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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine the effectiveness of a multi-media presentation relating to the topic of employer-supported child care in British Columbia in the business community. Changes in the knowledge and attitude of employers, as measured by a questionnaire, were the determinants of the effectiveness of the presentation. Personnel officers from the public and private sector were selected for the study subjects. Support for this study was obtained from a professional association of personnel officers, which offered to host an educational seminar on this topic. This seminar is the treatment of the study and the members of the association who elected to attend this seminar are the subjects.

This study was part of a larger study that was a joint research project between the University of British Columbia and Douglas College. Each institution supplied a principal investigator, project personnel and institutional resources. The author of this thesis was the project researcher. Funding for the project was received from the Child Care Initiatives Fund, Health and Welfare Canada. A section of the larger project's findings were extracted for this study.

The field of employer-supported child care is relatively recent in Canada. Since 1964 when the Riverdale Hospital opened a child care facility in Toronto, there have been just over one hundred such employer-supported child care facilities
set up. Many other companies have set up company-assisted child care options that also fall within the term "employer-supported child care," but no one to date has catalogued the total number of such initiatives.

In British Columbia there have been four known employer-supported child care centres; one is no longer in existence. There has been considerable interest and activity in the provincial business community since this study began in 1988. However, other than M. Mayfield's survey of employer involvement in child care in British Columbia in 1984, no research studies have been conducted on this topic. No other known studies are currently taking place, although the Child Care Initiatives Fund, Health and Welfare Canada does list several demonstration projects currently underway across Canada.

This study, then, is to develop an effective multi-media presentation relating to employer-supported child care that would educate and influence employers to consider involvement in the child care needs of their employees from an economic perspective. Measurement of knowledge and attitude toward the topic would be taken to determine the effectiveness of this presentation.

Results showed that the presentation was effective. Whereas before the seminar 2.5% of the respondents reported their company's level of involvement in child care at the "developing an option" stage, by the conclusion of the
seminar, 32.5% of the respondents reported interest at the same level. Responses showed that the perceived obstacles of "lack of evidence of child care services providing long term benefits to the company", "corporate liability", and "equity" were significantly reduced. Employers acquired knowledge about the topic through the seminar. Perceived obstacles were overcome. The respondents were motivated to become involved in employer-supported child care.

A need for future studies has been identified from the interpretation of the research results and it is hoped that issues raised from this study will form future research questions.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Employer-supported child care is innovative and still largely unexamined. But the interest in the topic from the business community, parents, government and the field of Early Childhood Education is high. All parties are seeking solutions to the shortage of available, affordable and quality child care in Canada. Critical questions such as cost, company productivity and profit, confidentiality and quality of care need to be examined. One key area of needed research is the knowledge and attitude towards employer-supported child care by employers. If companies are going to be encouraged to provide this employee benefit, the opinions and knowledge of mid-managers who would bring forward such policies must be explored.

The term "employer-supported child care" is defined as the involvement of an employer in the provision of assistance to employees' child care arrangements. It includes direct financial support to those costs, set-up and operation of an on- or near- site child care centre, and the various personnel policies that enable an employee to better meet the family responsibilities relating to child care.
Employees and the Work/Family Conflict

An ever increasing number of Canadian women are entering the work force. A review of statistics indicates that the biggest increase in the number of working women are mothers of young children. The percentage of working mothers in Canada in 1951 was approximately 10%. By 1961 this figure had grown to 20% and in 1984, approximately 60% of mothers with children under the age of sixteen were in the labour force (Statistics Canada Labour Force Survey, 1987). This increase of working mothers is projected to continue in the 1990s.

It can therefore be said that, from this perspective alone, work and family life for many Canadians can no longer be viewed as separate entities. Conditions at work spill over and affect the employee's family life. Family life stresses can interfere with a worker's performance on the job. The worker, male or female, must increasingly juggle multiple roles and responsibilities that are not easy to leave behind on the job or at home.

A recent American study of employee absenteeism and tardiness found that employees with children under the age of twelve years missed 43% more work days per year and were late for work 60% more than other employees.

In this study, the three major sources of stress reported by employees were:

1. family finances
2. job related worries
3. Child care arrangements

Yet, a Gallup Poll in 1986 found that 48% of respondents thought that two income families should not receive government subsidies for child care. However, Health and Welfare Canada estimated in 1986 that children in need of some form of child care outnumber the spaces available in licensed centres across Canada by ten to one.

In the latter years of the 1980s employers have become aware of the issue of employee work/family conflicts and the possible consequences of these stresses on company productivity.

This concern has been supported as well by the Conference Board of Canada's analysis of labour participation rates of men and women, as well as projected shortages of skilled workers.² The topic of employer-supported child care has become one of importance as employers seek answers to recruitment and retention, as well as traditional concerns of tardiness, absenteeism, and morale. Innovative corporate leaders are examining their employee demographics and the labour scene to find solutions.

Perspectives and Limitations of the Study

The perspective taken in this preliminary study is to examine ways of effecting a positive change in how employers view their involvement in child care for their employees. The study was designed to confirm that a quality, multi-media
educational presentation would educate employers about this topic and encourage them to become further involved in this area.

The limitations of the study are:

1. the subjects are not random. Personnel officers registered to attend this seminar and are therefore self-selected. The generalizability of the results of this study are limited: the results apply to these subjects, and other members of the association who share similiar characteristics.

2. the sample size (N = 40) is small. Generalizability is also limited due to the small number of respondents.

3. the instrument had limitations. Although the instrument was adapted from a highly validated survey from another study, adaptation was necessary. The structure of the pretest and posttest did not permit direct correlation between all pretest and posttest test items. One general question of pretest and posttest involvement could only be analyzed at the numerical change level.

4. the treatment time was short. This study was a small part of a much larger joint U.B.C./ Douglas College research project. A follow-up study was conducted at six months and a one year follow-up study is being planned to determine lasting effects of the changes.

The goal of the study is to influence employers to consider employer-supported child care from an economic perspective. A multi-media presentation was developed to meet
this goal. Although the results of this study apply to the subjects of this study and other members of the association who share similar characteristics, this presentation, if effective, could be offered to the business community in general to achieve similar goals.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, a review of the related literature is presented. Because this topic is recent, there are few North American studies that address the focus of employer involvement in child care and perceived employer obstacles to involvement. This chapter will present the only known studies that specifically address this specific focus. Two Canadian studies, one American study, and the only study conducted in British Columbia will be reviewed. A review of a Canadian study on child/parent satisfaction with the use of employer-supported child care will also be given.

Introduction

As well as various levels of government, some employers, unions and community agencies have already recognized the connection between corporate efficiency and the state of the work force. Such employers have recently developed employee benefit programs geared to improving compatibility between work and family life. Innovative employee education and support programs and cafeteria-style benefit plans are some of the new approaches being considered by North American employers.

Care for the children of employees is one such recent business initiative that some companies are considering in increasing numbers. This Chapter will examine the results of
four studies of employer-supported child care initiatives in North America. Each study's methodology and findings as they pertain to employer involvement and obstacles will be presented. One Canadian study of parent and child perception of satisfaction of child care and sense of security of parent and child. A summary will conclude this section.

History of Employer-Supported Child Care

The field of employer-supported child care is recent, small in the number of existing programs in North America, and is a hybrid benefits area between child care and business.

The first employer-supported child care facility was opened in 1964 at Riverdale Hospital in Toronto. The second facility was established at the University of Alberta Hospital in Edmonton in 1967. Today there are approximately one hundred known facilities in Canada and health care industry have been the leaders in developing this employee benefit. In 1984, such centres constituted between 3 - 4% of all licensed spaces in Canada.³

Currently in B.C., there are less than six such on- or near-site centres, although a number of employers offer flexible personnel policies to partly address the child care needs of their employees. The first on-site employer-supported child care centre opened in B.C. in 1982 at Alouette Search Services in New Westminster. It operated continuously until the Spring of 1987 when it was discontinued due to lack
of need. Currently one hospital, one public sector union, and one national food chain store operate such programs. To emphasize how recent this field is, Statistics Canada reports that 87% of all employer-supported centres have started in Canada since 1976, while 42% of those have started since 1980.4

In the United States, the development of employer-supported child care facilities has occurred over the last twenty-five years. As in Canada, they were originally implemented by health care organizations (hospitals), or companies that produce health care products (Johnson & Johnson, Stride Rite), and who have traditionally addressed family issues of employees. One Canadian difference, however, is that almost all of these facilities that have opened since the federal Special Committee on Child Care Task Force Report was issued in March of 1987 have been sponsored by the public sector, and not the private (business) sector as was the case in the United States (Ebner, 1988).

In the past two years there has been a noticeable flurry of interest on the part of employers in this topic. The reasons for this inquiry are primarily considered to be "enlightened self-interest".5 As American research is disseminated in professional business journals, Canadian human relations personnel are becoming aware of the topic. As well, research initiatives have been encouraged through funding from the Child Care Initiatives Fund, Health and Welfare, Canada.
Recently, the topic of work/family conflict is receiving media attention in the public press. As yet, the employers who are at the beginning stages of involvement have generally yet to move beyond a general level of investigation of need within their organization.

The Literature

There is a small but growing body of North American literature on this topic. As yet, there is a limited source of easily accessible Canadian information on this topic, although several studies are currently being conducted (Mayfield, in press).

Four major studies have been selected to present a rationale for the selection of the four research questions of this study. Employer involvement in child care is often delayed or denied by the perception of obstacles that employers cite as pre-involvement concerns. A study of these obstacles is necessary to identify the importance of the obstacles as well as identifying ways of overcoming them (rationale for this study).

As well, one Canadian study has been selected from the literature because it examined the views and attitudes of parents and children who use employer-supported child care in Ontario and Quebec. Although this focus of this study is on the effectiveness of a presentation to employers about this topic, the attitude of the users of the service, especially
their satisfaction about, and sense of security provided from this type of care, is important to consider.

The federal government Task Force on Child Care surveyed Canadian employers for its 1985 publication, "Sharing the Responsibility, Series 6 - The Employer's Role" and included statistics from across the country. In 1989, the Conference Board of Canada issued "The Corporate Response to Workers with Family Responsibilities". The section entitled, "Canadian Work Environments: A Survey of Employers" includes an examination of employer attitudes and challenges.

There has been only one study conducted on employer-supported child care in British Columbia (M. Mayfield, 1984). This author is currently compiling an inventory of work-related child care programs in Canada for Labour Canada (in press).

One significant American study that explored perceived employer obstacles is the 1988 American Society of Personnel Administration 1988 Child Care Survey Report. The survey format from this study was used as a basis for the pretest and posttest used in the study conducted by this author.

During the research year (1989 - 1990), as part of the larger study, the writer conducted an ongoing literature search. Canadian, American and selected international articles have been set up in a catalogued collection at Douglas College. These articles will shortly be available for loan to the business and general community.
From that collection, the writer decided that, for this preliminary investigation, American literature on generic family and social issues can apply to Canada and may be of value when considering innovations in the business, family and social life of Canada. For that reason, the American Society of Personnel Administrators 1988 Child Care Survey Report has been included. The two Canadian studies are given as they represent the national scene, and the British Columbia study is included as it is the only previous examination of this topic.

The four employer studies have a methodology of survey. The Task Force Report also interviewed employers. The study of parental and child satisfaction was a case study. No study has been found on this topic that employed a quasi-experimental or experimental design.

The Perception of Level of Employer Obstacle about Involvement in Employer-Supported Child Care

The Conference Board of Canada conducted the most recent research program on the topic of work/family issues and its impact on the Canadian labour force. The Conference Board surveyed 1,600 companies and organizations during 1988 and 1989.7

The survey asked respondents about the extent of their involvement to a number of family-related benefit areas, one of which was employer-supported child care. Survey findings show that few Canadian companies are currently involved. The
respondents were not asked the degree of their involvement, but were asked to identify the option of child care in which they are currently involved. The proportion of companies for each employer-supported child care option follows:

(i) child care information and referral services - 8.4%
(ii) assistance for the care of sick children - 7.8%
(iii) child care centres (on-site, support for off-site, financial assistance for employees to help pay for child care) - 4.8%
(iv) parent education seminars - 4.6%
(v) child care assistance for employees who work outside of normal hours - 2.7%
(vi) summer camps - 1.1%
(vii) after-school programs - 1.0%

This section of the survey also asked for future interest in involvement ("actively" or "may" and a "no" category). Few employers reported that they would proceed with further involvement.8

This study did not directly ask the respondents about employer obstacles to providing child care services. However, the employers were asked to estimate the proportion of their work spent on human resource problems and the connection with those employees family responsibilities. 58.3% responded that at least one-quarter of their problems have to do with employee work/family conflicts. Just over half (56.2%
responded that over one-quarter of absenteeism problems are caused by work/family conflicts. These results show that employers are aware of the need to address this area.

The employers were also asked what their companies have previously done to learn more about the topic and ways of addressing this issue. 22% of the respondents had recently attended a conference or workshop on this topic. 15.4% of the respondents have met with other companies to explore solutions. 11% have hired a consultant to examine work and family problems and discover possible solutions.

43% of the companies have surveyed their employees recently to determine the level of satisfaction with existing policies, practices and benefits. 26% have surveyed employees for benefit preferences. However, only 2.1% of companies have surveyed directly employees' personal responsibilities. And only 2.6% would consider a survey of this kind in the future.

This report is presented because it shows that companies are aware of the work/family conflicts of many employees and are beginning to seek out knowledge of those problems and solutions to the problems. Implied here is a beginning level of involvement for such benefit areas as employer-supported child care services. The fact that only 2.6% would survey employee need in this area in the future suggests that these companies are facing internal obstacles to involvement that must be addressed before they proceed beyond an initial involvement level.
A Study of Work-Related Day Care in Canada: the Cooke Task Force Report

The second Canadian study to examine child care and employers was "A Study of Work-Related Day Care in Canada", part of the Cooke Task Force Report on Child Care.9

This report states that employers in seven out of ten provinces and the Northwest Territories sponsor 79 child care centres, with the capacity to care for 3477 children.10

Other employers sponsor child care information and referral programs, family leave benefits and other child care-related benefits to their employees. Until this survey, no national review of this topic had taken place. For this study, "work-related day care" was defined as "a day care program which has been established by an/or has some on-going involvement with a sponsoring employer or employee group for the purpose of meeting the child care needs of parents in the paid labour force of the sponsor".11

Short interviews with all known existing programs, longer interviews with a large sample of those programs, and general interviews with provincial and territorial officials formed the methodology of this study. Ninety-one programs were identified as of September, 1984. British Columbia is listed as having three existing programs at that time.

The Report also states that group child care centres form the majority of employer-supported child care initiatives, many companies have supportive personnel policies as well,
which reduce work/family conflict. Such benefits as paid parental leave, flexible working hours, job-sharing and paid leave to care for mildly-ill children are alternatives to on- or near-site child care.

One section of the Report specifically addresses the attitudes of senior management as a key factor in the involvement of child care: "Management attitudes often shape the philosophy that underlies day-to-day practice". The barrier of equity to all employees is identified as an obstacle often mentioned by management. Provincial officials also identified a lack of information about employer-supported child care and a lack of awareness of the need for child care services as obstacles. Size of business was cited: small businesses felt they could not support a child care program. A personal opinion that employees have sole responsibility for their children was another obstacle presented.

One significant obstacle mentioned in this report as a primary one and often mentioned in the literature is expense. Many employers held the view that a lack of financial assistance was a barrier to involvement. Eight out of ten employers thought that high on-going costs were an important obstacle. This section concludes with the comment, "To date, limited data are available regarding the attitudes of senior managers in Canada". The third study examined for employer involvement and obstacles to involvement was the American Society of Personnel Administration (ASPA) 1988 Child Care
Survey Report, "Employers and Child Care: The Human Resource Professional's View".

Two sections of this extensive survey are of interest to this review of the literature. Section A addresses "current involvement in child care" and Section C has a section, "potential obstacles to employer involvement in child care". This study also explored employer perceptions of child care legislation and included a question on employee/government/employee responsibility for child care. Since this was also a question in the study of this author, the results from this area will also be presented.

This study was a national examination of its members' views on the topic. A random sample of 5,554 members were selected from the membership list. The response rate was 27 percent. Of those companies, 10% reported involvement in child care, with larger companies more likely to be involved than small ones. Over half (53%) are not involved at any level, while the other half reported varying levels of involvement (25% exploring issue, 10% researching issue). Of the companies with no current involvement, 36% of the larger ones are exploring the issues. Smaller companies report no or little involvement.

Section C of the Report examined potential obstacles to involvement. Expense of providing child care is the top obstacle (77%), followed closely by liability concerns at 76%. Complexity of a child care system is also considered a
major obstacle (50%), followed by lack of commitment from senior management (49%). Lack of evidence of long term benefits to the company was an obstacle for 40%, and not enough providers was an obstacle for 33%. Other obstacles were:

(i) inability to be fair to all employees : 30%
(ii) unsure of employee needs : 25%
(iii) believe that business should not be involved in family matters : 24%
(iv) unfamiliar with child care options : 23%
(v) employees without children might object : 21%

One other relevant analysis is a distinction made of the obstacles listed by companies currently involved in child care against companies not yet involved in child care. It was suspected that there would be interesting differences between the obstacles.

It was explained that some major obstacles for companies not involved in child care may be viewed as major simply because they were not yet involved and dealing with the issues, eg. 32% of the uninvolved companies stated that "unfamiliarity with child care options" is a major obstacle versus 15% of those already involved. But two other obstacles differed significantly. Companies not involved in child care reported a "lack of commitment from senior management" as a
major obstacle (63%) whereas only 35% of those involved in child care scored that obstacle as major. "Belief that business should not be involved in family matters" also differed considerably:

uninvolved: 35%
involved: 15%

One opinion asked of the ASPA respondents was whose primary responsibility child care was: the employee, the government or the employer. In the question of legislative proposals, only 2% agreed to the statement that the responsibility of child care is that of the employer. 83% disagreed, 13% were neutral and 2% were not sure.

It should be noted here that the structure of this extensive survey was the basis of this study of personnel officers in British Columbia. These findings will be compared to the results and presented in Chapter 5.

"Employer-Supported Day Care From The British Columbia Employers' Perspective"

The fourth study presented here is M. Mayfield's 1984 survey of employer involvement in and attitude about employer-supported child care in this province. The methodology of this study was a mail questionnaire sent to 170 B.C.-based corporations asking about "their need for, attitudes toward, interest in, and current or future plans for employer-supported child care". This study had a high return rate (75%) against an average 37% for such studies.
The answers to the questions of involvement and future plans show that only a small proportion of companies were willing to become directly involved in child care. Only 2% said they currently have worksite child care, although 20% indicated they would consider this option. A further 78% said they would not consider on-site child care. The off-site child care option received only slightly more commitment: 4% are currently involved, 29% would consider this option and 67% would not consider this. A higher response rate was given for child care information and referral service: 8% were currently using this option; 58% would consider this option, and 34% would not consider this option.16

The obstacles that employers indicated would prevent them from involvement are: cost, lack of interest by their employees, and the complexity of B.C. licensing regulations for child care centres.17

Mayfield concludes her report of the study by estimating that British Columbia employers, in 1984, were at an awareness and interest level of involvement, but "do not seem to have a great deal of information nor are they actively seeking information".18

A Sense of Security: Parent and Child Views Regarding Work-Related Child Care

A Canadian study examined the views of parents and children about their sense of security and satisfaction in the use of employer-supported child care. Nina Howe and Lora
Muller used a questionnaire to determine the factors that influence selection of worksite care, parental perceptions of a reduction of work/family stress and their job performance as affected by child care. Since no other study had examined the opinions of children, they also asked the older children in care (five year olds) about their likes and dislikes of this form of care.

The authors point out that while research in the 1970s attempted to determine the effects of out-of-home care on a child's development, more recent research (Belsky and Steinberg, 1978) has instead examined how the quality of care affects specific domains of development (Studkey, McGhee and Bell, 1982: child care and family interactions). The authors distinguish between "work-site care" (near the place of work, but functions independently of the company) and "employer-supported child care" (a direct tie to the company). Attention is drawn to a recent Canadian study (Howe and Moller, 1987) that found that on-site care (a form of employer-supported child care) was associated with low staff turnover, high job satisfaction, and a strong sense of professionalism among the teachers.

Two centres were investigated. One centre is a department of a company and a "pure" example of employer-supported child care. The other centre in this study serves employees of a mall and adjoining business offices and functions as a non-profit society independent of an employer.
Both centres are considered to provide high quality child care.

Approximately two-thirds of the parents reported that using these work-related centres reduced their guilt and stress about leaving their child in care. They also reported increased morale on the job. No parent reported this proximity of child care to work site as disruptive to their work. 74.5% reported that such care increased their child's sense of security; 72.6% felt it increased their child's happiness. As well, 62.7% reported that using on-site child care made them feel more positive about child care.

The children's views supported the positive perceptions of the parents. Questions were asked of the children about their likes and dislikes of child care, if they would rather come to child care or stay at home, and how they felt about being close to their parent's place of work. Most of the children said they liked to come to child care because they could play with their friends. 60% said they preferred child care over staying at home, because, "it's funner". Dislikes included broccoli and not being able to chew gum. All of the children indicated that they liked being close to their parent's place of work, including the comment, "She doesn't have to walk so far (to work) and I don't have to worry about it." The authors note that this type of comment shows that even young children are sensitive to the work/family dilemma.
This study indicates that employer-supported child care in general supports family relationships and reduces parental anxiety.

Summary

These five studies of employer involvement have been reviewed because they included in their surveys sections on company level of involvement and perceived employer obstacles to involvement.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will describe the methodology used to address the research problem as it evolved out of the review of the literature. The chapter includes the research problem, the procedures of the study, construction of the instrument, the subjects of the study, analysis of the data and a summary.

Statement of the Research Problem:

The research problem is:

"A MULTI-MEDIA PRESENTATION ABOUT EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE WILL BE EFFECTIVE IN INCREASING POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT OF COMPANIES IN CHILD CARE"

For the purposes of this study, the term "effective" is defined as:

1 having an effect; producing a result
2 producing a definite or desired result"19

To interpret the effectiveness of the research presentation, it was decided that effectiveness would be measured by the change in pre and post treatment responses of level of company involvement in child care and three often-cited obstacles to company involvement in child care.

To determine the impact of the individual respondent's background and profile, and the impact of the company that the
respondent represents, the post test instrument also collected information about the characteristics of the respondent and company so that changes in the effectiveness of the presentation could be compared if necessary.

Two items were selected from the test instrument to answer the first part of the research question. These are:

1. pretest company involvement in meeting employees' child care needs, as compared to
2. posttest respondent interest in meeting employees' child care needs.

The three supporting items are the perceived obstacles of: lack of evidence of long term benefits to the company, corporate liability when involved in child care, and, equity: concern that employees without children will object to the benefit.

Procedures

This investigation has a quasi-experimental methodology. The study consists of a pretest, treatment and posttest. The treatment is a one-day, multi-media educational seminar that was constructed to inform the subject group about the topic.

The business advisors for the larger study were asked about effective teaching strategies for the subjects in the study. The learning model most preferred by the subjects, namely the personnel officers in a professional association, is one that:

1. identifies steps that their colleagues are
already taking on an issue,

2. presents information in a concise, visual format, with a minimum of reading required, and

3. focuses specifically on local initiatives and concerns about an issue.

The format of the educational seminar was constructed to reflect these points to ensure maximum effect from a one-day, initial exposure to the topic.

Because the treatment time is short, additional time-delayed measures of effectiveness of the treatment are required. Therefore, as part of the larger study, a followup study was conducted six months after the test, and a more extensive follow-up study will be conducted one year later. Selected results of the six month followup study comprise Appendix B.

(i) Research Video

A fourteen minute, broadcast quality video was prepared that presented the topic according to:

the need for employer-supported child care the options available to employers, common questions and answers that employers raise about the topic, and, local examples of companies that have become involved in this form of child care.

Because the video was designed to be a marketing tool on the topic and intended to influence both knowledge and attitude of the topic, one specific American productivity
study of a company who became involved in child care, and measured its economic value to the company, was featured throughout the video. Local examples of companies involved in employer-supported child care were included.

(ii) Research Speakers

Experts were invited to present information on their specific areas of expertise on the research topic. A balance of perspectives were sought in selecting speakers who would best answer the interests and questions that employers initially have about the topic. These questions and concerns were identified in the review of the literature.

Speakers included an international researcher who gave the keynote address and was featured in the video as the author of the American productivity study, a local personnel officer whose company has been successfully involved in employer-supported child care for five years, a renowned Canadian researcher on the topic, and a provincial government civil servant who is responsible for licensing procedures of child care centres in British Columbia.

Subjects

The group of subjects were identified according to the following criteria:

1. corporate management personnel who are in a position to take forward a recommended plan of action,
2. personnel or human relations officers who are responsible for personnel matters and records,
3. available as a group for research purposes.

The subjects for the research are members of a provincial professional association for personnel officers. The executive of this association was approached and agreed to organize and present a seminar on the topic for its members. These self-selected subjects received a flyer advertising the seminar, paid a fee and were registered to attend. The seminar was jointly organized by the research team and a member of the association's educational committee.

Construction of the Instrument

A pre and post test design was selected as the research strategy because earlier studies in North America on this topic had consisted of mail surveys.

A survey from the American Society of Personnel Administrators was selected from their 1988 national survey in the United States to ensure reliability and validity and was then converted to the pre/post test used in this study. The original survey was constructed according to the criteria desired for this study:

Attitude
Knowledge
Respondent and Company Profile
In the event that it was needed, copyright permission from the Society was obtained. Considerable alteration was necessary to convert the original survey to a pre and post test instrument model.

Advice was sought on content terminology from the study's business advisors and obtained also in the pilot studies. Necessary alterations were made specifically in terms used that reflected a difference between common terms in the United States and Canada in the area of corporate personnel/human relations.

Prior to the final construction of the instrument, the services of the Educational Measurement Research Group (EMRG) at the University of British Columbia were contracted for final design of the instrument and consultation on data analysis. The final copy of the research instrument was designed by EMRG. Design features included a cover letter to the respondents, a subject research permission form and a test format that permitted computer scan of the results (Appendix A).

EMRG was also contracted to administer the tests in person. They also set up a cross-reference system whereby each subject received a pre and post test with a matched randomly assigned identity number. The cross-reference list is held in confidence at EMRG.

The pretest and posttest, with accompanying documents, is presented in its entirety in Appendix A.
(iii) Pilot Studies

Two pilot studies were conducted to measure and improve content and construct validity.

The first pilot study was conducted with a group of ten pilot subjects. It consisted of a three-quarters day seminar on the topic. The treatment was designed to approximate the research treatment and members of the research team administered it. The subjects varied from senior corporate decision-makers to mature students. The setting was the residence of one of the research team members. Materials were prepared and used for the pilot treatment. Extensive discussion and evaluation followed the treatment and records were kept of all recommendations and advice. The time taken to complete the pre and post test was measured and all materials were kept for later consideration.

As a result of the first pilot study, revisions were made to the treatment and instrument. A second pilot study was conducted prior to the research seminar (treatment) to ensure that the language and content reflected the constituent groups of the research subjects:

(i) public sector personnel management officers
(ii) private sector personnel management officers
(iii) crown corporation personnel management officers.
The second study had six subjects from these groups. The pilot instruments were analyzed and the subjects were interviewed for their recommendations and impressions of the construct of the instrument. Further minor revisions were made.

Conduct of the Research

The seminar was held on January 23, 1990. A lecture and film theatre was the site of the research.

The events of the day were filmed for a visual and written record of the treatment. The observers of the seminar included the two project Principal Investigators, the Western Representative of the Child Care Initiatives Fund, Health and Welfare, Canada (study funding agency) and the project personnel (Project Researcher, Research Coordinator, Project Manager, three Graduate Assistants).

An extensive binder on the topic of employer-supported child care that reinforced the main points of the treatment was presented to each respondent after they had completed the post test.

The research instrument was administered by the author and a consultant from EMRG. The consultant collected the tests at the end of the day and took them back to EMRG for statistical analysis.
Analysis of the Data

The pretest and posttest questions were coded and analyzed. The pretest and posttest questions for this study were selected from the larger study and statistical procedures were completed.

Pre and post frequency comparisons were examined at the individual item level to identify numerative changes between the pretest and posttest research items.

Factor analysis was then conducted for the entire instrument. The level of significance was set at .3 in each factor column. Two-way cross tabulations identified changes of significance. A Chi-Square "goodness of fit" procedure was used. The level of significance was set at .05.

Summary

This chapter has outlined the procedures.

Each procedure was selected from the knowledge gained from the review of the literature, consultation from the business advisors to the study, the direction of the principal investigators and the thesis committee and the advice of the Director of the U.B.C. Educational Measurement Research Group.

Results of the study are presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of analysis of the data. A profile of the companies and subjects will first be given to provide a limited basis for generalizability. The results of the primary research item of involvement will come next. Following this and to provide supporting evidence for the primary research question, the results of three questions that tested pretest and posttest perceptions of obstacles will be given. The chapter will conclude with an overall statement of results.

Profile of the Companies and Subjects

A total of forty people participated in the seminar, representing 38 institutions. A profile of the companies represented showed that:

- over 63% were located on the Lower Mainland;
- while the average number of employees was 2,000, 66% of the companies counted fewer than 1,000 employees;
- the majority of organizations (66%) reported their companies were at least partially unionized, and
- 61% of the companies were public and 39% were privately owned.

Most of the seminar participants were personnel managers or human resource managers. A profile of the subjects showed:
- the average tenure was 10.8 years; over 67% were with the company they represented for less than ten years;
- the average age of the subjects was 43.5 years;
- only 36.6% were parents with children under 12 years;
- female subjects outnumbered males 33 to 7.

To the extent to which other members of the professional association share similar characteristics, it is not unreasonable to assume that similar results as presented below would also apply to other members as well as the research subjects.

Results Of The Primary Research Problem

"A multi-media presentation about the topic of employer-supported child care will be effective in increasing potential involvement of companies in child care."

To confirm the research problem, responses from one general pretest item of the respondents' company involvement in child care was compared with a general posttest item of the level of respondent interest in meeting employees' child care needs.

To provide additional support of evidence for the research problem, three pretest and posttest items were compared.
Pretest Involvement and Posttest Interest in Employer-Supported Child Care

At the pretest, the respondents were asked to report their companies' "current level of involvement in child care", according to a category of five possible responses (see Figure 1 and Table 1). 15% said that their companies were "not involved in child care".

At the posttest, the respondents were asked to then report their "interest in meeting employees' needs". All respondents reported involvement. 40% of the respondents were at the pretest "discussing" level of involvement in child care and at the posttest that percentage had declined to 35%. 42.5% were at the pretest "researching" level and at posttest, only 10% respondents were at that level.

The biggest change occurred at the "developing an option" level of involvement: whereas only 2.5% reported that level at the pretest, 32.5% reported being at that level by the posttest. By the posttest, one company had also moved to the expanding an option level and one company was reviewing or revising their child care services.

TABLE I: COMPANY LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT IN CHILD CARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uninvolved</th>
<th>Discussing</th>
<th>Researching</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting Research Questions

Three pretest and posttest items were analyzed to measure the change in opinion of how the respondents perceived obstacles to a company being involved in child care. The three obstacles are:

1. lack of evidence of child care services providing long term benefits to the company
2. corporate liability
3. equity.

To answer these questions, the respondents selected an "obstacle" level from a five-point scale (1 - not an obstacle, 5 - major obstacle).
Nonparametric tests were used to determine the results because the data was categorical and ordinal. Frequencies and cross-tabulations were examined. A chi-square test was used to analyze the data because "to determine whether two frequency distributions differ significantly from each other". The level of significance was set at .05.

The respondents were asked their pretest and posttest perception of three oft-cited obstacles to involvement in employees' child care: lack of evidence of long term benefits to the company, corporate liability, and equity. The respondents viewed all three obstacles as less of a posttest obstacle.

The greatest change occurred with the obstacle of long term benefit to the company. Prior to the seminar, over 51% of the respondents saw lack of evidence as an important or major perceived obstacle. At the conclusion of the seminar, 15% reported this perceived obstacle at these levels. The finding is significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Obstacle</th>
<th>Minor Obstacle</th>
<th>Average Obstacle</th>
<th>Import. Obstacle</th>
<th>Major Obstacle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 20.461 \]
\[ \text{DF} = 4 \]
The perceived obstacles of corporate liability and equity were also significantly reduced. The reduction in the obstacle of equity is included because it is often listed as a major obstacle. The alpha level was relaxed to 1.0 for this exploratory result because it may be of interest to the reader.

**TABLE III: CORPORATE LIABILITY AS AN OBSTACLE TO INVOLVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 25.433 \]

\[ DF = 4 \]
According to Figure 3, the perception that corporate liability is an obstacle was significantly reduced. Prior to the seminar, 53% reported that corporate liability was an important or major perceived obstacle. At the conclusion of the seminar, 23% reported this perceived obstacle at these levels. There was also an increase in seven companies who no longer viewed corporate liability as an obstacle at the end of the seminar. Several speakers addressed this perceived obstacle in depth.

**TABLE IV: EQUITY AS AN OBSTACLE TO INVOLVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Obstacle</th>
<th>Minor Obstacle</th>
<th>Average Obstacle</th>
<th>Important Obstacle</th>
<th>Major Obstacle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.810 \]

DF = 4
As shown in Figure 4, the perception of equity as a perceived obstacle was significantly reduced. Prior to the seminar, 23% of the participants indicated that equity was an important or major obstacle. Following the seminar, only 5% of these participants still held these views.

Summary
This chapter has presented the results of the research. Three obstacles were significantly reduced. Frequency changes in the overall question of involvement in employees' child care needs clearly show a shift from weaker interest prior to the seminar to stronger interest after the seminar.
CHAPTER FIVE

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This chapter will discuss the results of the four research questions. Recommendations for further research will be presented as they have been confirmed from the results of the study. The procedures and content of the six-month follow-up study will be discussed. A summary will conclude this chapter.

Implications

Although this question was examined at the numerical change level only, a number of companies had increased their level of interest in involvement in child care for their employees between the pretest and posttest. There are a number of factors that must be considered when drawing conclusions from this finding:

1. the change could have occurred without exposure to the test treatment.
2. the change could have occurred because of reasons that were not part of the test treatment.
3. the treatment was effective in encouraging the subjects to further involve themselves in child care for their employees.
4. their stated posttest interest in involvement will not lead to further actual involvement in child care.
Given these cautions, it is notable that 30% of the respondents had moved from non-involvement, discussion or researching levels at the pretest to development of an option of child care at the posttest. We do not know from which pretest level each of the companies moved, but over the course of the seminar, there were representatives from twelve out of forty companies that became further interested in involvement of employer-supported child care.

The supporting questions provide evidence that the treatment was effective. Three obstacles were significantly reduced:

lack of evidence that child care services provides long term benefits to the company,
corporate liability when involved in providing of child care services, and,
equity.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is proven. Three off-cited obstacles were significantly reduced. Although the general question of pretest and posttest involvement cannot be confirmed to have a significant result, it can be argued on the basis of logic that the significant findings in the obstacles prove that the multi-media presentation on the topic of employer-supported child care was effective for this group of subjects.

The implications of these results are that personnel officers who are motivated to seek information about the topic
of employer-supported child care will move to a higher level of involvement from this multi-media presentation. It also shows that these personnel officers have moved to a development level of involvement from a previous discussion/research level and that barriers to involvement will be reduced.

The advice from the business advisors was sound in that these personnel officers learned about the topic from the multi-media presentation. Logically, it can be concluded that repeated offerings of this presentation would further encourage development of employer-supported child care for similar groups of personnel officers.

Recommendations For Further Research

Further study is implied in at least four areas.

Expense of involvement in employer-supported child care remains an obstacle. This may be correlated to the obstacle of a lack of evidence of long term benefits to the company. Study is called for in this area: productivity studies to provide evidence of the cost/benefits for a company when involved in child care would reduce the one direct obstacle (current lack of evidence) and may affect the obstacle of expense.

The obstacle of corporate liability requires study. Is this obstacle simply a lack of information about the nature of child care? Or is it a broader issue that indicates companies are concerned about such legal issues as protection against
charges of abuse or low quality care? Since corporate liability is affected by the type of child care option chosen, i.e. on or near site child care, and it would vary from company to company depending on the economic category of the company, a study is called for.

The obstacle of equity appears to have been addressed adequately in this multi-media presentation. Perhaps as employers learn of the many options available to a company when addressing the child care needs of their employees and see the topic of child care from an economic perspective, child care can be perceived as an employee benefit within a range of benefits available to employees.

Expense remains an often-perceived obstacle. It may also be a genuine obstacle. The cost of involvement in child care depends, again, on the option of employer-supported child care chosen by the company. Specific ways of educating companies about the expense of the various options and comparing it to the child care needs of the company's employees could be examined. Costs could then be compared to the productivity gains that could be expected from employer-supported child care.

One other study is called for. Social policy for child care is lacking in Canada. The role of the government, the employer and the employee/parent requires further examination. A study of companies currently involved in child care may reveal employer attitudes about their perception of
their responsibility for employees' child care, their reasons for becoming involved, and their perception of the long term benefits to the company.

Since companies value knowing what their more "innovative" colleagues and competitors are doing, this information may convince the "fast followers" to proceed with child care.

Follow-up Study

One limitation already stated was the shortness of the treatment time. A one-day educational seminar, even though the effectiveness has been proven to reduce obstacles and strengthen an opinion, did change the respondents' stated level of involvement in child care. But how long will such a treatment last? A binder of quality materials on the topic of employer-supported child care, including ways to overcome obstacles, was presented to the respondents after the posttest had been concluded.

The larger study, of which this study is a small component, includes two follow-up studies to determine if the respondents did proceed with involvement in child care within their companies. One follow-up study was conducted six months after the educational seminar (Appendix B) and there will be a further follow-up study one year later.21
Summary

This study was conducted as a preliminary investigation of personnel officers about their knowledge and attitude towards involvement in employer-supported child care. The review of the literature revealed that several surveys have been done to examine company involvement in this topic and obstacles to involvement. No studies could be found that attempted to change the level of involvement by a specific treatment. This study did provide evidence that a quality, multi-media presentation about the topic will change the level of involvement of personnel officers. Since it is personnel officers who are responsible for policy development in this area of employee benefits, there is value to this type of presentation in encouraging companies to become involved in meeting the child care needs of their employees.
ENDNOTES

2. Conference Board of Canada: see bibliography for information.
7. Balancing Work and Family Responsibilities; Paris; Helene; Conference Board of Canada: see bibliography for details.
8. Conference Board of Canada: see bibliography for details.
12. Ibid, p. 100.
15. University Reserach Corporation, 1982, as quoted in M. Mayfield, p. 94.
17. This is cited as a cost factor, according to M. Mayfield, p. 102.

21. "Not part of this study".
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APPENDIX A: Test Instruments
I have read the enclosed letter and understand that I will be asked to complete a questionnaire, to listen to an informational presentation on employer-supported child care, and to complete a second questionnaire. I understand that I may refuse to participate in the session and may withdraw at any time without any penalty. I understand that all information will be kept anonymous.

I acknowledge signing and receiving a copy of this consent form for my own records.

Signature

Name

Date
PRE-TEST
EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: Please use the dark pencil provided and indicate your response by filling in the appropriate bubble completely. If you wish to change your answer, erase all traces of the wrong mark and darken the correct bubble.

FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY.

SECTION I: CURRENT INVOLVEMENT

A. Categorize your company’s levels of involvement in meeting employees’ child care needs. N.B. “Child care needs” refers to care for children (aged 0 to 12 years) in licensed family day care or group child care settings.

- NOT INVOLVED in child care
- DISCUSSING the topic
- RESEARCHING the topic
- DEVELOPING an option (i.e., close to implementing)
- CHILD CARE in place
- REVISING/EXPANDING our child care

B. Based on your perception of the child care needs of your employees, how adequately is your company meeting its perceived employees’ child care needs?

- Very adequately
- Adequately
- Less than adequately
- Unsure
- Not at all

SECTION II: KNOWLEDGE

A. General Knowledge

To what degree have you heard of each of these topics related to employer-supported child care?

1) Proposed federal legislation on child care
none little some lot

2) "Workforce 2000", the Hudson Institute (U.S.) report of labour conditions and skill shortages
none little some lot

none little some lot

4) Needs assessment procedures to determine your employees’ child care arrangements
none little some lot

5) Employer costs when choosing child care benefits
none little some lot

6) Research on the effects of child care assistance on productivity, absenteeism, and other employee behaviours
none little some lot

7) Provincial procedures necessary to establish licensed child care centres
none little some lot
8) Tax advantages of flexible child care benefit plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>none</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Options

A broad range of options exist for a company to respond to the child care needs of its employees.

1) Information and Referral Services
2) Financial Assistance
3) Direct Child Care Services
4) Flexible Personnel Policies

1) Information and Referral Services

Specify if your company has considered and/or implemented any of the information/referral options listed below:

(Fill one bubble for each option)

1 = Unfamiliar with option
2 = Currently considering
3 = Implemented
4 = Considered and rejected
5 = Have not considered

a) Information and referral/counselling services (includes employer-supported child care)

b) Company-sponsored parent education workshop/seminars

c) Counselling services to help parents cope with the stress of family demands

d) Parent resource centres at work, eg. library for information on child-rearing issues

e) Other:
(Please specify)

2) Financial Assistance

The organization financially supports, in whole or part, the development and/or operation of a selected child care benefit.

These options permit the employer to select the degree to which the company wishes to become involved financially with the employee/parent.

Instructions: Specify if your company has considered and/or implemented any of the financial assistance initiatives listed below:

(Fill one bubble for each option)

1 = Unfamiliar with option
2 = Currently considering
3 = Implemented
4 = Considered and rejected
5 = Have not considered

a) Financial corporate contribution to community child care service

b) In-house corporate contribution to community child care service

c) Flexible employee benefit plan (cafeteria style)

d) Employee reimbursement plan for child care (voucher system)

e) Employee discounts offered at specific child care centres (vendor system)

f) A policy for family responsibility days (including cost of sick child care)

g) Other:
(Please specify)
### 3) Direct Child Care Services

**Instructions:** Specify if your company has considered and/or implemented any of the child care services listed below:

(Fill one bubble for each option)

1 = Unfamiliar with option
2 = Currently considering
3 = Implemented
4 = Considered and rejected
5 = Have not considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Child care centre as part of corporate structure at or near work site</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg. child care staff are employees of the company)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Child care centre as separate from corporate structure at or near work site</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg. child care staff are employees of a non-profit society)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Employer-consortium arrangement with other companies for a child care centre</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Employer contributions to after-school programs in the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Financial contribution by employer to community-based non-profit society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Child care services for employees whose children are sick</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Family day care networks, ie. a system of licensed day care homes with spaces reserved for employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Other: (Please specify)
**SECTION III: ATTITUDES**

**A. Perceived Obstacles**

Instructions: Indicate the extent to which you believe the following are an obstacle to implementing an employer-supported child care program in your company:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expense of child care assistance or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Corporate liability when involved in providing of child care services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concern that employees without children will object to child care benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inability to be fair to all employees with child care needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uncertainty as to employees' child care needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unfamiliarity with child care options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complexity of child care licensing procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Unfamiliarity with child care licensing procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shortage of qualified child care professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of evidence of child care services providing long term benefits to the company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Opinions on Child Care Legislation**

Instructions: Specify the position most closely representing your personal viewpoint:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lack of commitment from senior management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Possible pending legislation on a national child care program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Belief that business should not be involved in family matters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other: (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Opinions on Child Care Legislation, Cont'd...

Instructions: Specify the position most closely representing your personal viewpoint:

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Disagree
4 = Strongly Disagree

4) The funding of child care services should be shared between government and employees

5) The funding of child care services should be shared between employers and employees

6) The funding of child care services should be shared by employees, employers, and government

7) Additional tax credits/deductions should be given to employers for providing child care assistance

8) Government grants should be provided for employer-supported child care programs, i.e. vouchers, start-up costs, and staff training

9) Government dollars should be spent on establishing group liability insurance pools for licensed child care programs

10) Government funding should be directed toward studying possible economic effects (costs/benefits) of child care benefit plan

11) The inclusion of a child care option should be a mandatory component of a flexible cafeteria-type plan
Dear IRMA Member:

In order to complete the research component of this seminar, we now need your participation in the post-test.

Please answer each question as completely as possible. Your comments and opinions will be valuable to the project.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Carol Ehner, B.A.
Project Researcher
Instructor
Early Childhood Education
Douglas College
**EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE SURVEY**

**Section I - CURRENT INVOLVEMENT**

Which of the following would now best describe your interest in meeting your employee's child care needs? (Please fill the appropriate bubble)

- [ ] 1) I plan to DISCUSS the child care topic
- [ ] 2) I plan to RESEARCH the employee's child care needs
- [ ] 3) I plan to DEVELOP an option for child care support or service
- [ ] 4) I plan to EXPAND an option for child care support or service
- [ ] 5) I plan to REVIEW OR REVISE child care support or service
- [ ] 6) Other (Please specify)

**Section II - KNOWLEDGE**

**A. General Knowledge:**

Instructions: Fill the appropriate bubble.

After participating in this seminar, do you know more about the following topics related to employer-supported child care?

1) Proposed federal legislation on child care
   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE

2) "Workforce 2000", the Hudson Institute (U.S.) report of labour conditions and skill shortages
   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE

   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE

4) Needs assessment procedures to determine your employee's child care arrangements
   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE

5) Employer costs when choosing child care benefit options
   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE

6) Research on the effects of child care assistance on productivity, absenteeism, and other employee behaviours
   - [ ] YES  [ ] NO  [ ] UNSURE
B. Options:

You now know there are at least four different child care options:

1) Information and Referral Services
2) Financial Assistance
3) Direct Child Care Services
4) Flexible Personnel Policies

1. Information and Referral Services

Do you personally flunk your company will now consider and/or implement any of the information/referral options listed below?

Instructions: Fill one bubble for each option.

1 = Will Consider
2 = Will Implement
3 = Will neither Consider nor Implement
4 =  Already Implemented

a) Information and referral/counselling services (includes employer-supported child care)  

b) Company-sponsored parent education workshop/seminars  

c) Counselling services to help parents cope with the stress of family demands  

d) Parent resource centres at work eg. library for information on child-rearing issues  

2. Financial Assistance

Do you personally think that your company will now consider and/or implement any of the financial assistance initiatives listed below?

Instructions: Fill one bubble for each option.

1 = Will Consider
2 = Will Implement
3 = Will neither Consider nor Implement
4 =  Already Implemented

a) Financial corporate contribution to community child care services  

b) In-house corporate contribution to community child care services  

c) Flexible employee benefit plan  

d) Employee reimbursement plan for child care (voucher system)  

e) Employee discounts offered at specific child care centres (vendor system)  

f) A policy for family responsibility days (including cost of sick child care)  

g) Other (please specify)  

If you indicated "Will neither Consider nor Implement" for any of the information/referral options listed above, please give reasons:
3. Direct Child Care Services

Do you personally think that your company will now consider and/or implement any of the child care services listed below:

Instructions: Fill one bubble for each option.

1 = Will Consider  
2 = Will Implement  
3 = Will neither Consider nor Implement  
4 = Already Implemented

a) Child care centre as part of corporate structure at or near work site
   (eg. child care staff are employees of the company)
   1 2 3 4

b) Child care centre as separate from corporate structure at or near work site
   (eg. child care staff are employees of a non-profit society)
   1 2 3 4

c) Employer-consortium arrangement with other companies for a child care centre
   1 2 3 4

d) Employer contributions to after-school programs in the community
   1 2 3 4

e) Financial contribution by employer to community-based non-profit society
   1 2 3 4

f) Child care services for employees whose children are sick
   1 2 3 4

g) Family day care networks, ie. a system of licensed day care homes with spaces reserved for employees
   1 2 3 4

h) Other (please specify)

If you indicated "Will neither Consider nor Implement" for any of these services listed above, please state any reasons for not proceeding:

4. Flexible Personnel Policies

Do you think that your company will now consider and/or implement any of the alternative work schedules listed below?

Instructions: Fill one bubble for each option.

1 = Will Consider  
2 = Will Implement  
3 = Will neither Consider nor Implement  
4 = Already Implemented

a) Flex-time (variable daily/weekly)
   1 2 3 4

b) Part-time work options
   1 2 3 4

c) Job sharing
   1 2 3 4

d) Work at home programs (flex-place)
   1 2 3 4

e) Special summer or holiday hours for child care needs
   1 2 3 4

f) Paid maternity leave in addition to statutory level
   1 2 3 4

g) Unpaid leave time for family responsibilities
   1 2 3 4
b) Other (please specify)

Do you consider Flexible personnel policies a form of employer-supported child care?

If you indicated "Will neither Consider nor Implement" for any of the flexible personnel policies, please give your reasons:

Comment

Section III - ATTITUDES

A. Perceived Obstacles

Instructions: As a result of this presentation, indicate the extent you believe the following STILL to be an obstacle to implementing an employer-supported child care program in your company:

1 = Not an obstacle
5 = Major obstacle

1) Expense of child care assistance or services

2) Corporate liability when involved in providing of child care services

3) Concern that employees without children will object to child care benefits

4) Inability to be fair to all employees with child care needs

5) Uncertainty as to employees' child care needs

6) Unfamiliarity with child care options

7) Complexity of child care options

8) Unfamiliarity with child care licensing procedures

9) Shortage of qualified child care professionals

10) Lack of evidence of child care services providing long term benefits to the company

11) Lack of commitment from senior management

12) Possible pending legislation on a national child care program

13) Belief that business should not be involved in family matters

14) Other (please specify)
B. Opinions on Child Care Legislation

Instructions: After participating in this multi-media presentation, specify the position now reflecting your personal viewpoint:

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Disagree
4 = Strongly Disagree

1) The federal government should invest more dollars in providing child care programs

2) The funding of child care services is primarily the responsibility of
   2.1 The employee
   2.2 The employer
   2.3 The government

3) The funding of child care services should be shared between government and employees

4) The funding of child care services should be shared between government and employers

5) The funding of child care services should be shared between employers and employees

6) The funding of child care services should be shared between employees, employers and government

7) Additional tax credits/deductions should be given to employers for providing child care assistance

8) Government grants should be provided for employer-supported child care programs, ie. vouchers, start-up costs, and staff training

9) Government dollars should be spent on establishing group liability insurance pools for licensed child care programs

10) Government funding should be directed toward studying possible effects (costs/benefits) of child care

11) The inclusion of a child care option should be a mandatory component of a flexible cafeteria-type benefit plan

C. General

1) Do you think your company could benefit by providing a child care option for its employees?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

2) Has this seminar changed your thinking about employer-supported child care?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

3) Is there any additional information about the topic that you would like to know more about?
4) Evaluation of the video:

What new information on the topic of employer-supported child care did the video present to you?

5) Any additional comments for the presenters?

Section IV - PROFILE

Please provide the following information to assist in the analysis of our survey findings: (All survey responses are confidential)

A. COMPANY PROFILE

1) Number of employees in the company (BC only)

- under 25
- 25 - 50
- 51 - 100
- 101 - 500
- 501 - 1,000
- 1001 - 5,000
- 5001 - 10,000
- over 10,000

2) Which category best describes your business?

- a) Manufacturing
- b) Utilities, Transportation, Communication
- c) Retail/Wholesale Trade
- d) Computer/Data Processing
- e) Finance, Insurance, Real Estate
- f) Health Care
- g) Education
- h) Service Industry
- i) Primary Resources
- j) Environmental Services
- k) Construction
- l) Other (please specify)

3) What is the geographic location of your B.C. business facility?

- a) East Kootenay
- b) Central Kootenay
- c) Okanagan-Boundary
- d) Lillooet-Thompson
- e) Lower Mainland
- f) Vancouver Island/Coast
- g) Cariboo-Fort George
- h) Peace River-Liard
- i) Skeena-Stikine
- j) Multi-site (please state locations by letter)

4) Which category best describes your business?

- Public sector
- Private sector

5) When considering all mid to senior management level employees in your company, what percentage are male? female? (should total 100% together).

percent male
- don't know
percent female

6) What number of male and female employees in your company are in the following age groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) What percentage of your workforce is unionized?

- 0%
- 10% or less
- 11% to 24%
- 25% to 50%
- 51% to 75%
- 76% and over

8) What is the percentage of employees with children under 12 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. RESPONDENT PROFILE:

1) What is your title?

2) How long have you been with your company?
   __________ years __________ months

3) What access do you have to information about employees' needs for child care and how they resolve work/family conflicts?
   - direct (employees provide information to me)
   - semi-direct (employee provides information to me through a supervisor)
   - by third party report only

4) Age of respondent (last birthday):
   - under 20 years
   - 20 - 29
   - 30 - 39
   - 40 - 49
   - 50 - 59
   - 60 or over

5) __ Male  __ Female

6) Marital Status
   - Married
   - Single
   - Divorced
   - Separated
   - Widowed

7) To which ethnic or cultural group(s) do you or did your ancestors belong?

8) When you were a child, which did you attend:
   - child care centre
   - nursery/preschool
   - family day care
   - kindergarten
   - none of the above
   - other (please specify)

9) Are you presently parenting one or more children under the age of 12?
   - yes
   - no

10) Which do/did your child(ren) attend?
    - day care
    - nursery/preschool
    - family day care
    - kindergarten
    - not applicable
    - other (please specify)

11) Have you attended a workshop on this topic in the last six months?
    - yes
    - no
    
    If yes, which organization sponsored the workshop?

12) Comments - please write any comments you would like to share on employer involvement in child care.
APPENDIX B: Follow-up Study: Results
APPENDIX B: FOLLOW-UP STUDY

A limitation of the study was its brevity. Although the seminar effectively reduced obstacles and increased interest in involvement in employer-supported child care, a follow-up study would determine the seminar's lasting effects. How long would such commitment last?

A mail survey that corresponded to key items in the original test instrument was designed and sent out to the research subjects six months after the seminar. The services of EMRG were contracted to assist with the design (Appendix A) of the follow-up study. The original cross-referenced list of subjects and reference numbers was used to assure confidentiality. A response time of two weeks was requested. A further telephone call was made one week after the deadline to tardy respondents.

Thirty two out of forty respondents returned the survey. Comparisons were made between a selected pretest or posttest item and a follow-up study item. Comparisons were made by comparing individual subjects' responses on each item.

General Levels of Involvement

In response to a question of change of interest in the topic of employer-supported child care as a result of the research seminar, 35% of the respondents said that their interest had changed, 54% said that their interest had not changed, and 13% did not know if there interest had changed.
As to their company's level of involvement in child care after the research seminar, 23% said that the involvement had changed, 71% said it had not changed, and 6% did not know if their company's level of involvement had changed.

When comparing the subjects' posttest level of involvement and the follow-up study's question regarding their company's present level of involvement, there was a 27% increase in companies' researching and developing employer-supported child care. There was less discussing and reviewing the issue and more active involvement in employer-supported child care from the seminar in January to the follow-up study in July.

**TABLE V: LATER INVOLVEMENT IN EMPLOYER-SUPPORTED CHILD CARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Discuss</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Develop</th>
<th>Expand</th>
<th>Review/Revise</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>8*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 12.438 \]
\[ DF = 3 \]
\[ ^* = 8 \text{ companies increase involvement level} \]
APPENDIX C: Follow-up Survey
YOUR COMPANY'S INTEREST

1. Has your company's LEVEL OF INTEREST changed as a result of the IRMA "Employer-Supported Child Care" seminar on January 23rd?
   - YES
   - NO
   - DONT KNOW

2. Which ONE of the following would now BEST describe your MAJOR interest in meeting your employees' child care needs? (Mark ONLY one)
   - ( ) Have DISCUSSED the child care topic
   - ( ) Have RESEARCHED the employees' child care needs
   - ( ) Plan to DEVELOP an option for child care benefit
   - ( ) Plan to EXPAND an option for child care benefit
   - ( ) Plan to REVIEW or REVISE a child care benefit

   Comments:

YOUR COMPANY'S INVOLVEMENT

3. Has your company's LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT changed as a result of the January 23rd seminar on employer-supported child care?
   - YES
   - NO
   - DONT KNOW

4a. Which ONE of the following BEST describes your company's present level of involvement in meeting employees' child care needs? (N.B. "Child care needs" refers to care for children ages 0 to 12 years in licensed family day care or group child care settings.)
   - ( ) NOT INVOLVED in child care
   - ( ) DISCUSSING the topic
   - ( ) RESEARCHING the topic
   - ( ) DEVELOPING an option (i.e. close to implementing)
   - ( ) CHILD CARE in place
   - ( ) REVISIGN/EXPANDING child care benefit

4b. Please list the child care options that your company is considering or implementing:

   Comments:

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
5. How do you feel the government should increase its level of assistance in child care benefits to employers?

- Provision of tax credits directly to employees
- Provision of tax credits to employers
- Direct funding to child care centers
- Simplified regulations on setting up a child care center
- Deduction of pre-tax dollars as part of employee benefit plan
- Financial incentives to implement a child care center
- The government should NOT increase its level of assistance
- Other

Comments:

6. Did the print materials provided at the IRMA seminar help you to clarify the topic of employer-supported child care?

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW

If "yes", please indicate the areas of information you found most useful. (Mark all that apply)

- The need for child care
- Child care options (i.e. information and referral)
- The benefits of child care to the employer
- The status of the research on child care

Comments:

7. If you did not proceed with employer-supported child care, why not? (Mark all that apply)

- Lack of knowledge on how to proceed
- Expense of child care assistance or services
- Issue of corporate liability when involved in providing child care services
- Concern that employees without children will object to child care benefits
- Inability to be fair to all employees with child care needs
- Uncertainty as to employees' child care needs
- Unfamiliarity with child care options
- Complexity of child care licensing procedures
- Unfamiliarity with child care licensing procedures
- Shortage of qualified child care professionals
- Lack of evidence of child care services providing long term benefits to the company
- Lack of commitment from senior management
- Possible pending legislation on a national child care program
- Belief that business should not be involved in family matters
- Unavailability of qualified child care consultant to assist with procedures
- Lack of employee interest
- Other

Comments: