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Abstract

This research was carried out in an attempt to determine the child care needs of parents in Windsor and to test a number of research hypotheses concerning the use of and attitudes toward child care arrangements. The questionnaire was in the form of a telephone interview and was administered to 349 respondents.

It was hypothesized that use of and attitudes toward various child care arrangements would vary greatly by socioeconomic status. Some reliable differences were found but not as many as were expected. There was a trend toward increased satisfaction with child care among higher SES groups, and there was evidence that perceived availability and affordability were affected by SES. There were no reliable differences among the type of arrangement being used and SES although there was a trend in the direction of increased use of day care among higher maternal education levels. Contrary to expectations, higher SES and education levels were associated with higher caregiving concerns and as expected with higher educational concerns.
Sex of one's child also had a number of effects on responses. Mothers of daughters were much more likely to express moderate satisfaction with their employment status. Mothers of sons were much more concerned with disciplinary issues, and there was a slight trend toward increased concern with affection among mothers of daughters. Discipline and affection concerns themselves were related to SES. Higher maternal education level and paternal SES were associated with higher discipline concerns and higher maternal education level was associated with higher affection concerns.

The data collected demonstrate that educational level and maternal characteristics lead to significant differences. These pieces of information have not always been included in past research but should be in the future. It has also been found that different samples can yield evidence of different attitudes and use patterns. To provide parents with what they want and need, each community needs to assess its own particular needs.
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Chapter I
Introduction

Maternal Employment

Economists have referred to the movement of women into the paid labour force as the single most outstanding phenomenon of the twentieth century (Maynard, 1985). In 1985, one out of every two married women was gainfully employed. The fastest-growing sector of the work force consists of mothers of infants. It is estimated that by 1990, three out of four mothers will be employed outside the home, as will 45% of those with children under six. This means that many parents will need to find appropriate care for their children while they work.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the child care needs of parents in Windsor. Before discussing why such an investigation is necessary, it is beneficial to look at some of the research concerning the effects of maternal employment on children. In choosing various forms of child care and indeed, in choosing whether or not to use nonmaternal care, parents rely on perceived differences in what the care provides and in what its effects are. Before looking at what is perceived by parents one must
consider what effects are actually documented in the literature.

Much of the research on maternal employment began within the framework of the maternal deprivation literature. Those observing institutionalized infants or children who were deprived of their mothers noted that very serious consequences ensued. The difference between maternal deprivation and maternal separation was overlooked and the serious negative effects of prolonged parental separation were extrapolated to the conclusion that any separation of the mother and child is harmful. Etaugh's (1980) review of popular literature in the 1950's and 1960's revealed that much of this literature expressed disapproval of nonmaternal care and of maternal employment in children's early years. Kugelmass (1965) went as far as to assert that "the worst natural mother is better in the long run than the best day-care mother."

Other researchers were quick to point out that maternal deprivation literature was not the proper source for conclusions regarding the effects of maternal employment on young children. Mead (1954) believed the insistence that any separation is damaging was unfounded and warned against the over-emphasis on the importance of the tie between the child and its biological mother. "On the contrary, cross-cultural
studies suggest that adjustment is most facilitated if the child is cared for by many warm friendly, people." This more positive view was reflected in the popular literature of the 1970's. It described many of the benefits of day care experience and emphasized the importance of good day care for all children and not just those of working mothers (Etaugh, 1980).

As a result of the notable influx of women with children into the paid labour force, there has been a great deal of interest and research designed to uncover what, if any, effects this change of traditional female role was having on those involved. Hoffman (1964) presents the rather interesting hypothesis that the role of the present-day nonemployed mothers may be as new as the role of present-day mothers who are employed. Neither one represents the traditional pattern. Due to factors such as decreasing family size and the diminished amount of work necessary to run a household, the nonemployed mother today may have a lot more time and energy to invest in her offspring. This may well result in more intense parent-child interactions than have ever been seen before.

Much of the research on maternal employment has focused on the effects of nonmaternal care on children. Researchers have investigated the areas of cognitive and intellectual functioning, social-emotional
development, attachment, mother-child interactions, father-child interactions and sex role perception.

**Effects on Intellectual Functioning**

In studying the effects of nonmaternal care on a child's cognitive and intellectual functioning, many of the original investigations failed to report the results separately by sex. As a result, the findings were often contradictory and no clear pattern emerged. Hoffman (1963), in commenting on the inconsistent findings, hypothesized that maternal employment is negatively related to achievement for boys, but is either unrelated or positively related for girls. Later studies which included analyses by sex have provided some support for this hypothesis. Dits and Cambier (1966) reported lower school grades for sons of working mothers and Brown (1970) found poorer performance on achievement tests.

Gold and Andres (1978a) investigated the role of maternal employment on intellectual ability in a number of different samples. In their study using ten-year-old children, it was found that middle-class boys with employed mothers had lower scores on language and mathematics achievement tests than did the other middle-class children, despite the higher educational level of these mothers. In a study using nursery school
children (Gold & Andres, 1978b), it was again found that the sons of employed mothers had lower IQ scores than either the daughters of employed mothers or the children of nonemployed mothers. Two further studies used as their samples ten-year-old francophone children (Gold & Andres, 1980) and nursery-school francophone children (Gold, Andres & Glorieux, 1979). These investigations revealed no effects of maternal employment, however, the fathers in these francophone families were much more involved in child care than were the fathers in the other samples. Gold and Andres hypothesized that maternal employment had fewer ramifications on the development of children in the francophone sample because of this greater paternal involvement.

Frankel (1964) compared high- and low-achieving high school boys of high intellectual ability and found that the incidence of maternal employment was greater among the lower achievers. Frankel interviewed the mothers and noted that the working mothers of the low achievers were aggressive and hostile; more rejecting of the homemaker role, more dissatisfied with their position in the family and less involved with their sons than were the mothers of the high achievers. He concluded that maternal employment per se was unrelated to academic achievement, but that the mother's
personality and occupation might play an important role. In short, maternal satisfaction is an important intervening variable.

Other studies have failed to find any relationship between maternal employment and achievement for either boys or girls (Burchinal, 1963; Keidel, 1970; Nelson, 1969). Farley (1968), on the other hand reported that maternal employment was positively related to college grade point average for boys, but unrelated for girls. Banducci's (1967) data suggest a positive effect of maternal employment for laborers' and skilled workers' sons, but lower performance among the sons of professionals. No differences were found for girls. Hoffman (1974), in her review of the relevant literature, states that overall the data suggest that the sons of middle class working mothers show lower academic performance than the daughters. For lower class children, however, better academic performance is associated with maternal employment for both sexes.

Much of the research in the past decade has focused on comparing home-reared and day-care-reared children. Most of these studies indicate no difference between day-care-reared children and matched controls on subsequent intellectual development (Caldwell, Wright, Honig, & Tannenbaum, 1970; Cochran, 1977; Moore, 1975). There have been, however, a number of positive effects
accruing from day care reported for children who have been categorized as higher risk than the average middle class child. Ramey and Smith (1976) conducted a longitudinal study of three groups of infants: (1) a high-risk experimental group placed in a specially designed cognitive enrichment day-care program (2) a high-risk, home-reared control group and, (3) a general population contrast group reared at home. Between 6 and 18 months, performance on the mental developmental subscale of the Bayley Developmental Scale declined for the high-risk control group, from 104 to 86. It remained stable, at 104, for the high-risk experimental groups. Moreover, these experimental children did not differ significantly from the general population control group. These results remained stable well into the child's third year (Ramey & Campbell, 1977). Further research has demonstrated that these benefits may not be restricted to high quality, cognitively enriched programs (Golden et al., 1978).

The overall picture suggests that the day-care experience has neither salutary nor adverse effects on the intellectual development of most children. Day care may have positive effects, however, for children who are economically disadvantaged, for it appears that such day-care experience may attenuate the decline in
test scores typically associated with high-risk populations (Golden & Birns, 1976).

**Effects on Social-Emotional Development**

Investigators have used many different measures to compare the social-emotional development of day-care children and home-reared children. These include the Bayley Infant Behavior Record, the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, and observations of social and emotional responses. Results of studies using these measures indicate that the overall social-emotional adjustment of children receiving nonmaternal care is not significantly different from that of those receiving exclusively maternal care (Etaugh, 1980).

A number of researchers have investigated the effects of nonmaternal care or more specifically center care on a child's peer relations. Some researchers have found few differences in peer interactions when comparing home-reared and day-care children (Doyle, 1975; Wright, 1975). Such interactions, however, seem to be related to the age of entry into day care.

Children who were enrolled in day care before the age of 2 are more likely than later-entering children to interact in both positive and negative ways (Schwartz, Krolley, & Strickland, 1973; Schwartz, Strickland, & Krolley, 1974). At earlier ages (12 to 18 months),
day-care children in the presence of their mothers are more likely to look at and interact with peers than are matched home-reared children (Ricciuti, 1974). And, even at later ages, children with day-care experience interact more with their peers (Moore, 1975). When observed, these children who have attended day care are rated higher in sociability with peers and are more often chosen by their peers as likeable.

There is a tendency then for day-care children to be more peer oriented. What about their interactions with adults or their socialization of adult like behaviors? Schwartz et al. (1974) report that day-care children exceeded their home-reared counterparts in aggression towards peers and adults, that they were less cooperative with grown-ups, that they engaged in more running around, and that they had lower frustration tolerance. Other researchers have also found this tendency towards greater aggression in day-care children (Moore, 1964; Raph, Thomas, Chess, & Korn, 1964). Wright (1975), however, did not find any differences in various behavioral interactions with adults, and Etaugh (1980) in a recent review of the research states that "comparisons of home-reared and day-care children do not reveal any consistent differences in interactions with adults".
It is possible that these seemingly contradictory findings indicate that the effects of day care are program specific. There are a lot of variations in what is present and considered acceptable from program to program and what the program stresses may determine the outcome in terms of the child's behavior. Belsky and Steinberg (1978) suggest that the observed tendency toward greater aggressiveness, impulsivity and egocentrism may represent a phenomenon specific to American society. The social development of children in day-care programs most often reflects the characteristically stressed American values of aggressiveness, impulsivity and egocentrism.

Attachment Effects

Early research on attachment looked at the difference between children attending day care and children who were cared for at home. The results of such studies have been contradictory. Studies by Blehar (1974), Ricciuti (1974), and Cochran (1977) can be interpreted as evidence in favor of home-reared children, while those of Moskowitz, Schwarz, & Corsini, (1977) and Doyle and Somers (1975) show differences in favor of day-care-reared children. Still more investigations carried out by Brookhart and Hock (1976), Doyle (1975), Roopnarine and Lamb (1978), and
Portnoy and Simmons (1978) failed to discern any day-care / home-care differences.

Later research on attachment simply compared employed mothers with nonemployed mothers, not specifying what type of nonmaternal care was being used. In most of these studies, mother-infant attachment was investigated using Ainsworth's Strange Situation Measure (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978). Hock (1980) and Vaughn, Grove, & Egeland (1980) found no relationship between security of attachment and employment status. Vaughn et al also reported that the kind of insecure attachment shown by infants whose mothers returned to work during the first year was the anxious-avoidant type. Such an infant shows avoidance of the mother when she returns after a brief separation but the infant's exploratory behavior continues throughout the separation.

This same pattern of not finding more insecure attachment but of finding more of the anxious-avoidant type of attachment was reported by Schwartz (1983). However, in this study, a different rating scale was used which resulted in a rather liberal assignment of the anxious-avoidant label. Perhaps the best designed study on attachment to date was conducted by Chase-Lansdale (1981). One hundred and ten middle-class families were included in the sample and
Ainsworth’s classification system was used. In this study, there were no relationships between the mother’s employment status and the security of the mother-infant attachment nor between the mother’s employment status and the type of attachment.

Thus, the bulk of the evidence suggests that nonmaternal care does not impair the child’s attachment to the mother. In fact, Ricciuti (1974) suggests that nonmaternal care may make it somewhat easier for children to adapt comfortably to social situations which require a willingness to tolerate some distancing from the mother. Provided the child is experiencing good quality day care, significant disruption of the mother-child bond does not appear likely. Nor is there reason to conclude that the mother is replaced by the caregiver as the child’s primary object of attachment. Research carried out by Ricciuti (1974) provided evidence that infants can develop an attachment-like relationship toward the caregiver; but this relationship did not replace or supercede the child’s emotional bond with his or her mother.
Effects on Mother-Child Interaction

Several recent studies using behavioral observations have set out to examine the quality of mother-infant interactions. Hock (1980) and Cohen (1978) found no differences between the interaction patterns of employed and nonemployed mothers during the infant's first year. Cohen did find differences in the second year, not in the mother's behavior but rather in the baby's responses. The infants of nonemployed mothers engaged in more nondistress vocalization. Pederson and his colleagues investigated the mother's verbal behavior. In the first study (Pederson, Cain, Zaslow, & Anderson, 1983), employed mothers were higher in verbal interaction and social play. In a second study (Zaslow, Pederson, Suwalsky, Cain, Anderson, & Fivel, 1985), no differences were found.

Most of the research seems to suggest that the employed mother is more attentive to her child, particularly verbally, but no clear-cut pattern has emerged. Schwartz (1983) reports that more positive emotional behavior is expressed by employed mothers toward their children. Perhaps it is not employment per se which is the pertinent variable in predicting mother-child interaction. Perhaps it is congruence between one's employment status and one's attitude.
which is important. Studies with infants and older children, have consistently demonstrated that maternal satisfaction with employment status relates positively to the quality of mother-child interaction and to various indices of the child's adjustment and abilities (Farel, 1980; Hock, 1980; Schubert, Bradley-Johnston, & Nuttal, 1980; Stuckey, McGhee, & Bell, 1982; Yarrow, Scott, DeLeeuw, & Hägglund, 1962). The main difficulty lies in demonstrating the direction of causality. Maternal satisfaction may be the reason for positive mother-child interaction but it is also possible that the satisfaction is the result of the positive relationship with the child and the awareness that the child is doing well.

Other researchers have looked at the quantity of mother-child interaction. National time-use studies have been conducted that compare the amount of time employed mothers spend with their children with the amount of time full-time homemakers spend. Employed mothers do spend less time in child care but this differs by social class and education. The employed-nonemployed difference is considerably less for college-educated women. They reduce mainly sleep and television viewing in an attempt to compensate. When compared with the number of hours nonemployed mothers spend looking after their children, there is
only a 25% deficit in child-care time for employed college-educated mothers of preschoolers (Hill & Stafford, 1978). Goldberg (1977) found no difference in the amount of one-to-one interaction between the mother and child although the full-time employed mother obviously had less available time with the child.

**Effects on Father-Child Interaction**

Recent investigations have also looked at the quantity of father-child interaction. Analyses of time-use indicated that fathers are more involved in child-care when their wives are employed (Pleck, & Rustad, 1980). Behavioral observations, on the other hand, suggest that when the mothers of infants are employed, fathers have less interaction with their infants than fathers in single-wage families. Pederson et al. (1983) observed parents with their five-month old infants during the early evening hours. In the single-wage family, this is the father’s time with the baby, but in the dual-wage family this is the mother’s time to compensate for her absence during the day. These apparently conflicting results may be due to the possibility that different variables are being measured. Observational studies measure the number of interactions in a short period of time, in essence, the intensity of interaction rather than the total amount.
The time use studies, however, do cover the amount of time spent with the child over the whole week.

A number of investigations have also looked at the relationships between fathers and their children and how they are affected by maternal employment. Chase-Lansdale (1981) investigated father-infant attachment in a middle-class sample of infants. There was no effect of employment status on father-daughter attachments, but fathers in dual-wage families had significantly less secure attachments with their sons. In their sample of middle-class nursery school children, Gold and Andres (1978b) found that the sons of employed mothers perceived their fathers as more punitive and indicated less same sex preference. In their sample of ten-year olds (Gold & Andres, 1978a), similar findings were obtained but only among the sons of employed working-class mothers. More fathers in this group claimed to have problems with their sons behavior in school, and they checked the fewest number of favourable adjectives to describe their sons.
Effects on Sex-Role Concepts

There has also been recent interest in how maternal employment affects children's views of the two sexes. Gold and Andres (1978a) in their study of ten-year olds, found that the employed mothers were more content with their roles than nonemployed mothers. The employed mothers who were most content with their roles had children with the most egalitarian sex-role concepts. In the nursery school sample, it was also found that children's sex-role concepts were broader if the mother was employed. Similarly, Miller (1975) investigated sex-role perception in kindergarten-aged girls. She found that children with employed mothers had less traditional perceptions of parental roles; in particular, daughters had less traditional sex-role stereotypes.

Conclusions About the Effects of Maternal Employment

What conclusions can be drawn from this large body of research? It is becoming increasingly obvious that we can not deal with such global independent variables as working versus nonworking mothers. Differential effects arise from maternal satisfaction, the sex of the child, and the social class of the family involved.
Maternal Satisfaction

Thus far, the literature seems to indicate that there are no harmful effects of maternal employment when adequate substitute care is provided and when maternal satisfaction is high. Dissatisfied women have been found to be less involved, affectionate, playful, stimulating, and effective with their children (Clarke-Stewart, 1982). Many research findings suggest that it is employed mothers who are more satisfied overall. This is especially true of mothers with more education and higher socio-economic status.

Gold and Andres (1978a) found that among working-class and middle-class mothers, it was the employed mothers in both groups who were more content with their roles. For the most part, the employed mothers were very content with their roles. The only exception was the working-class mothers of sons. The least content of all groups, however, was the middle-class nonemployed mothers of sons. In the same study, it was found that the husbands of employed wives were also the group claiming to have the most satisfaction with their wives' role. This also varied by class. The middle-class husbands of employed mothers were the most content. The least content were the middle-class husbands of nonemployed mothers.
Birnbaum (1971) compared professionally employed mothers with mothers who had graduated from college with distinction but had become full time homemakers, that is, women who had the ability to pursue professional careers had they so chosen. With respect to morale, the professional women were clearly higher. The nonworking mothers had lower self esteem, felt less attractive, expressed more concern over identity issues, indicated greater feelings of loneliness, and had a lower sense of personal competence, even with respect to child care skills. These mothers were even more insecure and unhappy than a third group of professionals who had never married. When asked what was missing from their lives, the predominant answer from the two professional groups was time, but for housewives it was challenge and creative involvement.

Among employed women, one of the most important contributions to a mother's satisfaction is what kind of child care arrangement she has (Kamerman, 1985). If she is not assured that her children are being well looked after, she cannot concentrate on or enjoy her work, and she is unlikely to feel very good about her family life and obtain satisfaction in this area either. Or if a woman is unable to find any care which she deems adequate and therefore remains at home, although her real wish is to work, it is unlikely that
she will be as effective a parent as would otherwise be the case.

**Sex of the Child**

As we have seen, the sex of the child is an important factor in determining the effects of nonmaternal care. This is not surprising because boys and girls do tend to be different to start with, regardless of maternal employment status. Research findings in developmental psychology demonstrate some very definite differences between boys and girl (Maccoby, 1980). It has been found that boys are more resistive to the teaching and training efforts of their parents and are more likely to make counterdemands. Girls, on the other hand, are more ready and willing to enter into reciprocal interactions with their parents, especially their mothers. Girls are more likely to approach mothers socially, wanting to play or offering to share in the mothers' activities. Boys, even when quite young, tend to approach their mothers with egoistic demands, asking for service or attempting to control or dominate.

Coercive cycles of interaction are much more likely to develop between parents and sons. Boys run a greater risk of getting into a battle of wills. Boys are more likely to become rebellious at home and more likely to
develop problems at school. The relationships between mothers and sons then, tend to revolve around disciplinary issues while those between mothers and daughters involve shared activities. It has also been found that boys' relationships with their parents deteriorate more rapidly when the family is under unusual stress. Perhaps this is because the relationships are initially more fragile (Maccoby, 1980).

Social Class

There are also different employment effects associated with different socio-economic status groups. This is also to be expected because there is a lot of documentation in the literature suggesting that child-rearing attitudes and practices vary greatly by social class. For the most part, people from lower SES groups believe that they have no direct access to power; they believe their lives are controlled by the more advantaged members of society. This sense of powerlessness and insecurity affects the expectations parents have for their children. Children from the middle class are expected to get ahead, while children from lower classes are expected to get by (Maccoby, 1980).
Being from a lower social class means learning to live with an added degree of stress. Living on a lower income is stressful in itself. When parents are worried, ill, and feeling unable to control the events affecting their lives it is very likely that they will not be as patient and as understanding or as willing to reason with their children. It has also been found that parents from lower SES are generally less knowledgeable about the school system and less involved in school activities (Shaffer, 1985).

In general, working class parents are harsher or more demanding in the socialization of children. Lower SES parents stress obedience, respect for authority, neatness, cleanliness, and staying out of trouble. Higher SES parents stress happiness, curiosity, independence, creativity, ambition and self control. While working class parents tend to be more restrictive and authoritarian, higher SES parents are either permissive or authoritative. The majority of these differences are also more pronounced for boys (Maccoby, 1980).

It has also been found that children from lower socio-economic status groups show stronger preferences for sex-typed behavior and hold a more stereotyped view of males and females than middle-class children. There are several explanations for this finding. Firstly, it
has been found that parents from lower SES groups are more likely to accept unegalitarian sex-role standards. Lower-class mothers are also more likely to emphasize and encourage sex typing to a greater degree than middle-class mothers (Shaffer, 1985). It is also true that working-class parents provide very different models for their children. Working-class fathers are much more likely to have jobs classified as being traditionally masculine, such as heavy laborer, mechanic, or machinist. Working-class mothers, too are more likely to have traditionally feminine occupations, such as clerk or waitress. In short, children from the lower classes are more firmly sex typed because their parents are more likely to encourage and display sex-typed patterns of behavior.

Various groups of children and parents differ from each other in important ways. These parent and child characteristics are likely to be important for child care choice and satisfaction. It has been found that relationships do exist between certain child-rearing methods and certain characteristics of children (Maccoby, 1980). Those child-rearing methods that have been investigated differ by social class and sex of the child. Parents with different child-rearing values and practices will be likely to make very different
assessments of the value of various child care arrangements.

The Importance of Good Child Care

Mothers of preschoolers are moving increasingly into the paid labour force and will likely continue to do so. There are numerous economic and social needs pushing in that direction. There have been great increases in the occurrence of single parenthood and divorce. Women tend to have much smaller families, often later in life, thus extending the amount of time they are likely to spend in the work force. And due to smaller family size and greater geographic mobility, the availability of other relatives for child care is vastly decreased.

Child care is a particularly important problem for poorer women who must work. Kammerman (1985) discusses what she terms the feminization of poverty. She points out that the poverty rate is very high for female-headed families and particularly for mother only families. In 1982, such families constituted more than half (54%) of all poor families with children. Only when these single mothers have paid employment are they less likely to be poor. The main reason they give for not being in the labour force is lack of adequate and affordable child care services. This problem, however,
is common to women of all strata. When asked about the problems they face in managing work and family life or the barriers they face in entering or advancing in the labour force, women almost unanimously named child care as the single most important problem they face. Their comments reflected concern about the need for child care, the lack of it, the high cost and the poor quality available (Kamerman, 1985).

Good quality child care is desperately needed. Maternal employment under adverse circumstances can put excess pressure on the mother and instead of the positive effects mediated by higher morale, there may be negative effects mediated by the strain of unsatisfactory child care arrangements. If working mothers can find good quality substitute care which suits their needs and preferences, employment can have beneficial effects for the child, his or her parents, and the whole family. If satisfactory child care is not available, employment will have little effect at best, or deleterious effects at worst.

But what is the demand for child care? How many people actually want child care for their children and more importantly, what kind of care do they want? For social planning purposes, it is very important that this demand be estimated or predicted. It is quite obvious that the demand for child care has increased
over the past two decades as a function of such factors as: increased participation of women in the paid labor force, greater incidence of single parent families, the changing focus of social assistance policy towards encouraging women with children to seek employment, more visible parental interest in providing young children with pre-school educational opportunities, and research indicating that a variety of handicaps (physical, social and developmental) may be overcome, or the effects minimized, through participation in specialized programs.

It has been suggested that the need for child care can be measured in at least three different ways. Firstly, the expressed demand can be considered. The existence of applications and requests that can't be met with the available supply of services is one indication of the expressed demand. Day care waiting lists are so long that many expecting women have their unborn children placed on waiting lists. Secondly, the potential demand can be assessed. This involves the consideration of people who might express a demand given changed financial or social circumstances, or if a different type of care were available. Lastly, one can use an informed judgment to estimate the extent of need. This involves a consideration of the nature and purpose of the services provided and the incidence of
situations to which it might appropriately be applied. All evidence confirms a striking gap between organized child care facilities and the potential or expressed need for them, however this need is measured (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1972).

In the past, most of the research and most of the funding designed to create more child care has focused on group care in day care centers. However, the largest portion of day care service has been traditionally provided by unregulated private home care. There are two systems of child care in Canada. The formal system of licensed, approved day care spaces serves approximately 15% of the children requiring care. The informal system of unsupervised care serves the remaining 85%. In 1980, it was estimated that there were 760,000 children under six whose mothers were in the work force. At the same time, there were 91,913 children under age six in licensed full-day programs. This means that the remaining 668,000 pre-school children were receiving care of largely unknown quality (Canadian Council on Social Development, 1983).

Before our governments continue to concentrate their attention and funding dollars on group day care, it would be wise to find out whether this is the type of care desired by parents. The majority of mothers make
non-center satisfactory arrangements (Epstein, 1979). It is possible that they don't want to and wouldn't place their children in group day care centers. Most of the findings indicate that whatever arrangement is being used is deemed satisfactory by most parents (Epstein, 1979, Lero, 1981). There are problems, however, in asking parents to evaluate their degree of satisfaction with current child care arrangements. Due to the feelings of guilt that would ensue, parents are very reluctant to admit that the care they are using may not be all that good. There is a tendency to make peace with the inevitable. If people believe no other arrangement is possible, there is an inclination to adopt the attitude that one likes the arrangement one has.

It has also been found though, that the largest single factor deterring people from making day care arrangements is financial (Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton and District, 1971). Regardless of what governmental agencies do to provide parents with the child care arrangements they want, such child care arrangements, ideal as they may be, will not be used if people can not afford them. So if an ideal arrangement costs $300 a week, but parents also state that all they can afford is $100 a week, providing the arrangement is quite useless. Availability entails having the
preferred type of care and spaces available but also providing it at costs that parents who wish to use it can afford.

It would appear that many parents are not making use of the available subsidies. Is this because they are unaware of the existence of such subsidies or do they merely not apply because they consider themselves ineligible? In the study carried out in Hamilton (Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton and District, 1971), less than one-quarter of the respondents were aware of the available subsidies. It is also probable that a fair number of eligible parents are aware of subsidies and simply do not apply because they have erroneous views of what qualifies one to be subsidized.

Parents are making what they seem to consider satisfactory unsupervised child care arrangements. Are they contenting themselves because they believe these are the only arrangements available? Are they blocked from considering other arrangements which might potentially be more satisfying due to financial constraints? Or are these the arrangements they would actually prefer even if the constraints of availability and cost were removed? These are questions which need to be answered if social planning policy is to be as
effective and as gratifying as possible for all involved.

Many people have the impression that in the last few years, the gap between need and supply has been closing. Although the supply has been rising, the demand has been rising even faster. For example, between 1971 and 1973, there was a 54.2% increase in day care spaces across Canada. The proportion of children of working mothers served by day care, however, rose by only .5% (Joe, 1981). Simply creating day care or child care spaces will not solve the problem either. Need is not only a matter of how many places are available. One must also consider how accessible such spaces are, how much they cost, and whether or not they are the type desired by those in need.

There are many different types of child care potentially available. This variety should be preserved and developed further, since it facilitates flexibility and creativity in meeting the different needs of different families. The distinct pattern of need and program requirements depends on the ages and needs of the particular child, the personal and economic circumstances of the family, the hours of work, the duration of care required, and the attitudes of the parent(s) toward various types of care. All
these variables need to be considered in planning sound comprehensive policies for supplementary child care programs.

No one form of child care is best. What is best is what most effectively shares with parents their responsibility for raising their children. In terms of social planning policy, it makes little sense to create programs parents will use reluctantly or not at all. It would also be useful to determine why particular types of care are unacceptable to parents. If the reasons for disliking the arrangement are not an integral part of the arrangement itself, something can be done to make the arrangement more desirable for those who otherwise wish to use it. For example, some people may be unwilling to use group day care because it is too expensive, or may be unwilling to use family home day care because the adult to child ratio is unacceptable. These are problems which may very well characterize the mentioned arrangements but this need not be the case.
Assessing Child Care Needs

Child care needs are very different from family to family and indeed, from community to community across Canada. Windsor is a city very much dependent on the automotive industry. Therefore, it is likely that a fairly high percentage of parents do shift work. It is hypothesized that this probably presents some special problems for those attempting to obtain child care. It probably limits the type of care which parents can consider.

A survey of parents and their child care arrangements was conducted in Toronto by Johnson (1977). This survey revealed substantial differences in the characteristics of families using various types of child care. It was found that, in general, parents born outside of Canada tended to use care provided by relatives, while those using day care centers were more likely to be white Canadian born or English-speaking families. Parents using day care also had the highest representation from the upper and middle socio-economic classes.

Type of care was also related to financial resources, family size and family structure. Families at the lowest and highest extremes in terms of financial resources tended to use care by sitters and
day care centers, while those in the middle tended to use relatives. In this sample, nuclear families tended to use sitters and day care centers, while extended families were more likely to use relatives. And finally, there was an inverse relationship between the number of children present in the home and the probability of using a day care center.

Lero (1981) conducted a study of the child care arrangements used by parents in Guelph, Ontario. Her comparisons of people using different types of care also revealed a number of significant differences by socio-economic status. Parents in this community who used family home day care were more likely to be single parents with limited income and occupational choices. Those using day care tended to be more highly educated and had more prestigious and better-paying occupations. In this sample, however, there were no significant differences between groups in the number of other children in the family or in the number of other children requiring full time care. There was also no significant difference in the type of care used when considering the number of relatives living in the area.

The data obtained by Johnson (1977) revealed that child care provided in the home of a sitter is an extremely popular arrangement. It accounted for one-quarter to one-third of all arrangements used. Day
care center arrangements, on the other hand, accounted for only 10% of all arrangements. When comparing users of relative care, sitter care and center care, however, it was the users of sitter care who were the least satisfied. A primary difficulty with such care is instability. In the Toronto sample, the mean duration of each arrangement was 24 weeks.

The parents were asked about their preferred mode of care in the absence of external constraints such as financial considerations and work schedules. The preferred mode was more likely to be a day care center. For a child aged three and above, the majority of respondents believed that the optimum arrangement was center care. In choosing between sitter care and center care for a one-year old, the optimum arrangement was judged to be a household arrangement by most respondents. There were still 29.9% of the respondents, however, who judged center care to be the optimal arrangement.

Lero's (1981) study was undertaken in an attempt to determine just what factors did account for the differences in parents' preference for and use of alternate child care arrangements. She looked at the respondents' present arrangements and those that had been used previously. While most previous arrangements had been terminated because of a change in access,
there was considerable variation in the reasons for change. The family home day care users appeared to be more critical of the quality of care, while the center users more often indicated cost as the reason for changing.

She also assessed the perceived availability of various types of care because of its importance in affecting search strategies and eventual choice. Sitters were perceived as being readily available by most respondents. Otherwise, respondents perceived the arrangement they chose as being the most available. Interestingly enough, more than half of the sample elected not to search at all but rather to use an arrangement they were already familiar with. This finding has important implications. People may be choosing the arrangements they do because they are seen as being more available. While very few people use day care, Lero reported that 56.6% of her respondents indicated that center care was their first preference.

Maybe people are not searching for their desired forms of care because they realize or presume they are unavailable. Even among those who did search, however, more than one third reported difficulties obtaining what they wanted. The two most prevalent reasons for not using a considered arrangement were lack of availability and the cost of the particular arrangement.
The five dimensions considered to be the most important in deciding on a particular arrangement were reliability of care, good physical care, adequate opportunities for outdoor play, opportunity for contact with peers, and similarity between caregiver and respondent in discipline practices.

Which factors were most important varied by the arrangement used. Parents using more informal arrangements more often mentioned the caregiver's personality and attitudes about child rearing as being important factors. The location of the arrangement and the caregiver being someone the child knew and liked were also given high priority by users of informal care. Those using center care mentioned social stimulation, educational stimulation and also the caregiver's personality as being important. Overall, those using informal arrangements felt individual attention and affection were more important than the level of stimulation provided. Center care users, however, stressed the importance of stimulation over individual attention and affection.

The perceived positive and negative effects of the various forms of care are very different from type to type. The positive effects of day care mentioned by respondents were educational stimulation (46.3%), social stimulation (36.6%), reliability (31.7%), trained
staff (22%), and good physical care (15.9%). The negative effects mentioned were cost (23.2%), insufficient individual attention (17.1%), and limited availability (15.9%). The positive effects listed for family home day care were supervision by social services (54.5%), subsidization (29.5%), and more individual attention (25%). The negative effects were inadequate supervision or training of caregivers (18.1%), and lack of stimulation or inadequate physical care (13.7%). The only positive effect of sitters which was mentioned by more than 10% of the respondents was that of more individual attention (26%). The negative effects were that the quality was variable (59.1%), it was not reliable (44.1%), and there was a lack of stimulation or poor physical care (26.9%).

The positive effects of care by relatives mentioned were more individual attention (32.4%), more personal investment (25.7%), and reduced cost (28.4%). The perceived negative effects accruing from such care were conflicts within the family (28.4%), the child becoming spoiled (25.7%), variable quality (14.9%), and lack of reliability (14.9%).

Respondents were also asked if someone else had an influence on the decision they made. Husbands and partners were involved only half the time and this usually involved broad decisions about what type of
care to use. Forty percent of the respondents polled made the decision entirely on their own. As is usually found, most respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the arrangements they made. There were still 20% of the respondents, however, who actually preferred another arrangement to the one they were now using and it was the noncenter users who were more likely to indicate an alternative preference.

Parents should be able to freely choose how their children will be cared for. In order for this to become a reality, it must be ensured that this choice is not heavily weighted by availability or economic factors. The provision of child care should be recognized as a public responsibility to ensure that the service is truly available to anyone who needs it or might want to use it. Society does accept the responsibility to educate school-aged children with well-qualified teachers in clean, safe, pleasant surroundings. Pre-school children need these advantages at least as much as do older children. In fact, it only makes sense that any attempts at human resource development be initiated in early childhood, when the effects have the greatest impact.

Joe (1981) points out that "good day care will always benefit a child, his parent(s), and his country, regardless of how perfect the home from which the child
might come." The availability of good child care centers for children of all ages would enable parents to be better parents by sharing child-care responsibilities. If parents can be assured that their children are receiving good care, are learning new skills, and are gaining useful educational and social experiences, they can relax, become better parents and subsequently enjoy their children more. Parents can also gain from their interactions with other adults involved in child care. They can learn new skills and also gain reassurance that they are good parents.

Mothers are firstly individuals, and they can be only as good mothers as they are fulfilled and satisfied individuals. A mother's satisfaction with her maternal role will be much higher if she does not have to forgo educational, occupational, and social participation options. Motherhood should not be achieved only at the expense of personal fulfillment and development. And, as has been discussed earlier in this paper, maternal satisfaction is very much dependent on the availability of good quality, affordable child care. Maternal satisfaction has proven very important in determining the effects of maternal employment on children and is very likely related to some of the variables included in the questionnaire. It would be interesting to see what type of child care arrangements are used and
preferred by those satisfied with their employment status versus those who are not.

The question we are all faced with then is, can parents hold full time paying jobs and still ensure the healthy development of young children? The answer to this question depends to a great extent on just what is available and affordable in child care. Governmental agencies have become increasingly aware of the great need for affordable, accessible, good-quality child care and they appear ready to demonstrate their support through funding dollars. In order to determine how these dollars would be best spent, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of what women want and need in child care. The present study has been carried out in an attempt to uncover the child care needs of mothers in Windsor and surrounding communities.

It is hoped that the present study will enable us to answer a number of questions about the child care needs of parents in this area. What kinds of child care are parents presently using? Does this vary by parents' income, SES, educational level, and ethnic background? How much are parents paying for their present arrangements? What factors are considered important in choosing child care? What are the particular likes and dislikes associated with each type
of care? How satisfied are parents with their present arrangement?

What do parents envision as the ideal arrangement for children of various ages? What forms of care are they willing to use and why? What forms of care do they feel provide good quality care? What forms would they not even consider using and why? How much are they willing to pay for child care? What sources of child care do people perceive as being available? What sources do they feel are affordable? How many people are aware of the existence of government subsidies? How many full-time mothers feel they would return to school or to the work force if affordable, reliable care were available?

**Research Hypotheses**

It is also hoped that a number of research questions will be answered using the present data. These research questions and hypotheses revolve around three central themes: maternal satisfaction, the child’s gender and the social class of the family.

It is hypothesized that among employed women, satisfaction with employment status will be related to satisfaction with present child care arrangements. Those who are satisfied with their child care arrangements are more likely to be satisfied with their
employment status. Similarly, women who are satisfied with their employment status are more likely to be satisfied with their present child care arrangement.

As mentioned previously, satisfaction with employment status is very much dependent on satisfaction with child care arrangements. A mother is unlikely to be satisfied with her work status unless she can be assured her children are being well looked after and not suffering because of her decision to work. If a woman can be assured that her children are being given adequate care, she can feel less guilty about working and can enjoy her work to a greater degree. If she has found good care, she is also more likely to do a good job and experience less tension at work. She can leave her children knowing they are in good hands and can spend the rest of the day concentrating on her work.

It may also be the case though, that satisfaction with employment status leads to greater satisfaction with child care arrangements. Satisfaction with employment status is likely to be reflected in other areas of a woman's life. If she is happy with her job or career, this is likely to be reflected in better relationships and interactions with her children. They will appear happier, more well adjusted and she will be convinced that her absence is not having adverse effects. If she has happier, healthier children she
will also believe that the substitute care she is using is of superior quality. She will rate herself as being more satisfied with her child care arrangements.

It is also hypothesized that satisfaction with employment status will be greater for employed than nonemployed mothers, especially in the higher SES groups. Findings by Birnbaum (1971) and Gold and Andres (1978a) suggest that overall, employed mothers are more satisfied with their employment status. When the results were examined in terms of social class, it was found that this was especially true of mothers in higher social classes.

Among employed women, it is hypothesized that satisfaction with present child care arrangements will be greater for higher socio-economic groups. For this group of mothers, there will be a smaller difference between the ideal or preferred arrangement and the one being used and there will be more types of care perceived as being available and affordable. Higher socio-economic groups have more information about availability and have the economic resources necessary to make use of more of these options. They will perceive more as being available and affordable. This perception of options and the opportunity to exercise them will lead to a higher level of satisfaction.
It is also hypothesized that satisfaction with employment status varies by the sex of the child. Employed mothers with girls will be more satisfied than employed mothers with boys. A number of findings have led to this hypothesis. It has been found that boys' relationships with their parents deteriorate more rapidly when the family is under stress (Maccoby, 1980). Maternal employment is just such a stress. It has also been found that in families where the mother is not employed, sons receive more attention than do daughters. In families where the mother is employed, daughters receive more attention than sons do.

Research on maternal satisfaction has shown that among employed mothers, it is the working-class mothers of sons who are the least content.

Research on the effects of maternal employment has also revealed a number of difficulties for boys. It has been shown that the employment of middle-class mothers with sons has negative effects on academic performance and intelligence test scores (Banducci, 1967; Frankel, 1970; Gold & Andres, 1978a, & 1978b; Hoffman, 1974). Gold and Andres (1978a), also found a negative correlation between the length of time the middle-class mother had been employed and the son's adjustment scores. Chase-Lansdale (1981) found that fathers in dual-wage families had significantly less secure
attachments with their sons. In their sample of middle-class nursery school children, Gold and Andres (1978b) found that the sons of employed mothers perceive their fathers as being much more punitive and indicate less same sex preference. In their sample of ten-year olds (Gold & Andres, 1978a), similar findings were obtained, but only among the sons of working-class mothers. More fathers in this group claimed to have problems with their sons' behavior in school and checked the fewest number of favorable adjectives to describe their sons.

Gold and Andres list the following adjustment difficulties as characterizing their sample of boys from working-class employed-mother families. They are described more negatively by their fathers, they are more shy and nervous, they differentiate between the sexes more, they have poorer school relations and they report poorer grades. McCord, McCord and Thurber (1963) found greater sexual anxiety in the sons of working-class employed mothers. Propper (1972) found less respect for fathers in this same group. These findings seem to suggest that maternal employment is associated with difficulty in developing adequate sex-role identification for boys.

Maternal employment tends to have more negative effects on boys. The nature of these effects tend to
vary by social class, but in general, one finds more adjustment difficulties, poorer academic and intellectual performance, and greater father-son tensions. These negative effects are likely to affect the mother herself, and should be visible in the form of reduced satisfaction with employment status.

It is also hypothesized that sex and social class will have an effect on the type of child care arrangements chosen and more specifically on the reasons given for using or preferring various arrangements. It has been found that boys are much more demanding and controlling than girls (Maccoby, 1980). They run a greater risk of developing problems at school and becoming rebellious at home. Girls, however, are much more likely to approach their mothers socially, and ask to share in maternal activities. The relationships between mothers and sons tend to revolve around disciplinary issues, while those between mothers and daughters involve shared activities (Maccoby, 1980). It is therefore hypothesized that, mothers of sons will be more concerned about such issues as good discipline, consistency of care, educational stimulation, the maintenance of routines and health and safety. Mothers of daughters will be more concerned about sufficient individual attention, affection and a home-like environment. It is expected that these
reasons will be mentioned more by the relevant mothers as reasons for preferring to use a particular arrangement.

Research on child-rearing attitudes has found that parents from lower social classes tend to stress obedience, respect for authority, neatness and staying out of trouble. Parents from higher social classes stress happiness, independence, self-control, ambition, and achievement. It is hypothesized that the higher the parent's socio-economic status, the more likely they will be to use center-based care. The reasons given for willingness and nonwillingness to use various types of care, and the likes and dislikes reported for care already used will also vary by social class. High SES parents will be more likely to mention such factors as educational stimulation, social stimulation, training of caregivers, and preparedness for formal schooling. Lower SES parents will be more concerned with such factors as the characteristics and personality of the caregiver, the caregiver being someone the child knows and likes, and convenience of the arrangement.

It is also expected that there will be an interaction between social class and the child's gender on variables important in selecting child care. Any gender differences which already exist in the sample will be greater for the lower SES. As already
mentioned, mothers of sons are likely to be more concerned with discipline, consistency of care, educational stimulation, health and safety, and maintenance of routine. This will be even more true for mothers from the lower social classes.

Similarly, factors such as individual attention, affection and home-like environment will be mentioned even more by lower SES mothers with daughters.

This is due in part to different sex-role stereotyping. Parents from lower SES groups are more likely to accept unegalitarian sex-role standards, they are more likely to emphasize and encourage sex typing to a greater degree, and they provide very different models for their children. It has also been found that the differences in child rearing associated with different SES groups vary by sex. The differences previously mentioned (lower SES stressing obedience, etc.) are much more pronounced for males (Maccoby, 1980). Lower SES parents see the sexes as being more dissimilar and therefore treat them differently. It is expected that in all social classes the pattern of being more concerned with discipline issues if one has a son and being more concerned with affection issues if one has a daughter will hold. In the lower SES groups, however, the differences between mothers with sons and mothers with daughters will be even greater.
A last hypothesis concerns satisfaction with various child care arrangements. It is very likely that sitter care will be the arrangement used most often. This was found by Lero (1981) and Johnson (1977). Johnson also found however, that this was the arrangement with the highest proportion of dissatisfaction among users. It is hypothesized that this will also be the case in the present study.

Summary

1. It is hypothesized that among employed mothers, satisfaction with employment status is related to satisfaction with child care. As one increases so does the other.

2. a) It is expected that satisfaction with employment status will be greater for employed women.
b) This will be especially true in higher SES groups.

3. It is expected that satisfaction with present child care arrangements will be greater for higher SES groups. It is more likely that they will be using child care arrangements they list as providing good quality care, and that they will perceive more arrangements as being available and affordable.
4. It is hypothesized that satisfaction with employment status varies by sex of the child. Employed mothers with daughters will be more satisfied than employed mothers with sons.

5. a) It is hypothesized that sex of the child will affect reasons given for liking or not liking an arrangement type. Mothers of sons will be more concerned with disciplinary issues and will more often mention such factors as consistency of care, educational stimulation, discipline, maintenance of routine, and health and safety. Mothers of daughters will be more concerned with affection issues and will more often mention such factors as individual attention, affection, personal investment in the child and a home-like environment.

   b) It is also expected that these gender differences will be even greater among lower SES groups.

6. a) It is also hypothesized that social class will have an effect on the type of child care chosen. The higher one's socio-economic status, the more likely one is to use a day care center.

   b) It is also expected that social class will affect the reasons given for preferring various arrangements. The factors mentioned by such high SES parents will be social stimulation, educational
stimulation, training of the caregiver, and preparedness for formal schooling. Among lower SES groups the reasons given for liking an arrangement will tend to be the characteristics and personality of the caregiver, the caregiver being someone the child knows and likes, the health and safety of the child, the convenience of the arrangement, and the arrangement being one which makes the child happy.

7. A last hypothesis is that even though sitter arrangements will be the most frequently used, there will be more dissatisfaction associated with such arrangements than with others.
Chapter II
Method

The Women's Incentive Center was approached by the Secretary of State to conduct a study of child care needs in Windsor. The purpose of administering the questionnaire was to discover just what was needed or wanted by parents in this area so that any forthcoming funds would be deployed in the most efficient manner possible. The Women's Incentive Center approached the Psychology Department at the University of Windsor to find someone to conduct the study.

Sampling

The object of this undertaking was to poll the various child care needs of women in Windsor and adjacent communities. The sample size chosen was 430. This decision was made primarily on the basis of a consensus among statisticians that for a reliable estimate of the population characteristics, at least 2% of the relevant population must be sampled. A number of relevant population characteristics were considered, such as the number of children under six living at home, the number of children under fourteen, the number of families containing children, and the average number
of children per family. A sample size of 430 was chosen as an approximate estimation of 2% of these various populations. The actual number of interviews obtained, 349, fell slightly short of this number, however.

The sampling procedure used was stratified random sampling. It was chosen because it allows one to draw a sample with representation from different parts of the population. The advantages accruing from such sampling are increased efficiency in estimation of population characteristics and greater ease of access to subpopulation information of interest. Since child care accessibility is very much tied in to where one lives, it is very important to be able to look at the needs of parents in different locations of the city.

The population was divided into 53 classes on the basis of census tracts used in the 1981 Census of Canada. There were 46 tracts in the city of Windsor and an additional seven tracts immediately outside the city, including the outlying communities of Tecumseh, Emeryville, Belle River, Maidstone, Essex, La Salle, and Amherstburg. Proportional allocation was used because it requires no previous knowledge of stratum variances. The population of the given tract as compared with the total population of the county was proportional to the number of interviews obtained from the tract as compared to the total number of
interviews. Those tracts with greater populations then, would have greater representation in terms of interviews obtained.

Within each class or tract, a simple random sample was selected. For the city tracts, a list of the streets and relevant house numbers included in each tract were obtained. The city directory was then used to obtain the telephone number associated with each address. Using a table of random numbers, the relevant number of streets was chosen. A standard of two or three interviews for each street was adopted. Among the applicable house numbers for each street, a starting number was randomly chosen. Interviewers were instructed to begin at that specified number and continue until the relevant number of interviews was obtained.

For the contiguous communities, no such listing of telephone numbers by streets or geographic location was available. Therefore, the telephone book was used. For each tract, the corresponding section in the phone book was found. The columns were chosen randomly in the same way as the streets were. The starting point was determined by randomly choosing a row.
Before actual interviewing began, a pretest was undertaken. Twenty-five interviews were carried out in several of the city census tracts. The same random selection procedure was used to choose the appropriate street and house numbers. Any subsequent changes made in the questionnaire were not enough to warrant discarding this data. Most of the changes involved the additions of options not already listed. Any answers given that weren’t listed were recorded anyway so there was essentially no difference between those answers obtained during the pretest and those obtained using the questionnaire in its’ final form.

**Questionnaire Development.**

The questionnaire was given in the form of a telephone interview. It took 15 to 20 minutes to administer, on average. Since the purpose of the study was to measure child care needs from a woman’s perspective, the questionnaire was designed to be given to women only. The only exception was in the case of single fathers. Obviously, some fathers are very concerned with child care and they too should have a say in such matters. For the most part, however, it is still mothers who make the decisions and arrangements for child care.
The first information obtained was that of marital status, number of children, and employment status. Respondents also answered questions covering the general areas of present availability of child care, present affordability of child care, particular likes and dislikes associated with different forms of child care, maternal satisfaction, knowledge of government subsidization, and the need for some special types of child care service.

In assessing the child care needs of parents in Windsor it was first necessary to determine how available various types of child care were perceived to be. This was done in two ways. First, respondents were asked to list what sources they felt were available. No prompts or suggestions were given at this point; the respondents themselves had to generate the possibilities. Second, various forms of child care were listed and the respondents was asked to rate the availability of each in their area on a five-point scale.

The perceived affordability of child care was also assessed. Respondents were asked directly what sources of child care they felt were affordable, and they were also asked how much they themselves felt they could afford.
A large portion of the questionnaire was also devoted to determining whether or not parents would use particular types of child care. Several types of care were mentioned and defined if necessary. Each mother was asked if she would consider using this type of care for her children and then asked to explain why or why not. If the mother was presently using the arrangement being discussed or indicated that she had used it in the past, she was asked to delineate her likes and dislikes associated with each type of care. The four scales were generated from these questionnaire items: a disciplinary scale, an affection scale, a caregiving scale, and an educational scale.

The disciplinary scale was computed by summing the number of times a mother mentioned consistency, educational stimulation, discipline, maintenance of routine and health and safety as reasons she would or would not use various arrangements, or as likes and dislikes associated with the use of these arrangements. As such, the disciplinary scale measured not only concern with disciplinary issues but also a more general concern with structure and education stimulation. The affection scale was the sum total of responses referring to individual attention, affection, personal investment of the teacher in the child, and a home-like environment. The educational scale was
made up of the items educational stimulation, social stimulation, training of the caregiver and preparedness for formal schooling. The caregiver scale was composed of the items referring to the characteristics and personality of the caregiver, the caregiver being someone the child knows and likes, the health and safety of the child, the convenience of the arrangement and the arrangement being one which makes the child happy.

An attempt to measure maternal satisfaction with child care and with employment status was also undertaken. In questions 27 and 28, mothers were asked how satisfied they were with their present child care arrangement. It was expected that not many respondents would admit that they were dissatisfied so an attempt was made to ask this question in a slightly different manner. Question 17 was asked to determine if respondents would consider switching from their present child care arrangement if something else were available.

An attempt was also made to determine overall satisfaction with employment status. In question 4, respondents were simply asked if they were satisfied with their employment status. In question 11, they were asked if they would still prefer to work if financially they could afford not to. Mothers who were
presently not working were also asked if they would return to the labour force or to school if they could find affordable reliable care for their children.

Several questions about government subsidies were included. Respondents were asked whether or not they had ever applied for such a subsidy and if they hadn't, why they hadn't. They were also asked to delineate what factors they felt qualified one to be subsidized. Parents were also asked if they would make use of such services as sick child care, before and after school care, supplementary child care, and twenty-four-hour care.

The last section of the questionnaire was designed to obtain information about the respondent's ethnic background, education, income and occupation of the respondent and her spouse. The socioeconomic status of respondents and their spouses was determined using the revised economic index for employed women (Blishen & Carroll, 1978), and the Blishen and McRoberts scale (1976), respectively.
Chapter III

Results

General Findings

The sample consisted of mainly married women. They accounted for 81% of those polled. About 7% were separated, 8% were divorced and 2% were single. The sample was fairly evenly divided in terms of employment status. Thirty-six percent of the sample did not work outside the home, 26% were employed on a part-time basis and 28% were employed full-time.

The most popular child care arrangement is care by a relative. This arrangement accounts for 42% of all arrangements made. An additional 25% of the respondents use sitters, 17% use day care centers or nursery schools, 10% use family home day cares, and 6% allow the children to look after themselves or arrange for an older child to do so.

The arrangement used varies somewhat by total family income. Day care is most popular among middle income families ($30,000-$40,000), accounting for 27% of all arrangements made by this group. In every income bracket, relatives constitute the most popular arrangement. Even among the highest income group, it accounts for 35% of all arrangements made. It is most popular, however, among very low income groups.
accounting for 58% of the arrangements made by families falling in the $10,000-$20,000 range. Sitters appear to be equally popular among all income groups, accounting for 20 to 30% of the arrangements. Similar trends are observed when SES data are considered. More day care center arrangements and sitter arrangements are made by higher SES groups and more relative arrangements are made by lower SES. Arrangements also vary by education level of the parents. When mothers’ education level is low the arrangement is much more likely to be one where the children care for themselves or older children do, and much less likely to be a day care center arrangement. When father’s education level is high, the arrangement is slightly less likely to be a day care center arrangement.

Ethnicity also has a very profound effect on what child care arrangement is used. Among respondents born in Canada, 38% use a relative and 21% use a day care center. Among respondents born outside of Canada, 64% use a relative and only 12% use a day care center.

The average cost of child care varies by the age of the child. The average cost per child for children under 3 is $43.00 a week with the maximum amount paid being $200.00. Many respondents, however, especially those using relatives pay nothing. For children aged 3
to 6 the average cost is $37.00 a week with the maximum being $120.00. Parents of children 6 to 12 pay an average of $16.00 a week with the maximum amount paid being $80.00. The average amount paid by people with children in all three age groups is $80.00 a week.

What do parents look for in an arrangement? What factors are of most importance in selecting child care? Respondents seem equally concerned with two of the five factors mentioned. When asked to pick which factor was the most important to good child care, 43% of the respondents choose assuring an affectionate loving environment for the child and 36% choose assuring the health and safety of the child. Nine percent feel assuring a stimulating environment is of prime importance, 8% feel dependability is, and 4% feel learning to get along well with others is most important. When asked to list the next most important factor, 28% choose assuring an affectionate loving environment, 26% choose safety and health, 19% choose assuring a stimulating environment, 20% choose dependability, and 7% choose learning to get along well with others. The responses to this question do not vary greatly by SES; the only trend is in the direction of increased concern with dependability among lower SES.
The arrangements listed as being ideal vary greatly by the age of the child being considered. For children under the age of 3, some sort of in home care is felt to be the ideal arrangement by 47% of respondents. Twenty three percent feel that care by a relative would be ideal, 13% feel day care would be ideal, 11% say care by someone known to you would be most desirable, and 5% list sitter care as being best. For children between 3 and 6, day care is the most popular choice, being chosen by 40% of the respondents. Care by a relative is considered ideal by 28% of the respondents, nursery school is considered ideal by 21%, in home care is considered ideal by 7%, and 6% feel care by a sitter would be best. These choices are not markedly dissimilar for various SES groups. There is, however, a slight trend toward increased preference for day care and decreased preference for care by relatives among the higher SES groups.

Knowing what the ideal arrangements are is valuable but since it is unlikely to be the case that everyone will be able to obtain their ideal arrangement it is also necessary to know just what type of arrangements people are and are not willing to use. Of the respondents polled, 43.3% state they they are unwilling to use a day care center. Nineteen percent say they are now using or have used this arrangement in the past.
An additional 37% say they would be willing to use this arrangement though they haven't in the past.

Forty-four percent of the respondents also say they would not use family home day care, while 11% report having used it in the past or using it at present. Forty-five percent say they would be willing to use it if the need arose. The findings with regard to private home day care are very similar. Forty-one percent are not willing to use it, while 56% are. Only 2% are using or have used such an arrangement in the past.

A much smaller percentage of respondents are unwilling to use care by relatives or sitters. Seventeen percent of the respondents say they would not use care by a relative. Approximately 48% say they are willing to use such an arrangement and 34% report using the arrangement previously. When asked if they would be willing to make an arrangement with a sitter, 28.8% of the respondents say they wouldn't, and 40% say they would. An additional 31% report having used the arrangement before.

Many respondents are unwilling to use day care centers, family home day care and private home day care. Some of the positive qualities of day care centers mentioned by respondents are educational stimulation, social stimulation, reliable care and a
well trained staff. Among its deficits are expensiveness, lack of sufficient individual attention, being restricted to use by younger children, and simply being less preferred than other arrangements.

The positive things mentioned about family home day care are social stimulation, convenience, more individual attention (than large group care), flexible hours and a home like environment. Reasons given for not wanting to use it are insufficient individual attention, inadequate training of caregivers, unfamiliarity of the caregiver, another arrangement being better, and the child being too old.

Respondents mentioned a number of positive qualities about private home day care, including increased individual attention, convenience, more training of the caregiver, flexible hours, home like environment, and the presence of supervision. The reasons given most often for not using this arrangement are that another arrangement is better and that this person is unknown to you.

Care by relatives also has a number of positive and negative attributes: Respondents perceive the benefits to be increased individual attention, more personal investment on the part of the caregiver, familiarity with the caregiver on the part of the respondent and her child, and inexpensiveness. The reasons given for
not preferring the arrangement are limited availability, the difficulty of family conflicts, the possibility that the child would be spoiled and fear of imposing on relatives.

Sitter arrangements are perceived by many respondents as being convenient, less expensive, offering more individual attention, being in one's home and provided by someone the respondent knows. The three dislikes are that another arrangement is better, that the quality of the care is variable and that it is unreliable.

A number of questions assessed the perceived availability and affordability of various child care arrangements. When respondents are asked to list what forms of child care they feel are available, 79% list sitters, 74% list day care, 47% mention relatives or friends, 13% mention family home day care, and 11% mention nursery school. Respondents were also asked to rate various forms of child care according to how available they were on a scale of 1 to 5. Five represents total lack of availability and 1 represents very high availability. The mean rating for infant care is 3.4, while that for child care for children aged 2 to 5 is 2.1. Before and after school care receives a mean rating of 3.4, sick child care is 4.7,
24 hour care is 4.8, day care is 1.9 and sitters are 2.0.

When asked to list what forms of child care are affordable a slightly different pattern emerges. Relatives are perceived as being the most affordable, being mentioned by 72% of the respondents. Sitters are perceived as affordable by 50% of the respondents and day care by 17%. No other arrangements are mentioned by more than 4% of the respondents.

A number of arrangements are felt to be of good quality but three arrangements are listed more often. Forty two percent of the respondents feel that relatives provide good quality care, 38% feel sitters do, and 27% of the respondents feel day care centers provide good quality care. Nursery schools are mentioned by 8% of mothers interviewed, and family home day cares are mentioned by 4%. An additional 15% of the respondents state that what is defined as good quality care depends on the child and the situation.

One portion of the questionnaire was devoted to determining what kind of information mothers had about government subsidies. Only 17% of the mothers interviewed feel they they are eligible for subsidies. This finding does vary by SES, but not to the extent that one would expect. Among high SES respondents, 7% feel they are eligible for subsidies. At the moderate
SES level this figure rises to 15% and at the lowest SES level it is 30%.

Only 9% of the respondents polled had ever applied for government subsidization, and only 3% received it. Among those who had never applied, the most popular reason for not applying is that they never thought of it (39%). An additional 28% state that they did not apply because they considered themselves ineligible, and 23% did not apply because they never needed to (their children never received formalized care).

Respondents were asked about what factors they thought qualified an individual to be subsidized. Seventy one percent list low income as one such reason. Forty seven percent mention single parenthood, 31% mention welfare recipients, 20% mention having a child with special needs and 7% feel parents returning to school is reason for qualification.

Several questions were devoted to determining the need for various specialized services. The majority of respondents feel there is a need for sick child care (67%) but fewer will commit themselves to using it. Twenty six percent say they would, 27% say they might, 23% say they probably wouldn't and 24% say they definitely would not make use of sick child care. Many more respondents indicate a willingness to use
supplementary care. Forty two percent state that they would, and 31% say they might.

The findings with regard to 24 hour care are rather surprising. Only 14% of the respondents feel they would use 24 hour child care on a regular basis and another 14% feel they would use it on an occasional basis. This is surprising because 40% of the working respondents do shift work and an additional 33% of those who don't work state that they would consider doing shift work if 24 hour care were available. The response to before and after school care is much more positive. Forty percent of the respondents feel that they would use it on a regular basis, and 23% feel they would on an occasional basis. Mothers who were not presently working were also asked if they would consider returning to work or school if they could obtain affordable, reliable child care. Fifty nine percent feel they would consider returning to work and 35% say they might return to school.
Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses were tested by chi square analyses. The first hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between satisfaction with child care arrangements and satisfaction with employment status. While the majority of respondents (59%) indicate high satisfaction with their employment status no relationship was found between employment satisfaction and satisfaction with child care arrangements ($\chi^2 (2, N = 175) = .85, p < .65)$ (see Table 1). The child care satisfaction scale was made up of responses to three different questions. As mentioned previously, questions 27 and 28 simply asked the respondents how satisfied they were and how closely the arrangement they had matched the ideal arrangement they were looking for. Question 17 asked whether the respondents would consider switching from their present arrangement.

There was an association between question 17 and employment satisfaction ($\chi^2 (8, N = 175) = 13.74, p < .05$). As demonstrated in Table 2, higher employment status satisfaction is associated with higher child care satisfaction as measured by question 17. Twenty-five percent of those in the highest satisfaction category say they would consider switching from their present arrangement. Forty-nine percent of those in the middle category say the same as do 50% of those in
### Table 1

**Child Care Satisfaction and Employment Status Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employment Status Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (2, N = 175) = 2.85, P < .65 \]

### Table 2

**Employment Status Satisfaction and Question #17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Employment Status Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would definitely consider switching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might consider switching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably wouldn't consider switching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely wouldn't consider switching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (8, N = 179) = 13.74, P < .05 \]
the lowest category.

It was also hypothesized that satisfaction with employment status would be greater for employed women. This hypothesis is not supported by the data and in fact, the opposite is found. In the category of high satisfaction, there is a higher percentage of nonworking women \( \chi^2 (2, N = 346) = 29.88 \ p < .0001 \). As shown in Table 3, 56\% of the women in this category are not working while 44\% are. At the moderate and lower levels of satisfaction, there is a substantially higher percentage of working women. In both cases, the category consists of approximately 26\% nonworking and 74\% working women.

Among employed women, it is those working part time who are the most satisfied \( \chi^2 (2, N = 224) = 91.34 \ p < .0001 \) (see Table 4). Fifty-three percent of women working part time reported high satisfaction, while none of the women working full time reported high satisfaction. Comparison of satisfaction among women working full time and women not working indicated significant differences \( \chi^2 (2, N = 256) = 88.00 \ p < .0001 \). As reflected in Table 5, those who are not working are more satisfied than those working full time. The difference between those working part time and those not working at all is not significant (see Table 6).
Table 3

Employment Status and Employment Status Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (2, N = 346) = 29.88 \ p < .0001 \)

Table 4

Employment Status Satisfaction Among Women Employed Part Time and Full Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (2, N = 224) = 91.34 \ p < .0001 \)
### Table 5

**Employment Status Satisfaction Among Women Not Working and Women Working Full Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Full Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \ N = 256) = 88.00 \ p < .0001 \]

### Table 6

**Employment Status Satisfaction Among Women Not Working and Women Working Part Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Part Time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \ N = 212) = 4.3 \ p < .81 \]
It was also hypothesized that satisfaction would vary by socioeconomic status. No relationship is found between satisfaction with employment status and socioeconomic status, as computed separately for mothers' and fathers' occupation. An examination of the relationship between maternal/paternal SES and employment status satisfaction was carried out while controlling for employment status. Although none of the chi squares reached the .05 level of significance, there is a trend among nonworking women in the direction of increased satisfaction among higher maternal SES groups (see Table 7). The chi squares comparing employment status among various SES groups reveal no statistically significant differences. The data seem to suggest that full time employed women are the least satisfied with their employment status, regardless of socioeconomic status. It was hypothesized that higher SES would be associated with higher satisfaction with child care arrangements (hypothesis 3). The data did not confirm this hypothesis.

The SES indices used are a composite of education levels, income level indicators, and prestige ratings. When a simple measure of education is used, the results are a bit different. The higher the education level of the respondent or her husband, the more likely she
Table 7

Employment Status Satisfaction and Maternal SES for Women Not Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status Satisfaction</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (4, N = 76) = 3.42 p < .08
is to fall into a higher satisfaction category ($\chi^2(3, N = 173) = 2.97, p < .08$) and ($\chi^2(3, N = 134) = 9.040, p < .029$) respectively (see Tables 8 and 9).

As mentioned previously, it was expected that childcare satisfaction would be higher among higher SES groups because there would be greater similarity between the arrangement being used and the arrangements the mother deemed to be of best quality. Chi squares for the data on similarity were computed using maternal SES, paternal SES, maternal education level, and paternal education level. None reached the .05 level of significance. The majority of respondents (over 80%) are presently using arrangements that they list as providing good quality care, regardless of SES and education level.

Similar findings are evident from other questionnaire responses. When asked how satisfied they are with their present childcare arrangement, 57.7% of the mothers state that they are very satisfied and an additional 30% say they are fairly satisfied. Yet when the respondents are asked if they would consider switching to another arrangement, more than 21% say they would definitely consider it and over 22% say they might consider it. Only 25% of the respondents say they definitely wouldn't consider switching.
Table 8

Child Care Satisfaction and Paternal Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care Satisfaction</th>
<th>Paternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Degree/Year Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- 28 - 15 - 35 - 6 - 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- 9 - 5 - 26 - 10 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>- 37 - 20 - 61 - 16 - 134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²(3, N = 134) = 9.04 p < .03

Table 9

Child Care Satisfaction and Maternal Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care Satisfaction</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Degree/Year Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- 23 - 18 - 56 - 7 - 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- 10 - 11 - 38 - 10 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>- 33 - 29 - 94 - 17 - 173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²(3, N = 173) = 2.98 p < .09
It was also hypothesized that there would be a positive relationship between perceived availability of various forms of child care and SES. The first measure of availability was simply the number of child care options judged to be available. Examination of Tables 10, 11, and 12 reveals statistically significant relationships between availability and mothers' SES ($\chi^2(4, N = 286) = 9.28, p < .05$), fathers' SES ($\chi^2(4, N = 276) = 12.17, p < .02$), and mothers' education level ($\chi^2(6, N = 332) = 6.46, p < .01$). Respondents from lower SES and educational levels tend to see less as being available, while those from higher SES and educational levels see more options as being available. This trend is deviated slightly in the case of father's education level ($\chi^2(6, N = 332) = 9.25, p < .16$). Here too, it is found that those seeing fewer options are more likely to be from lower SES groups, but those seeing many options are likely to be from any one of the three SES groups (see Table 13). It may be noted that the majority of respondents (63%) perceive either two or three arrangements as being available.

The second method of measuring perceived availability involved having the respondent rate a list of child care options according to how available the respondents felt they were. This scale of availability is not
Table 10  
Perceived Availability and Maternal SES  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(4, N = 286) = 9.28, p < .05$

Table 11  
Perceived Availability and Paternal SES  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(4, N = 276) = 12.17, p < .02$
Table 12

Perceived Availability and Maternal Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (6, N = 332) = 16.46, \ p < .01 \]

Table 23

Perceived Availability and Paternal Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (6, N = 332) = 9.25, \ p < .16 \]
related to any of the SES or education variables (all p's > .25).

A last hypothesis related to child care satisfaction predicted a positive relationship between affordability and SES. More arrangements are listed as being affordable if the education level of the respondent or her spouse is high ($\chi^2(6, N = 334) = 36.95, p < .0001$ and $\chi^2(6, N = 282) = 12.69, p < .05$ respectively) or if maternal SES is high ($\chi^2(4, N = 284) = 11.67, p < .02$). As demonstrated in Tables 14 and 15, lower availability ratings are obtained by those with lower education levels or SES. It may be noted, however, that in most cases very few respondents list more than three arrangements as being affordable. The majority of respondents (58%) list either one or no arrangements as being affordable. The average amount respondents feel they could afford for child care is $53.00 a week per child. This figure of course varies by SES. Respondents from the highest maternal SES group list an average amount of $65.50, the average in the moderate category was $50.27 and that from the lowest category was $45.74. For the high, moderate and low paternal SES groups the averages were $62.17, $46.84, and $46.87.
Table 14

Perceived Affordability and Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (6, \ N = 334) = 36.95, \ P < .0001 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (6, \ N = 282) = 12.69, \ P < .05 \)
### Table 15

**Perceived Affordability and SES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(4, N = 284) = 11.67, p < .02 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(4, N = 277) = 4.42, p < .35 \]
Hypothesis 4 predicted higher employment status satisfaction among mothers of daughters. To test this hypothesis, only data from respondents with all female children or all male children was used. This obviously leads to a lot of lost data but no other alternative seemed plausible. It was felt that even if a respondent was asked to focus on and answer the question with regard to the child(ren) of one particular sex this would not be possible. It is improbable that parents can focus on and answer each question without letting experiences with and perceptions of other children enter into this process.

As shown in Table 16, the modal satisfaction category for mothers of daughters is moderate satisfaction. Seventy one percent of the mothers of females report moderate satisfaction, while the remaining 30% are equally divided between high and low satisfaction. Among the mothers of males, however, a slightly different pattern emerges. Fewer report moderate satisfaction (51%) with the rest approximately equally represented in each of the other two categories (25% in the category of high satisfaction and 24% in low satisfaction) ($\chi^2(2, N = 130) = 5.18, p < .08$).
Table 16

Employment Status - Satisfaction and Sex of Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status Satisfaction</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (2, N = 130) = 5.18, p < .07 \)
It appears then that working mothers of females are quite likely to be moderately satisfied with their employment status. Many working mothers of males are also moderately satisfied but they are more likely to be in the highest or lowest satisfaction levels.

Hypothesis number 5 (a) asserted that mothers of daughters will have different concerns than mothers of sons. The reasons for willingness and unwillingness to use various forms of care were expected to reflect these different concerns as will the various likes and dislikes associated with the arrangements being used.

It was hypothesized that the mothers of sons would endorse items in the disciplinary scale more often than would mothers of daughters. Mothers of daughters were expected to mention items on the affection scale more often.

As seen in Table 17, mothers of sons are much more likely to have higher scores on the disciplinary scale ($\chi^2$ (2, N = 185) = 14.06, $p < .001$). While not statistically significant at conventional levels ($\chi^2$ (3, N = 185) = 3.98, $p < .27$), mothers of males are slightly more likely to have low affection scale scores (see Table 18). Sixty nine percent of the mothers of males have low affection scale scores (two lowest
Table 17

Child's Sex and Disciplinary Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Score</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (2, N = 185) = 14.06, p < .001 \)

Table 18

Child's Sex and Affection Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affection Scale Scores</th>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^\prime (3, N = 185) = 3.94, p < .27 \)
categories), while only 48% of the mothers of females do the same.

It was also hypothesized that the sex differences would be greater for lower than higher socioeconomic status mothers. Among mothers of daughters, there is no relationship between the affection scale and any of the SES or education level variables (all p's > .26). Among the mothers of sons, however, maternal SES is significantly related to affection scale scores ($\chi^2(6, N = 80) = 15.86, p < .02$), as is maternal education level ($\chi^2(9, N = 95) = 21.82, p < .01$) (see tables 19 and 20). The respondents in the higher SES and education categories are more likely to endorse more items on the affection scale. Those in the lower SES and educational categories have lower scale scores. Items on the affection scale are not significantly related to fathers' SES ($\chi^2(6, N = 76) = 9.53, p < .15$) or fathers' education level ($\chi^2(9, N = 77) = 7.86, p < .54$).

For mothers of daughters, the disciplinary scale is not related to any of the SES or education level variables (all p's > .15). For sons, however, a number of statistically significant relationships emerge. Low SES, as measured by mothers' occupation,
Table 19

Maternal SES and Affection Scale Scores For Male Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affection Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal SES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6, N = 80) = 15.86, p < .02

Table 20

Maternal Education Level and Affection Scale Scores for Male Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affection Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
<th>University College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13 &lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9, N = 95) = 21.82, p < .01
is associated with low scores on the disciplinary scale \( \chi^2(4, N = 80) = 9.27, p < .055 \) (see Table 21).

In the lowest SES level, 40% of the mothers report low concerns with disciplinary issues. In the moderate level, 61% have low levels of concern with disciplinary issues and at the highest SES level, 25% do. As seen in Table 22, higher maternal education levels are also associated with higher disciplinary scores and lower maternal educational levels are associated with lower scores \( \chi^2(6, N = 95) = 17.55, p < .01 \). No relationship was found between discipline scale scores and fathers’ SES \( \chi^2(4, N = 76) = 4.182, p < .307 \) or fathers’ education level \( \chi^2(6, N = 77) = 1.90, p < .93 \).

As seen in Tables 23 and 24, the disciplinary scale itself is positively associated with paternal SES \( \chi^2(4, N = 287) = 9.99, p < .04 \) and with paternal education level \( \chi^2(6, N = 344) = 25.01, p < .0001 \).

In both cases, higher SES and education level categories contain higher scores on the disciplinary scales.

The relationship between the sex of the child and the disciplinary scale score was assessed at all levels of socioeconomic status and education level (see Tables 25 and 26). Greater disciplinary concerns are expressed by mothers of sons, at the highest maternal
Table 21

Maternal SES and Disciplinary Scale Scores for Female Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal SES</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2(4, N = 80) = 9.27, p < .05
\]

Table 22

Maternal Education Level and Disciplinary Scale Scores for Male Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University College Gr 12/13 &lt; Gr 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3 4 33 7 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>8 6 8 6 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5 5 9 1 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 15 50 14 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2(6, N = 95) = 17.55, p < .01
\]
Table 23

Disciplinary Scale Scores and Paternal SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Paternal SES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (4, N = 287) = 9.90, \ p < .04 \)

Table 24

Disciplinary Scale Scores and Maternal Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 (6, N = 344) = 25.01, \ p < .0001 \)
Table 25

**Disciplinary Scale Score and Sex of Child**

For High Maternal SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>- 11 - 4 - 0 -</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>- 6 - 12 - 6 -</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 16 6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (2, N = 39) = 9.99, p < .01

For Low Maternal SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>- 9 - 7 - 0 -</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>- 6 - 5 - 4 -</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15 12 4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² (2, N = 31) = 4.91, p < .04
Table 26
Disciplinary Scale Scores and Sex of Child
For Mothers Completing Grade 12 or Grade 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \text{ N } = 101) = 8.16, p < .02 \]

For Mothers With College Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(2, \text{ N } = 28) = 3.49, p < .07 \]
Table 26 continued

For Mothers With University Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (2, N = 28) = 5.88, p < .05$

For Fathers Completing Grade 12 or Grade 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Child</th>
<th>Disciplinary Scale Scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 (2, N = 77) = 6.10, p < .05$
SES level ($\chi^2(2, N = 39) = 9.92, p < .01$) and the lowest maternal SES level ($\chi^2(2, N = 31) = 6.45, p < .04$). Greater disciplinary concerns are also expressed by mothers of sons in the top three maternal educational levels ($\chi^2(2, N = 101) = 8.16, p < .02; \chi^2(2, N = 28) = 3.22, p < .07; \chi^2(2, N = 28) = 5.83, p < .05$) and the second lowest paternal education level ($\chi^2(2, N = 77) = 6.10, p < .05$).

The affection scale was found to be unrelated to fathers' education level, fathers' SES, and mothers' SES (all $p'$s > .18). As seen in Table 27, it is related to mothers' education levels, though ($\chi^2(9, N = 344) = 5.48, p < .02$), with higher education levels being associated with higher affection scale scores. Chi squares were computed to measure the association between the sex of the child and the affection scale scores while controlling for SES. In the highest paternal SES category, higher affection concerns are expressed by mothers of daughters ($\chi^2(3, N = 61) = 8.12, p < .04$). In the highest and lowest categories approximately equal percentages are found. Among the second highest category, significantly more females are found and among the second lowest scale significantly more males are found. There were no other statistically significant findings.
Table 27

Maternal Education Level and Affection Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affection Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (9, N = 344) = 5.48, \ p < .02 \]
The data do support the hypothesis that the mothers of sons are more concerned with disciplinary issues. The findings regarding affection are less clear cut but there does appear to be a slight tendency toward greater concern with affection among the mothers of daughters. Secondly, the scale scores themselves are related to SES and education level. Higher maternal education levels and paternal SES are associated with higher disciplinary concerns. Higher maternal education level is associated with higher affection concerns.

The findings with regard to the hypothesis that the gender differences would be greater among lower SES groups are mixed. The only significant findings occurred in the case of sons. Among the mothers of sons, lower SES and education are associated with lower affection scores and lower SES is associated with lower disciplinary scores (see Table 28).

Hypothesis 6 asserted that the higher one's socioeconomic status and education level, the more likely one was to use a day care or nursery school. This hypothesis was not directly supported by the data. When the type of care used was examined by SES and education level, no statistically significant relationships emerged (all p's > .07). In the case
Table 28

Affection Scale Scores and Child's Sex For High Paternal SES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>- 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( (3, N = 61) = 8.12, p < .04 \)
of mothers' education level and SES, however, a trend is observed (see Tables 29 and 30). There is a steady increase in the percentage of respondents using nursery schools and day cares as one moves from lower SES to higher SES and a steady decrease in the percentage using sitters. Among the group classified as low SES, 12% use day care and 88% use sitters. Among the moderate group, 17% use day cares and 83% use sitters and in the high SES group, 30% use day care centers while 70% use sitters. Very similar results were obtained by female education level. In the highest level, 32% use day cares and 68% use sitters. In the next group, 25% use day cares and 75% use sitters. In the second-lowest group, 17% use day cares and in the lowest group 14% use this arrangement.

It was also expected that social class and education level would have an effect on the reasons given for willingness and unwillingness to use various forms of care and the likes and dislikes associated with care already experienced. It was expected that respondents classified as belonging to lower educational and SES groups would give more responses indicating concern with characteristics of the individual caregiver. Actually, as demonstrated in Table 31, the opposite relationship was found. Lower
Table 29

Maternal SES and Type of Child Care Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal SES</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care / N S</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitter-Type</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(2, N = 125) = 3.12, p < .07$

Table 30

Maternal Education Level and Type of Child Care Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitter-Type</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2(3, N = 132) = 2.95, p < .09$
Table 31

Maternal Education Level and Caregiver Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caregiver Scale Scores</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Gr 12/13</th>
<th>&lt; Gr 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2(9, N = 344) = 19.37, \ p < .02 \)
caregiving scores are obtained by respondents falling in low maternal educational level categories ($\chi^2(9, N = 344) = 19.37, p < .02$). Fifty five percent of the respondents in the two lowest educational categories report the lowest caregiving concerns. Of the respondents in the top educational category, 42% express high concern with caregiving issues, while only 19% of those in the lowest educational category do. Lower paternal educational level was also associated with lower caregiver concerns (see Table 32). Of those classified as having the lowest education level, 62% fall in the lowest scale score category, while only 46% of those from the highest educational level do so. Among those respondents scoring in the highest level of caregiving, 5.4% are from the lowest educational level while 13.5% are from the highest level. When the top two categories of the caregiving scale are considered together, one finds they are made up of 39% from the highest educational level and only 11% from the lowest.

It was also hypothesized that respondents from higher education levels and SES would exhibit more concern with educational issues when considering child care arrangements. A positive relationship between female education level and educational concerns was obtained ($\chi^2(12, N = 344) = 27.91, p < .01$) (see Table 33).
Table 32

Paternal Education Level and Caregiver Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caregiver Scale Scores</th>
<th>Paternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- 27 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>- 9 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>- 15 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(9, N = 293) = 18.04, p < .04 \]

Table 33

Maternal Education Level and Education Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Scale Scores</th>
<th>Maternal Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>- 13 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Medium</td>
<td>- 8 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>- 11 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Medium</td>
<td>- 11 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>- 7 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2(12, N = 344) = 27.91, p < .01 \]
Among the two highest categories of education scale scores, there is a much higher percentage of respondents from the higher educational levels. Of the respondents classified as having the highest education levels, 36% fell in the top two scale categories and 31% fell in the second highest category. Fifteen percent fell in the lowest scale score category, and 15% fell in the second lowest category. If one simply looks at the lowest scale score category, however, there is not a large difference in the percentage of respondents coming from the various educational levels. Thirty percent come from the lowest educational category, 45% from the next lowest, 35% from the second highest category and 26% from the highest.

The last hypothesis asserted that people using sitters as their primary child care arrangement would be more dissatisfied than those using other arrangements. The data do not support this hypothesis. The relationship is not significant at the conventional levels (χ² (4, N = 165) = 5.37, p < .25), but there are noticeable differences in Table 34. Among respondents using babysitters, 51% report high satisfaction. Fifty seven percent of those using relatives are highly satisfied as are 64% of those using day care centers and nursery schools. Among those using family home day care, 62% are highly
Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Care Satisfaction</th>
<th>Type of Care Being Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitters</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2(4, N = 165) = 5.38, p < .25 \)
satisfied as are 55% of those who let their children care for themselves or arrange to have them cared for by an older child. Therefore, respondents using sitters as their primary child care arrangement are not significantly less satisfied than are respondents using other arrangements. It does seem, however, that those using day care centers, nursery schools and especially family home day cares are more satisfied than those using sitters, relatives or older children.
Chapter IV
Discussion

The questionnaire was given in the form of a telephone interview for a number of reasons. A mail questionnaire was decided against because the response rate of such measures is so typically low. A door-to-door interviewing technique was also ruled out due to its great time consuming nature.

While the telephone-interview format appeared the most suitable, it was not without drawbacks. Firstly, such interviewing is very difficult if not impossible when a respondent's English is poor. Some such language difficulties may have been overcome in a face-to-face interview. Secondly, there is a chance of biasing the sample somewhat because only those with telephones and listed telephone numbers have a chance of being reached. It was felt that telephone ownership is fairly standard at this time even for very low income families so the number of people ruled out was not sufficient to cause concern.

Contrary to expectation, no association was found between the child care satisfaction scale and employment status satisfaction. Other researchers (Leio, 1981; Johnson, 1977) have commented on this
unwillingness to admit dissatisfaction. It may be difficult for a working mother to admit that she is dissatisfied with the child care arrangement she is using when using it. Admitting that would be equivalent to admitting that she is not providing well for her children, that her personal satisfaction is more important than her children's. The same can be said of employment satisfaction. Most working mothers indicate that they are fairly happy with their employment status. They do not attest to being totally happy without any reservations about whether or not they should be working, for that might indicate that they were less than adequate mothers. The idea is "I like working but sure I'd rather spend more time with my children and I am very concerned about their well being."

Even though there does not appear to be a relationship between satisfaction with employment status and the child care satisfaction scale, it appears that question 17 is positively associated with employment satisfaction. By asking question 17 in the form of, "Would you consider switching from your present child care arrangement," many more respondents are willing to admit that, although they like the
arrangement they are using, there is probably another they would consider using, maybe even prefer using.

Contrary to prediction, satisfaction with employment status is higher for nonemployed than employed mothers. However, one can see that it is dissatisfaction among full time employed mothers which is primarily responsible for this result. Mothers who are employed full time are much less satisfied than are those employed part time. It may be suggested that part time workers have the benefit of enjoying a career and all that goes with it in terms of increased self esteem, interesting, challenging work, a chance to interact with other adults, and increased economic resources. Yet, such women probably still have time to attend to their child and household related duties.

Full time employed mothers are also likely to gain the above benefits but there may be a bit of a trade off because they have far less time available to them for other things. These findings are quite different from previous findings (Birnbaum, 1971; Gold & Andres, 1978a). These studies did not report the findings separately for part time and full time employment. It is possible that their sample had a larger proportion of mothers employed part time and that would account for higher satisfaction among employed groups.
Although the relationship between child's sex and satisfaction with employment status did not reach traditional levels of significance, an interesting trend was noted. The results indicate that for mothers of girls the modal category is that of moderate employment satisfaction. Among the mothers of sons, there is an increased percentage falling in the higher and lower satisfaction categories. This may be explained by some of the findings discussed earlier about boys. It has been found that boys are affected more by family stressors and maternal employment is just such a stressor. It was also found that boys are far more demanding and even more difficult to deal with that girls (Maccoby, 1980). They are more likely to approach mother with egoistic demands and are also more likely to get into trouble at school and similar settings.

It can be speculated that this wide range of satisfaction is due to a couple of factors. On the one side, if boys are more demanding and more difficult to deal with then it may make sense that a far higher percentage of mothers of sons are highly satisfied with working. Employment may allow mother to have time away from the stress of dealing with such demanding troublesome children. On the negative side, however, since boys are more difficult and since they are more
negatively affected by family stressors, many of them may not react well to maternal employment. They may not get along as well at the daycare or the sitters' as girls are likely to do. If mother is aware of this, as she is likely to be, her employment satisfaction is likely to suffer. She may feel guilty about working if her son is not happy in his child care arrangement or if the sitter or teacher discusses with mother the problems they are having with the child. Or if one's son is unhappy with his arrangement and dislikes being away from mother during the day, his demands may intensify when mother does return home at the end of the day. This too is likely to decrease one's satisfaction with working.

A number of interesting findings emerged concerning the issues mothers see as important in the selection of child care type. As predicted, mothers of sons are more concerned with disciplinary issues. These findings are in line with developmental research demonstrating that boys are much more resistant to the teaching and training efforts of their parents (Maccoby, 1980). If the relationships between mothers and sons tend revolve around disciplinary issues, it makes sense that disciplinary concerns are high on mothers' list of concerns when searching for and evaluating child care arrangements.
The findings from developmental research suggest that in the case of girls, mother-child relationships revolve around shared activities. It was suggested then that mothers of girls would have more affection concerns. This hypothesis was not reliably demonstrated. It would appear that while mother-daughter relationships are more mutual and less demanding than mother-son relationships, this difference is not reflected in higher concern with affection on the part of mothers of daughters. Mothers of daughters are less concerned with disciplinary issues but mothers of both sexes have approximately equal concern with affection-type issues.

Many of the research hypotheses postulated differences according to the parents SES. It was expected that parents from different SES levels would chose different types of care, would have different child care concerns and would have different levels of satisfaction. The data did confirm many of the original hypotheses but not to the extent that was expected. All were tested using mothers' and fathers' SES and education level, yet in many cases only one or two of these measures proved statistically significant. Furthermore, it was educational level and mothers' data which more often led to reliable differences.
Generally, satisfaction with child care is related to SES and parental education level. The relationship is significant for fathers' educational level and approaches significance for mothers' education level, fathers' SES and mothers' SES. In all cases, the trend is towards higher satisfaction with higher SES and education levels. Significant relationships were also found between perceived availability of child care arrangements and female SES, male SES and female education level. Again, higher SES or education levels are associated with an increasing number of arrangements being perceived as available. Significant relationships are also found between affordability and mothers' SES, mothers' education level and fathers' education level. More arrangements are listed as being affordable if education or SES levels are high.

If higher SES and educational groups see more arrangements as being available and more as being affordable, they are likely to feel that they actually have a choice among arrangements. This in turn should lead to higher levels of satisfaction. The only subsidiary hypothesis which was not supported by the data was that higher SES groups would be more likely to be using an arrangement which they listed as providing good quality care. Among all SES groups and educational levels, the majority of respondents were
using an arrangement they said provided good quality care. This is probably also part of the larger tendency to justify the care presently being used. How could a good mother not consider the arrangement she is presently using as good quality care?

As mentioned in the results section, it was also found that the affection, discipline, caregiver, and educational scales themselves are related to SES and education levels. Higher disciplinary concerns are associated with higher paternal SES and maternal education level. At first glance, this is rather surprising because past research has demonstrated that working class parents are harsher or more demanding in the socialization of children (Maccoby, 1980). Such parents tend to stress obedience and respect for authority. However, these are what they themselves stress as parents, they do not seem to affect verbalized concerns about child care. Higher SES parents tend to stress independence, ambition and self control. It is not terribly difficult to see how these kinds of concerns could translate into increased concern with items in the disciplinary scale. They are consistency of care, educational stimulation, discipline, maintenance of routine, and health and safety.
Greater concern with affection-type issues is also expressed by higher maternal education level respondents. This concurs with past research findings that it is higher SES parents who are more concerned with the happiness, curiosity and creativity of the child, while lower SES are concerned with respect for authority, obedience, and staying out of trouble. Lower caregiving scores are obtained by low female education level categories. And it is found that higher educational concerns are found among higher maternal education levels.

Actually, what seems to be emerging is a greater number of concerns, of whatever type among higher SES and education groups. Higher SES and educational levels are associated with higher verbalized concerns about everything. It is probable that respondents from higher SES and educational categories have more information and knowledge about child care and alternative child care arrangements. Such respondents also appear to have more choices available to them because they perceive more as being available and affordable. They, therefore, have given many areas a lot of thought and more quickly and readily verbalize all these concerns.
Throughout the results, it may have been noted that more often it was maternal SES or education data which produced statistically significant findings. This makes sense if one considers the fact that it is mothers only who are responding to the questionnaire. Most of the items are asking for the mothers' opinion on child rearing and child care issues. Since the father is never polled, one expects that paternal SES and educational data will have a smaller effect on the results obtained. Nevertheless, paternal education level and SES do have some effect. This is perhaps the largest determining factor in overall family income and it may also be postulated that any child care decisions made by the family could have involved the father and his input. Earlier findings, however, suggest that this is the exception, not the rule (Lero, 1981).

It was hypothesized that any male/female differences would be exacerbated in lower SES groups. There are mixed results here. Firstly, the only reliable differences are found among the mothers of sons. This again is to be expected given past research suggesting that males are more likely to be affected by family changes or stressors. Secondly, affection concerns are not found to be reliably higher among the mothers of females. There is a trend in the expected direction, however, and it is found that for sons in
the lower SES and education levels, affection concerns are lower. In the higher groups there are no differences in concerns for mothers of sons and daughters. This does provide some support for the hypothesis.

With regard to disciplinary scale scores, it was again found that lower SES is associated with lower disciplinary concerns among mothers of sons. This finding is the result of two opposing forces. Among the mothers of sons in general, disciplinary concerns are higher. And among higher SES groups, disciplinary concerns are also higher. These findings are contrary to the hypothesis. Fewer, rather than more, male/female differences are found in the lower SES groups.

Some of the findings in this study are identical to findings from other studies conducted in other cities. In both Lero’s (1981) Guelph sample and Johnson’s (1977) Toronto sample, informal arrangements were more popular among lower SES and educational levels, while higher SES was associated with greater use of center and sitter care. This result was also found in the present study. Among the three samples (Toronto, Guelph and Windsor), there was also great similarity in the ratings of what factors are of importance in choosing child care, in what positive and
negative factors are associated with various types of arrangements and in what is considered an ideal arrangement.

There are, however, differences in the percentage of respondents using various arrangements. Johnson's Toronto sample was more similar to the present. In Johnson's sample (1981), 42% of the respondents used care by a relative, 45% used a sitter and 11% used a day care center. This is similar to the Windsor sample, in which 42% use relatives, 25% use sitters, 10% use family home day care and 11% use day care centers. In Lero's sample, however, only 11% used relatives, 26% used sitters, 20% used family home day care and 42% used day care centers.

There is also a slightly different pattern of use when considering income. In the Windsor sample, day care use was most popular among middle income families ($30,000-$40,000). In the Lero sample, it was also most popular among families with incomes between $11,000 and $25,000. In the Johnson sample, however, day care was very popular among those in the very lowest income brackets. Twenty six percent of those making under $5000 used day cares as did 26% of those earning between $5000 and $10,000.
Conclusions

Employment satisfaction is greater among women employed part time than women employed full time. There is no statistically significant difference between those working part time and those not working at all. Employment satisfaction is positively related to child care satisfaction as measured with the question "Would you consider switching from your present arrangement?" Traditional measurements in the form of "How satisfied are you?" do not yield reliable results.

Mothers of sons are more concerned with disciplinary issues than mothers of daughters in their consideration of child care arrangements. Mothers of sons are more likely to have very high or very low employment status satisfaction. Mothers of daughters are more likely to have moderate levels of satisfaction. Among the mothers of sons, higher affection scale scores are found among higher SES and education levels and higher discipline concerns are found among higher SES and education levels.

Higher SES is associated with greater disciplinary concerns, and greater numbers of arrangements being rated as available and affordable. Higher education levels are associated with higher child care satisfaction, higher ratings of availability and
affordability, higher disciplinary and affection scale scores, and greater concern with caregiver characteristics and educational issues.

In the past, much of the research has computed family SES using only the occupation of the male family head. Further research would benefit from collecting data on both mothers' and fathers' SES and also education levels. Consideration of the data in terms of education level and maternal data produced many reliable findings in this study.

Different patterns of use are found among different samples of parents. The reasons for this are not known, but it does seem to suggest a need for individual assessments of various populations. Such assessments would determine what child care arrangements are being used, what arrangements people would like to make, and what could be done to improve the present system among each population of parents.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF CHILD CARE NEEDS
Hello. My name is ________ and I'm working with an organization called the Women's Incentive Center. We've just received funding from the Secretary of State to conduct a study of child care needs in Windsor and Essex County.

Are there any children 12 and under living in your household?

____ no Thank you very much. Sorry to have troubled you.

____ yes Am I speaking to the lady of the house?

Could I speak to the lady of the house?

___ speaking to lady of the house

___ speaking to single father

IF YOU NOW HAVE SOMEONE DIFFERENT ON THE PHONE
REPEAT THE FIRST PARAGRAPH

Would you mind answering a few questions?

Your household has been randomly selected for a telephone interview. This interview is designed to take as little of your time as possible and will take only 10 to 15 minutes to complete. You can be sure that your answers will be confidential and will never be associated with you in any way. We expect your answers to contribute to a better understanding of child care problems and preferences in Windsor, and hopefully to improved child care services.

)

Census tract ________________

Interviewer ________________
1. How many children, aged 12 and under, live in your home?

Could you please tell me the age and sex of each child?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your present marital status?

- married
- common law
- widowed
- separated
- divorced
- single

Were you ever married?
- no (status remains single)
- yes Are you now separated, divorced, widowed? (check appropriate)

3. Do you work outside the home?

- no
- yes

Is this part time or full time?
- part time
- full time

Do you go to school or attend a job training program?

- no
- yes

Is this part time or full time?
- part time
- full time

4. Are you presently satisfied with your work status?

READ THE CHOICE YOU'VE CHECKED TO GET THEIR REACTION

- yes, don't work and don't wish to
- yes, work/study part time and wish to
- yes, work/study full time and wish to
- no, don't work but want to
- no, don't go to school but want to
- no, work but don't want to
- no, work full time but only want part time
- no, work part time but want full time
- no, go to school part time but want to full time

ASK QUESTIONS # 5 THRU # 11 ONLY IF MOTHER WORKS/STUDIES
5. Do you do shift work or work at night?  
   ___ yes  ___ no

What hours do you usually attend work or school?

MONDAY  
TUESDAY  
WEDNESDAY  
THURSDAY  
FRIDAY  
SATURDAY  
SUNDAY

6. Does your work schedule make it difficult for you to arrange for child care?  
   ___ yes  ___ no

7. When do you find it difficult to obtain child care?
   ___ early morning (6:00 - 9:00)  
   ___ during day (9:00 - 5:00)  
   ___ lunch  
   ___ after school (3:30 - 7:00)  
   ___ evening (5:00 - 11:00)  
   ___ during night  
   ___ weekends

8. In the past two years, did you ever miss work or school because your child was sick?  
   ___ yes  ___ no  
   estimate the number of days ______

9. Has your spouse or mate ever missed work or school for this reason?  
   ___ yes  ___ no  
   estimate the number of days ______

10. Have you had to make supplementary child care arrangements because your child was sick?  
    ___ yes  ___ no  
    estimate the number of days ______

11. If financially you could afford not to work, would you still prefer to work?  
    ___ yes  ___ no  
    ___ yes but only part time

IF FULL TIME. HOUSEWIFE ASK # 12
12. If you knew you could obtain affordable, reliable care for your child(ren), would you enter the labour force?
   _____ yes    _____ no

If you knew you could obtain affordable, reliable care for your child(ren), would you return to school?
   _____ yes    _____ no.

13. Do you make arrangements for someone to regularly take care of any of your children?
   _____ no    _____ yes. For how many hours a week? _____

IF NO OR IF HOURS < 10 GO TO # 18

ASK #14 ONLY IF THERE ARE CHILDREN 3 AND UNDER IN HOUSEHOLD

14. What arrangements do you make for your children aged 3 and under? What is the cost of this arrangement per week/per child? How many hours a week is each arrangement used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Arrangement Used</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other member of household cares for child (relationship ________)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative or friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRED sitter in child's house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRED sitter in sitter's house with your child(ren) being the only one(s) cared for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day care-child cared for in sitter's home and sitter looks after other children as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASK #15 ONLY IF THERE ARE CHILDREN AGED 4-6 IN HOUSEHOLD
15. What arrangements do you make for your child(ren) aged 4 to 6? What is the cost of this arrangement per week/per child? How many hours a week is each arrangement used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Arrangement Used</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child takes care of self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other member of household cares for child (relationship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older child cares for your child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative or friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired sitter in the child’s home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired sitter in her home with your child(ren) being the only one(s) cared for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day care—child cared for in sitter’s home and she looks after other children as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch, before/after-school program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ask #16 only if there are children aged 7-12 in household

16. What arrangements do you make for your children aged 7 to 12? What is the cost of the arrangement per week/per child? How many hours a week is each arrangement used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Arrangement Used</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child takes care of self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other member of household cares for child (relationship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older child cares for your child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative or friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired sitter in child’s home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired sitter in sitter’s home with your child(ren) being the only one(s) cared for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day care—child cared for in sitter’s home and she cares for other children as well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch, before/after-school program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. If other sources of child care were available to you, would you consider switching from your present arrangement?

__ would definitely consider it
__ might consider it
__ not sure
__ probably wouldn't consider it
__ definitely wouldn't consider it

18. What sources of child care do you see as being available?

If they ask - we do mean for children of all ages.

__ don't know, really haven't looked
__ care by a sitter
__ care by a sitter in your home
__ care by a sitter in her home
__ care by a relative
__ family daycare - a sitter cares for your child(ren) and others in her home
__ infant day care
__ care in a day care center
__ nonprofit or city day care
__ private daycare
__ cooperative daycare
__ sick child care
__ 24 hour care
__ before and after school care
__ lunch time programs
__ private home daycare
__ child care registry
__ nanny
__ other (specify)____________________

Can you think of any others?

19. Which of these sources do you see as being affordable for you?
20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?

---

20. How much do you think you could realistically afford to
expend on child care per week? (for each child)

21. Which sources of child care do you see as providing good
quality care?
22. IF RESPONDENT IS USING A DAY CARE CENTER ASK

What do you like about day care and what do you dislike about it?

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT USING A DAY CARE CENTER ASK

Would you be willing to make an arrangement with a day care center?

___ yes ___ no ___ yes I have used it before
___ yes with qualifications list them

Can you tell me why? What did you like and dislike about this arrangement?

MAY NEED TO EXPLAIN MORE

What is it about this arrangement that would (wouldn’t) appeal to you?

YES / LIKES

___ educationally stimulating
___ provides good social stimulation, peer contact
___ care is very reliable
___ convenient
___ well-trained staff
___ good physical care (meals etc)
___ the government regulations ensure health, safety and proper ratios
___ well supervised
___ good facilities, equipment
___ people there care for your child
___ economical (with subsidy)
___ care is consistent

NO / DISLIKES

___ limited availability
___ another arrangement is better
___ too expensive
___ my child is too young
___ not enough individual attention
___ children learn little
___ parents’ requests are ignored
___ quality of care is variable
___ wouldn’t trust it (hear bad stories)
___ children are sick more catch it from others
___ not convenient or close to home
___ inflexibility of hours
23. IF RESPONDENT DOES USE FAMILY HOME DAY CARE ASK

What do you like about family home day care and what do you dislike about it?

IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT USE FAMILY HOME DAY CARE ASK

Would you be willing to make an arrangement for Family Home Day Care—wherein your child(ren) is cared for in a sitter's home and she also looks after other children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yes with qualifications

Can you tell me why? What did you like and dislike about it?

IF NECESSARY

What is it about this arrangement that would (wouldn’t appeal) to you?

YES / LIKES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More individual attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient, close to home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer contact is beneficial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less illness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO / DISLIKES

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate training of caregivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of stimulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough individual attention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior physical care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care may not be reliable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another arrangement is better</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not convenient, close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of care is variable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know this person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Would you be willing to make an arrangement for Private Home Day Care—wherein a caregiver registers with and is licensed by a government or similar agency? The subsidies which now apply to day care centers would still apply.

___ yes ___ no ___ yes with qualifications

Can you tell me why?

IF NECESSARY
What is it about this arrangement that would (wouldn't) appeal to you?

**YES / LIKES**

___ supervised by someone
___ subsidized (less expensive)
___ more individual attention
___ convenient, close to home
___ flexible hours
___ home environment
___ better training of caregiver

**NO / DISLIKES**

___ inadequate training of caregivers
___ lack of stimulation
___ inferior physical care
___ care may not be reliable
___ not enough individual attention
___ variable quality
___ another arrangement is better
___ not convenient, close
___ limited availability
___ lack of supervision
___ fear of child abuse (bad stories)
___ no other children
___ person not known to you (stranger)

25. **ASK IF RESPONDENT USES A RELATIVE**

What do you like about having a relative care for your child and what do you dislike?

**ASK IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT USE A RELATIVE**

Would you be willing to make an arrangement with a family member or relative?

___ yes ___ no ___ yes I have used this arrangement before ___ yes with qualifications
Can you tell me why? What do you like and dislike about this arrangement?

IF NECESSARY

What is it about this arrangement that appeals to you?

YES / LIKES

___ more individual attention
___ someone the child knows
___ less expensive
___ convenient, close
___ flexible hours
___ more personal investment
___ other children present
___ You know/trust them
___ more feedback
___ better discipline

NO / DISLIKES

___ difficulty of conflicts
___ child can be spoiled
___ quality of care variable
___ care may not be reliable
___ limited availability
___ (no relatives live close)
___ they expect more from you
___ lack of (peer contact)
___ another arrangement is better
___ lack of stimulation

26. ASK IF RESPONDENT USES A PAID BABYSITTER

What do you like about having a paid babysitter, and what do you dislike?

ASK IF RESPONDENT DOES NOT USE A PAID BABYSITTER

Would you be willing to make an arrangement with a paid babysitter?

___ yes ___ no
___ yes with qualifications ___ yes I have used this arrangement before

Can you tell me why?

IF NECESSARY

What is it that appeals to you about this arrangement?
YES / LIKES

- more individual attention
- convenient, close
- flexible hours
- less expensive
- would be in your home
- playmates available
- you have more control
- someone you know / trust

NO / DISLIKES

- quality of care is variable
- may not be reliable
- lack of stimulation
- poor physical care
- no other kids
- less impersonal
- too expensive
- don't know them
- inadequate training of caregivers
- inadequate supervision
- another arrangement is better
- limited availability

27. How would you rate your satisfaction with your present child care arrangement?

- very satisfied
- fairly satisfied
- unsure
- somewhat dissatisfied
- very dissatisfied

28. In terms of the ideal arrangement you were looking for, was the choice you made

- exactly what you wanted
- almost what you wanted
- more or less what you wanted
- not really what you wanted
- definitely not what you wanted

29. Here is a list of things various people have said are important for good day care or babysitting. I'm going to ask you which you think is most important.

A. Assuring an affectionate, loving environment for the child.
B. Assuring a stimulating environment for the child. As a child gets older, basic learning like colors, alphabet, numbers etc.
C. Being dependable - care is available whenever you need it and it never breaks down.
D. Assuring the safety and health of the child
E. Assuring that the child learns to get along well with other children and adults.
Could you tell me which one of these things you think is the most important to you to good babysitting or daycare in general.

Which is the next most important? _______

30. Often a child's parent(s) must work. Ignoring financial constraints, what in your view is the most desirable form of care for a child under the age of 3?

- care in their own home
- care in a day care center
- care in a nursery school
- care by someone you know
- care by a babysitter
- care by a relative
- family day care
- private home day care
- some combination of these
  (please specify) _______
- depends on the individuals (child and parent)
- other _______

31. What is the most desirable for a child who is between 3 and 6?

- care in a nursery school
- care in day care center
- care by a babysitter
- care by a relative
- family day care
- some combination
- other

33. As you may be aware, some families qualify for subsidized day care. That is, the government pays for some or all of their expenses for child care. Do you think you are eligible for such a subsidy?

- yes
- no

Have you ever applied for a subsidy? Why?

- no, never thought of it
- no, never needed to (children never cared for outside the home)
- no, because considered yourself ineligible
- yes

IF YES Did you receive a subsidy?

- yes
- no
34. Can you tell me what factors you think might qualify an individual to be subsidized?
   ___ being a single parent
   ___ having a low income
   ___ having a child with special needs (handicap)
   ___ parent(s) returning to school
   ___ assets owned
   ___ number of children
   ___ people on welfare

35. Do you think there is need for a service that provides care for children when they are sick?
   ___ definitely
   ___ probably
   ___ not sure
   ___ probably not
   ___ definitely not

36. Would you make use of child care for sick children?
   ___ yes
   ___ maybe
   ___ probably not
   ___ definitely not

37. Would you make use of a service that provided supplementary care for those days that something pops up? Care just for that day or week or whatever?
   ___ yes
   ___ maybe
   ___ probably not
   ___ definitely not

ASK ONLY IF DOESN'T DO SHIFT WORK

38. Would you consider accepting shift work if 24 hour child care were available?
   ___ yes    ___ no

39. Would you make use of 24 hour child care?
   ___ yes on a regular basis
   ___ occasionally
   ___ not sure
   ___ probably not
   ___ definitely not
40. Would you make use of before and after school care?
   __ yes ______ on a regular basis ______
   ______ occasionally ______
   __ not sure ______
   __ probably not ______
   __ definitely not ______

41. I will read a list of several types of child care. Please rate each one according to how available you believe they are in Windsor (Essex County).
   It's a five point rating scale,
   1 - very available (available to almost everyone)
   2 - fairly available
   3 - rather difficult to obtain
   4 - very difficult to obtain
   5 - impossible to find (it doesn't exist)

Infant care ______
Child care for children aged 2-5 _______
Before and after school care _______
Sick child care. __________
24 hour care __________
Day care for children aged 2-5 _______
Sitters ________________

Now I have a few background questions for statistical purposes.
42. In what country were you born?
   ______________________

43. What is your ethnic background?
   ______________________

ASK #44, #45, AND #47 IF MARRIED

44. In what country was your spouse/mate born?
   ______________________

45. What is his ethnic background?
   ______________________

46. What is the highest grade or year you finished and got credit for in regular school or college or university?
   __ no formal school or grade school only
   __ some high school
   __ completed high school (grade 12)
   __ grade 13 or some college or university
   __ completed college
   __ university bachelor degree
   __ some graduate school
   __ MA or PhD
47. What is the highest grade or year your spouse/mate completed and got credit for in regular school or college or university?
   - no formal school or grade school only
   - some high school
   - completed high school (grade 12)
   - grade 13 or some college or university
   - completed college
   - university bachelor degree
   - some graduate school
   - MA or PhD

48. Are you presently employed?
   - no
   - yes

49. What kind of work do you do (or did you do on your last regular job)?

QUESTIONS 50, 51, 52 ARE USED TO CLARIFY OCCUPATION
KEEP ASKING ONLY IF UNSURE OF OCCUPATION

50. What is (was) your main occupation called?

51. What are (were) some of your main duties?

52. What kind of business or industry is (was) that in?

ASK # 53- # 57 ONLY IF MARRIED

53. Is your spouse presently employed?
   - no
   - yes

54. What kind of work does he do (or did he do on his last regular job)?

QUESTIONS 54, 55, 56 ARE USED TO CLARIFY OCCUPATION
KEEP ASKING ONLY IF UNSURE OF OCCUPATION

55. What is (was) his main occupation called?

56. What are (were) some of his main duties?

57. What kind of business or industry is (was) this in?
Some people seem a bit sensitive to this next question, it involves income. You will not be forced to answer it, but I would encourage you to do so. It would be of great benefit to us in presenting our results and requesting more daycare. After all, it's not only millionaires that need child care.

58. If you can, please tell me which category best represents your total family income in 1987 (1986) before taxes. This should include wages salaries, net income from business or farm, pensions, dividends, interest, rent and any other money income received by all the people in the household who are related to you?

A. under $10,000  
B. $10,000 - $20,000  
C. $20,000 - $30,000  
D. $30,000 - $40,000  
E. $40,000 - $50,000  
F. $50,000 +

**IF RESPONDENT IS MARRIED WORKING WOMAN**

Can you tell me in which category your salary falls?

In which category does your husband's fall?

59. How many people over 12 years of age live in your home?

Could you please tell me their ages, sex and relationship to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person 1</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>sex</th>
<th>relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAKE SURE THEY INCLUDE THEMSELVES AND SPOUSES.

We have now completed all the questions. Thank you very much for your cooperation and your time. It has been greatly appreciated.
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