORPORATE-SPONSORED CHILD CARE CENTER

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Patricia Lynn O'Connor

December, 1993

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis with love to my grandmother, Gladys Roehl. Her unfailing devotion to the pursuit of higher education, and her love, support and faith in me has been the catalyst for my academic career. She has given me invaluable educational opportunities which have offered me new directions in life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to those who contributed to this research endeavor. First, I particularly want to thank Dr. Connie Steele, the chairperson of my committee. Her guidance, flexibility, encouraging support, and unflagging positive attitude have been instrumental to me throughout this entire research process. In addition, I appreciate all the insightful evalutions and sound contributions of Dr. Debbie Tegano and Dr. Joseph Rentz, the other members of my committee.

I would like to acknowledge and thank Ann Reed and Peggy Wilkinson, who are excellent computer consultants, for the hours of patient computer guidance they spent with me.

I would also like to lovingly acknowledge the support of my parents, Helen and Larry O'Connor, whose consistent love and faith in me throughout my lifetime have made it possible for me to reach for and attain my dreams. My family members and friends deserve a special thank-you for all their encouragement.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my fiance, Daniel Cordaro, who has lovingly supported me in all my endevors, most especially this one. His years of generous and devoted love, support, encouragement, sacrifices, enthusiastic involvement in my academic career and my life, and his wonderful sense of humor have been a mainstay for me for which I am deeply grateful.

ABSTRACT

Within the literature addressing on-site corporate child care, it has been widely claimed by researchers and businesses alike, that the presence of an on-site child care center in a corporation will lower employee absenteeism and tardiness, and increase retention and recruitment.

This study used existing data from one health-care corporation to discover if there were similarities or differences in perceptions between employers and employees regarding their company's benefits of on-site corporate child care. Differences in perceptions between the groups was discovered and further analysis of the data was performed. By using the demographic variables of age, gender, marital status, education level, and income of department-heads and/or parent/employees, fifteen research hypotheses were tested against ten potential benefits of on-site corporate child care to determine if demographic characteristics might explain the differing perceptions between the two groups of individuals. The ten potential benefits of on-site child care which might be perceived as improved due to the availability of the child care were: recruitment of new employees, quality of work, level of productivity, retention of existing employees, absenteeism, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, company's relationship with the community, and customer service.

The analysis revealed that employers and employees do have differing perceptions about the improvement level of the potential benefits of on-site child care. The demographic variables which had the greatest impact on differing perceptions were: gender, age, education level, and marital status. The four potential benefits which consistently received the most favorable responses, for both department-heads and parent/employees, due to the availability of on-site child care were: level of productivity, retention of employees, morale, and job satisfaction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A major phenomenon in our country over the past two decades has been the increasing number of women who have become gainfully employed outside the home. Government and social science projections indicate that by the year 2000, women will account for one-half of the entire work force and two-thirds of the labor force growth. By the turn of the century, two of every three newly created jobs will be filled by women (Women's Bureau, 1990). In order for American employers to remain competitive in the marketplace, they have had to adapt to the changes in the work force.

The impact of these work force changes is felt by workers, families, and employers. The continued reliance on women in the work force has influenced many employers to expand or adjust their personnel and benefits policies to meet the needs of the changing labor force. One critical reason for the policy changes has been the growth of working mothers. In March, 1988, there were nearly 33 million women who had children under the age of 18 and 65% of those mothers were participating in the labor force. That means that approximately 34 million children had mothers who were working or seeking employment (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1989). Several employers have altered their work policies or developed child care assistance programs to make it easier for parents to balance their work and family responsibilities. Employer's reasons for accommodating their policies to worker/family stresses is not entirely altruistic on their part. They have discovered many problems employees face in arranging care for their children's care may result in employee absenteeism, tardiness, low morale, and productivity problems (Sher & Brown, 1989; Braddy, 1989; Wayne & Burud, 1986).

From the employer's point of view, it is in their best business interests to try to maintain and even raise production levels by serving the needs of their employees. Providing child care benefits to employees is one option of family benefit packages that is available to employers. There are an array of child care benefit options for employers to offer depending upon the employee's needs and the employer's resources. The options include a resource and referral service, a family day care system, an on-site or near-site child care center, a consortium, sick child care, the vendor system, the voucher system, flexible benefits plan, or flexible work policies. The number of child care programs corporations are offering is steadily increasing; about 4,300 companies were offering some form of child care assistance in 1990, compared with 600 companies in 1982 (Smith, A., 1990). For the purpose of this study, the focus remained on the child care benefit option of on-site corporate child care centers.

Research Question

Although it is vital in research to determine the relationships and correlations of factors accounting for the validity of theories and concepts, it is equally important to determine any discrepancies that may exist within the theory. Current studies of corporate-sponsored child care contend that when an on-site child care benefit was provided for employees and utilized, the outcome for employers is a decrease in employee absenteeism, tardiness, and an increase in employee retention and recruitment (Swerdlin, 1990; Yalow, 1990; Ransom, 1989). The purpose of this study is to compare the perceptions of employees and employers regarding the benefits of their own on-site child care center and to determine if there are differences in their perceptions, and to analyze how those perceptions might impact the effectiveness of the current employee benefit.

Definition of Terms

Perception. For the purpose of this study the term, "perception," will be defined to clarify its use and determine its conceptual boundaries in this context. Shuster and Ashburn stated that "perception is selective and it is each individual's representation or image of reality" (1986). Perception is influenced not only by the data available through the senses, but also by the cognitions that guide one's interpretation of this stimulation (Small, 1990). Melinda Small posited a "top-down and bottom-up" analysis of perception (1990). A bottom-up analysis of perception proceeds from the elements of the stimulation to the rules for organizing the elements into a whole. A top-down analysis focuses on how our cognitions affect our perceptions (Small, 1990). Webster's New World Dictionary defines perception as, "insight or intuition, or the faculty for these; the understanding, knowledge, etc. gotten by perceiving, or a specific idea, concept, or impression so formed" (1988). It is important to this study that the term "perception" not be loosely associated with the term "attitude." A person's attitude toward something or someone in particular is best defined as, "a manner of acting, thinking, or feeling that shows one's disposition, opinion, or mental set" (Webster, 1988). The use of the term "perception" most clearly explains the way in which corporate-sponsored child care is viewed by employers and employees as a company benefit.

Benefit. The term, "benefit," is defined for these purposes as, "anything contributing to an improvement in condition" (Webster, 1988). An employee benefit is seen as positively contributing to the improvement of the employee's quality of life which, therefore in theory, contributes to the company's level of productivity and employee retention and loyalty.

On-Site Corporate Child Care Center. A child care facility which provides a structured curriculum geared to the physical, intellectual, and social needs of children that is located on or near company grounds and is provided by the company for its employees' use.

Department-Head. An individual holding the employment position of department-head is simultaneously fulfilling the role of an employee of the company and also an employer to those working directly under them in the various departments they supervise. In this study, department-heads are referred to as employers because they hold direct administrative positions over the employees they supervise who are the parent/employees. For brevity's sake, the term department-head will hereafter be referred to as DH.

Parent/Employee. An individual holding the employment position of parent/employee is an employee who has one or more children enrolled in the company's child care center. These employees work in various departments within the company and are supervised by DHs. In this study, the DH supervisors are referred to as the employers of the parent/employees. The term parent/employee will hereafter be referred to as PE.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Employers offer child care benefits to employees to help them balance their work and family responsibilities. Previous studies have shown that employees having child care problems result in higher rates of employee absenteeism, tardiness, lower morale, and lower job retention (Chapman, 1987; Ransom, 1989; Smith, 1989; Wayne & Burud, 1986). These negative results are believed to lower productivity and profits, so companies are investing in the care of employees' needs with child care programs in order to maintain productivity and competitiveness in the marketplace. Harvey Freeman of American Express told a Senate subcommittee, "The cost of improving our child care capabilities will be high, I can assure you, but the cost of not doing this is prohibitive--both in terms of our future quality of life and sheer ability to compete" (Sher & Brown, 1989).

Numerous studies regarding the effectiveness of on-site child care have been conducted (Braddy, 1989; Chapman, 1987; Ransom, 1989; Sher & Brown, 1989; Smith, 1989; Swerdlin, 1990; Wayne & Burud, 1986). Many claim results of lower rates of employee absenteeism and tardiness, and higher rates of employee retention and recruitment by offering on-site child care to their employees. They reached these claims by using varied methodologies. Some studies compared changed employee behavior between users and non-users of on-site centers (Lucas, 1987;

Weissman, 1987). Studies have also surveyed the employer's perceptions of how profitable the program is in decreasing work time lost and increasing employee recruitment and retention (Braddy, 1989; Cohen, 1991; Dietsch, 1982; Swerdlin, 1990). Other studies have concentrated on the employee's perceptions of how well on-site child care is serving their needs and, therefore, helping the company's bottom line (Wayne & Burud, 1986). Employee attitudes toward work after a certain amount of time spent participating in on-site child care are measured for the purpose of revealing a positive attitudinal change toward the company resulting in increased loyalty and dedication to the company (Ransom, 1989). An increase in employee morale and productivity is also considered to be an important benefit from on-site child care (Braddy, 1989; Kossek, 1992; Swerdlin, 1990).

The relevant literature addressing on-site corporate child care is generally divided into two categories: research studies and survey findings exploring employees' perceptions of the benefits of on-site child care, and survey results and anecdotal reports of employers' perceptions of the corporations' bottom line benefits from offering on-site child care to their employees. Within this review of the literature, employees' and employers' perceptions of on-site child care and the methodologies used to obtain that information were examined, together with, one study that compared the perceptions of employees and employers.

Employee's Perceptions

Employees' perceptions of the benefits that may be derived from the use of on-site child care have generally been collected from in-house surveys by corporations which either conducted the surveys themselves, or hired the job out to a consulting firm. The majority of corporations who sponsor on-site child care have a large percentage of women as employees within the childbearing age of 23 - 38 years of age, such as banks and hospitals. Therefore, the respondents to many of the in-house surveys are predominately women. This results in a consistent lack of perceptions from male employees. The sample size within these studies is another factor which must be considered when questioning the validity of the surveys and the responses. Although a corporation may employ thousands of people, their child care centers generally are only large enough to accommodate 60 - 100 children. This means, that if a survey is only distributed to the parent/employees of the 60 - 100 children, the amount of data collected after factoring the true response rate from individuals can be quite small considering the survey might have come from a large corporation.

Furthermore, the content and amount of information available for public review from companies is controlled by the discretion of corporation leaders. Very often, the only available data for review about the employees' perceptions of their own corporate child care center is quite positive in nature. To gain an understanding of the differing perceptions employees may have concerning on-site child care, the following section reports findings from in-house corporate surveys and academic surveys designed to answer specific research questions of employees' perceptions of the benefits that may be derived from corporate-sponsored child care.

One glimpse of the productivity costs comes from recent book, Childcare and Corporate Productivity, by John P. Fernandez, a manager of personnel services at AT&T. Fernandez found that 77% of women and 73% of men he surveyed take time away from work attending to their children - making phone calls, ducking out for a long lunch to see their children. That alone translates into hundreds of millions of dollars in lost output for U.S. corporations (Chapman, 1987).

Ellen Galinsky, director of Work and Family Life Studies, who designed a nationwide survey for Fortune, surveyed 400 men and women with children under 12 to study the relationship between child care problems and productivity and it was conducted in coordination with New York's Bank Street College of Education and Gallup Organization. The study asked questions addressing child care, stress symptoms, and job satisfaction and how these anxieties carry over into the workplace. Galinsky wrote, "Our major finding is that problems with child care are the most significant predictors of absenteeism and unproductive time at work." Within the survey it was reported by working parents that 59% of women and 38% of men missed at least one workday in the past three months due to family obligations (Chapman, 1987). The data did not reveal the employment positions of the employees that were surveyed, such as, whether they were a mixture of all levels of employees, including supervisors or managers, or whether they were all general employees.

One study's focus was to determine if employee child care difficulties were related to absenteeism (Lucas, 1987). The case study conducted among 63 employees at a north Dallas bank compared the responses of the general/employees to parent/employees. With regard to productivity, the majority of general/employees experienced difficulty when co-workers had child care problems. Thirty-nine percent of the parent/employees considered leaving their job due to unmet child care needs. A relationship between unmet child care needs and absenteeism could not be deduced from the small amount of data collected. This study did not differentiate between department supervisors and parent/employees. It also did not survey any management persons (Lucas, 1987).

The Union Bank, a $15-billion organization with nearly 170 offices located throughout California, opened the Union Bank Child Care Center in January, 1987. The center serves 60 children from six weeks through five years of age. It is open on a space-available basis to all company employees working in the Los Angeles area. To determine the impact of the Child Care Center on employee absenteeism, maternity leaves, turnover, recruitment, work performance, morale and public relations, data were collected from personnel records and opinion and self-report data. Comparisons of work behaviors of the employees before and after using the program were conducted with the data. The study's results claimed that in the first year the Child Care Center had positive effects across the board--retaining employees, reducing absenteeism, tardiness and maternity leave time; helping to recruit new employees; improving morale and work performance; and providing a significant quantity of favorable publicity for the bank (Ransom, 1989). This study's results did not differentiate between the employment positions of the employees.

Weissman (1987) investigated differences in employee job satisfaction, commitment to organization, and perceived stress when different levels of employer support for child care were provided. Two different companies with numerous sites were used for this study--a pharmaceutical company with two sites and a savings and loan bank with three sites. The pharmaceutical sample had two types of employees from the sites--those who used an on-site child care center and those who did not have one available to them. The savings and loan sample had three types of employees from the different sites--those who used an on-site center, those who did not have a center available to them, and those who planned to open their own center in the near future. Women comprised the entire sample from all the sites combined. The two pharmaceutical samples combined consisted of 36 women, mean age of 32 years, employed an average of 6 years at the company, 42% had college degrees, 27% had graduate degrees, 83% were married, the majority earned over $30,000 annually, and 86% of the sample were Caucasian. The three savings and loan samples combined consisted of 148 women, mean age of 30 years, 63% had a high school diploma, 75% were married, 71% earned over $20,000 annually, and 57% of the sample were Caucasian. The analysis of the pharmaceutical employees found the group of employees receiving on-site child care reported greater job satisfaction than the group receiving no child care. There was no significant difference between groups with respect to organizational commitment or perceived stress. The analysis of the savings and loan employees found the group receiving on-site child care reported greater job satisfaction than the group receiving no child care or the group anticipating a child care center. There was also no significant difference between any of the three groups with respect to organizational commitment or perceived stress. This study did not compare responses between differing employment levels of employees.

Through various surveys the Marriott Corporation discovered many of its employees had young children and the employees ranked child care very high on a list of preferred amenities. Marriott found child care programs were an effective way to recruit and retain its workforce (Ransom, 1989).

In 1984, Mercy Hospital of Bakersfield, California conducted a survey of the hospital's employees who use the child care center to measure the effects of the center on employment factors such as recruitment, absenteeism, tardiness, turnover, productivity, and morale. A total of 83 employees used the center and 50 employees completed the survey. The results of the study indicated that recruitment was enhanced by the child care center. Thirty-four percent of the respondents reported that the child care center was a factor in accepting a position at Mercy. The hospital stated it saved approximately $84,000 in turnover costs alone because 17% of the respondents reported that they would have left the hospital if not for the child care center. Absenteeism was reduced because of the center; over half (54%) of the responding parents said the center reduced the amount of missed time from work. Tardiness was also reduced; 64% said the center made it easier to be on time. Forty-two percent said the center improved their productivity. Fifty-four percent said the center improved their morale, and 28% said they felt it had a direct impact on the quality of patient care they delivered (Wayne & Burud, 1986). The data available for this review did not describe a comparison of responses among the employment positions of the employees.

These survey findings illustrate the numerous ways in which a survey may be conducted, from a single company in-house survey, through consulting firms, or through coordination with colleges and universities, to surveying one company location or one company with many sites, or surveying many different companies at different sites. The methods of targeting specific population samples vary also, from comparing men and womens' perceptions, examining womens' perceptions only, to surveying child care users only, or comparing the responses of child care users and non-users.

The two characteristics all these different surveys have in common is the search for employees' perceptions of the benefits that may be derived from their use of corporate-sponsored child care, and the lack of data available for review and/or the lack of comparisons between the different employment positions of the employees surveyed. According to the employees from the previously mentioned survey results, the perceived benefits most consistently found from participating in an on-site child care center for the employees and their companies are: increased recruitment of new employees, an increased retention of present employees, lowered absenteeism, increased morale and productivity, and greater job satisfaction.

Employer's Perceptions

Employer's perceptions of the benefits that may be obtained by offering on-site child care to their employees are often anecdotal accounts praising the corporation's bottom-line savings from offering this benefit. The majority of information from administrators concerning the effects of on-site child care are self-reports from the administrators themselves, and/or their interpretations of their own in-house survey. Too few times is the employee personnel information, that is readily available to the employers, compared to the perceptual responses of employee surveys to ensure the validity of their findings. If, in fact, this process has been performed, the employers have failed to mention it in their reports of the company benefits derived from offering on-site child care. The methods used by employers in obtaining their data are very general, sometimes vague, and often, not mentioned at all.

The statements and survey results reported in the following section comprise a number of the perceptions employers have toward the company benefits that may be derived from sponsoring an on-site child care center.

Chapman (1987) reported the issue of who should take care of the children is fast emerging as the number one source of executive guilt. Management psychologists agree that nothing tugs more insistently at executive psyches these days than the fear of shortchanging the kids. Corporations are beginning to discover that more and more of their most valued employees are willing to sacrifice work time, productivity, and possibly even careers to devote themselves to family matters.

A recent national survey conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics found that only 2 percent of all companies with 10 or more employees sponsor an on- or near-site day care center (Swerdlin, 1990).

Paula Kay Braddy is the Administrative Nursing Coordinator at Potomac Hospital in Woodbridge, Virginia. She evaluated child care alternatives as an employee benefit and published her report in the Health Care Supervisor. She found the United States is the only industrialized nation in the world without national family policies on child care and remains the only industrialized nation that does not provide national government support for child care. Child care problems have a negative impact on businesses by increasing production costs and decreasing output. According to Braddy, hospitals are the largest providers of on-site child care, with more than 400 hospital-based centers. For an employer, all ongoing costs related to the child care center are deductible as business expenses, because the center has a direct bearing on absenteeism, turnover, and recruitment and it has been found that employers with child care facilities report a 23% to 65% decrease in turnover (Braddy, 1989). The study results did not specify if the employees surveyed occupied different employment positions in the company.

Katherine E. Smith is the president of First Management Services, a human resource consulting and training company in Stamford, Connecticut. Her clients include publishers, manufacturers, banks, service, insurance, and high-tech companies. She stated, "Lost time from work because of day-care and family-related emergencies is the single largest culprit in today's corporate world." She has found that one out of three sick days taken by a working parent is actually due to child-related illnesses that prevent the child from attending school. In addition, an average of eight sick days related to child care problems are taken each year by either the mother or father (Smith, 1989).

The oldest operating corporate child care center is run by The Stride Rite Corporation in Boston. It began in 1971 and enrolls 50 children aged two to six years old. They opened another center in 1983 for employees in Cambridge. Karen Leibold, Stride Rite director of program development for the child care centers wrote, "The centers help the shoe company with recruitment and retention. People who take jobs here stay because of the child care center....It helps productivity and morale" (Swerdlin, 1990). Data were not available as to how these results were found.

The SAS Institute is a North Carolina based privately-owned software company that has 1500 employees which opened its on-site child care center in 1982. It has been stated by a SAS spokesperson that having children on-site and visible allows the parents to relax and leaves them stress-free. "The program has contributed to low turnover and high productivity," according to the spokesperson (Cohen, 1991).

In a report from Sher & Brown (1989), a group of companies calculated their savings due to employee participation in on-site child care. PCA Inc., a photography company, has reported $30,000 in annual recruitment savings. Nyloncraft has reported a drop in its turnover rate from 55 percent to under 10 percent. Intermedics found a tardiness and absenteeism savings of 15,000 work hours in a year. None of these companies stated how they measured and obtained these results.

The Sioux Valley Hospital in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, reported a savings of $250 million in turnover and absenteeism after implementing a child care center (Braddy, 1989).

JoAnne Brandes, labor and employment counsel for Johnson Wax, stated that enhanced recruitment is not the only motivation behind their on-site child care program. "We did it because it is an overall part of our wellness program" (Swerdlin, 1990).

At Campbell Soup Co.'s headquarters in Camden, New Jersey, Jane Everwine, supervisor of employee services, reported that its on-site child care facility has worked well for seven years. Campbell has seen reduced turnover, less absenteeism, easier recruitment of new employees and the public image of a company that cares for families is an important marketing tool (Sher & Brown, 1989).

Dominion Bankshares in Roanoke, Virginia have also opened their own on-site child care center. High turnover is traditionally rampant in the banking industry.

By meeting the child care needs of employees, Dominion is seeing increased productivity and decreased turnover. In the first year and half of the center's operation, turnover fell by 31 percent (Swerdlin, 1990).

Braddy (1989) stated, "With the increasing difficulty of finding quality child care, an on-site center has a positive effect on employee morale. Firms providing child care assistance to employees reported a 90% increase in morale." Braddy did not state how morale was measured.

In their Work and Family Resource Kit, The Department of Labor (1990) lists the assets of on-site corporate child care centers as: strong recruitment tool, creates a strong public image, retains employees who may be concerned about locating a site for care and enhances the employee's ability to work.

Margery Leveen Sher is principal at Fried & Sher Inc., a child care management and consulting firm in Herndon, Virginia. She has used the results from a 1988 survey, Child Care: A Workforce Issue, a Report of the Secretary's Task Force, U.S. Department of Labor that statistically reports the positive effects of child care programs for corporations, to confirm her findings of the benefits of corporate child care. The survey of 178 businesses found that child care programs positively affect morale (90 percent), recruitment (85 percent), public relations (85 percent), and employee work satisfaction (83 percent) (Sher & Brown, 1989).

Galinsky & Stein (1990) found two studies that have looked at companies' perceptions of the benefits of corporate child care programs. In a study of 58 employers, predominately hospitals with an on-site center, 88% indicated that the program increased their ability to attract employees, 72% noted lower absenteeism, and 65% felt that it improved employees' attitude toward the employer. In another study of 204 companies with child care programs, employers ranked the top benefits as improved ability to recruit and improved morale, and 85% felt public relations had been more positive (Galinsky & Stein, 1990).

A 1986 Small Business Report article stated that "a working parent on average misses one week of work each year because of child care problems." The statistic was based on a survey by Child Care Systems Inc., a Pennsylvania-based child care information and referral firm. The reasons include sick children, transportation problems, and school holidays. It was also noted that working parents lose an additional eight work hours per year because of early departures or late arrivals, according to a U.S. Census Bureau study (Nika, 1989).

In 1982, Carla Dietsch used a survey questionnaire of Fortune 500 companies, 50 unions, and 92 general employers providing child care support to obtain employer-supported child care information. The responding sample consisted of 139 Fortune 500 company officers, 4 union officials, and 27 general employers providing child care. Ninety-three percent of the sample had child care centers that had existed anywhere from 1 to 10 years. Eighty-five percent of the sample employed 4,000 people or more. Although a high percentage of respondents cited employer benefits resulting from corporate-sponsored child care, only 4% reported actual observation of employer benefits. From the 4% of company leaders actually observing employer benefits, the following statistics were cited by them as effects of corporate-sponsored child care: decreased absenteeism (44%), improved morale (39%), decreased turnover (31%), increased loyalty (29%), and improved attitude for work and toward organization (23%) (Dietsch, 1982).

A research study from the School of Labor and Industrial Relations compared supervisor perceptions of performance and absenteeism and employee attitudes of 155 child care users and waiting list employees. The employees' surveys were mailed to them and 92% of the respondents were female. The supervisors were interviewed on the phone and 57% of the respondents were male. The focus of this study was for supervisors to rate the absenteeism and work performance levels of two groups of employees; those who used on-site child care and those who did not. The surveyed attitudes of the employees concerning their views of their own absenteeism and work performance levels with regard to being on-site users or non-users were compared to their supervisors' attitudes of their levels of absenteeism and work performance. The study suggested that child care benefits are more likely to significantly affect employee attitudes and membership behaviors such as recruitment and retention than performance or absenteeism. Users of the center were significantly more likely to hold positive attitudes toward managing their work and family responsibilities and were significantly less likely to experience problems with child care. "Thus, child care benefits may be viewed as creating a favorable climate conducive to enabling good performance by alleviating problems and allowing employees to focus on their jobs", stated Kossek (1992). However, comparisons of the supervisors' and employees' perceptions of the benefits of corporate-sponsored child care were not mentioned, and were not performed.

"Child care will become the new benefit of the 1990s," says Michael Conway, president of America West Airlines. "It's a critical need that companies that can afford it will meet because it's the right thing to do. Even companies that have limited means may be forced to support child care from a competitive standpoint, to attract, retain and motivate personnel" (Yalow, 1990).

The perceptions of employers toward the possible benefits that may be derived from offering on-site corporate-sponsored child care to their employees are very positive. In fact, industry leaders are becoming convinced from their own experiences as well as those of their peers that a family-responsive company benefit such as, on-site child care, calculates into significant bottom-line results. The employers appear to have reached a consensus of the benefits that are attained with the utilization of corporate-sponsored child care as an increase in recruitment of new employees, retention of present employees, morale, productivity, job satisfaction, image in the community and a decrease in absenteeism and tardiness.

Although the findings appear impressive and significant, the validity of the reports are somewhat questionable since methods used to obtain the data, such as survey designs or distribution methods are rarely mentioned, and the number and gender of the respondents to these surveys is often missing in the reports. This may occur because many of the survey findings get reduced to fit into a management type magazine that other corporate leaders most likely subscribe to, or often only the perceptual significance of the benefit or significant survey results are released to the press by high-profile industry leaders. When in-house surveys are conducted, corporate leaders are often reluctant to release all the information acquired in the survey. For instance, in the entire section devoted to the survey results of employers' perceptions, the methods used to compute the actual dollar amount of savings due to the provision of child care as an employee benefit is not revealed.

The next section explores one study that compared the perceptions between employers and employees regarding the benefit of on-site corporate-sponsored child care. The subjects, methods and procedures of the study are examined.

One Comparison of Employee's and Employer's Perceptions

To date only one dissertation has compared perceptions of the benefits of on-site child care between employers and employees (Gampel, 1990). The study examined employers' and parent-workers' perceptions of the impact of corporate-sponsored on-site centers for the young (COSY). Four areas regarding COSY were addressed: impact on corporate life, meeting the workers' needs, perceived cost factors, and establishment of the COSY. The population sampled for this study were 43 institutions in Florida, ranging in business interests from health-related fields to a shrimp processing plant, which were identified as having COSYs. The human resource directors from the institutions were surveyed by a mailed questionnaire. Thirty-three institutions responded to the survey. Two of the institutions, which were hospitals, were targeted for more in-depth research. The human resource directors (employers) were surveyed and interviewed, and the employees (parent-workers) whose children were enrolled in the two hospitals' COSYs were surveyed. The employers' surveys were mailed to them and three follow-up requests for responses were initiated. The 185 parent-worker surveys were given to the directors of the child care centers, who, in turn, gave the surveys to the children to carry home to their parents. This survey received one follow-up letter, and a reminder for parents was posted on the door of the child care center. From those surveys, 135 of them reached the parents and 63 of the parents responded. With respect to the COSYs, among the 33 responding companies the average range of children's ages in the centers was from 6 weeks to 12 years old. The hours of operation of the COSYs among the companies ranged from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight. The mean year of establishment of the 33 COSYs was 1989.

Within the survey is one question that lists 20 possible effects that a COSY could have on corporate climate. The question was, "Which of the following do you think best describes your perception of these possible effects?" The respondent had five choices of answers to choose from given in this order: Strongly Agree, Agree, Unknown, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. The results of the study claim that employers and parent-workers perceived the COSYs as having a positive impact on the following aspects of corporate climate: company image, recruitment, morale, employee stress, job satisfaction, overtime capabilities, absenteeism, community relations, return from parental leave, turnover, and productivity (Gampel, 1990). A significant difference was found between perceptions of employers and parent-workers where the parent-workers' responses displayed a much more positive attitude towards the impact of the COSYs than the employers perceived them to have. The qualitative comments from the employers and the parent-workers obtained from the blank page in the survey provided for comments revealed that 7 employers out of 33 wrote extra comments, whereas 31 out of 63 parent-workers wrote in comments on their surveys.

Gampel found, "Parent-workers' responses were usually much more enthusiastic in regard to the COSY than the employer respondents" (1990).

Statistical evidence to support these findings was illustrated by use of median tests that were performed on 20 survey items to determine if there was a significant difference between the responses of the employers and the parent-workers. Gampel stated, "A significant difference was found in 16 of the 20 items analyzed. In most items, parent-workers strongly agreed or agreed with the effects in greater numbers than did their employers" (1990). According to the median test chart provided, there were only 4 items that lacked statistical difference between the employers and parent-workers perceptions, but the chart lacked labels for all 20 items so a complete interpretation of Gampel's findings is not possible to obtain. Gampel also stated that the amount of qualitative comments written on the surveys supported the claim that parent-workers responded more positively and in greater numbers to the survey items than did the employers. Within the survey, the employers and parent-workers were also asked to rank which items had the most significant effect on corporate climate due to the use of COSY. Employers ranked recruitment first, enhanced company image second, and enhanced company morale third as the most significant effects of having COSY on corporate climate. The parent-workers ranked increased job satisfaction first, recruitment was second, and enhanced company image was ranked third as the most significant effects COSY had on corporate climate.

According to Gampel, the COSY was perceived by employers and parent-workers to have a positive influence on the following aspects of corporate climate: company image, recruitment, morale, employee stress, job satisfaction, overtime capabilities, absenteeism, community relations, return from parental leave, turnover, and productivity. Although these items were perceived by both groups to have a positive influence on corporate climate due to COSY, Gampel stated that the parent-workers responses were much more positive towards these items than were the employers (1990).

While the scope of Gampel's study was admirable, surveying 43 institutions, the findings are somewhat unclear. It was stated that two institutions in particular were studied in-depth by surveys and interviews of human resource directors and parent-employees. Given that most institutions only hire one or two human resource directors per institution, depending on the size of the institution, does that mean the results of the employer (human resource directors) section were obtained from only two to possibly four employers within the two targeted institutions? Or did Gampel collapse all the employer responses from the 33 responding institutions and compare those responses to the 63 responding parent-workers from the two institutions that were studied in-depth? The premise of surveying employers' and employees' perceptions of a corporate benefit can be scientifically sound, yet the procedures and results of Gampel's study appear to be somewhat questionable and unclear.

Although much is known about work/family problems, little has been concluded about optimal work/family solutions to the care of young children. "A major reason for this discrepancy in knowledge is the lack of interest among corporations in systematic evaluations for their own benefit programs" (Galinsky & Stein, 1990). Child care researcher, Thomas Miller, stated, "Well planned evaluations with proper controls appear to be absent" (1984). Miller also wrote, "Despite enthusiasm by some chief executive officers, public relations officials and child care advocates, assertions that employer-sponsored child care reduces workers' absenteeism or tardiness, or that it increases workers' productivity or job satisfaction are not supported by credible research" (1984). Finally, child care literature researcher, Joan Aldous, reported that small samples, one-time surveys, and lack of comparison groups are only some of the weaknesses that make other authors in this field wary of the occasional positive findings (1990).

CHAPTER III

PILOT STUDY

Purpose of Pilot Study

It is important to add to this growing literature regarding corporate-sponsored child care so that a greater understanding of the impact and effectiveness of corporate-sponsored child care centers may be determined. The anticipated effectiveness of these programs is potentially crucial for company executive decision-making processes when employee benefit packages are being designed and implemented. Therefore, it is imperative that more precise studies measure and analyze the perceived benefits of corporate-sponsored child care by comparing the employers' and employees' perceptions to determine how well the program is serving the needs of the employees and companies for which they work. With this need in mind, a pilot study was conducted with a hospital in the southeast region of the United States for the purposes of examining the perceptions of employers and employees in regard to their own child care benefit. It was important to determine if there were any similarities or differences in perceptions so the meanings of those similarities/differences could be examined for whether or not they affect the success or failure of this type of employee benefit.

The basis for the survey and analysis of this particular health-care organization originated with a 1991 formal proposal submitted to the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., for solicitation of funding a research study of the hospital's data regarding costs and benefits, if any, from employer-sponsored child care arrangements. The proposal was entitled, "Cost/Benefit Analysis of Hospital Sponsored Child Care Centers." The focus of the proposed research was to determine whether or not employer-sponsored child care arrangements are beneficial both to employers as well as employees. This proposal represented a joint effort of The University of Tennessee College of Human Ecology, The Center for Business and Economic Research, The University of Tennessee Medical Center, and two area hospitals. This original proposal was not funded by the Department of Labor, but a University of Tennessee administrator agreed to fund the work of this investigator to explore how the hospital personnel, both DHs and PEs, from one area hospital perceive benefits that may or may not accrue from the health-care facility's on-site child care center. The area hospital in question agreed to participate in this new single research design in order to determine their employees' perceived benefits of their on-site child care center, The Child Enrichment Center (CEC). (See Appendix A for letters of agreement and approval).

Subjects For Pilot Study

The 142 subjects in the data collected for the health-care unit divided into two groups: 62 PEs and 80 DHs. All were surveyed by this investigator to determine what benefits may or may not accrue from the provision of on-site corporate-sponsored child care. The 62 PEs worked in various departments within the corporation, and at the time of the survey had one or more children enrolled in the company's on-site child care facility. These PEs comprised the entire population of employees using the child care facility. The 80 DHs were the total population of administrators in charge of the departments within which the PEs worked. Of the 142 subjects who were surveyed, 97 total responses were received from 39 PEs (36 females; 3 males) and 58 DHs (41 females; 17 males).

Survey Instrument For Pilot Study

The design of the survey instruments used in the pilot study resulted from a series of meetings with the hospital administrators, the hospital's child care center directors, and the hospital Parent Advisory Board to determine what issues they wanted addressed in the surveys. The development of survey questions resulted from the requests issued in these meetings, this investigator's research of previous studies addressing corporate-sponsored child care, and the council of three University of Tennessee professors: Dr. Connie Steele, Professor and Head of The Department of

Child and Family Studies; Dr. Joseph Rentz, Associate Professor in Marketing; and Dr. Debbie Tegano, Associate Professor in Child and Family Studies. The hospital's administrators, center directors, and Parent Advisory Board all provided feedback for survey revisions; and the Administrative Council of the hospital approved the final versions of the surveys before their distribution.

Previously tested corporate child care surveys were utilized in the design of these surveys to provide further rationale for the inclusion of particular questions (Dietsch, 1982; Gampel, 1990; Goff, 1989; Lucas, 1987; Weissman, 1987).

Within the pilot study's survey of the hospital's DH and PE perceptions of potential benefits by provision of employees' child care, not only were the previous studys' major variables of absenteeism, tardiness, retention, and recruitment addressed, but also, six additional variables of quality of work, level of productivity, morale of personnel, job satisfaction, relationship of community and this company and customer service were of particular interest for further investigation. The survey question involving these variables asked, "In your opinion, which of the following items do you think have improved due to the availability of CEC services?"

Pilot Study Procedures

The two groups of employees, 80 DHs and 62 PEs, received a survey designed specifically for their group. The DH survey was grey-colored, in booklet form and photographically reduced to 69% of full-sized paper, consisted of 9 pages including the cover letter, asked 23 questions regarding corporate child care, 10 demographic questions, and 1 blank page for comments. The PE survey was cream-colored, in booklet form and photographically reduced to 69% of full-sized paper, consisted of 8 pages including the cover letter, asked 18 questions regarding corporate child care, 10 demographic questions, and 1 blank page asking for any additional comments concerning the child care center. Each survey asked the same questions about using on-site corporate child care, except the DHs' survey contained an additional five questions concerning administrative issues. Both surveys contained a cover letter that explained what the survey was about, who issued it, amount of time needed for their participation: 7-10 minutes, a statement of consent ("By completing this questionnaire, you are giving your consent to participate"), and a voluntary participation statement ("Participation in this study is completely voluntary and refusal to participate will involve no penalty to you"). To insure confidentiality, the cover letter specifically asked that the respondent not put a name on the survey. (See Appendix B for survey and note).

The survey for the 80 DHs was distributed during a mandatory monthly departmental meeting at the area hospital in question. The DHs had been previously notified in their meeting agenda of this investigator's attendance to the meeting for the purpose of distributing the survey. Permission had been granted for this investigator to be brought into the meeting during the last 15 minutes by the Vice President of the hospital to be introduced to the group by him, to distribute the surveys, and to be available to the group to answer any of their questions while they completed the survey. The subjects were verbally informed that the choice to participate was purely voluntary on their part and, if they chose not to participate, they could drop the unanswered survey into the box provided. When the DHs completed the survey, they were asked to drop it into a sealed box by the door of the room on their way out of the meeting. The provided box was a 20"x12"x16" wooden container that was padlocked. The sealed box was taken to Dr. Connie Steele's office at The University of Tennessee where it remained until it was required to enter the data into a computer.

The survey for the 62 PEs was distributed one week after they received a post card at their corporate child care center requesting their response to the survey. (See Appendix C for post card). The post card informed them of the days and provisions at the area hospital where they could fill out the survey. The director of the child care center agreed to distribute the post cards to the parents. She also agreed to provide a room at the center where the parents could respond to the survey, on one of three self-chosen evenings, when they came to collect their children at the end of the day. The director supervised their children while the PEs went into the provided room, completed the survey, and dropped it into the aforementioned sealed box that was also used in this procedure. The subjects were verbally informed that the decision to participate was purely voluntary on their part and if they chose not to participate they could drop the unanswered survey into the box. The child care center's director and this investigator were both present during each of the three evenings in question to supervise the procedure and to answer any questions the subjects might have had concerning the survey. When completed, the PE surveys were handled similarly to those collected from the DHs.

Pilot Study Analysis and Results

The purpose of analyzing the data collected in the pilot study was to compare the perceptions from one company's DHs and their PEs regarding the benefits of corporate-sponsored child care. In order to utilize the pilot study's data, the following research hypothesis was tested:

H_1: There will be a significant difference between DHs' and PEs' perceptions with regard to their company's on-site child care center.

Frequency tests were run on each question of the surveys to determine if there were differences in the perceptions between DHs and PEs. There were some significant differences of responses between the two groups of employees, especially in regard to one ten-part question within the DH and PE surveys. The particular question reads as follows: "In your opinion, which of the following items do you think have improved due to the availability of CEC services?" The response choices were: Not Applicable, Not Improved, Slightly Improved, Somewhat Improved, Moderately Improved, or Extremely Improved. The respondents had ten variables by which they could evaluate their perceptions of the benefits or lack of benefits associated with CEC services. The ten variables were: recruitment of new employees, quality of work, level of productivity, retention of competent employees, amount of absenteeism, amount of tardiness, morale of personnel, job satisfaction, relationship of community and FSHS, and customer service.

Comparisons of the responses in the two surveys revealed statistically significant differences ($p<.05$) in opinions between DHs and PEs on six out the ten variables. These comparisons found that DHs and PEs showed no real difference in their perceptions of how recruitment, retention, absenteeism, or tardiness were influenced by the provision of the child care services--but PEs considered all these factors as more important than did DHs. On all other aspects investigating the child care benefits--quality of work, level of productivity, employee morale, job satisfaction, customer service, and relationship of FSRMC to the community, the PEs rated the child care service more positively than did the DHs. (See Figure 1 for comparisons).

Survey question:

In your opinion, which of the following items do you think have improved due to the availability of CEC services?

Choice of responses:

Not Applicable
Not Improved
Slightly Improved
Moderately Improved
Extremely Improved

	Percentage responses of "Moderately/Extremely Improved" regarding child care benefits	
	D.H.	P./E.
Recruitment of employees	47%	55%
Quality of work *	34%	78%
Level of productivity *	52%	81%
Retention of competent employees	64%	86%
Amount of absenteeism	40%	55%
Amount of tardiness	40%	69%
Morale of personnel *	55%	83%
Job satisfaction *	56%	86%
Relationship of community and FSHS *	36%	69%
Customer service *	40%	88%

*Statistically significant difference in opinions between department heads and parent/employees.

Figure 1. Comparison Of Department-Heads And Parent/Employees Evaluations Of Their Child Care Benefits.

CHAPTER IV

RATIONALE FOR FURTHER STUDY

From the analysis and results of the comparison of DH and PE perceptions, that were compiled in the pilot study, this investigator then asked, "What other variables may or may not be related to these differences between DH and PE perceptions of the child care benefit?" In other words, can these responses be compared in ways that would reveal more about the differences of the two groups' perceptions? No previous studies, including Gampel (1990), have investigated how differences in gender, age, marital status, etc., might explain perceptual differences between employers (DHs) and employees (PEs) regarding the benefits of corporate-sponsored child care. Analysis of differences between DH and PE responses using demographics such as age, gender, marital status, education level, and income, could be performed to reveal variables that might impact perceptions of the benefits for corporate-sponsored child care.

Assumptions

This study was based on the assumption that a survey questionnaire would reveal similarities/differences in perceptions among employers and employees regarding their company's benefits of on-site corporate child care. It was also based on the assumption that both employers and employees might perceive differently the variables of recruitment, retention, absenteeism, and tardiness due to the availability of on-site child care. It was assumed that an analysis of employer and employee demographic variables might reveal some significant differences between the groups which could lead to a greater understanding of why the individuals had differing perceptions regarding their own corporate-sponsored child care center.

Furthermore, this study was based on the assumption that the employers and employees were honest and open about revealing their perceptions regarding their own corporate child care center. This assumption was reinforced by researcher assurances to provide anonymity and confidentiality.

Hypotheses For Further Study

By using the demographic variables of DH or PE, age, gender, marital status, education level, and income, the following research hypotheses were tested to determine if demographic characteristics might explain the differing perceptions between the two groups of surveyed individuals.

There will be a difference between perceptions of :

H_1 (1): All DHs and PEs.

H_1 (2): DH females and DH males.

H_1 (3): DH females and PE females.

H_1 (4): DH males and PE females.

H_1 (5): DHs aged 40 years old and younger and DHs over the age of 40 years old.

H_1 (6): DH females aged 40 years old and younger and DH females over the age of 40 years old.

H_1 (7): DHs and PEs aged 40 years old and younger.

H_1 (8): DHs and PEs aged 40 years old and younger and DHs and PEs over the age of 40 years old.

H_1 (9): DHs who are married and PEs who are married.

H_1 (10): DHs and PEs who are married and DHs and PEs who are not married.

H_1 (11): DHs who are married and DHs who are unmarried.

H_1 (12): DHs and PEs who have education levels up to some college and DHs and PEs who have education levels of a college degree or higher.

H_1 (13): DHs and PEs who have a combined family income up to $50,000 and DHs and PEs who have a combined family income over $50,000.

H_1 (14): DH females without children and DH females with children.

H_1 (15): Male and female DHs without children and male and female DHs with children.

The analysis of these hypotheses did find that certain demographic variables appear to provide some explanation for the differentiated perceptions reflected in the responses of the DHs and PEs. The following section is a descriptive analysis of the test results concerning the fifteen research hypotheses.

Results of Further Study Analysis

A T-test and Ranked Means tests were performed for all fifteen hypotheses on each of the ten variables of recruitment, quality, productivity, retention, absenteeism, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service. T-tests were used to obtain the statistical level of significance (.05, .01, .001, or .0001) for differences in perceptions of the benefits of on-site corporate-sponsored child care between DHs and PEs using the fifteen hypotheses and the ten variables of interest. (See Table 1). A Ranked Means test was performed on the fifteen hypotheses to obtain a rank order of the variables scored with the most positive responses from DHs and PEs to determine which variables each group considered to be most improved due to the availability of their on-site child care center. (See Table D-1). A third table has been included using the four highest ranked means to display the pattern of responses from the DHs and PEs to the fifteen hypotheses regarding their perceptions of the benefits of corporate-sponsored child care.(See Table 2).

H_1 (1): There will be a difference between perceptions of all DH vs. all PE. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality of work (.001), level of productivity (.001), morale of personnel (.001), job satisfaction (.001), customer service (.001). However, the four variables ranked highest for DHs and PEs were both ranked in this order: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for PEs were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and

Table 1. T-Test P Values @ < .05 of 15 Hypotheses Against 10 Variables

T-Test P Values @ < .05 of 15 Hypotheses Against 10 Variables										
Hypotheses	Recruit	Quality	Product.	Retain	Absent	Tardy	Morale	Job Sat.	Comm	Service
1. All DH *vs* All PE	--	.0001	.0003	--	--	--	.0007	.0003	--	.0001
2. DH female *vs* DH male	.0590	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. DH female *vs* PE female	--	.0001	.0009	.0055	--	.0303	.0018	.0009	.0263	.0011
4. DH male *vs* PE female	--	.0080	.0169	--	--	--	--	.0327	.0065	.0020
5. DH < 40 *vs* DH > 40	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. DH female < 40 *vs* DH female > 40	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7. DH < 40 *vs* PE < 40	--	.0000	.0002	.0039	--	.0179	.0047	.0056	.0110	.0018
8. DH & PE < 40 *vs* DH & PE > 40	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
9. DH married *vs* PE married	--	.0001	.0003	.0033	--	.0260	.0008	.0003	.0015	.0001
10. DH & PE married *vs* DH & PE unmarried	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
11. DH married *vs* DH unmarried	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 1. (Continued)

Hypotheses	Recruit	Quality	Product.	Retain	Absent	Tardy	Morale	Job Sat.	Comm	Service
12. DH & PE < college *vs* DH & PE > college	--	.0079	.0098	.0417	.0236	.0104	.0001	.0007	.0002	.0014
13. DH & PE < 50,000 *vs* DH & PE > 50,000	--	--	--	--	.0132	.0322	--	--	--	--
14. DH female w/o child *vs* DH female w/child	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15. DH w/o child *vs* DH w/child	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 2. Benefits As Shown By Rank Order Of Means

	Benefits As Shown By Rank Order Of Means									
Hypotheses	Recruit	Quality	Product.	Retain	Absent	Tardy	Morale	Job Sat.	Comm	Service
1. All DH *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
All PE			✓	✓			✓	✓		
2. DH female *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
DH male	✓			✓			✓	✓		
3. DH female *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
PE female			✓	✓			✓	✓		
4. DH male *vs*	✓			✓			✓	✓		
PE female			✓	✓			✓	✓		
5. DH < 40 *vs*				✓	✓		✓	✓		
DH > 40			✓	✓			✓	✓		
6. DH female < 40 *vs*				✓				✓	✓	✓
DH female > 40			✓	✓			✓	✓		
7. DH < 40 *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
PE < 40			✓	✓			✓	✓		
8. DH & PE < 40 *vs*				✓			✓	✓		✓
DH & PE > 40			✓	✓			✓	✓		

Table 2. (Continued)

Hypotheses	Recruit	Quality	Product.	Retain	Absent	Tardy	Morale	Job Sat.	Comm	Service
9. DH married *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
PE married			✓	✓			✓	✓		
10. DH & PE married *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
DH & PE unmarried			✓	✓			✓	✓		
11. DH married *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
DH unmarried			✓	✓			✓	✓		
12. DH & PE < college *vs*				✓			✓	✓		✓
DH & PE > college			✓	✓			✓	✓		
13. DH & PE < 50,000 *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
DH & PE > 50,000			✓	✓			✓	✓		
14. DH female w/o child			✓	✓			✓	✓		
vs DH female w/child			✓	✓					✓	✓
15. DH w/o child *vs*			✓	✓			✓	✓		
DH w/child			✓	✓			✓	✓		

productivity. Yet, the PEs' mean scores were all significantly higher than the DHs' mean scores for these variables.

H_1 (2): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Female vs. DH Male. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variable: recruitment (.05). The four variables ranked highest for DH Females were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for DH Males were: retention, recruitment, morale, and job satisfaction. The DH Males' mean scores all ranked higher than the DH Females' mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (3): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Female vs. PE Female. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality (.001), productivity (.001), retention (.01), tardiness (.05), morale (.01), job satisfaction (.001), community (.05), and service (.01). The four variables ranked highest for DH Females were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for PE Females were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The PE Females' mean scores all ranked higher than the DH Females' mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (4): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Male vs. PE Female. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality (.01), productivity (.05), job satisfaction (.05), community (.01), and service (.01). The four variables ranked highest for DH Males were: retention, recruitment, job satisfaction, and morale. The four variables ranked highest for PE Females were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The PE Females' mean scores all ranked higher than the DH Males' mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (5): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH <40 vs. DH >40. This hypothesis was rejected for all the variables.

H_1 (6): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Female <40 vs. DH Female >40. This hypothesis was rejected for all the variables.

H_1 (7): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH <40 vs. PE <40. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality (.001), productivity (.001), retention (.01), tardiness (.05), morale (.01), job satisfaction (.01), community (.05), and service (.01). The four variables ranked highest for the DHs <40 were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for the PEs <40 were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The PEs' <40 mean scores all ranked higher than the DHs' <40 mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (8): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH & PE <40 vs. DH & PE >40. This hypothesis was rejected for all the variables.

H_1 (9): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Married vs. PE Married. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality (.001), productivity (.001), retention (.01), tardiness (.05), morale (.001), job satisfaction (.001), community (.01), and service (.001). The four variables ranked highest for DH Marrieds were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for PE Marrieds were: retention, job satisfaction, productivity, and morale. The PEs' Married mean scores all ranked higher than the DHs' Married mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (10): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH & PE Married vs. DH & PE Unmarried. This hypothesis was rejected for all the variables.

H_1 (11): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Married vs. DH Unmarried. This hypothesis was rejected for all the variables.

H_1 (12): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH & PE <College vs. DH & PE >College. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: quality (.01), productivity (.01), retention (.05), absenteeism (.05), tardiness (.05), morale (.001), job satisfaction (.001), community (.001), and service (.01). The four variables ranked highest for the DH & PEs <College were: morale, job satisfaction, retention, and service. The four variables ranked highest for the DH & PEs >College were: retention, job satisfaction, productivity, and morale. The DH & PEs' <College mean scores all ranked higher than the DH & PEs' >College mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (13): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH & PE <\$50,000 vs. DH & PE >\$50,000. This hypothesis was accepted for the following variables: absenteeism (.05), and tardiness (.05). The four variables ranked highest for the DH & PEs <\$50,000 were: job satisfaction, morale, retention, and productivity. The four variables ranked highest for the DH & PE >\$50,000 were: retention, job satisfaction, morale, and productivity. The DH & PEs' <\$50,000 mean scores all ranked higher than the DH & PEs' >\$50,000 mean scores for these four variables.

H_1 (14): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Female Without Children vs. DH Female With Children. This hypothesis was rejected for all variables.

H_1 (15): There will be a difference between perceptions of DH Without Children vs. DH With Children. This hypothesis was rejected for all variables.

The results of these analyses reveal that employers and employees do have differing perceptions concerning the potential benefits of corporate-sponsored on-site child care. The demographic variables that had the greatest impact on differing perceptions were: gender, age, education level, and marital status. The four potential benefits that consistently received the most favorable responses, for DHs and PEs, due to the availability of on-site child care were: level of productivity, retention of employees, morale, and job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Conclusions

Previous studies have found that employees having child care problems result in higher rates of absenteeism, tardiness, lower morale, and lower job retention (Chapman, 1987; Ransom, 1989; Smith, 1989; Wayne & Burud, 1986). These negative results are believed to produce lower company profits and productivity, so companies are investing in the care of employees' needs with child care programs in order to maintain productivity and competitiveness in the marketplace. The senior research associate at the Conference Board, Dana Friedman, stated, "Child care is likely to be the fringe benefit of the 1990s, because being sound for employees, it becomes good for business" (Chapman, 1987).

The purpose of this study was to use existing data from a pilot study that found differences between DH's and PE's perceptions concerning on-site corporate child care to examine whether or not the demographic characteristics of age, gender, marital status, education level, or income of the DHs and PEs could explain perceptual similarities/differences between the groups of individuals.

Comparisons of the pilot study's responses revealed statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) in opinions between DHs and PEs on six out the ten variables.

These comparisons found that DHs and PEs showed no real difference in their perceptions of how recruitment, retention, absenteeism, or tardiness were influenced by the provision of the child care services--but PEs considered all these factors as more important than did DHs. On all other aspects investigating the child care benefits--quality of work, level of productivity, employee morale, job satisfaction, customer service, and relationship of FSRMC to the community, the PEs rated the child care service more positively than did the DHs. Gampel (1990) also found a significant difference in perceptions between employers and parent-workers where the parent-workers displayed more positive attitudes towards the impact of COSY than did the employers.

By utilizing the pilot study's findings of differences in perceptions between DHs and PEs, fifteen hypotheses were constructed for further study involving various combinations of the DH's and PE's demographic characteristics that were run on ten variables of interest which included recruitment, quality of work, productivity, retention, absenteeism, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service. These variables of interest are considered to be benefits to employers and employees that may be derived from the availability and use of on-site corporate-sponsored child care centers.

The analysis of the fifteen hypotheses revealed the demographic characteristics that had the greatest impact on differing perceptions were: gender, age, education level, and marital status. The variable, income, did not differentiate between perceptions of employers or employees.

The significance of the gender characteristic was apparent only for the recruitment variable between males and females across both groups. For males, recruitment ranked in second place as the most improved variable due to the availability of on-site child care, whereas, females ranked recruitment in ninth place. The greatest difference in perceptions for gender occurred between DH females and PE females for the variables of quality, productivity, retention, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service. The gender characteristic appeared to have an effect on the females' differing perceptions especially in terms of their employment status, i.e., being a DH or a PE. Consistent with previous research (Kossek, 1992), this study found on-site child care to have a greater impact on females than males. However, the males do not fit the typical sterotype here--they do in fact rank order the variables in much the same way as females, not with the same emphasis, but in the same order. Could it be, that in hospitals where there is a majority of female employees the male DHs are more acculturated into the female perspective than in other male-dominated corporate settings? This may not be characteristic of other corporate structures.

The significance of the age characteristic was revealed between the DHs <40 and PEs <40 for the variables of quality, productivity, retention, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service. All other combinations of hypotheses tested with the age characteristic showed no significant difference in perceptions for any of the variables. The PEs <40 had higher response rates than the DHs <40 for all ten variables. The age of the DHs and PEs appeared to have some effect on their perceptions of the benefits of on-site child care.

The level of education of the respondents revealed significantly differing perceptions on nine out of ten variables. The variable which lacked a significant difference of perception was recruitment. The DHs and PEs with some college or less had higher positive responses than the DHs and PEs with a college degree or more for all ten variables. The level of education for the DHs and the PEs appeared to have some effect on their perceptions. The literature review did not address the demographic characteristic of level of education as having a significant effect on the responses of survey individuals regarding their perceptions of on-site child care.

The significance of marital status was apparent between the perceptions of DH married and PE married respondents for the variables of quality, productivity, retention, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service. All other combinations of hypotheses with the marital status characteristic showed no significant differences in perceptions for any of the variables. The PE married respondents had higher positive responses than the DH married respondents for all ten variables. The marital status of DHs and PEs appeared to have some effect on their perceptions. The literature review did not address the demographic characteristic of marital status as having a significant effect on the responses of survey individuals regarding their perceptions of on-site child care.

In sum, the most significant differences in perceptions regarding the improvement of benefits that may be derived from the availability of on-site corporate-sponsored child care were found between DH and PE married females age forty years or younger. Although the level of education revealed a significant difference in perception, it was tested by grouping the DHs and PEs together as having either some college or less, or a college degree or more. In future studies, it is recommended that the groups of respondents to be surveyed be tested separately for each demographic characteristic for clearer interpretations of the results.

Auerbach (1990) wrote, "Interest in employer-supported child care is most likely among companies that (a) have a high proportion of women; (b) are in the service or finance sectors of the economy; (c) have employees of childbearing age; (d) are nonunionist; (e) offer creative benefits; (f) have relatively "progressive" employment policies and philosophies." The findings from this study closely resemble Auerbach's, from the high proportion of women in this sample; the fact the company surveyed was a hospital--in the service sector; it is nonunionist; and also has a large number of employees of childbearing age.

The four potential benefits of on-site child care that consistently received the most favorable responses, for both DHs and PEs, were: level of productivity, retention of employees, morale, and job satisfaction. These findings differed somewhat with the results of the surveys cited in the literature review. The benefits of sponsoring on-site child care that received the most recognition from employees and employers in the review of the literature were: recruitment, retention, absenteeism, morale, and productivity (Braddy, 1989; Chapman, 1987; Dietsch, 1982; Lucas, 1990; Ransom, 1989; Sher & Brown, 1989; Swerdlin, 1990; Wayne & Burud, 1986). Although this study's results of productivity, morale, and retention matched the findings from the literature review, there were differing perceptions for the variables of absenteeism, recruitment, and job satisfaction. For these three variables, the majority of employers and employees in the literature review perceived absenteeism and recruitment as two of the most important benefits to be derived from the use of on-site child care, and perceive job satisfaction as one of the least important benefits. Contrary to these findings, the DHs and PEs in this study perceived job satisfaction to be one of the most important benefits, and perceived recruitment and absenteeism as the least important benefits derived from the use of on-site child care. Some of these results were confirmed by DHs and PEs in the comment section of the survey (See Figure 2, Appendix E). Several of the DHs decry the use of the on-site center as a recruitment or retention tool with comments such as, "Not large enough for all employees to use," "Not a good recruitment tool when there is an extensive waiting list," "No recruitment advantage when there is no space available." The PEs echoed these sentiments by responding negatively about the lack of space/slots available with some of these comments, "No space when needed," "Expand--let more parents enjoy this benefit," "Only room for eight infants for all the hundreds of F.S. employees." Yet, in terms of the perceived value of the center several PEs said, "The only reason I can continue with my career (is the CEC)," "CEC is the only reason I still work at FSRMC," and "I could not have returned to fulltime work without it." The DHs also commented about the value of sponsoring on-site child care with comments such as, "Very important," "Proud we offer it," and "Offers peace of mind to parents."

In this study, the DH's and PE's perceptions differ on the level of the benefit, but not the fact of the benefits that may be derived from on-site child care. With the PEs' responses to the benefits being more positive than the DH's, could it mean that management is not aware of the level of the employees' needs or the positive feelings from them about the center; and could that lack of awareness result in management being less likely to provide additional funding for the center? These questions also apply to the employers cited in the literature review. Are they accurately assessing the needs of their employees? The perceptual discrepancies between the literature review employers/employees and this study's DHs and PEs warrants further research in future studies that would examine employers' and employees' perceptions of the benefits of on-site corporate-sponsored child care by differentiating between the general employees and the supervisory employees.

According to this review of the literature no previous studies have compared the perceptions of employers and employees regarding the benefits of on-site child care, except for Gampel's (1990) study. Studies such as Ransom's (1989) have compared changes in employee behavior before and after the installation of an on-site child care center, and other studies such as Lucas' (1987) and Weissman's (1987) have compared the differences in perceptions between employee users and non-users of on-site child care centers. Besides this study, Gampel's (1990) is the only study to compare perceptions between employers and employees, but the methods and sample used by Gampel were questionable at best. Gampel's findings were unclear for interpretation, and replication of the study would be very difficult, if at all possible.

The aspects of this study which make contributions to the current on-site child care literature are the methods of comparing employers' and employees' perceptions of the possible benefits that may accrue from the availability and use of on-site corporate-sponsored child care by using the same variables of measurement for both groups (recruitment, quality, productivity, retention, absenteeism, tardiness, morale, job satisfaction, community, and service), using the same survey questions for both groups, surveying nearly equal sample sizes (DH = 80, PE = 62), and differentiating the perceptions of general employees (PEs) from employees with supervisory positions (DHs). Although the sample used in this study was not a random sample, the total populations of all DHs and PEs were surveyed which provides an accurate base from which to obtain a clear understanding of how the employers' and employees' perceptions differ, and what variables may be affecting those differences.

A criticism of some studies about company policy effects on employers and employees stated, "Too often studies have involved "soft" rather than "hard" data: perceptions of effects rather than actual behavioral measures. Thus surveys reported that managers think that X policy or program has effects on absenteeism, recruitment, morale, productivity, and so forth, but such factors are not directly measured" (Raabe, 1990).

In response to that criticism, this researcher found no empirically based theory or model to work from when examining the perceived benefits that may be accrued by the use and availability of an on-site corporate-sponsored child care center. For instance, an empirically-based model that incorporates a relevant management theory such as employee job satisfaction, with a relevant family theory such as the attachment theory, could result in richer data which may reveal further information of how employment affects the family and how the familys' needs affect corporate policies. Until a sound theory and/or model that addresses this issue is fully developed, researchers are virtually on their own when attempting to measure accurately the perceptual differences between employers and employees regarding on-site child care.

Limitations

Due to the size of this study, some limitations exist that may have an effect on the generalizability of the findings. The limitations of this study are as follows:

1. This was a one-time survey with no control group.
2. Only one company was surveyed, so adaptation of the survey may be needed when used on a larger scale.
3. The sample size surveyed was relatively small at 142 subjects with 39 PE respondents and 58 DH respondents.

4. The subjects were not necessarily representative of racial, ethnic or socio-economic groups.

5. The only employees surveyed were the present PE users of the child care center. It would be optimal to survey all employees that are employed in the corporation who have not taken advantage of the child care benefit available to them for a greater understanding of all employee perceptions regarding this on-site corporate child care.

6. Measures used in this study were employer and employee self-assessments.

7. In the pilot study, one DH employee had a child in the company's child care center which also put this person in the PE category. The person completed the survey as a DH and declined to participate as a PE. The overlapping of employee roles must be taken into account when replicating this study.

8. The mere fact that the PEs have placed their children in the on-site child care center could lead to a positively biased response from the employee and must be taken into account when interpreting their responses.

This study was also limited by the accuracy of the data collected in the employer and employee surveys. While the method offers several advantages such as anonymity and objectivity, it presents the chance of subjectivity and error.

Recommendations For Future Research

The recommendations for future research in this area are as follows:

1. A theory and a model for valid measurement of actual behavioral measures of morale, job satisfaction, quality of work, and a company's relationship with the community needs to be developed for more accurate interpretation of study findings which address these issues.

2. Further studies of the perceptions of employees not using available on-site child care centers need to be examined so comparisons of users' and non-users' perceptions can be made.

3. Studies addressing the responses of employees not using an available on-site child care center need to be compared with managers' perceptions of the need for continuation, termination, or expansion of the child care center benefit.

4. A longitudinal study, using multiple sites, that would explore the effects of on-site child care centers on employees' and employers' behaviors and perceptions of the benefits of corporate child care needs to be performed to gain a deeper understanding of the actual benefits obtained by companies and employees .

5. Calculations of actual financial benefits for the corporation derived from reduced absenteeism/tardiness, increased retention and recruitment and/or other possible benefits should be supported by employee personnel records which would

further substantiate or negate the perceptions documented herein for DHs and PEs. The methodology of calculation should be documented within the study for replication purposes.

6. To know the actual benefits of having corporate-sponsored child care, a comparative study of corporations/hospitals, with and without on-site child care centers, should be designed. The corporations/hospitals should be matched by similar sizes, histories, types of services offered, etc. Different groups of employers/ employees within the corporation could be targeted for the survey to reveal the similarities/differences in perceptions of the benefits that may be derived from on-site corporate child care.

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Aldous, J. (1990). Specification and speculation concerning the politics of workplace family policies. Journal of Family Issues,11 (4) 355-367.

Auerbach, J. D. (1990). Employer-supported child care as a women-responsive policy. Journal of Family Issues, 11 (4) 384-400.

Braddy, P. K. (1989). Evaluation of child care alternatives as an employee benefit. Health Care Supervisor 7 No.2 pp. 33-41.

Chapman, F.S. (1987). Executive guilt: Who's taking care of the children? Fortune, 115 (4), pp. 30-37.

Cohen, J. (1991). Keeping kids at work. Management Review 80 No.1 pp.26-28.

Dietsch, C. (1982). Employer-supported child care: A survey and analysis of business/union assisted child care. (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1982) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1982, (Volume 43/01-A, 210).

Galinsky, E. & Stein, P. J. (1990). The impact of human resource policies on employees. Journal of Family Issues, 11 (4) 368-383.

Gampel, J. L. (1990). Corporate-sponsored on-site centers for the young (COSYS): Employers' and workers' perceptions of their impact on worksites (Day care, worksite child care). (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1990) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1990, (Volume 52/01-A, 308).

Goff, S. J. (1989). The impact of a childcare center located at the work site on work/family conflict, absenteeism, and job performance. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1989) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1989, (Volume 50/09-A, 2976).

Kossek, E. E. & Nichol, V. (1992). The effects of on-site child care on employee attitudes and performance. Personnel Psychology 45 485-509.

Lucus, A. F. (1990). The relationship of unmet employee child care needs and absenteeism: A case study. (Doctoral disseration, North Texas State University, 1987) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1990 (Volume 26/03, 0301).

Miller, T. (1984). The effects of employer-sponsored child care on employee absenteeism, turnover, productivity, recruitment or job satisfaction: What is claimed and what is known. Personnel Psychology 37 277-289.

Nika, S. (1989). The child-care predicament. The Rotarian 12 p.18-23.

Raabe, P. H. (1990). The organizational effects of workplace family policies. Journal of Family Issues 11 No.4 477-491.

Ransom, C., Aschbacher, P. & Burud, S. (1989). The return in child-care investment. Personnel Administrator 34 No.10 pp.54-58.

Rubin, V., Weinstock, P. J., Chetkovich, C. A. & Schlichtman, L. (1989). A guide to assessing the benefits and costs of employer child care assistance. U.S. Department of Commerce: National Technical Information Service. PB90-225277, p. 3.

Sher, M. & Brown, G. (1989). What to do with Jenny. Personnel Administrator 34 No.4 pp.31-41.

Shuster, C. S. & Ashburn, Shirley S. (1986) The Process of Human Development - A Holistic Life-Span Approach. Little, Brown & Co. Boston/Toronto.

Small, M. Y. (1990). Cognitive Development. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Smith, A. (1990). Employers offering child, Elder benefits to attract workers. Corporate Cashflow 11 (9) 14-16.

Smith K. (1989). Child care: Not only the employee benefits. The Magazine For Management 18 No.11 pp.179-186.

Swerdlin, M. & Crowley, C. H. (1990). Child care: Why bosses are becoming babysitters; Elder care: Why caregivers need your assistance. Business & Health 8 No.1 pp. 26-30.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1989). Working mothers and their children. Facts on working women. (No. 89-3) Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1990). 20 facts on working women. Facts on working women. (No. 90-2) Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1990). Employers and child care: Benefiting work and family. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1990). On-site or near-site child care centers. Work & Family Resource Kit p.3. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wayne, W. & Burud, S. L. (1986). A hospital's on-site child care center proves to make business sense. Healthcare Management Review 11 No.3, pp.81-87.

Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition (1988). In Victoria Neufeldt & David Guralnik (Eds.) Webster's New World: Cleveland & New York. p.129 and p.1002.

Weissman, P. (1987). Employer-sponsored child care services: Employee job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and perceived stress. (Doctoral disseration, University of San Francisco, 1987) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1987 (Volume 48/11-A, 2925).

Yalow, E. (1990). Corporate child care helps recruit and retain workers. Personnel Journal 48-55.

APPENDIX

Appendix A.

FORT SANDERS REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER

1901 Clinch Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37916

615/541-1111

The Fort Sanders Health System:

Fort Sanders Alliance
Fort Sanders Loudon Medical Center
Fort Sanders Parkwest Medical Center
Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center
Fort Sanders Sevier Medical Center
Fort Sanders West
Patricia Neal Rehabilitation Center
Thompson Cancer Survival Center
Founding Member VHA Voluntary Hospitals of America

May 27, 1993

University of Tennessee
Child & Family Services Dept.
1215 West Cumberland Avenue
Room 115
Knoxville, TN 37996-1900
Attention: Connie Steele, Ed.D.

Dear Professor Steele:

I have met with Tish O'Connor and discussed the Regional Medical Center's participation in a study of the effectiveness of employer sponsored child care. Ms. O'Connor will be attending our Department Managers meeting on May 27 to distribute a questionnaire to this group.

If you need any further information, please call me or my secretary, Gail, at 541-1100.

Sincerely,

Jim Burkhart

Jim Burkhart
Administrator

gb

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

College of Human Ecology
Department of Child and Family Studies
1215 West Cumberland Avenue, Room 115
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1900
(615) 974-5316

Mr. James Burkhart
Vice-President
Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center
1901 Clinch Avenue
Knoxville, TN. 37916

April 12, 1993

Dear Mr. Burkhart:

Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center has been participating in a study of the effectiveness of employer-sponsored child care in conjunction with the Department of Child and Family Studies at the University of Tennessee. At the heart of this study is the information that may be obtained from the distribution of two forms of a questionnaire: (a) one form to be distributed to the employees/parents of the Child Enrichment Center, and (b) one form to be distributed to the Department Heads of the Regional Medical Center.

This letter and subsequent meeting on April 12th with you, Fern Smith, and me, serving as the principle investigator from the University of Tennessee, are for the purpose of obtaining your permission to distribute the "Department Head Questionnaire" during your May 27th meeting with the Regional Medical Center Department Heads. As I am sure you are aware, the more responses to these questionnaires that can be obtained, the more significant will be the results that can be translated into meaningful data for your institution. I am requesting that the questionnaire be completed during your May 27th meeting to obtain the highest return rate possible. The questionnaire is anonymous, requiring no names or signatures. It takes about 7 minutes to complete, and could be distributed at the start of the meeting, and then dropped into a sealed box (provided by the University) by the Department Heads at the end of the meeting as they exit the room.

This study is important in determining the financial, educational, and psychological benefits or lack thereof of the Child Enrichment Center to the Fort Sanders Health System as a whole. Information from more than 900 hospitals and health providers currently providing corporate-sponsored child care suggests that the effects of providing corporate-sponsored child care reduce absenteeism and tardiness of employees and provide the corporation with a valuable recruitment tool, and aids in retention of current employees.

I look forward to meeting you and will appreciate the opportunity to discuss the above mentioned with you on April 12th at 1 p.m.

Sincerely,

Tish O'Connor

Tish O'Connor

CFS RECEIVED

FEB 1 1 1993

February 9, 1993

University of Tennessee
Child & Family Services Dept.
1215 West Cumberland Avenue
Room 115
Knoxville, TN 37996-1900
Att: Connie Steele, Ed.D.

™ FORT SANDERS ALLIANCE

1901 Clinch Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37916

615/541-2800
FAX 615/541-2810

Dear Professor Steele:

Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center has been participating in a study of the effectiveness of Employer sponsored child care (reference letter sent 6/26/91). As part of this study, we are aware that Tish O'Connor, Masters student, is going to conduct a survey of employees/parents of the Child Enrichment Center. She will also be surveying Department Heads of the Regional Medical Center.

I hope that this letter will serve your purpose. If you need any additional information you may contact my secretary, Judy Permakoff at 541-1102.

Sincerely,

John D. Milner

John D. Milner
Senior Vice President
Human Resources

JDM/jp
attachment

cc: Pat Capps

The Fort Sanders Health System:

Fort Sanders Alliance

Fort Sanders Loudon Medical Center

Fort Sanders Parkwest Medical Center

Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center

Fort Sanders Sevier Medical Center

Fort Sanders West

Patricia Neal Rehabilitation Center

Thompson Cancer Survival Center

Founding Member VHA Voluntary Hospitals of America

June 26, 1991

College of Human Ecology
Knoxville, TN 37966-1900

Attn: Connie Steele, PhD
James Moran, PhD

Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center is pleased to participate in an investigation of the effectiveness of Employer sponsored child care. The Child Enrichment Center at Fort Sanders was established in 1979. The center serves sixty children. This letter serves to confirm our discussions regarding the study.

The following areas are available for confidential study:

- Records of recruitment, retention, and payroll deduction
- Training and hiring costs
- Survey of anecdotal information

Labor costs for locating and sorting data will be covered by the grant. Labor provided by Director of Child Care Services and other managers will be free of charge.

An in-house survey conducted by an independent consulting firm will include a question regarding satisfaction with child care benefits provided by the hospital. This survey will be conducted in early 1992.

Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center is pleased to participate in this project. Information gained in the study will allow us to provide better child care services for our employees.

Sincerely,

John D. Milner
Senior Vice President
Human Resources

Jonnel S. Capps
Director
Child Care Services

/jmp

Appendix B.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

College of Human Ecology
Department of Child and Family Studies
1215 West Cumberland Avenue, Room 115
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1900
(615) 974-5316

May 27, 1993

Dear Fort Sanders Employee:

More than 900 hospitals and health providers currently have corporate sponsored child-care centers. What is needed by both employers and their parent-employees is feedback regarding the benefits or lack of benefits from the provision of care for employee's children. What is true for Fort Sanders may be significant information for other child-care providers. We at UTK are interested in what benefits may or may not accrue from employer-sponsored child care.

To plan for obtaining feedback from you, I have been supported for this project by Mr. James Burkhart, Vice-President of Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center; Mr. John Milner, Senior Vice-President of Human Resources of Fort Sanders Alliance; Ms. Pat Capps, who consults with Fort Sanders' Human Resources and the Child Enrichment Center; Ms. Fern Smith, Director of the Child Enrichment Center and its Parent Advisory Council. I am also working under the guidance of Dr. Connie Steele, Professor and Head of the Department of Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

I need your assistance in determining the current benefits that you perceive from the child-care programs at Fort Sanders Child Enrichment Center. Attached is a questionnaire that I have developed with Dr. Joe Rentz, Associate Professor of Marketing, UTK College of Business Administration; Connie Steele, Pat Capps and Fern Smith. The questionnaire contains: (a) explanations of questionnaire's parts, (b) 23 items concerning your perceptions/opinions about the Fort Sanders Child Enrichment Center; (c) demographic data (e.g., gender, age).

By completing this questionnaire, you are giving your consent to participate. Completion of the questionnaire should take 7 to 10 minutes. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and refusal to participate will involve no penalty to you. The questionnaire has an identification number for filing purposes only. Your responses will remain confidential and anonymous, please do not put your name on the questionnaire. There are no anticipated risks involved in participation. There will be no specific benefit to you for participating in this study--except in having feedback of perceived benefits or lack of benefits that the Fort Sanders Child Enrichment Center may have on your institution.

This project report will be completed and the results will be issued to Jim Burkhart by August 26, 1993, so he can summarize and pass on the results to you at your next departmental meeting. If you have any questions, please call me or Dr. Steele @ 974-5316. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Tish O'Connor

Tish O'Connor
Project Director
Dept. of Child & Family Studies
(615) 974-5316

CHILD ENRICHMENT CENTER SURVEY

Circle the numbered answer which pertains to you or fill in the blank where it is appropriate.
Please feel free to comment or explain your responses.

1. How many children do you have? (Fill blank)

   ______CHILDREN

2. What are the ages of your children? (Fill blank)

   ______YEARS

3. Have you ever used the Child Enrichment Center (CEC)? (Circle the number to the left of your answer. If the answer is no, please skip to page)

   1 - YES
   2 - NO

4. How many of your children are now enrolled in the Child Enrichment Center (CEC) at Fort Sanders Hospital? (Circle number the number to the left of your answer).

   0 - NOT APPLICABLE
   1 - ONE CHILD
   2 - TWO CHILDREN
   3 - THREE CHILDREN
   4 - FOUR OR MORE CHILDREN

5. At what age did your child(ren) enroll in the CEC? (Circle number)

   0 - NOT APPLICABLE
   1 - SIX WEEKS TO SIX MONTHS
   2 - SIX MONTHS TO TWELVE MONTHS
   3 - ONE TO TWO YEARS
   4 - TWO TO THREE YEARS
   5 - THREE TO FOUR YEARS
   6 - FIVE YEARS OR OLDER

Note(s): This DH survey is identical to the PE survey except for the five additional questions previously mentioned, which do not pertain to this study.

6. How long did you wait for admission of your children into CEC? (Circle number)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NO WAITING
2 - WAITING RIGHT NOW
3 - LESS THAN ONE YEAR
4 - ONE TO TWO YEARS
5 - TWO TO FOUR YEARS

7. Was your child(ren) enrolled in another form of child care before enrollment in CEC? (Circle number)

1 - YES
2 - NO

8. For what reason(s) have you used child care arrangements other than CEC? (Circle all response numbers which apply)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NEVER USED ANOTHER FACILITY
2 - CEC NOT OPEN DURING MY SHIFT
3 - CEC NOT OPEN DURING MY OVERTIME
4 - CHILD NEEDED SICK CARE
5 - COST
6 - BETTER FACILITIES ELSEWHERE
7 - BETTER STAFF ELSEWHERE
8 - OTHER CENTERS WERE MORE CONVENIENT TO HOME
9 - DID NOT WANT TO INTERRUPT CHILD'S PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS
10 - CHILD WAS CARED FOR AT HOME
11 - CEC WAS NOT YET CONSTRUCTED
12 - OTHER________________________

9. How does the CEC compare with other available child care centers? (Circle number)

0 - DON'T KNOW
1 - MUCH WORSE
2 - SLIGHTLY WORSE
3 - MODERATELY BETTER
4 - CONSIDERABLY BETTER
5 - EXTREMELY BETTER

10. How many days were you absent from work in 1992 due to any sickness your child may have experienced? (Fill blank)

________DAYS

11. In the past year, 1992, how many times have you been late to work because of child related concerns? (Fill blank)

__________TIMES

12. In the past year, 1992, how many times have you left work early because of child related concerns? (Fill blank)

__________TIMES

13. How important is the availability of CEC to your decision to continue your employment with Fort Sanders? (Circle number)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
2 - SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT
3 - MODERATELY IMPORTANT
4 - CONSIDERABLY IMPORTANT
5 - EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

14. How important a factor to you was the presence of CEC when you initially sought employment with Fort Sanders? (Circle number)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL
2 - SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT
3 - MODERATELY IMPORTANT
4 - CONSIDERABLY IMPORTANT
5 - EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

15. If another company offered you a better paying position, but no child care, how seriously would you consider leaving Fort Sanders, all other factors being equal? (Circle number)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT AT ALL SERIOUSLY
2 - SLIGHTLY SERIOUSLY
3 - MODERATELY SERIOUSLY
4 - CONSIDERABLY SERIOUSLY
5 - EXTREMELY SERIOUSLY

16. How valuable is the CEC to you for these two items? (Circle one number per item line)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT VALUABLE
2 - SLIGHTLY VALUABLE
3 - MODERATELY VALUABLE
4 - CONSIDERABLY VALUABLE
5 - EXTREMELY VALUABLE

a. Enhances the relationship between you and your child 0 1 2 3 4 5

b. Increases the ability for you to perform your job well 0 1 2 3 4 5

17. With respect to your present child care in CEC, how satisfied are you with the following items? (By using the scale below, choose and circle one number per item line)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT SATISFIED
2 - SLIGHTLY SATISFIED
3 - MODERATELY SATISFIED
4 - CONSIDERABLY SATISFIED
5 - EXTREMELY SATISFIED

a. Cost arrangements 0 1 2 3 4 5

b. Competence of CEC staff in providing developmental programs 0 1 2 3 4 5

c. Communication from staff regarding child's health issues 0 1 2 3 4 5

d. Parent education resources 0 1 2 3 4 5

18. In your opinion, how valuable is the CEC? (Circle one number per item line)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT VALUABLE
2 - SLIGHTLY VALUABLE
3 - MODERATELY VALUABLE
4 - CONSIDERABLY VALUABLE
5 - EXTREMELY VALUABLE

a. To the Fort Sanders Health System 0 1 2 3 4 5

b. To the other Fort Sanders employees 0 1 2 3 4 5

c. To the employees of FSRMC/TCSC 0 1 2 3 4 5

19. Including yourself, how many persons are employed in your department? (Fill blank)

_______PERSONS
_______DON'T KNOW

20. How many of the employees in your department, including yourself, are now currently using CEC child care? (Fill blank)

_______EMPLOYEES
_______DON'T KNOW

21. Do you know of employees in your department who would like to use CEC, if available? (Circle number)

1 - YES
2 - IF YES, HOW MANY?_______
3 - NO

22. In your opinion, which of the following items do you think have improved due to the availibility of CEC services? (Circle one number per item line)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - NOT IMPROVED
2 - SLIGHTLY IMPROVED
3 - SOMEWHAT IMPROVED
4 - MODERATELY IMPROVED
5 - EXTREMELY IMPROVED

a. Recruitment of new employees	0	1	2	3	4	5
b. Quality of work	0	1	2	3	4	5
c. Level of productivity	0	1	2	3	4	5
d. Retention of competent employees	0	1	2	3	4	5
e. Amount of absenteeism	0	1	2	3	4	5
f. Amount of tardiness	0	1	2	3	4	5
g. Morale of personnel	0	1	2	3	4	5
h. Job satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4	5
i. Relationship of community and FSHS	0	1	2	3	4	5
j. Customer service	0	1	2	3	4	5

23. The following is a list of some potential drawbacks to on-site corporate child care. Which, if any, of the responses do you feel represent your opinions.(Circle all that apply)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - INTERFERES WITH WORK
2 - PREFER TO SEPARATE HOME FROM WORK
3 - GENERAL DISSATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM
4 - CHILD IS UNHAPPY IN THE PROGRAM
5 - OTHER (please specify)____________________________

24. What is your gender? (Circle one number)

1 - FEMALE
2 - MALE

25. What is your age? (Fill blank)

______YEARS OLD

26. What is your race/ethnic status? (Circle number)

1 - AFRICAN AMERICAN
2 - ALASKAN NATIVE
3 - ASIAN AMERICAN
4 - CAUCASIAN
5 - HISPANIC
6 - NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN
7 - OTHER (please specify)________________________

27. What is your marital status? (Circle number)

1 - NEVER MARRIED
2 - COHABITATING
3 - MARRIED
4 - DIVORCED
5 - WIDOWED

28. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Circle number)

1 - SOME HIGH SCHOOL
2 - HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
3 - TECHNICAL/VOCATIONAL TRAINING
4 - ASSOCIATES DEGREE
5 - SOME COLLEGE
6 - FOUR YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE
7 - SOME GRADUATE SCHOOL
8 - MASTER'S DEGREE
9 - DOCTORATE DEGREE
10 - CONTINUING GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL

29. How many years have you been employed with Fort Sanders? (Fill blank)

_______YEARS

30. Which schedule below best represents your usual working hours at Fort Sanders? (example: 7:30am to 4:00pm)

a.m. a.m.
FROM______p.m. TO______p.m.

31. Which category best describes your current job title at Fort Sanders?

1 - SUPERVISOR
2 - REGISTERED NURSE
3 - PHYSICIAN
4 - PROFESSIONAL, OTHER THAN RN/PHYSICIAN
5 - LICENSED/TECHNICAL PERSONNEL (INCLUDES LPN)
6 - BUSINESS OFFICE CLERICAL
7 - SKILLED MAINTENANCE
8 - SERVICE AND OTHER CLERICAL
9 - GUARD

32. Is your wife/husband/partner employed by Fort Sanders? (Circle number)

0 - NOT APPLICABLE
1 - YES, FULL TIME
2 - YES, PART TIME
3 - NO

33. Which following category best describes your total household income before taxes in 1992? (Circle number)

1 - $10,000 - 19,999
2 - $20,000 - 29,999
3 - $30,000 - 39,999
4 - $40,000 - 49,999
5 - $50,000 - 59,999
6 - $60,000 - 69,999
7 - $70,000 - 79,999
8 - $80,000 - 89,999
9 - $90,000 - 99,999
10 - OVER $100,000

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the Fort Sanders Child Enrichment Center (CEC) including any recommendations for CEC which you feel would benefit the Fort Sanders Health System? If so, please use the space below. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix C.

Dear Parent,

During the first week of June a questionnaire designed by The University of Tennessee for the Fort Sanders Regional Medical Center will be distributed to the employee/parents of children who are enrolled in the Child Enrichment Center (CEC). The questionnaire pertains to on-site corporate sponsored child care. It will only take 5-7 minutes to complete and the CEC director, Fern Smith, has agreed to watch your children during the few extra minutes you will be at the center.

The questionnaire is being offered from 3:30 to 6:00 P.M. June 2nd, 3rd, and 4th (Wednesday, Thursday, Friday) so that each parent may choose their most convenient day and time to respond. Because it is being given to a small, but representative, sample of on-site corporate child care users it is extremely important that your response be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Fort Sanders Child Enrichment Center employee/parents. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Tish O'Connor

Tish O'Connor
Project Director

Appendix D.
Table D-1 Ranked Means For Fifteen Hypotheses

Ranked Means of All DH vs All PE Hypothesis 1			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
All DH n=58			
	Retention	3.61	1.10
	Job Satisfaction	3.38	1.17
	Morale	3.36	1.18
	Productivity	3.30	1.11
	Service	3.19	1.14
	Recruitment	3.18	1.23
	Absenteeism	3.16	1.02
	Community	3.10	1.10
	Tardy	3.05	1.11
	Quality	3.00	1.12
All PE n=39			
	Retention	4.24	0.83
	Job Satisfaction	4.19	0.75
	Morale	4.16	0.85
	Productivity	4.11	0.78
	Service	4.08	0.81
	Quality	4.06	0.79
	Community	3.80	0.87
	Tardy	3.71	1.07
	Absenteeism	3.47	1.21
	Recruitment	3.42	1.17

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Female vs DH Male Hypothesis 2			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Female n=41			
	Retention	3.53	1.19
	Job Satisfaction	3.30	1.24
	Morale	3.28	1.25
	Productivity	3.25	1.16
	Service	3.19	1.26
	Community	3.16	1.19
	Absenteeism	3.10	1.11
	Tardy	3.03	1.25
	Recruitment	3.00	1.26
	Quality	2.91	1.15
DH Male n=17			
	Retention	3.83	0.83
	Recruitment	3.75	0.97
	Morale	3.58	1.00
	Job Satisfaction	3.58	1.00
	Productivity	3.42	1.00
	Absenteeism	3.33	0.78
	Quality	3.25	1.06
	Service	3.18	0.75
	Tardy	3.08	0.67
	Community	2.91	0.83

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Female vs PE Female Hypothesis 3			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Female n=41			
	Retention	3.53	1.19
	Job Satisfaction	3.30	1.24
	Morale	3.28	1.25
	Productivity	3.25	1.16
	Service	3.19	1.26
	Community	3.16	1.19
	Absenteeism	3.10	1.11
	Tardy	3.03	1.25
	Recruitment	2.97	1.26
	Quality	2.91	1.15
PE Female n=36			
	Retention	4.26	0.83
	Job Satisfaction	4.18	0.73
	Morale	4.15	0.83
	Productivity	4.12	0.78
	Service	4.09	0.80
	Quality	4.06	0.79
	Community	3.75	0.84
	Tardy	3.69	1.09
	Recruitment	3.43	1.22
	Absenteeism	3.42	1.23

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Male vs PE Female Hypothesis 4			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Male n=17			
	Retention	3.83	0.83
	Recruitment	3.75	0.97
	Job Satisfaction	3.58	1.00
	Morale	3.58	1.00
	Productivity	3.41	1.00
	Absenteeism	3.33	0.78
	Quality	3.25	1.06
	Service	3.18	0.75
	Tardy	3.08	0.67
	Community	2.90	0.83
PE Female n=36			
	Retention	4.26	0.83
	Job Satisfaction	4.18	0.73
	Morale	4.15	0.83
	Productivity	4.12	0.78
	Service	4.09	0.80
	Quality	4.06	0.79
	Community	3.75	0.84
	Tardy	3.68	1.09
	Recruitment	3.43	1.22
	Absenteeism	3.42	1.23

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH <40 vs DH >40 Hypothesis 5			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH <40 n=35			
	Retention	3.52	0.96
	Job Satisfaction	3.35	1.23
	Absenteeism	3.25	.90
	Morale	3.24	1.27
	Service	3.21	1.14
	Recruitment	3.15	1.08
	Productivity	3.08	1.12
	Community	3.04	1.11
	Tardy	2.96	1.00
	Quality	2.88	1.05
DH >40 n=23			
	Retention	3.74	1.28
	Productivity	3.58	1.07
	Morale	3.53	1.07
	Job Satisfaction	3.42	1.12
	Recruitment	3.21	1.44
	Service	3.16	1.17
	Tardy	3.16	1.26
	Quality	3.16	1.21
	Community	3.16	1.12
	Absenteeism	3.05	1.18

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Female <40 vs DH Female >40 Hypothesis 6			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Female <40 n=23			
	Retention	3.44	1.03
	Service	3.25	1.29
	Job Satisfaction	3.18	1.29
	Community	3.13	1.19
	Absenteeism	3.13	0.99
	Morale	3.06	1.34
	Productivity	3.00	1.15
	Recruitment	2.94	1.09
	Tardy	2.87	1.13
	Quality	2.75	1.00
DH Female >40 n=18			
	Retention	3.63	1.36
	Productivity	3.50	1.15
	Morale	3.50	1.15
	Job Satisfaction	3.44	1.21
	Community	3.19	1.22
	Tardy	3.19	1.38
	Service	3.13	1.26
	Absenteeism	3.06	1.24
	Quality	3.06	1.29
	Recruitment	3.00	1.46

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of PE <40 vs DH <40 Hypothesis 7			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
PE <40 n=39			
	Retention	4.24	0.83
	Job Satisfaction	4.08	0.75
	Morale	4.17	0.85
	Productivity	4.11	0.78
	Service	4.08	0.81
	Quality	4.05	0.79
	Community	3.80	0.87
	Tardy	3.71	1.07
	Absenteeism	3.47	1.21
	Recruitment	3.42	1.17
DH <40 n=58			
	Retention	3.61	1.10
	Job Satisfaction	3.38	1.17
	Morale	3.36	1.18
	Productivity	3.30	1.11
	Service	3.18	1.14
	Recruitment	3.18	1.23
	Absenteeism	3.16	1.02
	Community	3.10	1.10
	Tardy	3.05	1.11
	Quality	3.00	1.12

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH and PE <40 vs DH and PE >40 Hypothesis 8			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH and PE <40 n=70			
	Retention	3.93	0.96
	Job Satisfaction	3.80	1.06
	Morale	3.74	1.13
	Service	3.70	1.05
	Productivity	3.64	1.05
	Quality	3.52	1.06
	Absenteeism	3.39	1.11
	Tardy	3.36	1.10
	Community	3.45	1.03
	Recruitment	3.29	1.16
DH and PE >40 n=27			
	Retention	3.82	1.22
	Productivity	3.73	1.08
	Morale	3.68	1.09
	Job Satisfaction	3.59	1.14
	Quality	3.36	1.26
	Community	3.32	1.13
	Service	3.32	1.17
	Tardy	3.32	1.25
	Recruitment	3.27	1.35
	Absenteeism	3.09	1.11

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Married vs PE Married Hypothesis 9			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Married n=45			
	Retention	3.56	1.05
	Job Satisfaction	3.29	1.15
	Morale	3.26	1.19
	Productivity	3.24	1.16
	Service	3.15	1.12
	Recruitment	3.14	1.22
	Absenteeism	3.12	0.99
	Tardy	3.06	1.06
	Community	3.03	1.07
	Quality	3.00	1.18
PE Married n=38			
	Retention	4.25	0.84
	Job Satisfaction	4.17	0.75
	Productivity	4.14	0.77
	Morale	4.14	0.85
	Service	4.11	0.80
	Quality	4.09	0.78
	Community	3.82	0.87
	Tardy	3.68	1.07
	Recruitment	3.44	1.19
	Absenteeism	3.43	1.20

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH and PE Married vs DH and PE Unmarried Hypothesis 10			
	Variable	Mean	
DH and PE Married n=83			
	Retention	3.91	1.00
	Job Satisfaction	3.73	1.06
	Morale	3.71	1.11
	Productivity	3.70	1.08
	Service	3.65	1.08
	Quality	3.55	1.13
	Community	3.43	1.05
	Tardy	3.37	1.10
	Recruitment	3.28	1.20
	Absenteeism	3.28	1.10
DH and PE Unmarried n=14			
	Morale	3.82	1.17
	Retention	3.82	1.25
	Job Satisfaction	3.82	1.25
	Productivity	3.45	0.93
	Absenteeism	3.45	1.21
	Community	3.30	1.16
	Service	3.27	1.19
	Recruitment	3.27	1.27
	Tardy	3.18	1.40
	Quality	3.00	0.89

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Married vs DH Unmarried Hypothesis 11			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Married n=45			
	Retention	3.56	1.05
	Job Satisfaction	3.29	1.15
	Morale	3.26	1.19
	Productivity	3.24	1.16
	Service	3.15	1.12
	Recruitment	3.14	1.22
	Absenteeism	3.12	0.99
	Tardy	3.06	1.06
	Community	3.03	1.07
	Quality	3.00	1.18
DH Unmarried n=13			
	Retention	3.80	1.32
	Morale	3.70	1.16
	Job Satisfaction	3.70	1.25
	Productivity	3.50	0.97
	Community	3.33	1.22
	Recruitment	3.30	1.34
	Service	3.30	1.25
	Absenteeism	3.30	1.16
	Quality	3.00	0.94
	Tardy	3.00	1.33

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH and PE < College vs DH and PE > College Hypothesis 12			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH and PE <College n=39			
	Morale	4.25	0.67
	Job Satisfaction	4.19	0.69
	Retention	4.18	0.88
	Service	4.03	0.78
	Productivity	4.03	0.82
	Community	3.91	0.73
	Quality	3.88	0.98
	Tardy	3.73	1.13
	Absenteeism	3.64	1.11
	Recruitment	3.42	1.15
DH and PE >College n=58			
	Retention	3.71	1.09
	Job Satisfaction	3.45	1.19
	Productivity	3.42	1.13
	Morale	3.38	1.21
	Service	3.30	1.18
	Quality	3.21	1.13
	Recruitment	3.19	1.24
	Tardy	3.07	1.07
	Community	3.07	1.12
	Absenteeism	3.07	1.06

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH and PE < \$50,000 vs DH and PE > \$50,000 Hypothesis 13			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH and PE <\$50,000 n=37			
	Job Satisfaction	3.98	0.90
	Morale	3.94	0.89
	Retention	3.91	0.98
	Productivity	3.88	0.84
	Service	3.76	1.12
	Absenteeism	3.67	0.92
	Tardy	3.67	1.05
	Quality	3.65	0.92
	Community	3.64	0.96
	Recruitment	3.35	1.05
DH and PE >\$50,000 n=60			
	Retention	3.90	1.08
	Job Satisfaction	3.57	1.17
	Morale	3.57	1.24
	Productivity	3.50	1.17
	Service	3.48	1.07
	Quality	3.35	1.23
	Community	3.25	1.10
	Recruitment	3.23	1.31
	Tardy	3.11	1.15
	Absenteeism	3.04	1.17

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of DH Female Without Child vs DH Female With Child Hypothesis 14			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
DH Female Without Child n=13			
	Morale	3.44	1.33
	Job Satisfaction	3.44	1.33
	Retention	3.33	1.22
	Productivity	3.22	1.09
	Absenteeism	3.11	1.17
	Tardy	3.00	1.22
	Service	3.00	1.50
	Quality	2.89	0.93
	Recruitment	2.89	1.27
	Community	2.88	1.36
DH Female With Child n=28			
	Retention	3.61	1.20
	Community	3.26	1.14
	Service	3.26	1.18
	Productivity	3.26	1.21
	Job Satisfaction	3.25	1.22
	Morale	3.22	1.24
	Absenteeism	3.09	1.11
	Tardy	3.05	1.29
	Recruitment	3.00	1.29
	Quality	2.91	1.24

Table D-1 (Continued)

Ranked Means of All DH Without Child vs All DH With Child Hypothesis 15			
	Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
All DH Without Child n=17			
	Morale	3.69	1.18
	Job Satisfaction	3.62	1.12
	Retention	3.46	1.05
	Productivity	3.31	0.95
	Recruitment	3.23	1.17
	Quality	3.15	0.90
	Absenteeism	3.15	1.07
	Service	3.15	1.28
	Tardy	3.08	1.04
	Community	3.00	1.13
All DH With Child n=41			
	Retention	3.68	1.14
	Productivity	3.29	1.19
	Job Satisfaction	3.28	1.20
	Morale	3.23	1.18
	Service	3.20	1.10
	Absenteeism	3.17	1.02
	Recruitment	3.16	1.27
	Community	3.13	1.11
	Tardy	3.03	1.16
	Quality	2.93	1.21

Appendix E.

Department Heads

Category	Affirmative Comments	Constructive Comments
1. Availability	Good availability being offered on-site.	CEC would not take a part-time child.
2. Recruitment	Good recruitment tool.	Not a good recruitment tool when there is an extensive waiting list. Not large enough for all employees to use. No recruitment advantage when there is no space available.
3. Space		Need to serve more employees. Need space and staff to care for more children. Need more space. Too small for number to children enrolled. Space limitations. Not enough space for a true benefit.
4. Facility		Confined space. Need more space. Need better playground. Crowded, disorganized, cluttered. Playground too small. Too crowded. Need space to improve quality.
5. Teachers/ Staff	Excellent teachers. Good employees.	Teachers need more compensation. Teachers are more like baby-sitters than child-care employees. Poorly supervised.

Figure 2. Comments From Department-Heads And Parent/Employees Concerning The Child Enrichment Center.

Category	Affirmative Comments	Constructive Comments
6. Value	Good. Very important. Child-care needs to be addressed nationally. Offers peace of mind to parents. Proud we offer it.	Decided I did not want my child in this center.
7. Operation Comments		Need 24 hour service - not fair to shift workers. Need sick care. Need 24 hour service. Only for full-time employees - what about part-timers?
8. Used Other Child Care		Because waiting list was too long. Waiting list is a real barrier for twins. Other child-care centers offered many more activities. The wait was too long.
9. Food	Good to have hot food.	
10.Cleanliness		Dirty. Children sick too much.
11.Other		Educational equipment lacking. Playground needs relocation and revamping. Need more parental education.

Figure 2.(Continued)

Parent/Employees

Category	Affirmative Comments	Constructive Comments
1. Availability		Fort Sanders chooses not to offer more to our children!
2. Recruitment		
3. Space		No space when needed. Expand - let more parents enjoy this benefit. More space would shorten waiting list. Too many children crammed into too smal of a space. Too small - have considered going elsewhere. Wish facility was bigger. Need more space. Needs expansion. Only room for 8 infants for all the hundreds of F.S. employees.
4. Facility	Location is great. Very efficient.	Bathroom and kitchen poor. Needs more money for improvements. Needs better playground. Needs more space for children to play. Needs indoor playground.
5. Teachers/ Staff	Staff is always available to parent. Do an excellent job. They are the reason people keep their children here. Staff is great. Exceptional staff - makes me feel better about working. Staff is excellent.	
6. Value	I don't worry about my children being mistreated. Comforting to have child close to me. CEC has kept me here at Fort Sanders.	

Figure 2.(Continued)

Category	Affirmative Comments	Constructive Comments
6. Value (continued)	CEC is only reason I still work at FSRMC. I could not have returned to full-time work without it. Very happy. Very pleased. Worth a million bucks. Highly recommended. I never have to worry about my child's needs. The only reason I can continue with my career. Priceless!	
7. Operation Comments		Pay staff better so they won't leave. Day care should not close - hospitals sure don't. Need more flexible hours. What about a summer program for older children? Invest more money! Oak Ridge and Blount Memorial Hospital offer sick care - why doesn't Fort Sanders?
8. Used Other Child Care		No space available in CEC when I needed it. The wait was too long. Waiting list. Had too wait too long.
9. Food		Food arrangements need to be changed. Food looks terrible.
10.Cleanliness		Too much sickness spreading among all the children - need sick care space.
11.Other		Need better communication with parents. Need improved educational opportunities for parents.

Figure 2.(Continued)

VITA

Born in Knoxville, Tennessee, of parents Helen Roehl O'Connor and John Lawrence O'Connor, Patricia Lynn O'Connor attended elementary and junior high school in the Knox County School District and graduated from West High School in June, 1980.

Over the course of the next ten years, Patricia worked for a number of companies which eventually lead to her graduate student interest in work and family studies. Her first job was for the law firm of Poore, Cox, Baker, Ray & Byrne in Knoxville, Tennessee as a receptionist and personal secretary for thirteen attorneys. Moving to Arizona, she worked for Project Planning Consultants as general office manager for three businesses. In 1989, Patricia entered The University of Tennessee to complete in 1990 her B.S. Degree in Human Ecology. While finishing her bachelors degree, she was employed by Nutri/System Weight Loss Center, where she became a Certified Nutritional Specialist.

In January, 1991, she entered The Graduate Program in Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. In addition to her studies, she started her own business, Acquisitions, as a seller of fine jewelry to private clients. She is presently a research assistant in the Department of Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, where she expects to complete her Doctor of Philosophy degree.