

The University of North Carolina  
at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY



CQ .....  
no.853  
.....  
.....

Gift of:  
Jean Griffith Wall

COLLEGE COLLECTION

Women are entering the labor market in increasing numbers and remaining there even after the arrival of children in the family. If the mother is employed outside the home, arrangements must be made for the care of the children left at home. This study was designed to ascertain, by means of a questionnaire, whether or not industrial firms in North Carolina were providing child care facilities for the children of working mothers as an employee benefit and whether or not industrial firms would be interested in receiving information pertaining to a modular mobile child care center and its implications for use by industry. The firms chosen to receive the questionnaire were selected from the North Carolina Directory of Manufacturing Firms, 1968. The results revealed that only four firms were operating child care centers and that 60 per cent of the respondents indicated an interest in learning about the modular mobile center. The findings also indicated that a relationship existed between the number of female employees and the response to the questionnaire.

As a result of the study, the following recommendations were made.

1. Since many firms employing large numbers of women reported a problem with female absenteeism attributable, in part, to parental responsibilities, those firms might establish a child care center under one of the following plans:
  - A. a cooperative child care center located near an industrial complex and operated under the auspices of the cooperating firms;
  - B. a cooperative child care center established under the auspices of

- a community-industry group; or,
- C. a child care center funded in part by federal monies through Aid to Dependent Children programs.
2. A study, of those manufacturing firms presently providing child care services, designed to determine criteria for evaluating benefits to both the employer and employee would be beneficial to planners in the area of child care.
  3. Extend the present study to include the designing, manufacturing, and exhibiting of a modular mobile child care center.
  4. A study, directed to business executives in areas other than manufacturing, to ascertain their interest in child care for the children of employees.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE INTEREST OF EXECUTIVES OF  
MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN EMPLOYER-SPONSORED  
CHILD CARE CENTERS

by

Jean G. Wall

A Thesis Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science in Home Economics

Greensboro, North Carolina  
June, 1971

Approved by

Nancy White  
Thesis Advisor

Approval Sheet

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Advisor

Nancy White

Oral Examination  
Committee Members

Carol J. Braunter

Nanni D. Albanese

Rosmary M. Gye

March 17, 1991  
Date of Examination

## Acknowledgments

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and gratitude to all those people who have helped to make this study possible and especially to:

Dr. Nancy White, Chairman of my Graduate Committee, for her guidance, encouragement, support, and invaluable assistance in the preparation of this thesis;

Dean Naomi Albanese, Dr. Rosemary McGee, and Dr. Aaron Brownstein, members of my Graduate Committee, for their enthusiastic interest and constructive suggestions;

The business executives who responded to the questionnaire and supplied the data used in this study;

Margaret Hansel Currie, whose devotion to young children inspired me to pursue graduate study;

Stella Efird for her generous help with parental responsibilities;

Doris Dagenhart and Brenda Green for their assistance in typing manuscripts; and,

My husband, Percy, and my children, Anne and Allen, for their understanding, encouragement, and support.

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
Women in the Labor Force . . . . .	2
Arrangements for Child Care . . . . .	2
Industry-Sponsored Child Care Centers . . . . .	4
Franchised Centers . . . . .	5
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	7
Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
II. Review of Related Literature . . . . .	9
Historical . . . . .	9
Recent Developments . . . . .	10
III. Procedure . . . . .	14
Pilot Study . . . . .	15
Statewide Study . . . . .	22
IV. Summary and Recommendations . . . . .	29
Recommendations . . . . .	30
References . . . . .	32
Appendixes	
Appendix A . . . . .	34
Appendix B . . . . .	36
Appendix C . . . . .	39
Appendix D . . . . .	47
Appendix E . . . . .	48

## List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Sample and Respondents According to Type of Industry--Pilot Study . . . . .	16
2. Distribution of Female Employees in Total Response-- Pilot Study . . . . .	17
3. Response to Questions 2 - 6--Pilot Study . . . . .	18
4. Distribution of Responses According to Number of Female Employees--Pilot Study. . . . .	19
5. Distribution of Sample and Respondents According to Type of Industry--Statewide Study . . . . .	23
6. Distribution of Female Employees in Total Response-- Statewide Study. . . . .	24
7. Response to Questions 2 - 6--Statewide Study . . . . .	25
8. Distribution of Responses According to Number of Female Employees--Statewide Study . . . . .	26



## Chapter I

### Introduction

The position of women in contemporary society is vastly different from what it was even a decade ago. More varied educational opportunities have given women a wider choice of life styles. Women are not only entering the labor force in greater numbers, but are remaining there even after the arrival of children in the family. There are several reasons why women seek employment outside the home. The primary reason seems to be economic necessity. There is a direct correlation between the level of the husband's earnings and the likelihood of the wife's working (Keyserling, 1967). Some women who have had professional training or who have special skills want to use this training as a means of making a positive contribution to society. The role of wife and mother does not completely fulfill their need for self-gratification. Still other women work because they feel insecure and inadequate in assuming the total responsibility for the care of a young child. If a mother chooses to work outside the home, provision must be made for adequate care of the children left at home.

Annie L. Butler (1970) pointed out that the importance of early childhood education on the later development of the child is not always understood. She also emphasized that mere custodial care is a poor substitute for a planned group experience which supplements rather than supplants family care. It is imperative that all children have equal opportunity to receive care that is directed toward their developmental needs. Children of working parents especially need this

consideration.

### Women in the Labor Force

The total picture of the labor force is changing. There were, in 1968, 29 million women in the labor force. This represented 37 per cent of all workers and 42 per cent of all women (sixteen years or older). Sixty-four per cent of these women were married. Of these married women, 10.6 or 38 per cent had children under the age of 18 years. There has been a constant rise in the labor force participation of working mothers since 1940. During 1940 only 8.6 per cent of them worked outside the home while in 1967, 38 per cent were gainfully employed outside the home. The percentage of employed mothers with children under the age of six had risen from 13 per cent to 29 per cent from 1948 to 1967 (Handbook of Women Workers, 1969).

### Arrangements for Child Care

As mothers of young children returned to the labor market, it became increasingly necessary to focus attention on the arrangements that were made for the children while the mother was absent. It was especially important for those children under the age of six to have proper care because of the significance that early experiences have on later growth and development. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor sponsored a study of child care arrangements made for children of working mothers (Handbook of Women Workers, 1969). Working mothers were defined as mothers who were employed full or part-time for a minimum of 27 weeks in 1964 and who had at least one

child under 14 years of age. There were six million mothers in this category. They had 12.3 million children under the age of 14. Forty-six per cent of these children were cared for in their own home by the father, other relatives, or baby sitters. Sixteen per cent were cared for outside their own homes. Thirteen per cent were looked after by their own mothers while they worked and 15 per cent had mothers who worked only during school hours. Of the remaining ten per cent, only two per cent were in group care. The other eight per cent, approximately one million children, were expected to care for themselves. These figures indicated the urgent need for child care facilities. In 1967, there were licensed facilities for only 500,000 children.

At the present time, a working mother has several alternatives from which she may choose the type of group care best suited to the needs of her family. These alternatives include private child-care centers, church-related child-care centers, government-sponsored centers, industry-sponsored centers, or day care homes. There are several factors which may influence her choice: (1) the number of spaces available; (2) the quality of the care in the center; and (3) the cost of the care.

Costs for enrollment in industry-sponsored centers vary from one center to another contingent upon the nature of the program, the number of children served, and the amount, if any, of company subsidy. Often fees are determined by a sliding scale based on employee income and are shared by the employee and employer. In other instances, the entire cost is borne by the parents. If The Family Assistance Plan is passed by Congress, federal subsidy will become

available to working parents whose child is enrolled in a certified center, one which meets federal specifications as to size, staffing, health regulations and program. (Business Week, October 31, 1970).

#### Industry-Sponsored Child Care Centers

Private enterprise in Massachusetts and North Carolina have pioneered in the area of industry-sponsored child care centers.

In Massachusetts, KLH Electronics operated a child care center (KLH Child Development Center) for the children of employees and townspeople. According to Kate Lafayette, Director, (Business Week, March 31, 1970) the center was established with the concept that "to change a child in the first important years in its life, to create a series of values and initiatives (p. 107)" was to work against the poverty-welfare cycle. Company benefits, resulting from the project, were an expanded labor pool, a decreased absenteeism, and an increased productivity. Similar in concept was the center operated by Avco Corporation, located in Boston.

In North Carolina, there were, at the time of this study, four companies which offered a child care program as an employee benefit. Information was available describing some characteristics of three of these centers.

1. Mr. Apparel - High Point, North Carolina  
enrollment open to public  
tuition paid by parents  
operating cost subsidized by company  
located in separate building
2. Skyland Textile Company - Morganton, North Carolina  
enrollment limited to children of employees  
tuition paid by parents

operating cost subsidized by company  
located in separate building

3. Vanderbilt Shirt Company - Asheville, North Carolina  
enrollment open to public  
tuition paid by parents  
operating cost subsidized by company  
located in the manufacturing plant

These programs were relatively young, therefore, no controlled evaluation of their success had been attempted. However, one executive reported that:

. . . we feel that the image of our company in the community and to our employees is vastly aided by its (child care center) operation. Additionally we find that absenteeism among day care center mothers is practically nil, whereas the rest of the plant has a nearly 10% absentee rate. We also find that we have attracted many employees of a type we like to have as employees, and that we would not have been able to attract had we not had the day care center (Wadopian, 1970).

#### Franchised Centers

The operation of a child care center is expensive. One source (Logan, 1969) estimated the cost at \$2,000.00 per child per year. If an operator could be assured a minimum income through government assistance (Family Assistance Plan) child care centers could be attractive as business ventures.

There is much interest by private enterprise in selling day care in the form of franchised centers. This means that the franchiser would sell a packaged deal--building, staff, program, and supervision for the center. This plan might be attractive to industrialists who are considering day care programs because the plan would assume the total responsibility for the program.

In October, 1970, there were at least 25 companies selling franchised day care. According to Alice Lake (1970), the types of programs offered in the

different franchised centers varied from purely custodial care to well-planned programs based on child development theories. Licensing procedures in the states were different and this fact had a direct bearing on the quality of the program offered by the franchised center. While some states had excellent standards which delineated space requirements, pupil-teacher ratios, guidelines for curriculum, and qualifications for teachers; a few states had no mandatory licensing procedures. The following franchising companies have stated their operating policies and goals.

1. Little Shavers, Inc. - Woonsocket, Rhode Island  
custodial care.
2. Mary Moppets Day Care Schools, Inc. - Phoenix, Arizona  
quality custodial care--reading readiness, language arts, math, arts  
and crafts, nature study
3. American Child Centers - Nashville, Tennessee  
educationally oriented
4. Romper Room Interprises (Hasbro Industries) - Pawtucket, Rhode Island  
program not defined
5. Universal Education Corporation - New York, New York  
psychological evaluation service
6. Institute for Contemporary Education - Chicago, Illinois  
educationally oriented--art, music, reading, number concepts,  
swimming, and dancing, (parent education program)
7. Playcare Centers (American Institutional Developers, Inc.) -  
Wynwood, Pennsylvania  
full and part-time care (Nations Schools, 1969).

Even though some companies espouse educational goals for their centers, Burton White, a Harvard preschool specialist (Business Week, October 31, 1970) questioned the educational value of the franchised centers. The young child needs

more than custodial care. He needs the type of group care that makes available to him the experiences which will help him realize his potential. Some industrial leaders are interested in providing child care centers as an employee benefit. Because business-oriented people are not usually knowledgeable in the theories of child development they need the guidance and aid of educators in order to understand the components of a good program.

#### Purpose

It is the purpose of this study to determine, by means of a questionnaire, whether or not industries in North Carolina provide child care facilities for the children of working parents and whether industrial leaders would be interested in receiving information pertaining to an innovative, economically feasible housing for such a service.

#### Definition of Terms

For purposes of clarification, the following terms are defined.

1. Child care center--an appropriately housed, staffed, and equipped center for providing adequate "away-from-home" care for children.
2. Modular mobile child care center--a double wide mobile unit composed of two 12-foot wide mobile units of varying length so constructed that, when joined together, they form a single unit. The unit is designed and equipped for the care of young children.
3. Industry sponsored child care--a center established to provide care for children of working mothers and financed, in part or totally, by an industrial firm, and located at or near the sponsoring industrial firm.

4. Quality child care--care for children, in a setting other than home, which attends the child's emotional, social, physical and educational needs. Quality care is contrasted to custodial care which is concerned only with the child's physical needs.
5. Franchised child care center--a day care package marketed by a business organization for people desiring to establish a child care center. The package includes housing, program, and consultation on methods of operation.
6. Manufacturing firms--North Carolina firms engaged in manufacturing and employing 100 or more people.



## Chapter II

### Review of Related Literature

Reports in the literature with reference to industry-sponsored child care were limited to brief descriptive statements. Reference was made to early attempts at industry-sponsored child care in other countries and to developments in this country during World War II.

#### Historical

Industry sponsored child care is not a new concept. As early as 1817, Robert Owen (Lambert, 1961) initiated, at his mill in Scotland, a school to care for the children of working mothers. His school, which later developed into the British Infant School, was planned to provide more than custodial care. The curriculum included "singing, dancing, and playing as important features of the education of the child under six (p. 5)."

In European countries, day nurseries have existed since the nineteenth century. These nurseries, or factory creche, experienced a boom in growth during the World War II years because of the large numbers of women employed in munition plants. The factory creche was especially popular in France because the mothers were allowed time off in order to nurse their babies. One of the purposes of the French creche was to lower the infant mortality rates and medical authorities in France thought this could be accomplished by the elimination of artificial feeding methods (Beer, 1942).

The day nursery in Russia was considered to be a necessity because of the large industrial programs in which women were encouraged to participate (Beer, 1942). Russia today has an elaborate and highly structured system of preschool education (Chauncey, 1969).

Nursery schools and kindergartens were begun in the United States during the middle part of the nineteenth century by individuals, by schools and universities, and by child study groups (Beer, 1957). These schools for young children were not designed, however, for the children of the working class population. Indeed, the notion that the role of a woman was that of being a home-bound wife and mother was very widespread. The proper care of young children during working hours was not the pressing problem it is today because few mothers worked outside the home.

#### Recent Developments

With the advent of World War II, acute labor shortages were experienced by American industry because many men were called into military service. Maximum production was vital to the success of the war effort. Women were encouraged to enter the labor market to fill jobs left vacant by draftees. At the same time, attention was necessarily focused on the problem of child care. If the mother worked, care for the child left at home needed to be provided. Children were left in the care of elderly relatives, older siblings, neighbors, or were left to care for themselves. Employers soon became cognizant of the fact that women who were worried about the safety of their children were not the most efficient laborers. Local communities, industries, and the Federal Government

moved to meet the obvious need for quality child care. Perhaps the most ambitious program in child care was undertaken by the Kaiser Shipyards in Portland, Oregon, during the war years of 1944-45. According to Dr. James L. Hymes, Jr. (1944), director and organizer, the success of two child service centers sponsored by the Kaiser Company was the result of four unique circumstances. To begin with, the country was faced with an emergency war time situation which demanded immediate production and the employment of vast numbers of people. Due to the scarcity of men, women in great numbers flocked to the shipyards to help in the war effort. A second circumstance was the presence of a socially sensitive shipyard owner who recognized the needs of his employees regarding child care and determined to meet this need in the best possible way. The third circumstance was the availability of money. Since money was no problem, it was possible to employ a capable staff to administer the best possible program. The fourth circumstance was the location of the centers near the shipyard. The children were taken to the center by the mother as she came to work and were picked up by her as she went home. At peak enrollment, these two centers cared for 1005 children. It was regrettable that the immediate concerns of meeting a need were so great that no time was available for any evaluative studies of the contributions of the centers. Dr. Hymes stated that the centers were conceived and implemented in a crisis situation and were dissolved the day the war was over.

During World War II, community centers which were funded in part by the Lanham Act (Leeper, Dales, Skipper, & Witherspoon, 1968) made significant

contributions toward providing an educationally sound, pleasant, safe, all-day experience for the children of working mothers. Attention was directed toward physical as well as social and emotional needs of the children. When the war ended, the emphasis on day care dwindled as rapidly as it had precipitated at the onset. So quickly had these emergency centers been organized, utilized and discontinued that no formal attempt was made to evaluate or document the significance of their service to the mothers or to industry. Many plant foremen attested to the fact that employment problems declined and productivity increased and, indeed, this was most probably true; however, no statistical data to this point were available (McIver, 1964). After the war the climate in American society was such that women were not content to return to the home and abandon the challenges of outside employment. Statistics showed that on the contrary, women continued to enter the labor market in increasing numbers. The problem of providing quality care for the children of working mothers was still pertinent.

In a discussion of quality care, Annie L. Butler (1970) stated that:

A day care program for children under six years of age has responsibility for the total development of the child--for everything the child should get in a good home plus what he should get in a good school if it is an all-day program in a day care center. Comprehensive services are essential to quality day care. Ages served should include infants and toddlers as well as preschool and school age children. In-home care must be provided on a temporary basis for the child too ill to attend the day care program. Every precaution must be taken to insure that physical facilities are safe and hygienic; the educational program is appropriate; the staffing is adequate; opportunities are provided for parents to become involved; and social, health, and nutritional services are available. . . . . Most essential to the child's well-being is the presence of warm, loving adults who have time to listen, to sympathize, and to comfort, while encouraging him to be independent and to select and persist at activities he chooses (p. 61).

In analyzing the role of public welfare in providing care away from home, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheim (1962), characterized day care as:

. . . a service for those who need it--and for many children it offers far more than their homes ever could. The tragedy is that it is not available for the large numbers who do need it--that it is too often misunderstood, badly financed, and operated without regard for the terrifying dangers of poor standards. . . . A day-care center is not a nursery school, or a group work or recreation service, although if established for preschool children it may incorporate the kinds of programs that are present in good nursery schools, or, if for school-age children, the kind of skills that are used in group-work services. However, for children who are away from home most of the day there must be additional services to compensate for the lack of home and parental contact. . . . This requires broad understanding and skill in working with children (p. 109).

### Chapter III

#### Procedures

There is little doubt as to the importance of early experiences on the later development of the child. The question which does arise is how society can help working mothers provide these experiences for their children. It must be a joint effort involving many groups. As Gertrude Hoffman (1969) stated, "We need voluntary agencies, the business community, private and public help (p. 289)." This study was conducted to determine whether North Carolina manufacturing firms provided child care facilities for employees' children, and whether these firms would be interested in learning about a modular mobile child care center and its implications for use by industry. A questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to ascertain characteristics about the labor force as well as about industry sponsored child care centers in manufacturing firms located in North Carolina and employing 100 or more persons. There were 1469 firms which met this criterion. These were listed in the North Carolina Directory of Manufacturing Firms, 1968. In a pilot study, the questionnaire and an accompanying cover letter (Appendix B) were mailed to 118 such firms located in Guilford County, North Carolina (Appendix C). Upon completion of the pilot study, the same questionnaire was mailed to 338 firms, a 25 per cent sample of the remaining 1351 (Appendix D). These, determined by stratified random sampling, were drawn in such a manner that there was proportional representation of all types

of industries. The manufacturing establishments were alphabetically grouped in the Directory according to type of industry. The firms in each grouping were numbered consecutively and a table of random numbers applied to select the firms used in the study. The total number from each group was determined by: (1) calculating its representative percentage of the population; and (2) calculating the number of firms needed to present this same percentage in the sample. Four weeks after the mailing date, a follow-up letter (Appendix E) was sent to those firms not replying to the questionnaire.

The data were analyzed in two ways. The results were tabulated to show, first, the total response to each question, and second, the relationship between the responses and the number of female employees. No attempt was made to differentiate between married and single female employees because there was insufficient response to this question. One respondent pointed out that unmarried women also have child care problems. The pilot study will be considered first, then the statewide study.

#### Pilot Study

One hundred eighteen questionnaires were mailed to manufacturing firms in Guilford County, North Carolina. A total of 75, or 63.559 %, responded. Of these responses, three were returned unanswered because the firm was no longer in business, one was returned unanswered because of lack of interest in the area under question, and another stated that the ages of their employees were such that child care was not a concern. The firms receiving the questionnaire were distributed among the various industries of the county as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1  
 Distribution of Sample and Respondents  
 According to Type of Industry--Pilot Study

Type of Industry	Sample		Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%
Food	12	10.17	5	7.14
Tobacco	1	0.85	--*	-----*
Textile	35	29.66	20	28.57
Apparel	10	8.48	4	5.71
Lumber	2	1.70	2	2.86
Furniture	23	19.50	15	21.43
Paper	5	3.74	2	2.86
Printing	4	3.39	3	4.29
Chemical	3	2.54	3	4.29
Stone & Concrete Fabricated	3	2.54	3	4.29
Metal Products	6	5.09	4	5.71
Machinery	6	5.09	5	7.14
Electrical	4	3.39	2	2.86
Transportation	2	1.70	1	1.43
Miscellaneous	2	1.70	1	1.43

\*no response

The response to question 1 concerning the number of female employees showed that 53 per cent of the respondents employed fewer than 100 women.



Table 2  
 Distribution of Female Employees  
 in Total Response--Pilot Study

Number of Female Employees	Total Response	
	No.	%
0 - 99	37	52.85
100 - 199	18	25.71
200 - 299	5	7.14
300 - 399	2	2.86
400 - 499	2	2.86
500 - 999	5	7.14
over 1000	1	1.43

It is quite conceivable that the number of women employed by the firm might have had some bearing on the response to the questionnaire.

The responses to questions 2 - 6 are recorded in Tables 3 and 4. Question 7 which dealt with whether or not respondents desired a report of the results of this study showed an 81 per cent affirmative reply.

Table 3  
 Response to Questions 2 - 6--  
 Pilot Study

Question	Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%
2	16	22.85	54	77.14
3 <sup>a</sup>	34	50.00	34	50.00
3 <sup>b</sup>	31	91.18	3	8.82
4 <sup>c</sup>	1	1.43	69	98.57
4 <sup>d</sup>	--	0.00	67	100.00
5	29	45.31	35	54.69
6	44	65.67	23	34.33

<sup>a</sup>Part 1 of question 3

<sup>b</sup>Part 2 of question 3

<sup>c</sup>Part 1 of question 4

<sup>d</sup>Part 2 of question 4

Table 4

Distribution of Responses According to  
Number of Female Employees -- Pilot Study

Question	2		3 <sup>a</sup>		3 <sup>b</sup>		5		6	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-99										
Yes	3	8.11	10	27.78	8	80.00	10	27.57	15	42.86
No	34	91.89	26	72.22	2	20.00	25	72.43	20	57.14
100-199										
Yes	8	44.44	11	61.11	11	100.00	8	50.00	16	88.89
No	10	55.56	7	38.89	--	-----	8	50.00	2	11.11
200 and over										
Yes	5	35.71	12	92.31	11	100.00	11	84.62	13	92.86
No	9	64.29	1	7.69	--	-----	2	15.38	1	7.14

<sup>a</sup>Part 1 of question 3

<sup>b</sup>Part 2 of question 3

In response to question 2, whether prospective employees had ever refused employment because of lack of child care provisions, only 23 per cent answered affirmatively. When the data were categorized according to the number of female employees, and the responses examined, the results showed that the highest percentage of negative responses, 92 per cent, were from industries employing fewer than 100 women. Affirmative responses were highest from industries employing 100 - 199 women. Of those firms employing more than

200 women, 36 per cent responded affirmatively. It would appear that the likelihood of encountering refusal to accept employment because of the lack of child care facilities tends to increase with the size of the female population.

The first part of question 3 dealt with the rate of absenteeism among women employees. The response was equally divided on this question. When the data were categorized according to the number of female employees, and the responses examined, the results revealed that the highest percentage of negative responses were from firms employing fewer than 100 women. Affirmative responses were given by 61 per cent of the firms employing 100 - 199 women, and by 92 per cent of the firms employing more than 200 women. The second part of the question was concerned with affirmative replies. Of those firms employing fewer than 100 women, 80 per cent considered parental responsibility to be a cause of female absenteeism. All of the firms employing more than 100 women recognized parental responsibility as a causative factor.

In responding to the first part of question 4, regarding the present operation of a child care center for the children of employees, one firm, one per cent, was found to provide such a service. This firm was engaged in the manufacture of wearing apparel and employed 500 women. The second part of the question was concerned with the negative replies. Of the 99 per cent responding negatively, no firm had ever provided a center in the past.

In responding to question 5, concerning whether or not providing a child care center would broaden the labor market, 45 per cent of the respondents replied affirmatively and 55 per cent negatively. A spokesman from one firm

maintaining a center stated that his labor market had increased as a result of the center. One respondent commented that there were more women available for employment than they could possibly employ so that for them broadening the labor market was not a concern. When the data were categorized according to the number of female employees, the responses showed that 72 per cent of the firms employing fewer than 100 women answered negatively. In the group of firms employing 100 - 199 women, the response was equally divided. Of those firms employing more than 200 women, 85 per cent responded affirmatively.

Question 6 was concerned with whether or not the firm would be interested in information pertaining to a modular mobile child care center and its implications for use by industry. Sixty-six per cent expressed an interest in receiving this information. One respondent who employed 250 women expressed a desire to have such a unit. When the data were categorized according to the number of female employees, the results indicated that 57 per cent of those firms employing fewer than 100 women responded negatively. Of those firms employing 100 - 199 women, 89 per cent responded affirmatively, of those employing more than 200 women, 93 per cent responded affirmatively.

The affirmative responses to question 6 were examined in terms of the response given to question 3 (female absenteeism). The results showed that 70 per cent of those firms expressing an interest in receiving information about the modular mobile child care center had experienced a problem with high female absenteeism.

From this survey, the investigator concluded that some employers

experienced problems with female absenteeism which they attributed to parental responsibilities. The opinions of employers were equally divided as to whether or not providing a child care center would broaden the labor market. Although only one firm provided child care as an employee benefit, about 66 per cent of the firms responding expressed a positive interest in learning about a modular mobile child care center and its implications for use by industry. One respondent who answered question 6 negatively stated that in his opinion the five child care centers in operation in Guilford County were adequate to meet the needs for child care and that furthermore as long as the welfare paid women not to work there was no incentive for them to seek employment.

#### Statewide Study.

Three hundred thirty-eight questionnaires were mailed to a representative sample of manufacturing firms throughout the state (excluding Guilford County). The same questionnaire was used in the statewide and the pilot study. A total of 161, or 47.63 per cent responded. Of this number, five firms were no longer in business and three were of the opinion that their situation was such that they could not supply any pertinent information. One firm replied simply that the information requested was not available. The firms receiving the questionnaire were distributed among the various industries of the state as indicated in Table 5. The distribution of the respondents according to type of industry, was similar to the distribution in the total sample.

The response to question 1, concerning the number of female employees, showed that 46 per cent of the respondents employed fewer than 100 women. This percentage compares with 53 per cent found in the pilot study.

Table 5

Distribution of Sample and Respondents  
According to Type of Industry--Statewide Study

Type of Industry	Sample		Respondents	
	No.	%	No.	%
Food	23	6.80	10	6.58
Tobacco	12	3.55	4	2.63
Textile	145	42.90	61	40.13
Apparel	50	14.79	19	12.50
Lumber	9	2.66	2	1.32
Furniture	34	10.06	15	9.87
Paper	6	1.78	5	3.29
Printing	4	1.18	2	1.32
Chemical	4	1.18	2	1.32
Rubber	4	1.18	3	1.97
Leather	2	0.59	2	1.32
Stone and Concrete	5	1.55	4	2.63
Primary Metal	2	0.59	2	1.32
Fabricated Metal				
Products	6	1.78	2	1.32
Machinery	11	3.25	5	3.29
Electrical	13	3.85	7	4.61
Transportation	4	1.18	2	1.32
Scientific Instruments	1	0.30	1	0.66
Miscellaneous	3	0.89	2	1.32
Not Identifiable			2	1.32

Table 6

Distribution of Female Employees  
in Total Response -- Statewide Study

Number of Female Employees	Total Response	
	No.	%
0 - 99	68	45.95
100 - 199	29	19.59
200 - 299	14	9.46
300 - 399	16	10.81
400 - 499	6	4.05
500 - 599	5	3.38
600 - 699	5	3.38
1000 - 1999	3	2.03
over 2000	2	1.35

The response to questions 2 - 6 are indicated in Tables 7 and 8. Question 7 which dealt with whether or not respondents desired a report of the results of this study showed an 81 per cent affirmative reply.



Table 7  
 Responses to Questions 2 - 6--  
 Statewide Study

Question	Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%
2	52	36.30	91	63.70
3 <sup>a</sup>	62	42.11	86	57.89
3 <sup>b</sup>	58	93.55	3	4.85
4 <sup>c</sup>	4	2.65	147	97.35
4 <sup>d</sup>	2	1.39	142	98.61
5	86	39.01	55	60.99
6	88	59.60	59	40.40

<sup>a</sup>Part 1 of question 3

<sup>b</sup>Part 2 of question 3

<sup>c</sup>Part 1 of question 4

<sup>d</sup>Part 2 of question 4

Table 8  
 Distribution of Responses According to  
 Number of Female Employees--Statewide Study

Question	2		3 <sup>a</sup>		3 <sup>b</sup>		5		6	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-99										
Yes	10	14.49	9	13.04	8	100.00	26	40.62	27	39.71
No	59	85.51	60	86.96	-	-----	38	59.38	41	60.29
100-199										
Yes	13	46.43	14	50.00	14	100.00	20	71.43	18	64.29
No	15	53.57	14	50.00	-	-----	8	28.57	10	35.71
200-299										
Yes	8	61.54	11	73.33	10	100.00	12	80.00	10	66.67
No	5	38.46	4	26.67	-	-----	3	20.00	5	33.33
300-399										
Yes	7	46.67	11	73.33	9	81.82	10	71.43	13	86.67
No	8	53.33	4	26.67	2	18.18	4	28.57	2	13.33
400-499										
Yes	5	83.33	5	83.88	5	100.00	5	83.88	5	83.33
No	1	16.67	1	16.67	-	-----	1	16.67	1	16.67
500-999										
Yes	5	50.00	8	80.00	7	87.50	10	100.00	11	100.00
No	5	50.00	2	20.00	1	12.50	-	-----	-	-----
1000 and over										
Yes	4	80.00	3	60.00	3	100.00	4	80.00	5	100.00
No	1	20.00	2	40.00	-	-----	1	20.00	-	-----

<sup>a</sup>Part 1 of question 3

<sup>b</sup>Part 2 of question 3

The second question dealt with whether or not prospective employees had ever refused employment because no child care facility was provided. There were affirmative answers by only 36 per cent of the respondents. However, when the responses were examined in relationship to the number of female employees, it was observed that the affirmative responses were lowest from firms employing fewer than 100 females. As the number of female employees increased, the percentage of affirmative responses also increased.

The first part of question 3 dealt with the rate of absenteeism among women employees. In the total response, 58 per cent of the respondents reported that absenteeism among female employees was not high. However, when the responses were examined in relationship to the number of female employees, the results revealed that in all except the lowest category, 0 - 99, female absenteeism was considered to be a problem by at least 50 per cent of the respondents. The second part of the question was concerned with affirmative replies. In almost all instances where female absenteeism was a problem, parental responsibility was considered to be a causative factor.

In responding to the first part of question 4 regarding the present operation of a child care facility for the children of employees, 2.6 per cent were found to provide such a service. A representative of one firm which operated a center commented that as a result of the child care center, his labor market had been broadened. The second part of the question was concerned with the negative replies. Of the 97 per cent responding negatively, two per cent had operated a child care center during World War II, but had discontinued the

operation due to staffing problems.

In response to question 5, concerning whether or not providing a child care facility would broaden the labor market, 39 per cent of the respondents replied affirmatively. When the responses were categorized according to the number of female employees and examined, the results showed that with the exception of the lowest category, 0 - 99, at least 70 per cent of the respondents in each of the other categories responded affirmatively.

Question 6 was concerned with whether or not the firm would be interested in receiving information pertaining to a modular mobile child care center and its implications for use by industry. The total response revealed that 60 per cent of the respondents expressed interest in receiving the information. The percentage of affirmative responses increased as the number of female employees increased. In 80 per cent of the cases, those firms reporting high female absenteeism responded affirmatively to question 6.

## Chapter IV

### Summary and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (1) to determine whether industries in North Carolina provided child care services for employees; and (2) to determine whether industrial leaders in North Carolina were interested in learning about a modular mobile child care unit and its implications for industrial use. The results showed that only four industrial firms offered child care services and that 66 per cent of the respondents in the pilot study and 60 per cent of the respondents in the statewide study were interested in information about the modular mobile unit. The interpretation of the data indicated that there may have been circumstances which influenced the responses to the questionnaire. The firms selected to receive the questionnaire were chosen randomly from a listing of all manufacturing firms employing 100 or more persons in the state. In many instances, these firms employed fewer than 25 women, and therefore, female absenteeism and child care were not considered to be problems. However, the responses from firms employing large numbers of women revealed that female absenteeism, which might be attributable to parental responsibility, was a problem. Those firms which had experienced this problem evidenced the highest percentage of interest in the modular mobile center.

Some manufacturing firms receiving questionnaires were involved in types of work that was not suitable for females. The female employee and her

problems were not pertinent to these firms. Had the study been directed only to those manufacturing firms known to employ a high percentage of female workers, the results may have reflected more sensitivity toward the problems of female employees. There did appear to be a relationship between the number of women employed and the answers to the questionnaire.

The working mother and her problems are a concern not only for the employer, but also for all groups interested in social action. To reach an equitable solution will require much cooperative, creative thinking and planning. Certainly, for the problems related to child care, providing quality child care programs for the children of female employees is part of the answer. Providing this service is expensive. There is diversity of opinion among those concerned about the welfare of young children as to where to place the responsibility for helping working mothers with their child care problems. Perhaps the responsibility had best be shared by all concerned groups--industrial leaders, educators, governmental agencies, and parents.

#### Recommendations

Since quality all-day care for young children is expensive, attention should be directed toward determining a feasible plan whereby the service can be made available to those who need it. Although industry could do it alone, the returns might have to be counted in terms of intangibles such as good public relations, civic responsibility and better employer relations rather than in terms of dollars.

On the basis of this study, the following recommendations are made.

1. Since many firms employing large numbers of women reported a problem with female absenteeism attributable, in part, to parental responsibilities, those firms might establish a child care center under one of the following plans:
  - A. a cooperative child care center located near an industrial complex and operated under the auspices of the cooperating firms;
  - B. a cooperative child care center established under the auspices of a community-industry groups; or,
  - C. a child care center funded in part by federal monies through Aid to Dependent Children programs;
2. A study, of those manufacturing firms presently providing child care services, designed to determine criteria for evaluating benefits to both the employer and employee would be beneficial to planners in the area of child care. As a result of such a study, manufacturers might be able to assess their own position as a provider of child care services in more realistic terms.
3. Extend the present study to include the designing, manufacturing and exhibiting of a modular, mobile child care center.
4. A study, directed to business executives in areas other than manufacturing to ascertain their interest in child care for children of employees.

## References

- Beer, E. The day nursery. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1942.
- Beer, E. Working mothers and the day nursery. New York: Whiteside, 1957.
- Bersin, M. K. How working mothers solve problems at home. Today's Health, 1960, 38(1), 41-75.
- Breiland, D. Cultural and social change. Young Children, 1965, 20, 223-229.
- Business starts to fill the preschool void. Nations Schools, 1969, 84, 24.
- Business takes care of kiddies. Business Week, October 31, 1970, 50-51.
- Butler, A. L. Position paper on day care. Childhood Education, 1970, 27, 59-65.
- Chauncey, H. (Ed.) Soviet preschool education, vol. I. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.
- Day care: it's more than child's plan. Business Week, March 21, 1970, 110.
- Day care services and preschool education. Childhood Education, 1965 (41), 430.
- Day care: the boom begins. Newsweek, 1970, 76 (23), 92-95.
- Dittman, L. New opportunities in day care: an interview with Gertrude Hoffman. Young Children, 1969, 24, 275-278.
- Guggenheim, Mrs. R. Public welfare's role in day care for children. Children, 1962, 9, 109-113.
- Hoffman, G. Day care for young children. Children, 1963, 10, 119.
- Hosley, E. M. The long day. Young Children, 1965, 20, 135-139.
- Hymes, J. L., Jr. The Kaiser answer: child service centers. Progressive Education, 1944, 21(5), 222-246.
- Kellogg, R. Nursery school guide, Boston: Houghlin Mifflin, 1949.



- Keyserling, M. D. Who are the working mothers? Leaflet 37. United States Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Lajewski, H. C. Working mothers and their arrangements for care of their children. Social Security Bulletin, 1959, 22, 8-13.
- Lake, A. The day-care business. McCall's Magazine, 1970, 98(2), 61-97.
- Lambert, H. M. Early childhood education. Boston: Allyn Bacon, 1961.
- Leeper, S. H., Dales, R. J., Skipper, D. S., & Witherspoon, R. L. Good schools for young children. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Logan, M. The untapped potential of day care. AFL-CIO American Federationist, 1969, 76, 810.
- Lohv, L. & Richardson, M. F. While mothers work. N. C. Education, 1943, 10(1), 32-52.
- McIver, W. F. Extended school services in the greater Greensboro school district. Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964.
- North Carolina Director of Manufacturing Firms, 1968. Raleigh, N. C.: Division of Labor Statistics, North Carolina Department of Labor, 1968.
- Peterson, E. Labor and education. Childhood Education, 1969, 46, 22-23.
- Read, K. H. The nursery school (4th ed.). Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1966.
- Surprising facts about women, work, marriage. Science Digest, 1963, 54(4), 79-82.
- Wadopian, H. Executive at Vanderbilt Shirt Co., Asheville, N. C. personal correspondence.
- Women's Bureau, Bulletin 294, United States Department of Labor, 1969 Handbook on women workers. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1969.

## Appendix A

## Questionnaire

Please fill in the blanks or check the appropriate answer. If you have comments or questions, use the back of this page.

1. How many women do you employ?

\_\_\_\_\_ Married

\_\_\_\_\_ Single

Approximately how many of them have children under the age of six?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Have prospective employees ever refused employment because there was no provision for child care?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No.

3. Is the absentee rate high among female employees?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If the answer is "Yes", do you consider parental responsibility to be a causative factor?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

4. Do you maintain a child care center for the children of employees?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If the answer is "No", have you ever maintained one?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If the answer to the preceding question is "Yes", what factors contributed to the decision to close the center?

\_\_\_\_\_ Economically impractical

\_\_\_\_\_ Not needed

\_\_\_\_\_ Space not available

\_\_\_\_\_ Staffing problems

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please state)

5. In your opinion, would providing a child care center as an employee benefit broaden your labor market?

           Yes

           No

6. Would you be interested in receiving information concerning a modular mobile child care center and its implications for industrial use?

           Yes

           No

7. Would you like to receive a copy of the results of this study?

           Yes

           No

## Appendix B

A Listing of Guilford County, North Carolina,  
Manufacturing Firms Receiving Questionnaire

AMP, Inc., Greensboro  
Acme Sample Books, Inc., High Point  
Adams-Millis Corporation, Plant 1, High Point  
Adams-Millis Corporation, Plant 7, High Point  
Alma Desk Co., High Point  
American Bakeries Co., High Point  
Amos Hosiery Mills, Inc., High Point  
Anvil Brand, Inc., High Point  
Arnold Stone Company, Greensboro  
Bamby Bakers, Inc., Greensboro  
Bates Nitewear Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Blue Bell, Inc., Lee Street, Greensboro  
Blue Bell, Inc., Stokesdale  
Blue Bell, Inc., Elm Street, Greensboro  
Blue Gem Manufacturing Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Boren Clay Products Company, Pleasant Garden  
Borden Co., High Point  
Brame Textile Machine Co., Greensboro  
Brown, George C., & Co., Greensboro  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Continental Plant, High Point  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Globe Furniture Division, High Point  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Greene Street, High Point  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Lincoln Drive, High Point  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Meadowview Road, Greensboro  
Burlington Industries, Inc., 1103 S. Elm Street, Greensboro  
Burlington Industries, Inc., 1421 S. Elm Street, Greensboro  
Carolina Container Co., Inc., High Point  
Carolina Spring Corporation, High Point  
Carson's, V. P., Products, High Point  
Clarendon Industries, Inc., High Point  
Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Greensboro  
Colony Tables, Inc., High Point  
Cone Mills Corporation, Minneola Plant, Gibsonville  
Cone Mills Corporation, Proximity Plant, Greensboro  
Cone Mills Corporation, Proximity Print Works Plant, Greensboro  
Cone Mills Corporation, Revolution Division, Greensboro  
Cone Mills Corporation, White Oak Plant, Greensboro  
Container Corporation of America, Greensboro

Crestwood Furniture Co., High Point  
Crown Hosiery Mills, Inc., High Point  
Curtis Packing Co., Greensboro  
Dallas, Inc., High Point  
Dinette Parts Manufacturing Co., High Point  
Dixie Bell Textiles, Inc., Greensboro  
Eakes, M. L., Inc., Greensboro  
Elm Street Weaving Co., Greensboro  
Fletcher, Tolbert Machine Co., High Point  
Fli Back Co., High Point  
Foremost Screen Print, Inc., Stokesdale  
Founder's Furniture, Inc., Pleasant Garden  
Frames, Inc., High Point  
General Metals, Inc., Greensboro  
General Steel Products, Inc., High Point  
Gilbarco, Inc., Greensboro  
Greensboro Hosiery Mills, Inc., Greensboro  
Greensboro Manufacturing Coporation, Greensboro  
Greensboro News Co., Greensboro  
Guilford Dairy Cooperative Association, Inc., Greensboro  
Guilford Mills, Inc., W. Market Street, Greensboro  
Guilford Mills, Inc., Winston-Salem Road, Greensboro  
Harriss & Covington Hosiery Mills, Inc., High Point  
Hatteras Yacht Co., High Point  
Hayworth Roll & Panel Co., High Point  
Heritage Furniture Co., High Point  
High Point Enterprise, Inc., High Point  
High Point Paper Box Co., Inc., High Point  
Highland Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point  
Indian Head Hosiery Co., High Point  
Industries of the Blind, Inc., Greensboro  
Influentia, Inc., High Point  
Interstate Bakeries Corporation, Greensboro  
Jiffy Manufacturing Co., High Point  
Kay Manufacturing Corporation, High Point  
Kaylyn, Inc., High Point  
Kayser Roth Hosiery Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Laminated Parts Co., High Point  
Liberty Hosiery Mills, Inc., Gibsonville  
Lilly Co., High Point  
Lorillard, P., Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Lynch Hosiery Mills, Inc., Greensboro  
Mac Panel Co., High Point  
Marsh Furniture Co., High Point  
Melrose Hosiery Mills, Inc., English Road, High Point

Melrose Hosiery Mills, Inc., Kivett Drive, High Point  
Miller's TV Products, Inc., High Point  
Mobile Chemical Co., High Point  
Modern Poultry, Inc., High Point  
Monarch Furniture Co., Inc., High Point  
Morgan & Sons Poultry Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Mr. Apparel, Inc., High Point  
Myrtle Desk Co., High Point  
National Upholstery Co., High Point  
Newman Machine Co., Inc., Greensboro  
North Carolina Schoonbeck Co., High Point  
Oakdale Cotton Mills, Inc., Jamestown  
Pearson, Clyde, Inc., High Point  
Pickett Cotton Mills, Inc., High Point  
Pomona Pipe Products Co., Pomona Branch, Greensboro  
Royal-O-Apparel, Inc., High Point  
Ruzicka, Joseph, Inc., Greensboro  
Silver Craft Furniture Co., Inc., High Point  
Silver Knit Hosiery Mills, Inc., High Point  
Singer Co., Fidelity Division, High Point  
Slane Hosiery Mills, Inc., High Point  
Southern Bakeries Co., Greensboro  
Southern Webbing Mills, Inc., Greensboro  
Stevens, J. P. & Co., Inc., Greensboro  
Swift & Co., Dairy & Poultry Division, Greensboro  
Thomas, Perley A., Car Works, Inc., High Point  
Tomlinson of High Point, Inc., High Point  
Triangle Hosiery Co., Inc., High Point  
Union Camp Corporation, Jamestown  
Vick Manufacturing Div., Richardson-Merrell, Inc., Greensboro  
Ward Baking Co., High Point  
Western Electric Co., Inc., H. G. Worley, Greensboro  
Western Electric Co., Inc., W. O. Conrad, Greensboro  
Winzeler South, Inc., High Point  
Wysong & Miles Co., Greensboro

## Appendix C

A Listing of North Carolina Manufacturing  
Firms Receiving Questionnaire

Abbey Manufacturing Corporation, Wadesboro  
Acme Spinning Co., Belmont  
Adams-Millis Corporation, Kernersville  
Adams-Millis Corporation, Mount Airy  
Aeroglide Corporation, Raleigh  
Aerotron, Inc., Raleigh  
Air Preheater Co., Inc., Marion  
Aladdin Knit Mills, Inc., Bessemer City  
Alba-Waldensian, Inc., Valdese  
Albemarle Paper Co., Roanoke Rapids  
Alisa, Inc., Waxhaw  
Aluminum Company of America, Badin  
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Textured Yarn, Mount Holly  
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Thread & Finishing Plant, Mount Holly  
American & Efird Mills, Inc., Mount Holly  
American Bakeries, Co., Rocky Mount  
American Standard Industrial Div., Wilmington  
American Thread Co., Inc., Marble  
American Thread Co., Inc., Marion  
American Thread Co., Inc., Rosman  
American Tobacco Co., Durham Branch, Durham  
American Tobacco Co., Durham Leaf Dept., Durham  
Amphenol Cadre Div., Amphenol Durham, Durham  
Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., Tarboro  
Apex Manufacturing Co., Apex  
Arant Lumber Co., Inc., New Bern  
Armour & Co., Charlotte  
Armtex, Inc., Gastonia  
Atlantic Veneer Corporation, Beaufort  
Azalea Meats Corporation, New Bern  
Ball Brothers, Co., Inc., Asheville  
Barber Hosiery Mills, Inc., Mount Airy  
Bartey Spinning Co., Clayton  
Baxter-Kelly & Faust Co., Stoneville  
Beacon Manufacturing Co., Swannanoa  
Belmont Knitting Co., Belmont  
Betterwear Hosiery Mill, Inc., Catawba  
Bien Jolie Foundation, Dunn

Biltmore Dairy Farms, Charlotte  
Blue Bell, Inc., Bethel  
Blue Ridge Shoe Co., Wilkesboro  
Borden Manufacturing Co., Goldsboro  
Brenton Knitting Coporation, Statesville  
Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation, Winston-Salem  
Brown -Wooten Corporation, Mount Airy  
Burlington Garment Manufacturing Inc., Burlington  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Armfield St., St. Pauls  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Balfour Ave., Asheboro  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Elon College  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Graham  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Hgw. 221-A, Caroleen  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Interstate Hgw. 85, Burlington  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Mayflower Plant, Cramerton  
Burlington Industries, Inc., One Ave., Gastonia  
Burlington Industries, Inc., Smithfield  
Burney Industries, Inc., Thomasville  
Caldwell Cotton Mill Co., Hudson  
Caldwell Furniture Co., Inc., Lenoir  
Cannon Mills Co., Plant 5, Concord  
Capel, A. Leon & Sons, Inc., Troy  
Carolina Absorbent Cotton Co., Charlotte  
Carolina Dye Works, Inc., Monroe  
Carolina Fiberglass Products Co., Wilson  
Carolina Fine Woods, Inc., Louisburg  
Carolina Glove Co., Catawba  
Carolina Metal Products Corporation, Sanford  
Carolina Mills, Inc., Hickory  
Carolina Mills, Inc., Plant 16, Madison  
Carolina Mills, Inc., Plant 2, Marion  
Carolina Mills, Inc., Statesville  
Carolina Seating Co., Thomasville  
Carolina Throwing Co., Inc., Kings Mountain  
Caroline Foods, Div. Textron, Inc., Dobson  
Central Carolina Farmers Exchange, Inc., Durham  
Century Chair Co., Hickory  
Chadbourn Veneer Co., Chadbourn  
Challenger Products, Inc., Roxboro  
Champion Papers, Inc., Canton  
Chatham Manufacturing Co., Elkin  
Chatham Novelties Co., Siler City  
Cherokee Flooring Corporation, Burlington  
Clayton Products Manufacturing Co., Clayton  
Clayton-Marcus Co., Inc., Hickory



Climax Spinning Co., Belmont  
Coco-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., Raleigh  
Cole Manufacturing Co., Charlotte  
Collins & Aikman Corporation, Ca-Vel  
Collins & Aikman Corporation, Charlotte  
Collins & Aikman Corporation, Norwood  
Collins & Aikman Corporation, Siler City  
Colonial Store, Inc., Charlotte  
Concaster Collar & Shirt Co., Rutherfordton  
Concrete Materials, Inc., Charlotte  
Cone Mills Corporation, Cliffside  
Consolidated Brass Co., Matthews  
Cornell-Dubilier Electronics, Fuquay-Varina  
Cornell-Dubilier Electronics, Sanford  
Corriher Mills Co., Landis  
Countywide Sewing Co., Inc., Clinton  
Dacotah Cotton Mills, Inc., Lexington  
Deering Millikan, Inc., Robbins  
Dicey Mills, Inc., Shelby  
Dixie Yarns, Inc., Cumberland  
Doblin Carolina Limited, Morganton  
Dover Mill Co., Shelby  
Draymore Manufacturing Corporation, Mooresville  
Drexel Knitting Mills Co., Drexel  
Du Pont, E. I., de Nemours & Co., Inc., Gastonia  
Duplan Corporation, Winston-Salem  
Dura Tred Hosiery Mills Co., Inc., Burlington  
Durham Herald Co., Inc., Durham  
Eagle Yarn Mills, Inc., Belmont  
Edwards & Broughton Co., Raleigh  
Electric Storage Battery Co., Raleigh  
Electronic Components Corp. of North Carolina, Burgaw  
Engineered Plastics, Inc., Gibsonville  
Export Leaf Tobacco Co., Greenville  
Fairey Finishing Plant, Inc., Durham  
Fayetteville Publishing Co., Fayetteville  
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Salisbury  
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Bedspread Mill, Spray  
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Karastan Rug Mill, Spray  
Fieldcrest Mills, Inc., Worthville  
Fleetline Industries, Inc., Garland  
Florida Steel Corporation, Charlotte  
Food Processors, Inc., Wilson  
Fox, C. G., Lumber Co., Inc., Hickory  
France Neckwear Manufacturing Co., Wilmington

Frisell Fabrics, Inc., Burlington  
Gaston County Dyeing Machine Co., Stanley  
Gastonia Knitting & Finishing, Inc., Gastonia  
General Electric Co., Asheboro  
General Electric Co., Hickory  
Gibbs Underwear Co., Lincolnton  
Glen Raven Knitting Mills, Inc., Glen Raven  
Grace Hosiery Mills, Inc., Burlington  
Graham Hosiery Mill, Inc., Graham  
Great Lakes Carbon Corporation, Morganton  
Groves Thread Co., Inc., Gastonia  
Gulistan Carpet, Civ. J. P. Stevens Co., Inc., Aberdeen  
Gurney Industries, Inc., Armstrong Plant, Gastonia  
Gurney Industries, Inc., Clara Plant, Gastonia  
Hanes Corporation, Jefferson  
Hanes Corporation, Sparta  
Hanes Hosiery Div., Hanes Corporation, Winston-Salem  
Hardwood Dimension, Inc., Dunn  
Hekman Cabinets, Inc., Lexington  
Henderson Garment Co., Inc., Henderson  
Henry Link Corporation, Lexington  
Heritage Quilts, Inc., Bryson City  
Heritage Quilts, Inc., Stylecraft Div., Bryson City  
Herndon Lumber Co., Lewiston  
Hickory Knitting Mills, Inc., 23rd St., Hickory  
Hickory Tavern Furniture, Inc., Hickory  
Holly Farms Poultry Co., Inc., Wilkesboro  
Holt Hosiery Mills, Inc., Kourt Dr., Burlington  
Horne Chair Co., Inc., Ronda  
Homespun Hosiery Mill, Inc., Lincolnton  
Hunt Manufacturing Co., Statesville  
Hy-Lan Furniture, Inc., Hickory  
Ideal Industries, Inc., Bessemer City  
Imperial Tobacco Co., Ltd., Greenville  
Indian Head Hosiery Co., Wilmington  
International Paper Co., Statesville  
IRC, Inc., Boone  
Isenhour Brick & Tile Co., Salisbury  
Jenkins Metal Shops, Inc., Gastonia  
Joel Togs, Inc., Gastonia  
Johnston Spinning Co., Monroe  
Jordan Spinning Co., Cedar Falls  
Kayser-Roth Hosiery Co., Inc., Burlington  
Kayser-Roth Hosiery Co., Inc., Graham  
Kemp Furniture Co., Goldsboro

Kincaid Carolina Corporation, Lincolnton  
Knit-Sox Knitting Mills, Inc., Hickory  
Knitmore Mills, Inc., Newton  
Kroehler Manufacturing Co., Inc., Charlotte  
Laughlin Hosiery Mills, Inc., Randleman  
Lawrence, A. C., Leather Co., Hazelwood  
Leaksville Woolen Mills, Inc., Spray  
Lees, James, & Sons Co., Robbinsville  
Lenoir Hosiery Mills, Inc., Lenoir  
Levi Strauss & Co., Murphy  
Lewittes & Sons, Taylorsville  
Lexington Co., Thomasville  
Linford Mills, Inc., Belmont  
Link-Taylor Corporation, Lexington  
Little Cotton Manufacturing Co., Wadesville  
Long Manufacturing Co., Inc., Tarboro  
Long Shoals Cotton Mills, Inc., Lincolnton  
Luck's, Inc., Seagrove  
Luftin Rule Co., Apex  
Lumbee Corporation, Lumberton  
M A P, INC., Charlotte  
Madison Throwing Co., Inc., Madison  
Maola Milk & Ice Cream Co., New Bern  
Mars Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Asheville, Asheville  
Mauney Hosiery Mills, Inc., Kings Mountain  
Metal Bed Rail Co., Inc., Lexington  
Mid-State Farms, Staley  
Mid-State Paper Box Co., Inc., Asheboro  
Miller, James I., Tobacco Co., Wilson  
Mohican Mills, Inc., Lincolnton  
Monk, A. C., & Co., Inc., Plant 1, Farmville  
Monk, A. C., & Co., Inc., Plant 2, Farmville  
Monk-Henderson Tobacco Co., Inc., Wendell  
Moore Cotton Mills Co., Hudson  
Morton Frozen Foods, Concord  
Mount Olive Pickle Co., Inc., Mount Olive  
Mr. Jeans, Inc., High Point  
Mr. Jeans, Inc., Randleman  
Murphy Body Works, Inc., Wilson  
Murray Corporation, Mount Olive  
National Spinning Co., Inc., Whiteville  
North American Mills, Inc., Industrial Park, Gastonia  
North American Mills, Inc., S. Dupre Street, Gastonia  
North Carolina Granite Corporation, Mount Airy  
Northrop Carolina, Inc., Asheville

Norwich Mills, Inc., Clayton  
Norwich Mills, Inc., Wendell  
Nu-Southern Dyeing & Finishing, Inc., Henderson  
Oakdale Knitting Co., Mount Airy  
Package Products Co., Inc., Charlotte  
Palmer Products, Inc., Clarkton  
Park Yarns Mills Co., Kings Mountain  
Parks-Cramer Co., Charlotte  
Peck Manufacturing Co. of North Carolina, Inc., Gastonia  
Peerless Hosiery Co., Inc., North Wilkesboro  
Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co., Inc., Winston-Salem  
Perfect Packed Products Co., Inc., Henderson  
Perry Manufacturing Co., Mount Airy  
Pharr Yarns, Inc., McAdenville  
Pharr Yarns, Inc., Printing Plant, McAdenville  
Pharr Yarns, Inc., Spencer Mountain Plant, McAdenville  
Piedmont Garment Co., Inc., Harmony  
Piedmont Leaf Tobacco Co., Inc., Winston-Salem  
Piedmont Processing Co., Belmont  
Pine State Knitwear Co., Mount Airy  
Planters Industries, Inc., Rocky Mount  
Pneumafil Corporation, Charlotte  
Polkton Manufacturing Co., Inc., Polkton  
Porter, H. K., Co., Inc., Charlotte  
Prestige Furniture Corporation, Newton  
Proctor-Silex, Inc., Mount Airy  
Queen City Mattress & Upholstering Co., Inc., Charlotte  
Queensboro Steel Corporation, Wilmington  
Reeves Brothers, Inc., Cornelius  
Reeves Brothers, Inc., Rutherfordton  
Reliable Mills, Inc., Gastonia  
Rickman Manufacturing Co., Inc., Salisbury  
Ridgeview Hosiery Mill Co., Newton  
Robinson Manufacturing Co., Inc., Hosiery Mill Div., Elizabeth City  
Robinson, W. L., Co., Inc., Durham  
Rocky Mount Mills, Rocky Mount  
Rose Hill Poultry Corporation, Rose Hill  
Rowan Cooperative Dairy, Inc., Salisbury  
Roxy Hosiery Mill Div., Mebane  
Royal Cake Co., Inc., Winston-Salem  
Russell-Harvelle Hosiery Mills, Inc., Mount Gilead  
S K F Industries, Inc., Asheville  
Salem Co., Inc., Elkin  
Salemburg Manufacturing Co., Salemburg  
Samsons Manufacturing Corporation, Washington

Sansons Manufacturing Corporation, Wilson  
Sanders Hosiery Mills, Inc., Burlington  
Sandhurst Mills, Inc., Rockingham  
Scales Furniture Co., Inc., Claremont  
Schneierson, A. J., & Son, Inc., Sanford  
Selig Manufacturing Co., Inc., Siler City  
Sellars Manufacturing Co., Saxapahaw  
Shadowline, Inc., Boone  
Shelby Seamless Hosiery Mills, Inc., Shelby  
Sherman-Manson, Inc., Monroe  
Sherrill Furniture Co., Statesville  
Sherrill Upholstering Co., Inc., Hickory  
Shuford Mills, Inc., Granite Falls  
Siceloff Manufacturing Co., Inc., Lexington  
Skyland Textile Co., Morganton  
Sledge Lumber Corporation, Whiteville  
Smyre, A. M., Manufacturing Co., Gastonia  
Snyder, E. J., & Co., Inc., Albemarle  
Southern Desk Co., Hickory  
Southern Dyestuff Co., Charlotte  
Southern Garment Co., Inc., Robbins  
Spainhour Furniture Co., Inc., Lenoir  
Spencers, Inc. of Mount Airy, Mount Airy  
Spofford Mills, Wilmington  
Spring Mills, Inc., Laurel Hill  
Square D Co., Asheville  
Stanley Knitting Mills, Inc., Oakboro  
Sterling Cotton Mills, Inc., Granklinton  
Stevens Hosiery Div., Longview Plant 1, Hickory  
Stevens, J. P., & Co., Inc., Longview Plant 1, Hickory  
Stevens, J. P., & Co., Inc., Randleman  
Stevens, J. P., & Co., Inc., Rosemary Plant, Roanoke Rapids  
Stevens, J. P., & Co., Inc., Snow Hill  
Stevens, J. P., & Co., Inc., Stanley  
Stone Manufacturing Co., Inc., Fair Bluff  
Stonecutter Mills Corporation, Weaving Plant, Spindale  
Stoneville Furniture Co., Inc., Stoneville  
Stout Chair Co., Inc., Liberty  
Superior Yarn Mills, Inc., Mount Holly  
Supreme Manufacturing Co., Inc., Dallas  
Tait Yarn Co., Inc., Lincolnton  
Talon, Inc., Woodland  
Tanner of North Carolina, Rutherfordton  
Taylor Biscuit Co., Raleigh  
Textiles, Inc., Victory Plant, Gastonia

Thomasville Chair Co., Inc., Thomasville  
Thomasville Furniture Industries, Inc., Fisher Ferry St., Thomasville  
Timme Corporation, Wilmington  
Tool Service Engineering Co., Monroe  
Trimble Products, Inc., Southern Pines  
Troy Drapery Corporation, Troy  
Union Carbide Corporation, Asheville  
United Merchants & Manufacturing Inc., Old Fort  
Vale Hosiery Corporation, Lincolnton  
Vanderbilt Shirt Co., Inc., Asheville  
Venture, Inc., Mount Airy  
Waldensian Bakeries, Inc., Valdese  
Wallace Business Form, Inc., Gastonia  
Washington Mills Co., Marion  
Washington Mills Co., Mayodan  
Waverly Mills, Inc., Laurinburg  
Wee-Sox Hosiery Mills, Inc., Randleman  
Welcome Furniture Manufacturing, Inc., Welcome  
Wenco Furniture, Inc., Wendell  
West Knitting Corporation, Wadesboro  
Weyerhaeuser Co., Plymouth  
Whitakers Garment Co., Whitakers  
Whitehead & Anderson, Inc., Lumberton  
Wilkes Glove Manufacturing Co., North Wilkesboro  
Williams-Brownell, Inc., Asheville  
Wilson Manufacturing Co., Inc., Wilson  
Wix Corporation, Allen Plant, Gastonia  
Wix Corporation, Ozark Plant, Gastonia  
Zarn, Inc., Reidsville

## Appendix D

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
AT GREENSBORO

School of Home Economics

June 16, 1970

Dear Sir:

The School of Home Economics maintains an active interest in the problems which confront the business community. Adequate care for the children of working mothers looms as a problem which has implications for industry as well as for other groups. We are concerned with finding a solution to the problem which will benefit the employer, the employee, and the child. Our ultimate goal is to design a modular mobile child care center which will be practical for use in the care of children. As a part of this project, it is important to learn about some of the characteristics of the labor force in different industries in the state and to learn about the interest of these industries to employer-sponsored child care centers. At your earliest convenience, would you please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the envelope provided.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. It is through such cooperative efforts that progress is possible.

Very truly yours,

Nancy White, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Child DevelopmentJean G. Wall  
Graduate Assistant  
Child Development

GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA/ 27412

## Appendix E

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

School of Home Economics

July 14, 1970

Dear Sir:

Several weeks ago, a questionnaire dealing with labor characteristics and employee-sponsored child care centers was mailed to your firm. Since we have not received your reply, we wondered whether or not the questionnaire reached you. If you have not already done so, would you please answer it and return it in the enclosed envelope by July 28, 1970?

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Nancy White, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Child Development

Jean G. Wall  
Graduate Assistant  
Child Development