

**FAMILY DAY CARE AND
THE CENTRALITY OF CHILD CARE:
A MODIFIED GROUNDED THEORY APPROACH**

By Brenda Leah Mager

**A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement
for the degree of**

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

**Faculty of Social Work
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba**

(c) August, 1997



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-23403-7

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

**FAMILY DAY CARE AND THE CENTRALITY OF CHILD CARE:
A MODIFIED GROUNDED THEORY APPROACH**

by

BRENDA LEAH MAGER

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
MASTER of SOCIAL WORK**

BRENDA LEAH MAGER 1997 (c)

**Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell
copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis
and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to Dissertations Abstracts International to publish
an abstract of this thesis/practicum.**

**The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor
extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.**

Table of Contents

Table of contents	i
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction and Purpose of Study	1
Introduction	1
Relationship to Human Service Administration	2
Work/Family Stress	4
Benefits and Limitations	5
Motivation	7
Support System	7
Research Questions	8
Methodology	9
Family Day Care, Family Day Care Providers, Human Service Workers and Home Workers Defined	10
Summary	12
Chapter 2: Literature Review	14
Theoretical Frameworks	14
Feminist Political Economy Framework	14
Ethic of Care Framework	20
Work-family Stress and Women	22
Home-based Work Arrangements	26
Employed Mothers	26
Motives Related to Child Care Arrangements	28
Motives Related to Economic Instability	30
Other Reasons for Starting Home Work	31
Benefits and Limitations of	
Family Day Care and Home Work	32
Strategies used by Women Home Workers	43
Administration of Family Day Care Providers in Manitoba	51
Child Day Care Office, Government of Manitoba, Family Services	51
Provincial Coordinators	53
External Support Systems	54

	Family Day Care Association of Manitoba	54
	Manitoba Child Care Association	55
	Revenue Canada	56
	Employment and Immigration Canada	57
	Conclusion	57
Chapter 3:	Methodology	59
	Feminist Perspectives of Research	59
	Grounded Theory Methodology	61
	Rationale for Grounded Theory Methodology and Feminist Perspectives on Research	65
	Sampling	67
	Participant Recruitment	69
	Confidentiality, Anonymity and Informed Consent	72
	Data Collection	73
	Data Analysis	75
	Strengths and Limitations of Methods	79
Chapter 4:	Results	82
	Introduction	82
	Description of Participants	83
	Theme 1: Centrality of Child Care	84
	Category 1: Valuing their mothering role	85
	Category 2: High demand of mothering	88
	Category 3: Unable to afford and locate child care	89
	Category 4: Connecting to day care children and their families	91
	Category 5: Preference for home-like environment over institutional child care	92
	Category 6: Education and training in child care	93
	Theme 2: Work/Family Stress	95
	Category 1: Long work day	96
	Category 2: Physically and mentally challenging work	98
	Category 3: Isolation	99
	Category 4: Low and fluctuating income	100

Theme 3: Women as Primary Child Care Provider	103
Category 1: Level of family support	104
Category 2: Level of day care parent support	111
Category 3: Level of professional association support	115
Category 4: Level of child day care office and government support	121
Theme 4: Resisting the Limitations of Family Day Care	128
Category 1: Level of public resistance	129
Category 2: Setting boundaries	131
Category 2: Networking	134
Category 3: Acceptance and rationalization	135
Category 4: Changing household standards	137
Category 5: Purchasing help and appliances	138
Category 6: Self-care	139
Summary	140
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion	142
Introduction	142
Motivation to enter Family Day Care	143
Centrality of Care and an Ideological Commitment to Care	143
Economic Motivation	146
Work/Family Stress	147
The Social and Economic Exploitation of Primary Child Care Providers	149
Family Day Care Providers Resistance to Limitations	152
Women taking care of themselves	153
Creating new opportunities	154
Using support systems	155
Public resistance	157
Implications for Family Day Care Policy and Administration	158
Participants' Recommendations	159
Economic and social recognition and support	159
Transition to family day care	161
Professional and social support	163

	Researcher's Recommendations	165
	Recommendations for Home Work in the Human Services	170
	Recommendations for Future Research	171
	Summary	172
Bibliography		174
Appendix A	Request for participation published in the MASW and SASW newsletter	185
Appendix B	Letter to possible participants through agency/association	186
Appendix C	Letter of permission to agencies and association	187
Appendix D	Consent form	188
Appendix E	Schedule of data collection	190
Appendix F	Revised schedule of data collection	195
Appendix G	Sample of sociological constructs and indicators	200

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the motivations, behaviours and experience of women FDC providers as human service home workers. A major concern is to determine the social, economic and political support structures available to women while caring for their own and day care children. The implications of the study findings on FDC policy and administration is addressed.

The study analyzed interviews with eighteen FDC providers in rural and urban Manitoba. Seventeen participants were licensed and held a membership in either the Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA) or Family Day Care Association of Manitoba (FDCA). One participant was unlicensed and chose not to join a professional association. The "ethic of care" and feminist political economy theoretical frameworks facilitated interpretation of study data. Previous research on work/family stress, home-based work arrangements, and FDC policy and administration provided a context for examination.

Using modified grounded theory methodology combined with feminist research perspectives, four themes were identified. The "centrality of child care" was identified as the main theme and related to the other themes. This theme stated that all women purposefully made child care a dominant role in their lives. FDC offered women the best opportunity to care for their children while earning an income. Despite this, FDC primarily increased work/family stress. The thesis study also found that the contradictory support providers received was based on their own and others' acceptance of the social norm which predominately places women as child care

providers. This led to them being socially and economically exploited. Providers dealt with these disadvantages using public, group and individual strategies.

This study found that as home workers, family day care (FDC) providers are socially and economically exploited. These experiences are a product of the undervaluing of caring work and the view that FDC is a private arrangement between parents and providers. Only when child care is viewed as a collective and social responsibility will providers experience less exploitation.

Child care policy that supports the licensing of FDC providers is one way child care can be assigned a social responsibility. However, it is not politically feasible to make all providers license. To gain public support and recognition, child care licensing requirements and regulations need to be increased. To encourage women to license, economic and social incentives are needed. Government supported initiatives offered through licensing will also reduce the exploitation FDC providers experience.

Finally, this study has implications for FDC administration. Provincial coordinators can reduce some disadvantages, in particular, problems with the administration of subsidies. Also, with adequate government support, the professional association can support, enhance and advocate for recommendations in this study.

Acknowledgements

The support and encouragement I received throughout this research is deeply appreciated. Many people were involved and helped produce this document. I would like to thank the following people, for with them, this accomplishment became a reality.

To the FDC providers who graciously gave me their time, thoughts and opinions of their caring roles and responsibilities. Staff at the MCCA and volunteers at the FDCA who assisted by providing information on FDC, providers, and their Associations. I am also grateful for having the opportunity to use their membership list to reach FDC providers across the province.

The members of my thesis committee contributed to the completion of this project. Their interest in and validation of women's caring was a major motivation for me. Their appreciation of qualitative research, particularly grounded theory methodology, was also helpful. Their numerous editing changes were very much appreciated.

I am particularly grateful to Professor Lyn Ferguson, who continued to have confidence and trust in my abilities. Guidance and availability were elements of her supervision. Her understanding of my numerous roles demonstrated how support can be provided to those balancing work and family responsibilities.

I have been very fortunate to have nurtured some wonderful friendships while completing my thesis. A special thank you to Lorraine who spent Saturdays transcribing the interviews at a record pace. To Lloyd who helped me to cut up and

sort my data during his Christmas vacation. To Kathy and Ken for providing high quality care to my children. To my colleagues and "social work group" who always made time to support and encourage me when I was visiting Winnipeg.

I send a very special thank you to Gisele and Tony whose friendship supported me throughout the past three years. Their caring, concern and encouragement were instrumental in the completion of this thesis. The thesis brought us together, but our friendship continues to provide me with much joy and happiness.

The work required to complete a thesis interfered with the time I wanted to spend with my family. I was very fortunate to have the support, friendship and advice of my husband Ross. I want to thank Margaret, my mother-in-law, who opened her home to us for our year in Winnipeg. The importance she places on education continues to inspire me. To my daughter Margaret who did "her research" with me on many Saturday mornings. The birth of my son Ian will always have attached to it the memories of my thesis. I also want to thank Keith for his help in providing me access to his computer when mine was unavailable. Finally, to my parents who taught me to take on new challenges so that I may be able to help my community and fellow citizens.

Chapter 1 Introduction and Purpose of Study

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the motives, behaviours and experiences of women family day care (FDC) providers as human service home workers. It is intended to impact child care policy and increase FDC administrators', particularly provincial coordinators with the Child Day Care office, understanding of the potential benefits and limitations of FDC. Specific attention is given to the use of FDC as a method for women to fulfil their personal, family and work-related responsibilities.

Nelson's (1988) study of Vermont FDC providers found that women entered FDC because it was the best opportunity for them to provide care to their children and earn an income. However, this arrangement also led to these women being socially and economically exploited, particularly by day care parents and government. This study seeks to determine if Canadian FDC providers experience similar social and economic disadvantages, and if so, to what extent, by whom and under what conditions.

The use of home-based work arrangements in the human service sector makes such arrangements a salient research issue. Child care providers who operate FDC from their homes make up a large portion of human service home workers. In Manitoba there were 560 licensed FDC homes (Susan Tessler, personal conversation, May 11, 1995). Many other FDC providers remain unlicensed but provide services to a growing number of parents requiring alternate care for their children (Kamerma,

1985; Pence, Goelman, Lero & Brockman, 1993; Peters & Pence, 1993; Wattenberg, 1977).

Other areas within the human service sector are attempting to incorporate home work as a work arrangement. In April, 1995, Manitoba Health, Community Mental Health Division began a home working pilot project with several community mental health workers (Ruth Loeppky, personal conversation, November, 1994). Also, Winnipeg Child and Family Services, East Area, employ a unit of six night staff members who work from their homes (Rick Manteussel, personal conversation, April, 1995). Finally, human service workers have been increasingly entering private practice that can involve home-based work arrangements (Bracken & Walmsley, 1992; Levin & Leginsky, 1989). Due to a low response rate, an attempt to incorporate these groups of human service home workers in this study was unsuccessful. Therefore, this study focused on women FDC providers as human service home workers in Manitoba.

Relationship to Human Service Policy and Administration

The Manitoba Family Service, Child Day Care office administers FDC policy detailed in The Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983). "The purpose of this act was to develop a set of uniform and comprehensive licensing standards that would promote the well-being and development of children enrolled in day care" (McConnell, 1994, p. 33). As employees of the Child Day Care office, provincial coordinators are responsible for regulating and monitoring licensed FDC providers in accordance with the above Act. Family service supervisors employed by

the Family Centre of Winnipeg supervise FDC providers designated as special needs homes. Finally, FDC providers have the option to acquire a membership in their professional association. These associations are self-regulated but provide numerous resources, educational services and guidance to their members.

The relationship that exists between provincial coordinators, Family Service supervisors, and FDC providers has the potential to include administrative (e.g., licensing regulations, payment of subsidies) and educational support. However, the effectiveness and levels of support FDC providers receive from licensing and regulating bodies is uncertain (Andre & Neave, 1992; Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Cohen, 1992; Kyle, 1993; Leavitt, 1991).

As members of their professional association, FDC providers have another potential source of support. Until recently, Manitoba providers had access to two professional associations, the Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA) and the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba (FDCA). These organizations have amalgamated to form one child day care professional association representing both FDC providers and day care centre staff. At the time of this study, the professional associations operated individually and offered newsletters, liability and group insurance, workshops, conferences, FDC training and other resources (Background Information - FDCA, Family Day Care Association, nd.; Family Day Care Provider, Membership Benefits Checklist, Manitoba Child Care Association, February, 1995). Within this capacity, professional associations had the potential to provide advocacy and support to FDC providers.

Traditionally, the administrative parameters of helping workers balance work and family responsibilities have been ambiguous (Kossek as cited in Kossek, Dass & DeMarr, 1994). Administrators are often unclear or unwilling to provide assistance to employees struggling to meet work and family responsibilities (Lero, Brockman, Pence, Goelman & Johnson, 1993). Given the close proximity between work and family responsibilities in FDC operations, child care administrators need clarity on this important administrative role. Further, a lack of research on FDC has been influenced by the notion that FDC falls outside the public system and by the view that it is a private arrangement (Peter & Pence, 1993). This also makes this research timely.

Work/Family Stress

The sources of work-family stress have been identified as both work and family related (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994). Also, work-family stress is complicated for women given that they continue to be the primary child care provider in most Canadian homes while also participating in the paid labour force (Lero & Johnson, 1994). When a job makes it difficult for workers to meet both their family and work-related responsibilities, the result is work-family stress. Work-family stress is also a product of role overload and work-family interference (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994). Role overload occurs when a person's numerous roles and limited community resources result in them feeling unable to complete their tasks adequately (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994). Work-family interference occurs when work and family obligations compete for the same time slot (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994).

Job-related stress has ample opportunity to impact the FDC provider's home life. The provider's paid work resembles the personal family responsibilities and is performed in her home. Further, FDC creates its own unique job and family related stress factors. These factors complicate providers' attempts to meet their family and work responsibilities.

For many FDC providers, stress is a result of their work being undervalued and unrecognized (Ferguson, 1991). Other job-related stress factors have been identified as: reduced autonomy (Nelson, 1988); the nature of caring work (Dunster, 1994; McConnell, 1993); government regulations (Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1991); and relationships with day care children's parents characterized by late or no payments and little respect for FDC policies (Atkinson, 1988; Larner & Mitchell, 1991; Nelson, 1988, 1991). Some family-related stress factors include the infringement of time and space on FDC providers' family members and home, an unsupportive husband, increased demands on providers by their own children and increased household responsibilities (Atkinson, 1988; Dimidjian, 1982; Molgaard, 1993; Nelson, 1988). Family day care providers' experiences of job and family related stress provide an excellent opportunity to study the impact home work has on these women's efforts to fulfil their dual responsibilities.

Benefits and Limitations

Family day care literature reveals contradictory results as to the effectiveness of FDC to decrease work/family stress. For example, many FDC providers describe

conflicting experiences in their attempt to meet their personal and work-related child care responsibilities (Atkinson, 1988; Dimidjian, 1982; Ferguson, 1991; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991; Sanders & Bullen, 1992; Wattenberg, 1977). Also, some literature on home-based work arrangements argues that these arrangements can reduce work-family stress (Bova, 1991; Joice, 1991; Olmsted & Smith, 1992; Romzek, 1991). Paradoxically, home-based work arrangements have been found to simultaneously increase and decrease work-family stress (Christensen, 1988; Johnson, 1993; Johnson & Johnson, 1982).

In relation to women's attempts to meet their dual responsibilities, FDC literature identifies numerous benefits and limitations. The drawbacks of FDC as a home work arrangement include fatigue, increased work-family stress, economic instability, government intervention, and social and professional isolation (Atkinson, 1988; Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Barnett, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1988; 1991; Sanders & Bullen, 1993). Interestingly, these negative experiences mirror the positive experiences, thereby producing conflicting results. Similar to other home workers, women operating FDCs experience flexibility in meeting personal and family responsibilities (Atkinson, 1988; Barnett, 1993; McConnell, 1994; Nelson, 1988, 1991; Sanders & Bullen, 1993). By examining the benefits and limitations of FDC as a home work arrangement, this study addresses the conflicting results previously experienced by women. However, to truly understand what FDC providers classify as benefits and limitations, the motivation of these providers to enter FDC also needs to be understood.

Motivations

This study seeks to reveal what structural and individual factors impact on women's decision to enter FDC as a home work arrangement and become self-employed human service workers. With downsizing and deskilling occurring in the human service sector (Braverman, 1987; Barker, 1986; Wallace, 1982; as cited in Levin & Leginsky, 1989), it is difficult to identify the reasons motivating some women to choose home work. Are women's motivations related to family, to work issues, or to a general lack of employment options?

As a motivation to enter FDC, women identify their desire to care for their own children while earning an income (Atkinson, 1988; Auerback & Woodill, 1993; Barnett, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1991; Sanders & Bullen, 1993). Literature describing home work shows that, in part, women's entry into home work is related to a lack of affordable and accessible child care (Christensen, 1988; Joice, 1993; Johnson, 1994; Fomzeke, 1991; Swiss & Walker, 1993). Other research shows that personal and work-related autonomy are also motivating factors for workers who choose home work. Understanding the structural and individual factors which motivate women toward self-employment and home work simultaneously can enhance administrators' knowledge of home work.

Support Systems

Family day care providers are involved with numerous groups of individuals that make up potential support systems. These groups include their families, day care

parents, other FDC providers, and for licensed providers, provincial coordinators, subsidy clerks and professional associations. All of these groups negatively and positively impact FDC providers (Atkinson, 1988; Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Barnett, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; McConnell, 1994; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991). Therefore, the extent to which these groups support or hinder FDC providers' efforts to complete their personal and work-related roles is a focus of this study.

Research Questions

The "ethic of care" and feminist political economy theoretical frameworks provide a good starting point for attempting to understand the contradictions experienced by FDC providers as well as their motivations to enter such a work arrangement. An analysis of the impact the various groups (family, day care parents, professional association, other FDC providers and provincial coordinators) have on FDC providers' motivations and experiences serves to assist those in child care to help FDC providers meet their work and family responsibilities. Therefore, the research questions are:

1. What structural and individual factors motivate women to become family day care providers?
2. What structural and individual factors support or hinder their efforts to fulfil personal, family and work-related roles?
3. What structural and individual factors help women deal with the drawbacks of FDC?

Methodology

The research design combines grounded theory with feminist research perspectives. Qualitative methods, such as grounded theory, produce "descriptive data: people's own written or spoken words or observable behaviour" (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 5). A feminist approach was chosen in an effort to detail participants' experiences as home workers and mothers.

Using a methodology and perspective that can detail women's experiences is important for several reasons. First, since FDC and home work operate within the private realm, a design that brings experiences out into the public realm is required. Second, the administrative role of assisting paid workers in dealing with work-family stress is unclear. A qualitative design from a feminist perspective addressed these issues by allowing women to describe their experiences as home workers and mothers in more detail.

Grounded theory permits the use of a variety of data collection methods (Glaser, 1978; Corbin & Strauss, 1990). This design used semi-structured interviews conducted by the researcher over a four month period in 1995.

Sampling was based on purposive sampling, the snowball technique and grounded theory methodology. Eighteen participants were recruited. Seventeen participants were members of the Manitoba Child Care Association or Family Day Care Association of Manitoba. These participants were identified using purposive sampling and grounded theory methodology. One participant contacted the researcher after becoming aware of the request for participation in the Manitoba Association of

Social Work newsletter. This participant was located using the snowball technique.

Data analysis incorporated steps that Glaser (1978) outlined in Theoretical Sensitivity, and involved open coding, sorting, selective coding, theoretical sorting and writing. The researcher also completed memo writing and constant comparative analysis throughout data analysis. Finally, this analysis was augmented by the data analysis technique of hurricane thinking described by Kirby and McKenna (1989).

The analysis identified four themes: including "centrality of child care"; "work/family stress"; "primary child care provider"; and "resisting the limitations of FDC". The main theme throughout the data was "centrality of child care". Themes are sociological concepts that reflect the researchers' analysis. Categories are participants' actual words describing their experiences. Categories were supported by specific data.

Family Day Care, Family Day Care Providers, Human Service Workers and Home Workers Defined

This study uses the definition of licensed and unlicensed family day care as set out in the Community Child Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983) and refers to women who operate both types of day cares as family day care providers. Therefore,

[f]amily day care is a service provided in a family dwelling to a maximum of 8 children of whom no more than five can be under the age of 6, and no more than 3 may be less than 2 years of age. The day care provider's own children are included in these maximum numbers.

Private home day care is also provided in a family dwelling. The provider may operate without a licence and offer care for a maximum of 4 children under the age of 12 with no more than 2 children under 2 years of age. If more children

than this receive care the home must be licensed as a family day care home (A Parent's Guide to Quality Child Care, Child Day Care, Manitoba Family Services, n.d., pp. 5-6).

The researcher defines FDC providers as human service workers. According to Barker, human service work "includes planning, organizing, developing, and administering programs for and providing direct social services to people" (p. 105). Also, human service workers are individuals who have non-social work post-secondary education, training or accreditation and by the nature of their work provide human services (Barker, 1991). For example, such workers include those with a Bachelor of Arts degree majoring in psychology or with a licensed FDC operation. Family day care providers meet all of the above criteria and, therefore are defined as human service workers.

For this study, FDC providers are "home workers". Home workers are defined as self-employed entrepreneurs who work at least 20 hours per week from their place of residence. Chamot (1988) includes in his operational home worker classification scheme the category self-employed entrepreneurs. As "self-employed entrepreneurs" family day care providers were women who "... organize and manage private for-profit institutional facilities or educational institutions" (Barker, 1991, p. 112).

Revenue Canada requires FDC providers be deemed as self-employed to be eligible to claim expenses. The Government of Manitoba, in the Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care, concurs with Revenue Canada, stating: "[a]ll providers are considered self-employed..." (p. 13). The Family Day Care Association addresses some of the small business needs of FDC providers by offering support in the areas of

business management (e.g., income tax preparation and marketing). This suggests that the professional organization also supports a label of self-employed. Since all participants in this study claim their operating expenses, they are considered self-employed.

Summary

In summary, the purpose of this study is to examine the structural and individual factors: that motive women to enter family day care; that contribute to the benefits and limitations of FDC; and that influence the strategies women FDC providers use to deal with the drawbacks of their work. Specific attention is paid to the extent to which FDC, as a home work arrangement, assists or hinders women's attempt to complete their paid work and family responsibilities.

The thesis includes the following chapters: a literature review; a detailed description of the research design; the results of an in-depth analysis; and discussion and summary of these results. The literature review describes the feminist political economy and "ethic of care" frameworks. This presentation also includes previous research in the areas of FDC, home work and work-family stress. This is followed by a description of the grounded theory methodology and feminist perspectives on research. Included are the steps taken in the data collection and analysis. Results are presented in the fourth chapter. Four themes are presented with one theme, "centrality of child care", identified as the core theme around which the other themes are presented. The discussion chapter relates, when appropriate, the results to feminist

political economy and "ethic of care" literature, along with previous research on the administration of FDC policy and providers. Specific attention is paid to research about FDC as a home work arrangement completed by Margaret Nelson (1988, 1989, 1990, & 1991). Finally, recommendations to the Child Day Care office, provincial coordinators and professional associations by participants and the researcher are presented.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

Theoretical Frameworks

The researcher's understanding of the feminist political economy and "ethic of care" frameworks led to an interest in the experiences of women FDC providers as human service home workers. These frameworks influenced the data analysis during the identification of themes, categories and memo writing (Glaser, 1978) and, when appropriate, were used in the discussion of study results. Grounded theory methodology allows the use of existing theories, insofar as they reflect the emerging theories (Berg, 1989; Currie, 1989; Glaser, 1978). For these reasons, this study includes an analysis of feminist political economy and "ethic of care" frameworks.

Feminist Political Economy Framework

Maroney and Luxton (1987) outline several principles of a feminist political economy:

[f]irst, as gender differentiation occurs universally and is a necessary precondition for class hierarchy,...they [gender and class] must be seriously analyzed in all cases, and only sidelined if they are proven insignificant. Second, all classes are gendered and gender is fundamental to conflict within and between classes....Third, sex-gender systems are dialectically co-determined with economic structures....gender structures must be understood as having economic foundations. Fourth, biological reproduction is neither natural nor instinctive....Fifth, gender is among the deep structures of culture; culture codes, organizes and express in gender....Sixth, sexuality is harnessed and shaped in relation to gender, class, race, and economic structures....Seventh, the identity of individuals, including sexual identity, is formed in relation to location in gender and economic divisions (p. 27).

This framework clearly focuses on the relationship between gender, class and race and

the social, economic and political structures of society. A major objective of this study was to examine the structural conditions and constraints within which women FDC providers operate as home workers.

This structural perspective reflects the feminist political economy principle that "the personal is political" (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1985; Maroney & Luxton, 1987; Rosenberg, 1987). Feminist political economy is said to start "with the premise that the personal is political and that political economy is a significant component to even the most seemingly personal experience" (Rosenberg, 1987, p. 182). Armstrong and Armstrong (1985) state "that the private is invariably linked to the public, and that any analysis that fails to take this connection fully into account is necessarily flawed" (p. 176). This view facilitated the analysis of women FDC providers as paid workers and as family members. Since a provider's home becomes her paid work environment, there is an obvious interplay between a woman's private home life and her paid work. This makes the "personal is political" principle an important research starting point.

Administrative interest in the personal lives of employees contrasts sharply with the traditional approach (Kossek as cited in Kossek, Dass & DeMarr, 1994) in which family responsibilities are perceived as outside the administrative realm. "Historically companies have viewed child care as a 'women's issue,' not a mainstream, personnel matter" (p. 1121, Kossek as cited in Kossek, Dass & DeMarr, 1994).

This traditional separation between paid and unpaid work is based primarily on a narrow individualistic work ethic that sharply separates work and family life (Gummer, 1985; Martin & Chernesky, 1989; Swiss & Walker, 1993) and "assumes

that domestic labour is done by someone else (in the case of men, by a wife, in the case of a woman, by another woman)" (Newman, 1994, p. 189).

Family day care literature identifies some FDC providers as being hesitant to have administrators involved in their "private" home. In a study completed by Nelson (1991), these providers objected to government "interference" in their private work and cited this discontent as a reason for not wanting to license:

One-fourth of the providers were ideologically opposed to regulation. They indicated that the government should not be involved in the regulation of day care in a private home (Nelson, 1991, p. 234).

Evidence of this ideological belief is supported by other FDC literature (Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1990). Leavitt (1991) states that a major controversy in FDC is "the debate over public versus personal responsibility" (p. 245). Some FDC providers describe licensing as an invasion of their privacy (Millet, Mayer, Irwin & Porter, 1980 as cited in Leavitt, 1991, p. 245). Day care has been viewed by some as a personal partnership between parents and providers, and therefore requires no state intervention (Ruopp & Travers, 1982 as cited in Leavitt, 1991). One study shows FDC providers who aspire to a "private" view of child care are less likely to identify child care as "professional work" (Nelson, 1991). Clearly, these studies indicate many providers believe FDC administrators have little or no role in parent/provider relations or in assisting providers with work-family stress.

The point at which administrators should assist FDC providers with their work and family responsibilities has not been easily identifiable. This study explores the

ways administrators can provide support with work and family responsibilities without being too intrusive.

The gender/sexual division of labour principle of feminist political economy connects women's domestic and paid work to the market economy (Maroney & Luxton, 1987). This principle argues that society demands that "employees must devote full-time to their jobs and that family/home obligations belong primarily to women (as wives/mothers) [consequently] affect[ing] how women's (and men's) labour is construed and rewarded, in a market economy" (Martin & Chernesky, 1989, p. 118).

The political economy perspective also takes up Marx's notion of the "reserve army of labour"

In this view, women's position in the labour force is related to their role as a buffer supply which is drawn upon when there is a high demand for labour, and expelled in times of economic downturn (Bakker, 1988, p. 31).

Historically, the connection of many women to the labour market has been as a source of cheap labour (Maroney & Luxton, 1987). Consequently, women's contribution to the family wage has often received little or no recognition.

The gender/sexual division of labour principle acknowledges the significance of economic contributions to the household. Nelson (1988) argues that the exploitation of FDC providers is based "on the low status of women in wage labour and the unpaid labour of women in the home" (p. 91). Taking up this insight, this current study further examines the gender/sexual division of labour principle by identifying strengths and limitations of FDC - specifically, how women's working conditions help or hinder

the completion of their private family responsibilities and connection to the labour market.

Feminist political economy also claims that the separation between paid work and domestic labour is misleading (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1990; Maroney & Luxton, 1987; Rosenberg, 1987). Maroney & Luxton (1987) state "paid and domestic labour are not distinct and separate, but two sides of the same coin, necessary both for capital accumulation and for the reproduction of classes" (p. 19). As an extension of the perspective, this study examines the effectiveness of FDC work in helping women meet their financial, personal and child care responsibilities.

Feminist political economy literature identifies that childbirth and childrearing are profoundly influenced by society's social, economic and political structures (Rosenberg, 1987). Maroney and Luxton (1987) observe "how reproduction is embedded in a society's political, economic and social structures and how these structures make possible women's capacities to be autonomous actors or subject women to male control" (p. 21). This study examines the structural barriers that women FDC providers face in relation to child care and how these, in turn, shape their motivation to do home work. It also considers how FDC, as a home based work arrangement, helps or hinders women in doing their paid work while, at the same time, being responsible for the care of their own children.

Using a feminist political economy perspective, Nelson (1988, 1989) states that women start FDC because they are ideologically opposed to having others care for their own children. Also, feminist political economy literature strongly critiques the

view that the roles of women in childbirth and childrearing are biologically predetermined (Maroney & Luxton, 1987; Rosenberg, 1987). The literature also claims this instinctive view serves to justify the roles of women in domestic life and neglects to acknowledge childrearing as a social responsibility (Rosenberg, 1987). Rosenberg argues, "[u]nwaged caregiving in the household is rarely recognized as either a contribution to social reproduction or as real work; rather, it is seen in essentialist biological terms for women and as a private and personal reward for waged work for men" (Rosenberg, 1987, p. 188).

In opposing the traditional view of childbirth and childrearing, the feminist political economy theory defines mothering as work and views such work as both a social and personal responsibility (Rosenberg, 1987). This permits an analysis of mothering and FDC work in ways that have traditionally been reserved for paid work. For example, motherwork has been investigated in the context of job stress and isolation (Lowe, 1989; Luxton, Rosenberg, & Arat-Koc, 1990; Rosenberg, 1987). Similarly, job stress and isolation are problems of home-based work arrangements and FDC work (Atkinson, 1988; Christensen, 1988; Nelson, 1988; Wattenberg, 1977). In part, providers have experienced job stress and isolation because of the time required to complete both paid and domestic labour, the work location and nature of caring work (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988; Wattenberg, 1977). A major focus of this study is the experience of FDC providers in combining their paid and unpaid work.

'Ethic of Care' Framework

The "ethic of care" framework is also relevant to the experiences of women FDC providers as home workers. Like feminist political economy theory, this framework connects the public and private lives of women (Baines, Evans, & Neysmith, 1991). The "ethic of care" framework incorporates what Armstrong & Armstrong (1990) claim is missing from feminist political economy theory, mainly a "theory of women's relationship to children" (p. 32). Bakker (1988) also argues that the political economy tenets of the sexual/gender division of labour and the reserve army of labour fall short of explaining the conditions in which women carry out their personal and paid work.

Generally, the approach can be criticized for its middle-class bias and for its characterization of the home as a 'little firm', with economic actors having equal power and being engaged in a process of rational decision-making. Furthermore, this approach sheds no light on the difficult conditions under which women perform both domestic labour and wage labour (Folbre as cited in Bakker, 1988, p. 30).

Within this framework, theorists question the contradictions within "motherwork" which potentially decrease women's ability to work outside the home. Specifically, they question whether women can "love and relate to children without sentencing themselves to a secondary position in our society..." (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1990, p. 32).

How, if at all, does the relationship of women to their own and day care children influence their decision to start and continue in family day care? This study examines the impact of caring for family members, particularly for children, on the experiences of women as family day care providers. This is accomplished by asking

women to describe their likes and dislikes about FDC as a home work arrangement and how they deal with the limitations of FDC.

Conceptualizing care within an "ethic of care" framework involves eliminating the boundary between work and family. As a result, the caring skills of women are viewed as "learned" while their juggling of private and public work is validated (Baines, Evans, & Neysmith, 1991). Baines, Evans, and Neysmith (1991) state that an

analysis of women's role in caring needs to examine the ways in which the private and public worlds of women intersect. Women experience these boundaries as artificial. Despite the problems that the polarization of the public and private worlds have posed for women,....(further there are) various strategies different groups of women use in their attempts to negotiate this problematic divide (p. 31).

Feminist writer Leira (1994) argues that caring should not be viewed as a 'labour of love' but as "labour and love in harmonious integration" (p. 197). Other authors suggest that one should not individualize care or focus on the naturalistic paradigm, but view care as a collective responsibility (Baines, et al, 1991; Baldwin & Twigg, 1991; Graham, 1993). As a result, the "ethic of care" framework does not separate the paid and unpaid labour of women and views "caring" as a collective responsibility. This study begins with an acceptance of these principles, thereby respecting the situation of research participants and their efforts to balance work and family responsibilities.

Respect is also found in the belief that women actively determine their own lives (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1990; Baines, et al, 1991). The "ethic of care" framework recognizes women as having been socialized and segregated as primary family care providers (Baines, et al, 1991). However, they do not necessarily take on

this role passively. Baldwin & Twigg (1991) incorporate within the "ethic of care" framework the feminist notion that viewing women only as victims is inadequate, especially since it fails to acknowledge how central caring is to the lives of women. Arguably, if women are only pawns in the socialization process, they would not experience intense conflict when balancing work and family. In addition, they would not implement an array of coping mechanisms, such as FDC, to provide an opportunity for personal child care while obtaining an income (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1991).

This study attempts to assess whether feminist political economy theory and an "ethic of care" framework help explain the experiences of women FDC providers. The researcher's intent is not to prove or disprove any part of feminist political economy or an "ethic of care" framework. It is to discover whether any commonalities or differences exist between these principles and the experiences of FDC providers as home workers.

Work-Family Stress and Women

This study examines women's motivation to enter family day care as a home work arrangement. It also explores the extent to which this arrangement helps or hinders their efforts to satisfy work-related and family responsibilities. The term "work-family conflict" is used to encompass the difficulties workers experience in balancing work and family responsibilities. This study adopts the term "work-family stress" in conjunction with the following definitions to describe work-family conflict:

In effect, work-family conflict [i.e., stress] is explained as the complex interplay between work-related and family stresses and supports. Also, work-family conflict is related to the personal and community-based resources [e.g., child care services] that are available for and appropriate in meeting individual and family needs (Lero, Brockman, Pence, Goelman, & Johnson, 1993, p. 41).

Stone (1994) outlines a similar definition of work-family stress:

Job/family conflict [i.e., stress] results from the interplay between work-related sources of stress and supports, family stresses and supports, and the extent to which community-based resources such as child care services effectively meet individual and family needs (p. 35).

For women, in general, work-family stress is particularly difficult. Canadian women shoulder most family responsibilities, such as child and elder care, while at the same time participating in the paid labour force (Lero & Johnson, 1994). For these women,

[r]esearch has also shown that the experience of work-family conflict (i.e., stress) reflects two basic problems: role overload...and work-family interference...Role overload occurs when an individual has multiple roles [e.g., worker, spouse, parent],...Work-family interference occurs when the demands of one role come into direct conflict with another, due to competing time pressures (Lero, et al, 1993, p. 42).

Stone's (1994) description of role overload and work-family interference corresponds with the above definition.

Role overload takes place when the cumulative time demands arising from a person's multiple roles prevent the person from carrying out the roles adequately or with a sense of comfort. Job-family interference takes place when the job obligations and familial obligations create demands for incompatible uses of the same time slot (p. 33).

Lee, Duxbury and Higgins' (1994) study on employed mothers supports similar findings. The former study finds the role and behaviour of a woman's spouse (i.e., if

she has one) to be a major factor in her level of work-family stress. Lero, et al (1993) also find men can be most responsive to "helping" out with chores but are less responsive to providing child care. However, Christensen (1988) states that some male partners of women home workers would take care of their children in the evenings. This assists women's completion of paid work at night.

Both job and family-related factors contribute to FDC providers' experience with work-family stress. Numerous job stress factors are identified, including the undervaluing and lack of recognition of caring work (Ferguson, 1991). Nelson (1988) argues that FDC providers, when serving parents in the labour market, make accommodations (e.g., extending hours) which reduce their autonomy. Government regulations are also identified as causing restrictions on FDC providers (Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1991). Clearly, the nature of caring work is confirmed as stressful (Dunster, 1994; McConnell, 1993). For example, such activities as caring for small and sick children and being constantly busy produce significant job stress. Many studies find stress to be a factor in the relationship between FDC providers and day care parents (Atkinson, 1988; Lerner & Mitchell, 1991; Nelson, 1991). Failure by parents to drop off and pick up children within day care hours, receiving payment late or not at all, and unrealistic expectations of care all produce job stress for providers.

Family stress is also a product of FDC homes. Given the workplace location, job stress has ample opportunity to reach the families of providers. Infringement on the time and space of family members is identified as a source of family stress (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988). Some FDC providers experience increased

expectations from their spouse and children (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988). Tensions between providers and their spouses occur when day care operations cause their homes to be messy or damaged (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988). An increase in household standards, related to FDC operations and licensing regulations, are also found to increase family stress (Atkinson, 1988; Dimidjian, 1982; Leavitt, 1991; Molgaard, 1993; Nelson, 1988).

However, the difficulties associated with balancing work and family responsibilities are not experienced universally, nor are they necessarily detrimental to the level of stress experienced by women. For women, in general,

[t]he task of juggling home and job responsibilities is not always stressful; many women appear to be very resourceful in coping with these potentially conflicting demands. Indeed, the multiple roles of mother, wife, and worker actually may benefit health by providing alternative source[s] of personal identity and satisfaction (Sorensen & Verbrugge, 1987, p. 245).

Women experience different levels of stress and deal with stress associated with work-family tension in several different ways. As previously mentioned, a study on employed mothers by Lee, Duxbury and Higgins (1994) finds the two most common strategies used by women to balance work and family responsibilities includes setting priorities and dividing tasks within the family. Other identifiable strategies include hiring help and organizing tasks. Single parents in this study find that support from their extended family is a useful coping strategy. Women cope with work-family stress by reducing the time spent on personal care, such as taking time to relax by themselves (Walker & Best as cited in Facione, 1992). The cited

research indicates that employed women experience work-family stress and develop an array of methods to deal with such stress.

Home-based Work Arrangements

This section of the literature review focuses on the motivations, benefits, limitations and strategies of FDC providers and home workers in general. It also presents an overview of the increase in employed mothers in the Canadian labour force and the dilemmas experienced by these women. This information is necessary, since the study defines FDC as a home-based work arrangement. The study sample includes women who have their children living with them. All participants who responded to the study worked outside their home prior to entering FDC. Consequently, these women have experience in the labour force and at one time contemplated or used alternate child care arrangements.

Employed Mothers

Employed mothers are one of the fastest growing sectors of the labour force (Atkinson, 1991; Kamerman, 1985; Statistics Canada as cited in Lero and Johnson, 1993). In Canada, women with infants and toddlers represent the highest growth in labour force participation increasing from 32 percent in 1976 to 62 percent in 1991. Predictions are that women between the ages of 25 and 44 will make up the majority, up to 91 percent, of women paid workers by the year 2005. Although women have increased their labour force participation they continue to do most of the family care

work (Lero as cited in Lipoenko, December, 1994; Statistics Canada, as cited in Lero & Johnson, 1994). In Canada, 60 percent of women report being the major care provider compared to 26 percent of men (MacBride-King, as cited in Lero, et al, 1995). Canadian women were found to have "spent 29 hours per week on housework, including primary child care, compared to 15.6 hours for men, according to time use data collected in 1992" (Statistics Canada, as cited in Lero, et al, 1994, p. 21).

Employed mothers cope with increased child care cost and limited child care spaces.

Logan & Belliveau (1995) explained that in Canada:

[i]n 1990, there were 321,000 licensed day-care spaces. At the same time, there were 1.3 million children under age 6 and 1.7 million aged 6-12 whose mothers were in the labour force, and who were potentially in need of care...In 1992, families paying for child care spent an average of \$1,830, up 53% from \$1,200 (in constant 1992 dollars) ten years earlier. Costs were even higher for those with their child in a day-care centre or nursery. In 1992, costs averaged \$2,270 for families with such expenses, up 38% from \$1,620 (in constant 1992 dollars) (p. 28).

Arguably, a reduction in government spending and an emphasis on community care (e.g., families taking on responsibilities once provided by government) will increase the domestic demands on such employed mothers (Baldwin & Twigg, 1991;

Government of Saskatchewan, 1994; Land, 1991; Lero as cited in Lipoenko, 1994).

For some women, responsibility to provide family care, particularly child care, directs them to home work and FDC (Atkinson, 1988, 1991; Christensen, 1988; Molgaard 1993; Nelson, 1988, 1990, 1991; Sanders & Bullen, 1992).

Motive Related to Child Care Arrangements

Home work is often chosen by women who are unable to find suitable and affordable child care arrangements:

Her company offered no child care assistance, so she spent the first months of her maternity leave scouting for child care. She was horrified at what she saw, finding some unfit "even for a dog" (Christensen, 1988, p. 41).

Nelson (1988) finds that 21 percent of the respondents in her study of FDC providers were motivated to begin home work in order to avoid conditions of wage labour, such as difficulties accommodating the needs of their children while working outside the home. Barnett's (1993) study on FDC providers supports this finding.

Some self-employed home workers and FDC providers cite their childhood socialization as a source of their discomfort at allowing other women to take temporary care of their children (Christensen, 1988; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990). These discomforts sometimes lead to women entering home-based work arrangements, including FDC (Christensen, 1988; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990). Some FDC providers have such strong feelings about their role as primary child care providers that they are unable to understand why employed mothers just "don't stay home with their children" (Nelson, 1989, p. 12). In one study, women who began to offer FDC services found themselves unable to let go of the mothering role long enough to work outside the home. Such day care providers:

had formerly worked outside the home. Although they offered a variety of reasons for leaving wage labour, they placed first the fact that they could not tolerate the pain of daily separation [from their children] (Nelson, 1989, p. 11).

Sara (a respondent in Christensen's (1988) study on homeworkers and a career

psychologist) states she had every intention of returning to work after a short maternity leave "[b]ut once her son Max was born, Sara, like Lisa, couldn't shake the feeling that she should be the one to raise him" (p. 50).

The early socialization of women around caring strongly supports this ideological underpinning. Lisa Jacobi states:

My mom was always there when we got home...I know that this feeling of mine isn't innate [italics added], that it comes from all the conditioning I had as a kid. Mothers were always the ones who stayed home and took care of the kids. When Stewart [the child's father] offered to do that, I could not accept the idea that he'd be the mom and I'd be the breadwinner, I just couldn't reconcile that switch within myself" (p. 41 as cited in Christensen, 1988).

The women cited above use home work because they disapprove of having other people, including their husband, care for their children while they work for wages.

There is a direct relationship between how they understand their personal role as child care providers and their choice to engage in home work as self-employed entrepreneurs.

Like self-employed women, home-based workers (employed outside of the child care field) also address work-family stress associated with child care. For these women, difficulties around managing out-of-home child care with employment and the desire to spend more time with their children lead to their decision to try home work. This is particularly true for women who would normally have to commute to and from work (Johnson, 1994).

Such mothers view home work as a way to alleviate some child care responsibilities, including caring for an ill child, parental work at a child's school and other activities (Christensen, 1988; Public Service Alliance of Canada, 1993). In

summary, some women home workers and FDC providers enter home work in an effort to reduce work-family stress associated with child care arrangements.

Motives Related to Economic Instability

Some women choose home work as an attempt to reduce or prevent family economic instability and poverty (Christensen, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1982). It appears that the development of home work is, in part, a function of the poor economic situation faced by families and is a way women contribute to family incomes (Christensen, 1988; Nelson, 1988). Some women also choose FDC to eliminate the high costs and inaccessibility of child care (Nelson 1988, 1989, 1990).

In general, the income of Canadian women has become increasingly important in the prevention of family poverty. "On average, women's earnings accounted for 29.9% of family income in dual-earning families in 1991" (Statistics Canada as cited in Lero & Johnson, 1994, p. 13). Further, family income grew only 5 per cent from 1980-1991 (Statistics Canada, as cited in Lero and Johnson, 1994). This low growth means the contribution women make to the family income has become an economic necessity for many Canadian families.

Family day care providers, along with most other women, work from their homes due to financial necessity (Atkinson, 1988, 1991; Christensen, 1988; Dimidjian, 1982; Dunster, 1994; Johnson & Johnson, 1982; Nelson 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991). Not initially intending to work for pay, some women find this necessity directs them to home work. Although Christensen (1988) studied American home workers, their

experiences resemble those of Canadian women who experience similar, if not identical, economic difficulties. As described by Christensen (1988):

Susan had always assumed that her husband would support the family...Circumstances proved her wrong. When she was twenty-seven with a four-year-old and a one-year-old daughter, her husband was unexpectedly laid off...Susan needed a job quickly (p. 15).

In the study completed by Nelson (1988), 82 percent of the respondents stated that they entered family day care for financial reasons. "Family day care, like other forms of home-based work, appeals to women who want to find a way to earn money while staying at home" (p. 82). These women would appear to be using home work to meet both their family care and employment needs. Their major goal was to keep the family from poverty while remaining the primary child care provider.

Other Reasons for Starting Home Work

Family day care providers have other reasons to start working from their home. In particular, FDC providers see the "home environment" as a good service to offer children. These women see their role as a "substitute" mother as an important service:

74% of the family day care providers saw one of their primary responsibilities as keeping a home-like atmosphere and felt that they offered the role of second mother (Bailey & Osborne, 1994, p. 331).

It is clear from the research cited above that a *major* reason for women to choose home work is to meet paid work and family responsibilities. Home work and FDC can be seen as attempts to reduce work-family stress, allowing women to deal

with job and family-related factors which have, in the past, increased their overall level of stress.

Benefits and Limitations of Family Day Care and Home Work

There are many benefits and limitations to FDC and other home-based work arrangements. While recognizing some benefits, Christensen's (1988) research findings also summarize limitations:

The intent in this book was to go beyond the rhetoric and hype about home-based work and find out what it really is like. What we've seen is that it is merely a job or career option which, like any other, has both advantages and disadvantages, and generates possibilities yet has limitations. The main advantages are flexibility, particularly in balancing work, family and autonomy - the ability to work in your own way at your own pace. Yet "flexibility" and "autonomy" are to a certain extent euphemisms. Flexibility can be as much a curse as a blessing, and autonomy can result in isolation (p. 161).

Christensen's research indicates efforts by women home workers to reduce work/family stress are limited by the preconceived notion that women home workers can do it all (i.e. take care of the children and household maintenance while doing paid labour).

This respondent in Christensen's research explains:

I am home twenty-four hours a day and things kind of slip back to the age when the mother was always at home with the children. Slowly it turns back to that. I think even women begin to think that. 'It is more of a woman's job to take care of the house and family.' We just slip back into it (p. 26).

Atkinson (1988), Dunster (1994), Leavitt (1991), and Nelson (1988) also find the notion that women must be primary child care providers and do other domestic chores influenced their experiences. Women encountered both benefits and limitations and had some assistance completing their paid work and family responsibilities.

An increase in domestic chores and an unwillingness by family members to assist women have been found to lengthen FDC providers' work day (Atkinson, 1988; Dunster, 1994; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1988). Nelson (1988) finds family members are unwilling to reduce their expectations of their mothers and wives when it comes to completing housework, even though women are working long hours daily for pay. Further, the nature of FDC work means an increase in both tasks and expected standards. "When domestic chores are added to a nine- or 10-hour day, the burden on a woman is intense. Her time is entirely structured by the constant demands of paid and unpaid work" (Nelson, 1988, p. 88). Consequently, work-family stress increases.

As when working outside their home, long and tiring work days increase the work-family stress of home workers. Two studies suggest that many women experience the "double day" of working day and night in order to fulfil their paid work and family responsibilities (Lero, Brockman, Pence, Goelman & Johnson, 1993; Lero & Johnson, 1994). As with women who work in agency settings, a home worker's long work day is a function of working after regular work hours (Swiss & Walker, 1993). Some home workers work in the evening to allow completion of family responsibilities during the day (Christensen, 1988; Johnson, 1994). A self-employed home worker stated:

How do you separate your personal life from your professional life? There's a great overlapping. It happens at night, when I find myself under a lot of pressure, using my "free time" because I have done so much running around with the kids during the day (Christensen, 1988, p. 77).

Another problem identified for home workers is fatigue. Enmeshment between work and family roles leads to a long work day which, in turn, means an increase in

job-related and work-family stress. Cited as an employer benefit, home workers increase their productivity by working at their peak times, including evening work (Johnson, 1994; Olmsted & Smith, 1989). This hard work is, in part, a response to what home workers perceive as implicit management expectations that work should be completed at night (Lipovenko, 1994; Johnson, 1994). Sanders & Bullen (1992), while advocating the use of home-based work as a way for women to maintain career and family roles, recommend that women should do their work after their children have gone to bed. Indeed, Johnson (1994) finds that many home workers "...interviewed said they regularly worked unpaid overtime to meet deadlines and finish work that could not be completed during the day" (p. 5). These home workers share the "double day" shift with employed women who work in an agency environment.

Some home workers view professional flexibility as a strength of home-based work arrangements (Christensen, 1988; Costello, 1988). FDC providers identify flexibility in designing their own programs and being their own boss as benefits of home work (Atkinson, 1988; Dunster, 1994; Nelson, 1988). For some women, the flexibility and autonomy of their work arrangement leads to personal satisfaction (Barnett, 1993). "Forty-one percent said they [family day care providers] liked their jobs because they can be their own bosses" (Nelson, 1988, p. 89).

There are contradictory results regarding the effectiveness of home work in helping family economic stability. Arguably, if the paid labour of women is insufficient to provide for their children and family, work-family stress is inevitable.

In particular, economic instability is a significant issue for self-employed workers regardless of their work location. If total household income within our economy is pooled and allocated equitably, some women home workers would likely experience economic success. However, when taken separately, the income of women home workers, particularly self-employed women, will not completely liberate women or their families. The most economically exploited home work arrangement is found within the garment industry.

Garment home workers are economically exploited more severely than their co-workers employed in clothing factories (Johnson & Johnson, 1982). Johnson and Johnson (1982) describe a work environment that includes low pay at piece rates with no benefits such as pension plans and sick leaves. As a home worker from their 1982 study states, "[s]ometimes, when I am working by myself, I think about the fact that I am getting older and older, and when I get old, I will have no pension. It is unfair not to give us the same benefits as the women in the factory" (p. 62). Johnson and Johnson argue the women's immigrant status is a major factor in their inability to secure proper wages and benefits. Consequently, women experience many economic difficulties.

The economic difficulties of FDC providers contribute to work-family stress because women are restricted from adequately providing for themselves and their children and family. Nelson (1988) suggests that any success of home-based work arrangements comes with an enormous social and economic cost to women:

I argue that the dynamics that make it successful rest on the low status of women in wage labour and the unpaid labour of women in the home. These

same dynamics contribute to the exploitation of women in much home-based work. Women choose the occupation because they have few alternatives, in so doing, they would seem to substitute one set of limiting conditions for another. Home-based work can only appear to be a solution to the problems of wage labour for women with small children if we ignore these dynamics and the personal costs that such a choice entails (Nelson, 1988, p. 91).

Being dependent on employment income creates many economic limitations for FDC providers (Nelson, 1988):

The wages women earn in the labour force influence a family day care provider's income. Women's low wages in the labour force have traditionally been justified by the assumption that women are secondary workers making unessential contributions to family income. The assumption affects day care providers who set their rates relative to what the women who are their clients earn... The rate that can be charged for any child's care is thus closely linked to the public wage structure for women (p. 83).

As with workers in non-home based work, FDC providers experience income fluctuations (Nelson, 1988). Dunster (1994) identifies several sources of the fluctuating income, including day care children's illness, parents' vacations, grandparents visiting and spending time with day care children, parents taking their children to doctor's or dentist's appointments, and parents being transferred or laid-off. As well,

as a self-employed business person, you [FDC providers] are not entitled to coverage under the Unemployment Insurance Plan, so are without coverage for maternity benefits or in the event of other income loss (Dunster, 1994, p. 14).

Government regulations restricting the number of children, health and safety regulations and the care provided can impede the income of providers (Barnett, 1993; Kyle, 1993; Nelson, 1988). Dunster (1994) identifies that the wear and tear on FDC providers' homes results in financial set backs.

The nature of child care work causes confusion about the "fair price" of services (Nelson, 1988). The needs of children vary from one child to another, making this determination awkward. Special needs of children make caring work more intense. However, these differences are seldom recognized by parents requiring the child care service.

Transforming child care into a commodity which fits the provider/parent business relationship creates economic limitations for providers (Nelson, 1988). According to Nelson, the ideology of caring among providers makes it difficult for them to determine a "fair price" for child care services.

When asked to isolate the most important reason for opening a family day care home, 62 percent of the questionnaire respondents said they wanted to stay home with their own children; 35 percent gave as the second most important reason that they enjoyed working with children. Because this personal interest in providing care comes first, the women struggle to contain the contradiction of doing the job for love and doing the job for pay. They also do not want others to see them as motivated by financial concerns; they want to project an image of good care rather than good business (p. 86).

Adding to the difficulty of assigning a "fair price" for child care services is the low social status accorded home-based child care, another limitation of FDC work.

Thirty-seven percent of the respondents in the Montana study desired more information on this topic (i.e., self-esteem). Because family day care services are provided in the home and not at a separate place of business, they are often not viewed by society as having high status; this can have an effect on self-esteem, especially when one considers the hard work of family providers (Bailey & Osborne, 1994, p. 334).

Some FDC providers report being poorly paid. Others say they are not paid at all (Nelson, 1989). Family day care providers:

complained about parents who forgot to pay on time, who haggled over every nickel and dime, who made a fuss about a slight increase in rates, and who

assumed that "overtime" was free...(Nelson, 1989, p. 13).

Yet, for other home workers, the economic prospects have proven to be successful. Further, for some women, being able to earn an income while being home with their children reduces work-family stress. Sanders and Bullen (1993) relate the story of Rita Anderson, a mother with a background in remedial education, who began a successful developmental play program from her home as a way to stay with her children and provide them with playmates (while continuing the paid work she loved).

Rita states,

I started with one class for young children, then added more as my son grew older. I started the infant class when I had another baby. My kids were in class with me when they were little. I wanted a business where I could be with them. My classes soon outgrew the city's playground - it couldn't accommodate the number of people who wanted to attend - so I decided it was time to go out on my own. This happened less than three years after I started the program (p. 202).

Other economic benefits are related to the net income of FDC providers:

A comparison of net income is much more favourable to family home day care. Net earnings from formal employment are substantially reduced by income tax, social security tax, unemployment insurance, the cost of travel to and from work, work clothes, meals away from home, child care in many cases, and other work-related expenses. Many family home day care providers do not pay taxes on their income and avoid many of the other costs of jobs outside the home (Barnett, 1993, p. 86).

Jobs available to women in the external labour market have not proven to be economically beneficial, thereby making FDC an attractive option to some women.

"Although some formal jobs pay fringe benefits, many lower-paying and part-time jobs do not offer substantial fringes" (Barnett, 1993, p. 86).

Economic benefits of FDC are related to the traditionally unpaid work women do in their homes and other rewards. Barnett (1993) states,

... it is important to recognize that family home day care is an activity that can be jointly conducted with other household production, including the care of one's own children, and leisure activities. Thus, it is by no means the case of one's earning should be interpreted as the full return to each hour of the provider's time... (p. 79).

Consequently, FDC allows providers to economically support and be available to their children. In this way, FDC reduces work-family interference.

Dependence on the schedules of day care parents places restrictions on when child care services are offered and in turn reduces the autonomy of FDC providers. As a result, work-family stress is increased. The wage economy prevents services from being placed into a simple 9 - 5 routine (Bailey & Osborne, 1994; Nelson, 1988 & 1990). Two studies suggest that while FDC providers must be prepared to offer steady but flexible services, they cannot be assured of receiving similar guidelines from parents (Barnett, 1993; Nelson, 1988). According to Nelson, providers are unable to meet the requirements of parents for overnight care and weekend care, and they often experience parents being late in picking up their child(ren). Also,

[f]amily day care is important not only because of the percentages of children five and younger who use such care, but also because of the relatively long periods of time such care is used (Pence, Goelman, Lero & Brockman, p. 36).

Consequently, the hours of service of FDC providers are dependent on the needs of day care parents and organized in accordance with the wage economy. This results in such job-related stress factors as reduced autonomy, burdensome work schedules and long work hours.

Further reducing the control providers have over work schedules, hours and tasks is their personal relationship with parents (Dunster, 1994; McConnell, 1994; Nelson, 1988). Pollard & Lockwood Fischer (1993) cite research identifying some provider/parent relationships as hostile and conflicting, while describing others as helpful and supportive. For Nelson (as cited in Pollard & Lockwood Fischer, 1993), this results in disempowerment for both providers and parents. Nelson (1989) also explains the impact personal relationships have on providers:

personal relationships can also intensify the difficulty of negotiations and further reduce the provider's control over her work. Friendships complicate the work by making it more difficult to respect rate changes or to put into effect regulations concerning hours.... Such close relationships can lead to making special allowances. Such allowances may be seen as a kind of self-exploitation (Nelson p. 84).

Avoiding some job and family-related contributions to work-family stress have also been identified as a benefit of home work (Johnson, 1994; Joice, 1991; Joint working group on workers with family responsibilities, 1993, June). With increased flexibility, some home workers reported saving time picking up and dropping off children at day care. Other advantages include less time commuting and escaping the distractions of the work environment. Similarly, others state that job-related autonomy in daily operations is a benefit of FDC (Atkinson, 1988). For these women, FDC and home work reduce the potential of work-family stress.

Experiences of isolation appear to contribute to work-family stress by increasing the impact of job-related stress factors, such as unsupportive colleagues (i.e., FDC providers and government supervisors) and a negative social climate. Research on home workers identifies the isolation of some women as a drawback of

home-based work arrangements (Christensen, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1982; Johnson, 1994; Joice, 1991). Isolation is unique to this working situation, as women who work in other work settings often have regular contact with co-workers (Christensen, 1988). Women home workers, in general, detail their experiences with social isolation and loss of contact with colleagues. Family day care providers, in particular, describe home work as an isolating work environment (Dimijian, 1982; Dunster, 1994; Nelson, 1988; Wattenberg, 1977). Nelson (1988) states:

they [women] are bound to the house all day, family day care providers, like many mothers at home with children, experience intense isolation and loneliness. Days go by during which there are not opportunities for adult conversation.... The work may be personally fulfilling and important, but it has a low social status. And although family day care providers acquire significant skills, they worry that these skills have no market value (p. 89).

For some home workers who spend the vast majority of their time in the home, the potential to experience isolation is high. Christensen (1988) summarizes the factors underlying such isolation:

The constant pressure of work is exacerbated by the sheer solitariness of the situation. These are women who are working alone at home, often cut off from any social network, who feel that they...often are not taken seriously, and sometimes feel trapped by the combination of work and family in one place (p. 4).

The isolation of home-based work is not merely emotional or social - not being part of a typical office culture deprives a woman of the practical and professional benefits of having colleagues. She will not get the kind of information one gathers informally in the lunchroom, the mailroom, or the bathroom, information about changes and developments in her line of work, ideas that could lead to new possibilities (p. 164).

Isolation is not universally experienced by home workers or FDC providers. In reducing experiences of isolation, Atkinson (1988) reports "[m]ost providers in this

study indicated they could make arrangements allowing travel outside their home while providing child care" (p. 401).

As Nelson (1988) explains, the nature of child care work further limits family day care providers.

All caregivers by definition must be attentive to the needs of others. The work is unpredictable and highly contingent, demanding flexibility rather than adherence to set schedules. While the provider may not always be fully engrossed in the activities of the children, she does need to be attentive at all times (p. 85).

On a daily basis, providers are responsible for all aspects of children's lives when they are in their care (Atkinson, 1988; Dunster, 1994; Nelson, 1988). The physically and mentally demanding and absorbing nature of FDC work produces job-related stress.

Despite these drawbacks, many other FDC providers find the daily challenges of caring for children rewarding and satisfying. Atkinson (1988) asserts "most statements of satisfactions centred on providers' enjoyment of watching children develop..." (p. 401). McConnell's (1994) study finds FDC providers in Manitoba report "high levels of job satisfaction" (p. 124). A clear link exists between job satisfaction and control of job-related stress.

In summary, research on home workers identifies both limitations and benefits of home work as a strategy for balancing work and family responsibilities. Both job and family related factors contribute to, as well as alleviate, work-family stress. Job-related factors, such as a highly demanding work schedule, nature of work, isolation, long work days, physically, mentally and absorbing work and economic hardships, all contribute to work-family stress. Yet for other women, FDC produces benefits such as

work-related and personal autonomy and economic success, and thereby helps reduce work-family stress.

Strategies used by Women Home Workers

Strategies used by women to complete home work in a way that decreases work-family stress are documented in at least two different areas: a) strategies that result in women experiencing the benefits of home work; and b) strategies women use to deal with drawbacks of home work.

The support women receive from their partners impacts on their experiences with work-family stress within home-based work arrangements. In obtaining support and assistance, women home workers negotiate with clients and employers. In so doing, family and job-related factors that contribute to role overload, work-family interference, and therefore work-family stress are dealt with by home workers.

According to Christensen (1988), the women she studied successfully negotiated conditions with clients, employers and family members to allow home-based work arrangements to succeed:

These women see themselves as independent; they do not feel tied to the notions of how they are brought up and what other people expect them to be....They all hold notions as to what they will and will not accept at work and at home, and are at peace with the decision to work at home. When the situation ceases to please them, they negotiate alternatives....They figure out what they want and explicitly negotiate the conditions under which home work will give it to them. If married, they establish the rules of the game with their husband...[they]set boundaries with their husbands, their children, and their clients boundaries that are explicit and enforceable (pp. 130-131).

The negotiation between family members is particularly useful in the context of women in business with their husbands. By trading off their business and family roles, they are able to deal with work-family interference. "If one needs to work, the other will take care of their children. If the children are sick, they can both work late at night" (Christensen, 1988, p. 89). Atkinson (1988) finds that many FDC providers negotiate with their husbands to provide alternate care to the day care children, thereby freeing up some time and helping them deal with work-family stress.

McConnell (1994) finds that FDC providers who receive support from family members also experience high levels of job satisfaction. Such satisfaction does, at least in part, reduce the impact of job-related factors on overall work-family stress.

Some FDC providers experience role overload when they are unavailable to their own children. This stress factor is dealt with by some providers through a process of rationalization. Nelson (1988) finds that:

[s]ome women rationalized these sacrifices (not being available to their children) by stressing how their children benefited by their work, either directly--they learned to share, they became more responsible, they did have a mother 'at home'--or indirectly by having material luxuries they would not otherwise have had (p. 87).

Other research on attitudes of employed mothers indicates that women deal with their own guilt about not being available to their own children by rationalizing their choice of work (Henderson, Lee & Birdsall, 1993). This research leads to speculations that:

[w]omen who find themselves in a must-work situation may forfeit traditional ideals to justify their position, while women who are not employed may adopt stereotypical attitudes to justify remaining home and out of the work force. A second reason for the discrepancy between employed and nonemployed

women's attitudes could be that women who have supported the concept of maternal employment may simply be acting upon their theoretical beliefs. The same may be true of women who do not support maternal employment and therefore choose to remain unemployed following childbirth (Henderson, Lee & Birdsall, 1993, p. 36 - 37).

Providers also use rationalization in dealing with their economic limitations, for example, placing a high "value" on their unpaid caring work.

... [I]n choosing between market work and household work, mothers weigh after-tax income (net of child care and other costs) and other benefits of employment against the value of their household production, including maternal child care (Barnett, 1993, p. 79).

Dunster (1994) suggests that those interested in doing FDC should realize "the recognition and status of home child care is largely determined by our [i.e., family day care providers] own attitudes and behaviour" (p. 74). By emphasizing the high personal value of child care, FDC providers rationalize their lower economic status through decreased work-family stress.

Some women home workers develop a range of strategies to deal with job-related stress such as isolation. Self-employed women social workers, some of whom worked from their home, are more likely than men to belong to their professional association and contact other social workers for professional consultation, in part, reducing isolation (Levin & Leginsky, 1989). The husbands of FDC providers sometimes provide alternate care for day care children, thereby allowing providers to leave "home base" (Atkinson, 1988). These practices provide some relief from job-related stress.

Studies illustrate how women deal with other job-related stress factors in FDC, such as long work days or late pick-ups by parents. In considering the problem

resulting from personal relationships with parents, Nelson (1988) states "some providers,... try to keep a distance from their clients. Some absolutely refuse to care for the children of relatives" (p. 85). Through examining the historical perspectives of family day care, Auerbach and Woodill (1993) agree that providers want to keep their "social distance" with parents in order to retain a business-like relationship with them.

Some providers are said to exercise control over their operation by selecting children in their care and by influencing other aspects of their working environment (Nelson, 1988). This job-related autonomy enhances the ability of providers to deal with work-family stress flowing from their physically and mentally challenging work.

In areas of high demand, among providers with established reputations and extensive training, and for those who are less dependent on their child care incomes, working conditions can be more readily controlled through a careful selection of clients. Some refuse to take babies or take only children of a certain age; some limit their clientele to those who will use their services on a full-time basis; some charge for sick days and request a certain number of paid holidays; some weed out 'unattractive' parents and children (Nelson, 1988, p. 86).

Ninety-seven percent of the family day care providers in Atkinson's (1988) study:

... interviewed new families to discuss policies and to assess how they would fit their current FDC [family day care] group. Trial enrollment periods were also used to screen new families. The child's age, gender and temperament appeared to be variables used by providers in selection. Parental philosophy and values were also considered important... [providers] asked parents to complete general information forms (p. 402).

There is considerable debate over the relationship between professionalism and licensing of FDC providers (Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1990). Professionalism is defined as the attainment of some advanced learning or as a process which guides or self-monitors its members through a set of particular beliefs relevant

to that profession (Oxford Dictionary, 1984). To attain professional membership in Manitoba, FDC providers join the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba (FDCA) or Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA). Both associations provide a code of ethics and support advanced learning in child care. For example, the FDCA "received funding from Health & Welfare Canada and the Province of Manitoba, Department of Education and Training, to develop and deliver Family Day Care training to three classes over three years" (Background Information - FDCA, Family Day Care Association, n.d.).

Licensing subjects FDC providers to government regulations which are monitored by the provincially operated Child Day Care office and in accordance with The Community Child Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983). Current first aid and CPR training is the only training required for licensing (Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care, Manitoba Community Services, Child Day Care, 1986). The licensing manual also indicates that licensed providers require a minimum of \$2,000,000 general liability insurance coverage. Since liability insurance is economically attainable at a group rate through the FDCA and MCCA, most FDC providers attain a professional membership and license simultaneously. In doing so, licensing and professionalism overlap but do not necessarily co-exist. For example, not all licensed providers have a professional degree and some unlicensed FDC providers have professional degrees but are not held accountable to government regulations.

According to Auerbach & Woodill (1993), many providers resist using licensing as a way of dealing with limitations because of the potential for increased

work-family stress.

Professional status [i.e., licensing] might enhance the pay and well-being of providers, but it would impose new requirements on them as well. Whether these would take the form of child development credentials or retrofitting their home to meet licensing regulations, such requirements are unwanted impositions to many family day care providers who are content with their informal operations (p. 24).

These FDC providers consider state involvement through registration as an invasion into their privacy and emphasize the significance of a private agreement between providers and parents (Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1991). Consequently, state intervention increases work-family stress when government policies impact upon family relations and life. Licensing is viewed by some providers as further restricting their job-related autonomy (Nelson, 1990). Arguably, for these women, licensing increases both job and family related stress.

Some argue that FDC providers benefit from licensing and membership in professional associations (Andre & Neave, 1992; Kyle, 1993). Professionalism is tied to quality child care services as "the career-minded, professional, trained, and regulated provider role is associated with higher-quality care for children" (Pollard & Lockwood Fischer, 1993, p. 101). From this point of view, professionalising child care serves to increase its social and economic status. This, in turn, could potentially reduce work-family stress associated with financial instability within the family unit.

Cohen (1992) argues that licensing and professional association membership help FDC providers deal with the economic limitations of working from their home in child care. While this was an American study, the similarity of tax law in Canada renders this proposition equally relevant to Canadian FDC providers. That is,

[f]or many providers, the financial benefits of becoming regulated (i.e., licensed) outweigh the costs (with the notable exception of providers who risk losing public assistance). Many providers owe little if any tax because business income is low and they can take substantial deductions (p. 350).

Other benefits Cohen (1992) cites are found in the infrastructures available to FDC providers. Cohen defines infrastructures as services and organizations available to providers. Both the government and professional organizations qualify as infrastructure. The benefits of involvement with such infrastructure are professional contacts and improvement of services which can help reduce job-related stress. One example which can help reduce job stress is government assistance to providers in caring for poor children and children with special needs such as abused children (Leavitt, 1991; Lamer & Mitchell, 1992; Nelson, 1988; Handbook for Special Needs Family Child Care Providers, The Family Centre of Winnipeg, n.d.).

According to Cohen, providers also receive assistance through licensing procedures, service regulations, training, liability insurance and referral services. Other advantages of licensing identified by Leavitt (1991) include higher incomes than unlicensed providers, tax deductions, and positive and supportive relationships with licensers. Kyle (1993) describes similar benefits, including training and workshops, drop-in programs, relief services for care provisions, group support for supplies, equipment and insurance coverage, and assistance related to operating a small business and advocacy. These services help women cope with stress resulting from a lack of supervisor and co-worker support, the physically and mentally challenging aspects of the work, and economic limitations.

Membership in a professional association gives FDC providers the resources needed to deal with professional isolation (Leavitt, 1991; McConnell, 1994; Nelson, 1991). Professional associations have been found to provide emotional support and practical guidance to their members. Through understanding and supportive relationships, associations contribute to increasing the self-esteem of providers regarding their job and enhance a sense of professionalism among providers (Leavitt, 1991, p. 251). Training services are especially beneficial because they increase professional support and political contacts (Cohen, 1992):

When groups of providers take training courses, they often seem to form bonds with one another that result in informal telephone relationships or more formal provider associations. Intensive services also help some providers become leaders in the field.... They also report making contact with providers whom they can call when they have problems or questions.... Providers seem to be particularly effective at working with their colleagues because they know the joys and stresses of family child care (pp. 353&355).

McConnell (1994), in her study of FDC providers in Manitoba, finds services offered by the Family Day Care Association (such as networking groups and liability insurance) increase job satisfaction. Further, she finds liability insurance is helpful to providers in "protect[ing] herself and her family from possible financial hardship in the event of an injury to a child in your [their] care" (Dunster, 1994, p. 61).

Much of the research cited above involves white and middle class women. Those researching the area of home work also need to recognize the many factors affecting the social and financial negotiating power of these women. These factors include skill levels and ethnic and economic status. Johnson & Johnson's (1982)

research finds immigrant women, who make up the majority of garment home workers, are an economically exploited group of home workers.

Nelson (1990) states that some FDC providers feel working in child care from their homes results in underdevelopment of their employable skills. Some feel this would make their re-entry into the work force difficult. Arguably, this factor reduces women's negotiation powers to deal with the limitations of home work.

Administration of Family Day Care Providers in Manitoba

Licensed FDC homes in Manitoba are regulated according to The Community Child Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983). Provincial coordinators are employees of the Manitoba Family Services who license and monitor FDC providers. Employees of the Family Centre of Winnipeg supervise Special Need Family Child Care homes which are operated by FDC providers.

Child Day Care Office, Government of Manitoba Family Services

The Child Day Care office, within Manitoba Family Services, administers The Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983). Regulations to this Act govern licensing, space, daily programming, behaviour management, furnishings and equipment, health, community standards, nutrition, and emergency procedures (Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care, Manitoba Community Services, 1986). The Community Child Day Care Standards Act also specifies the number of children permitted to attend licensed FDC homes.

The Child Day Care office provides financial assistance to eligible FDC homes through operating grants (Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care, Manitoba Community Services, 1986). A subsidy program is available to parents who require financial assistance. Subsidies are only available to parents who enroll their children in licensed FDC homes (Child Day Care Subsidy Program: Helping with Payment of Child Care Fees, Manitoba Family Services, 1995). The Manitoba Family Services, Child Day Care office also subsidizes FDC for children and their families through the Special Needs Family Child Care program. Eligibility requirements for the use of these homes include:

children from 3 months of age must show medical, developmental, emotional or behavioral concerns, children at risk due to family problems, families in crises, families requiring support and/or parental guidance in addition to child care (Handbook for Special Needs Family Child Care Providers, Family Centre of Winnipeg, p. 2, n.d.).

Referral services are also provided for parents and providers (Day Care Facts, Manitoba Family Services, n.d.). The operations of a telephone "intake" line and advertisement in the Winnipeg Free Press every Saturday are also available to parents and others requiring FDC services (Day Care Facts, Manitoba Family Services, n.d.).

Support services are made available to FDC providers (Day Care Facts, Manitoba Family Services, n.d.). Educational and information services are provided to persons interested in becoming a FDC provider or who are already operating a FDC home. Finally, the Child Day Care office supports FDC providers by designating a coordinator and subsidy clerk to work with individual FDC providers.

Provincial Coordinators

Provincial coordinators play numerous roles. As the contact person in the Child Day Care office the coordinator plays a critical role in the daily lives of FDC providers. The coordinator "licences, monitors standards and provides information and resources to day care providers within a specific geographic area" (Day Care Facts, Manitoba Family Services, n.d.).

For the purpose of relicensing, coordinators complete annual "visits" or "inspections" of FDC homes (Day Care Facts, Manitoba Family Services, n.d.). This role results in coordinators' having a critical role in the supervision of FDC providers. Supportive, educational and administrative supervision is provided through "comment sheets" used during the "visits" as well as personal and telephone consultations. These were available in areas outlined within the regulations of The Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983).

Special Needs Family Child Care homes are also subject to licensing and regulations as outlined in The Community Day Care Standards Act. The Family Centre of Winnipeg supervises these homes and FDC providers. Consequently, supervisor support provided by a Family Service Supervisor can potentially reduce FDC providers' job-related and work-family stress (Handbook for Special Needs Family Child Care Providers, Family Centre of Winnipeg, n.d.).

The Centre is responsible for intake and matching special needs families with FDC providers. Policies related to confidentiality, child abuse and neglect, and accidents are available to FDC providers. These policies also deal with other

administrative areas, including closing the day care due to an illness of the provider or family member, vacation, or the termination of an agreement between the provider and the Family Centre of Winnipeg. Finally, educational opportunities are also provided through the Centre.

External Support Systems

Family Day Care Association (FDCA)¹

The FDCA is a non-profit, non-government volunteer organization incorporated in 1983. The association represents 450 FDC providers throughout the province (Background Information - FDCA, Family Day Care Association, nd.). A full membership costs \$100.00 annually. A Code of Ethics guides FDC providers' provision of services. The goals of this professional association include:

To promote high quality Family Day Care through the development of and support, information, services and training for Providers and parents.

To make known the needs and concerns of Providers, parents and children to all levels of government.

To eliminate the isolation of Providers by inviting participation in an organization offering mutual support.

To give support and direction to Family Day Care Networking Groups throughout Manitoba.

To ensure Family Day Care is accepted as a valued child care alternative through out Canada (Background Information, Family Day Care Association of Manitoba, n.d.).

¹A working team comprised of board members from the Family Day Care Association and Manitoba Child Care Association have recently completed amalgamation of these two organizations.

Based on these goals, the FDCA offers numerous services to members which could potentially decrease work-family stress. Educational opportunities include the Family Day Care Provider Training manuals, a library, low cost workshops and conferences (e.g., Integrating Your Family into the Family Day Care Home) and newsletter called "Connections". Members can make professional contact through networking groups arranged geographically throughout the province. Members are also encouraged to take part in the association through the board of directors and various committees. Assistance is also provided through a provider/parent referral service. Finally, group rates for life insurance, group term life and home insurance are available to full members.

Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA)

The mission of MCCA "is to advocate for a quality system of child care, to provide services for our membership and to advance child care as a profession" (Family Daycare Provider, Membership Benefits Checklist, Manitoba Child Care Association, February, 1995). MCCA represents over 2,000 members including FDC providers, child care day care workers, boards of directors of child care centres and nursery schools and other interested community groups. Memberships for FDC providers cost \$100.00 annually. The majority of MCCA members are child care workers working in day care centres.

MCCA attempts to provide professional development and recognition through a Code of Ethics, scholarships, professional awards and by advocating for child care

workers in the community and to all levels of government (Family Daycare Provider, Membership Benefits Checklist, Manitoba Child Care Association, February, 1995). Also offered are group and liability insurance plans. Members receive assistance with direct service provisions through information sheets on such difficult service issues, such as resolving conflict with parents. Other resources include a quarterly newsjournal called Child Care Focus, a resource centre, consultation services on parent/provider relations and reduced rates for consulting and training services. Financial assistance is made available to facilitate networking with other FDC providers and child care workers at regional, provincial and national conferences and MCCA workshops and a travel subsidy for provincial conferences.

Revenue Canada

In order for FDC providers to claim day care operation expenses, they must be "self-employed". The Government of Canada's finance department, called Revenue Canada, states that FDC providers who control their hours of work, the use of their residence and materials, and their day care duties are considered to be "self-employed" (Using Your Home for Day Care, Revenue Canada, 1993, p. 5). As self-employed persons, FDC providers can claim numerous expenses including: accounting and legal fees, advertising expenses (e.g., business cards), bank charges, capital cost allowance (i.e., depreciation), field trips, food, household space used for day care operations, postage and stationery, repairs, salaries to employees, supplies, telephone costs, training and vehicle expenses (Using Your Home for Day Care, Revenue Canada,

1993). Revenue Canada stipulates guidelines for claiming these expenses. As "self-employed" persons, FDC providers are responsible for contributing to the Canada Pension Plan and for paying income tax (Using Your Home for Day Care, Revenue Canada, 1993).

Employment and Immigration Canada

Women interested in family day care can access resources to start a day care as self-employed business persons. The Federal Employment office operates a program which provides unemployment benefits to women while they are starting a FDC.

Self-employment assistance will help unemployed people start a business and thereby create work. Claimants eligible for this assistance will be referred to a variety of service providers to obtain the business skills needed to start viable enterprise. Participants will continue to receive income benefits while they establish their business (A 21st Century Employment System for Canada, Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1995, p. 22)

Conclusion

As an aid to interpreting the data collected during this study, secondary research is considered. This literature review analyzed and considered feminist political economy, the "ethic of care" framework, work/family stress, home based work arrangements, employed mothers, and FDC providers. It focused on motives, benefits, limitations and strategies used by FDC providers and other home workers. Accompanying this information is data on the administration of FDC providers and support systems available to study participants. While the nature of grounded theory methodology and feminist research perspectives do not verify or disprove present

theory, a broad consideration of secondary research is necessary to identify the researcher's biases in the interpretation of data. Since grounded theory permits the use of extant theory, if it fits the research data, knowledge of previous research is required.

Chapter 3 Methodology

This chapter includes an indepth description of the research design. Details are provided on grounded theory methodology and feminist research perspectives. The rationale for combining this qualitative method with a feminist perspective is presented. A description of the sampling, participant recruitment procedures, and steps taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity are included. Also described are the methods and process of data collection and analysis. Finally, the chapter describes the strengths and weaknesses of the research design.

The research design and purpose were largely influenced by the choice of grounded theory methodology. By applying this qualitative method, participants could disclose their experiences. Since feminist perspectives on research can be combined with grounded theory methodology, they were chosen to enhance this study.

Feminist Perspectives on Research

Feminist perspectives are concerned with countering the absence of women's experiences within traditional social science research (Currie, 1988; Epstein, Jayaratne & Stewart, 1991; Heinonen, 1995; Olsen, 1994; Smith, 1987). Research on women's paid and unpaid work show the minimization and marginalization of private unpaid work such as family responsibilities (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1990; Luxton, 1983; Maroney & Luxton, 1987; Rosenberg, 1987). As a method of caring, family day care

has also been minimized and marginalized within society (Baines, Evans, & Neysmith, 1991; Nelson, 1988, 1990). Peters and Pence (1993) attribute a lack of research on family day care to the following:

family day care is often considered to be outside the "formal" system of early childhood education and child care. As an unregulated or marginally regulated service, typically delivered by a private entrepreneurial component of the child care economy and generally staffed by untrained caregivers, family day care is seen by many as not much different from out-of-home care by close relatives or friends (p. 2).

Also, traditionally not viewed to be in the realm of administrative practice, the private family responsibilities of women in the paid labour force have been largely avoided (Gummer, 1985; Martin & Chernesky, 1989; Swiss & Walker, 1993). Finally, there are limited references to women home workers' experiences in the management literature advocating such work arrangements (Bova, 1991; Gray, Hodson & Gordon 1993; Joice, 1993; Romzek, 1991). A goal of this study was to add these women's experiences as child care providers to the human service and administration research.

Smith (1987) describes some of the elements of feminist research perspectives:

we [feminist researchers] insist on preserving the subject as active and competent and as the knower of inquiry, the knower to whom our texts should speak. We insist on recognizing our active presence as doer as well as the scope of our direct knowledge and power to change...exploring the dynamic of relations in which our lives are caught up and which are continually at work in transforming the bases and contexts of our existence and our struggles (p. 142).

Smith (1987) also states "a household cannot be understood as if families formed autonomous systems" (p. 139). This research study incorporated Smith's perspectives and concern with the structural factors related to women's experiences as family and occupational caregivers.

Currie (1988), citing Dorothy Smith, states that using a feminist perspective means presenting questions normally neglected in traditional research. Using a feminist perspective does not always mean there is a generalization of participants' experiences. As Smith (1987) states, feminist informed methodology:

does not universalize a particular experience. It is rather a method that, at the outset of inquiry, creates the space for an absent subject, and an absent experience that is to be filled with the presence and spoken experience of actual women speaking of and in the actualities of their everyday worlds (p. 107).

In summary, the feminist perspective that the researcher incorporated in the study provided an avenue for women to detail their public and private lives. It was not intended to generalize women's experiences. It acknowledges research participants as knowers and actors and focuses on how women's worlds are structurally organized and determined by their social relations. Finally, it is concerned with the formulation of research themes based on women's experiences (Currie, 1988; Smith, 1987).

Grounded Theory Methodology

Grounded theory methodology was integrated with the above feminist perspective on research to form the research approach. Glaser (1978) describes grounded theory as:

... based on the systematic generating of theory from data, that itself is systematically obtained from social research... [it] is a perspective on both data and theory. It contends that there is much value in the conceptualizing and conceptual ordering of research data into a body of theory. This theoretical grasp of problems and processes within data is--in our perspective--a very useful way to understand what is going on in a substantive area and how to explain and interpret it (p. 2 - 3).

Grounded theory has unique characteristics that distinguish it from other methodologies. The most distinctive characteristics of this methodology are emphasis on theory development and the joining of theory development with the research process (Currie, 1988; Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). According to Glaser (1978), the development of theory is not separate from the research process:

[g]enerating theory and doing social research are two parts of the same process. How the analyst enters the field to collect the data, his method of collection and codification of the data, his integrating of the categories, generating memos, and constructing theory--the full continuum of both the processes of generating theory and of social research--are all guided and integrated by the emerging theory (p. 2).

This study begins the process of theory development with the identification of four research themes. The generative nature of grounded theory methodology puts emphasis on the researcher's conceptualization of the data (Currie, 1988; Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). This emphasis was fundamental to developing themes during data analysis. The conceptualization of data produced the researcher's understanding and explanation of the meanings located in the data.

The generative nature of grounded theory also led to other distinct characteristics. A study using grounded theory methodology does not begin with a hypothesis or seek to verify or disprove present theories (Berg, 1989; Currie, 1988; Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The researcher did not begin with a hypothesis or deductive theory. Rather the researcher's guide to the inquiry was her goal of explaining research themes based on Glaser's (1978) four criteria for data analysis.

These four criteria state that themes and categories must have fit, be relevant, work and be modifiable. To have fit means "that the categories [e.g., this study identifies them as themes and categories] of the theory must *fit* the data" (Glaser, 1978, p. 4). To meet these criteria, the themes and categories were not pre-selected from existing theory but were rigorously chosen from the research data. According to Glaser,

many existing categories also fit the data. We do not have to discover all new categories nor ignore all categories in the literature that might apply in order to generate a grounded theory. The task is, rather, to develop an emergent fit between the data and a pre-existent category that *might* [italics added] work (p. 4).

When identifying themes and categories, this researcher was influenced by the pre-existing theories previously outlined in the literature review. However, only when concepts from these theories emerged during data analysis were they incorporated in this study.

Themes and categories are relevant when they are about the data. A goal of grounded theory is to explain and understand the problem or process under study. "Grounded theory arrives at relevance, because it allows core problems and processes to emerge" (Glaser, 1978, p. 5). Through extensive data analysis it became clear to the researcher that participants' primary motive for entering FDC was a desire to care for their own and day care children. Consequently, the core theme "centrality of child care" emerged from the research data and explained the participants' behaviour.

The third criterion of a grounded theory methodology is that it must work. By this, Glaser (1978) means "a theory should be able to explain what happened, predict

what will happen and interpret what is happening in an area of substantive or formal inquiry" (p. 4). This study did identify themes and categories which are the first steps in developing a theory. Therefore, this information may serve to direct additional research required to complete theory production.

The final criterion for grounded theory is modifiability (Glaser, 1978).

Modifiability involves the ongoing development and change of theory as it was being generated. Glaser (1978) explains the need for modifiability:

[w]e soon learned that generation is an ever modifying process and nothing is sacred if the analyst is dedicated to giving priority attention to the data. Doctrinaire and excess loyalty to pet ideas defeat this priority (p. 5).

Therefore, as data in this study were analyzed, the initial themes and categories generated were continually modified to ensure the emerging themes and categories fit, worked, and were relevant to the data.

To meet the four criteria of grounded theory, the researcher employed the constant comparison method when coding. This constant comparison method greatly influences data analysis (Barker, 1989; Currie, 1988; Glaser, 1978; Kirby & McKenna, 1989; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1994). Strauss and Corbin (1990) describe how to employ this method: as an incident is noted, "it should be compared against other incidents for similarities and differences" (p. 9).

To identify the core theme, "hurricane thinking", a form of the constant comparison method was also employed. This involved:

moving data from category to category (constant comparative), looking for what is common (properties) and what is uncommon (satellites) within

categories and between categories. The data is arranged and rearranged until some measure of coherence becomes evident (Kirby and McKenna, 1989, p. 146).

Therefore, the constant comparative method simply involved identifying the similarities and differences within the data. These variances were identified by comparing categories (e.g., variables) in trying to decide if categories fit, worked with and were relevant to the data. Categories were then organized into themes using the same method.

Rationale for Grounded Theory Methodology and Feminist Perspectives on Research

Similar to work by Currie (1988), Epstein, Jayaratne and Stewart (1991), and Kirby and McKenna (1989) this study combined a feminist perspective with grounded theory methodology. Given the inductive nature of grounded theory, it could be argued that an ideological position has no place in grounded theory. However, this researcher based her argument for a joining of grounded theory and a feminist perspective on the prior use of this research approach. Kirby and McKenna (1989) in Experience, research, social change: Methods from the margins advocate the juxtaposition of grounded theory and a feminist perspective stating, "[t]he methodology of research from the margins is based on the commitment to advancing knowledge through research grounded in the experience of living on the margins" (p. 64). A feminist perspective acknowledges that women and their concerns are generally well-represented 'on the margins'.

While not supporting grounded theory directly, Epstein, Jayaratne and Stewart (1991) support combining feminist perspectives with qualitative methodological approaches. Their position is that qualitative approaches are consistent with the feminist belief that many women's experiences are left out of social science research because traditional quantitative methodologies fail to "permit women to express their experience fully and in their terms" (Epstein, Jayaratne & Stewart, 1991, p. 89).

In citing Glaser and Strauss, Currie (1988) supports the argument that "the task of the sociologist is more than fact-finding or description: it is the development of sociological explanations from data" (p. 235). Currie's support for the combination of a feminist perspective and a qualitative methodology is based on her argument that women's oppression cannot be deduced theoretically.

Grounded theory is a branch of qualitative methodology that seeks a sociological explanation of a phenomenon under study (Glaser, 1978; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This feature is evident in a study by Currie which uses a feminist perspective and tries to identify the oppressive nature of social institutions and structures. She argues that to avoid exploring the structural barriers that women experience would result in developing theories that would be oppressive to individual women. Further, Currie claims grounded theory methodology incorporates the feminist principles of viewing women's every day life as 'problematic' and starting with the experiences of women. Smith (1987) also argues that while social scientists must rely on women to detail their experiences, social scientists in turn must present an understanding of these experiences. Given this rationale, the researcher chose to

combine feminist perspectives on research with grounded theory methodology.

Sampling

The guidelines used for sampling were based on purposive sampling, the snowball technique and grounded theory methodology. Purposive sampling is a method of selecting "certain types of individuals or persons displaying certain attributes" (Berg, 1989, p. 110). In this study all requests for participation specified "women human service home workers with family responsibilities" as suitable candidates. Participants met the requirement of working at least 20 hours per week from their home. Letters (See Appendix B) sent to women human service home workers requesting their participation in this research study incorporated the snowball technique. The researcher asked potential participants to inform other women human service home workers about the study. Correspondence also contained instructions on how interested home workers could contact the researcher (i.e., address and telephone numbers) directly.

Grounded theory methodology utilizes the idea of saturation in deciding sample size (Glaser, 1978; Morse, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). In attempting to ensure validity and reliability, Morse (1994) argues that there be more concern with quality, as opposed to the quantity, of data collected. "Adequacy is attained when sufficient data have been collected that saturation occurs and variation is both accounted for and understood" (Morse, 1994, p. 230). Once all properties and connections of the data

are determined, saturation is completed (Glaser, 1978). Saturation of the data collected was reached in this study.

According to Glaser (1978), theoretical sampling:

is the process of data collection for generating theory [in this study research themes and categories] whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes and analyzes his data (Glaser, 1978, p. 36).

Therefore, theoretical sampling uses codes to compare the data from one interview to another interview. It directs data collection by deciding what group or area will next provide the needed information for the study.

This researcher incorporated theoretical sampling during interviews, coding and data analysis. For example, theoretical sampling was used when this researcher asked a specific follow-up question involving the extent to which the income tax system helped or hindered participants' financial status. After each interview, this sampling was also completed by making notes (i.e., initial coding and analysis). Finally, codes identified from the analysis of the first twelve interviews were used to direct the last six interviews.

Since this study primarily centred on identifying research themes and categories, further theoretical sampling is required for theory development. The themes and categories can be used to direct future research by helping researchers decide what and where to collect further data. Due to time and financial constraints, it was not feasible to attempt to make contact with more FDC providers or other groups. However, according to Glaser (1978), limiting data and saturation does not preclude the use of grounded theory:

[t]he more data, the more sure the analyst can become of saturation, relevance, workability and intergratability of his chosen core. Time and data can be expensive; in smaller studies [such as this study] an analyst often has to take his chances (p. 95).

Finally, after the first twelve interviews, it became evident to this researcher that a variety of home workers, other than FDC providers, would not be interviewed. To accommodate the overall change in the sample, the initial question on arranging child care for the participants' own children was changed to a question concerning alternate child care arrangements for both their children and day care children (See Appendix E and F). It was evident from previous participants' responses that arranging alternate child care for day care children was more dominant in their experiences than arranging care for their own children.

Participant Recruitment

An initial letter was sent to the Manitoba Child Care Association (MCCA) and the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba (FDCA) which contained an outline of the study, described criteria for participation, and requested permission for the researcher to send a letter through their association to potential participants. After receiving their permission, letters to potential participants were sent through the Associations with the following information: an outline of the study's purpose; criteria for participation; the time required for interviews; steps taken to ensure participant confidentiality and anonymity; and the stipulation that women interested in participating in the research should contact the researcher directly. Both of these letters were approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social Work

at the University of Manitoba. See Appendix B and C for copies of the letters. Seventeen licensed women FDC providers responded. Before each interview, the consent form, approved by the Ethic Review Committee, was signed (See Appendix D).

The researcher also sent a request for participants through the Manitoba Association of Social Workers (MASW) and the Saskatchewan Association of Social Workers (SASW) newsletters. See Appendix A for a copy of the advertisement circulated. SASW forwarded the same request to participants at their conference in April, 1995. Only one response from Saskatchewan and two from Manitoba were received through these advertisements. Unfortunately, despite numerous attempts by telephone, the researcher was unable to contact two of these three potential participants. One woman, an unlicensed FDC provider, contacted the researcher and was later interviewed.

MASW also provided the researcher with a list of 11 women social workers who operated a private practice. Ten of the eleven social workers received a letter requesting their participation from the researcher (See Appendix B). Three women contacted the researcher but did not qualify for the study because they did not have child or dependent adult care responsibilities.

The researcher also sent a letter to Manitoba Health, Community Mental Health Division and Winnipeg, Child and Family Services. The same process (as outlined above) for securing participant names and initial contact to potential candidates was followed for these employee home workers (See Appendix B and C for a copy of the

letters). Twelve initial and follow up letters to potential participants were sent through their supervisors at the above agencies. The researcher received no responses.

Additionally, the researcher also asked colleagues in Winnipeg to inform potential participants about the research study. These colleagues provided some information on the research and the researcher's name and address so interested women could contact the researcher directly for further information. Two women in Manitoba expressed interest but failed to contact the researcher. In Saskatchewan, letters were sent to potential participants identified by colleagues but there were no responses. After the low response rate from the above mentioned groups, the researcher decided to continue the study using only FDC providers as the sample.

Limited success in participant recruitment meant the focus of this study changed. Originally intended to be an examination of women human service home workers, this study became focused on women FDC providers. While a study on a specific group of home workers was unintended, the result was a more in-depth examination of one group of home workers as opposed to an examination of a more diverse group of human service workers. This, in the end, was beneficial to those interested in the administration of FDC homes. It is also particularly relevant given the large number of FDC workers and the limited research in this area. For administrators and others, a study of these women's experiences could expand their understanding of the lives of FDC providers and add a piece to the emerging literature on home-based human service workers.

The limited response has several potential explanations. It is possible the use of home-based work arrangements in the human service sector has not been frequent to date. Those involved (e.g., mental health workers) were most likely not working from their home long enough to feel comfortable commenting. Also, the potential sample of mental health workers was small. Some human service workers did not meet the requirement of having children at the time of the study. Finally, other potential human service participants may have simply been too busy to respond to the request to participate.

Confidentiality, Anonymity and Informed Consent

"Confidentiality is given to mean an active attempt to remove from research records any element that might indicate the subjects' identities...anonymity refers to the subjects remaining nameless" (Berg, 1989, p. 138). Potential risks were discussed with participants prior to their signing a consent form and commencing the interview. At this time, the researcher again outlined the purpose of the study, the amount of time required to participate, the possible risks and benefits associated with participation, and the steps taken to ensure confidentiality and anonymity (i.e., nameless of the readers) of each participant (See Appendix D).

Transcribing taped interviews required special attention to protect participants' confidentiality and their anonymity to readers. The use of pseudonyms during the interview protected participants. Transcribing was completed in Saskatchewan, thereby making participant identification highly unlikely. However, confidentiality and

anonymity issues were discussed with the transcriber when she was hired. Directions were given to the transcriber to not discuss interview material with anyone.

The researcher was the only person to have access to the real names, pseudonyms, occupation titles, and places of employment and addresses of participants. MCCA and the FDCA have not been provided with the names of the research participants. The researcher did not include participants' place of residence in the thesis document when reporting research findings and conclusions. The researcher did not include the association memberships of the participants nor their addresses in the interviews, analysis or thesis documentation.

All identifiable data was stored in the researcher's safety deposit box. Interview tapes and computer disks were secured in a drawer in the researcher's home. The researcher will destroy all identifiable information upon acceptance of the thesis by the committee and after providing results to study participants. The researcher will retain interview tapes and computer disks for use in future research and publications. Since these tapes and disks do not include information identifying participants, anonymity is ensured in future publications.

Data Collection

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews conducted by the researcher. A schedule for interviewing was developed according to the research aims, and the research questions focused on the motivations, benefits and limitations of FDC providers as home workers. An initial interview schedule was used during the first

twelve interviews (See Appendix E). Minor changes were made to this interview schedule for the remaining six interviews (See Appendix F).

The semi-structured format allowed this researcher to provide participants ample time to tell their story. That is, probing questions were incorporated to help identify and clarify data relevant to the study. Interviews lasted from one and one-half to two and one-half hours. All interviews were tape recorded. Upon completion of the interviews, the researcher wrote notes (i.e., memos) on interviews, which included reflections on the research process and interview content. Following is such a note:

Joanne was really struggling with trying to balance her work and family responsibilities. She talked about her efforts to really try to take special time for herself. This was really hard. Even her own time was related to the day care (i.e., guitar lessons).

Interviews were completed in two steps. Twelve participants were interviewed between June and August, 1995 and six were interviewed in October, 1995. One interview was completed over the telephone, with the remaining completed at participants' homes. Sixteen interviews were transcribed by a transcriber and the researcher transcribed two. After six of the initial twelve interviews were coded, the researcher interviewed the final six participants. This coding and the change in sample produced a slightly revised schedule of data collection for the second interviews (See Appendix F, question 5). These revisions involved requesting that women describe what arrangements they make for the day care children when they must leave the day care. Also, references to contractors and employers was changed to include day care parents, professional associations and day care office.

Data Analysis

There are many concrete data analysis stages in the development of grounded theory (Berg, 1989; Currie, 1988; Glaser, 1978; Kirby & McKenna 1989; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). This research study incorporated most of what Glaser (1978) described as the data analysis process in Theoretical Sensitivity. To enhance the analysis described by Glaser, "hurricane thinking" a kind of constant comparative method as described from Kirby and McKenna (1989) was used in the analysis.

The data analysis steps included open coding, sorting, selective coding, theoretical sorting, memo writing and writing. In each step, the researcher incorporated memo writing and constant comparative analysis. Memo writing was done extensively during all coding stages. Memo writing helped this researcher stay attached to the substantive area under study. In accordance with Glaser's (1978) directions, memos were written on whatever idea came to mind when this researcher was involved in the analysis. It was also during memo writing that this researcher included and noted influences on the analysis from extant research including concepts from literature on home work and feminist political economy and the "ethic of care" frameworks (Glaser, 1978).

During analysis, the researcher generated codes using the concept-indicator model based on constant comparison analysis (Glaser, 1978). Indicators were simply pieces of data, such as a sentence or a paragraph. Concepts were the researcher's understandings of how these indicators fit and work together. The concept-indicator model generated codes by constantly comparing "indicators to indicators" and

"indicators to concepts". The researcher identified codes by analyzing each interview after they were transcribed. In this study, indicators are identified as categories. How these categories fitted and worked together was explained in the conceptualization of themes.

Analysis began during data collection with open coding. This coding had several steps and rules (Berg, 1989; Glaser, 1978). The researcher used the rules for open coding as explained by Glaser (1978). When completing open coding, the researcher first asked the data a set of questions. The questions Glaser suggests, and which were used by the researcher, were: "What is this data a study of?"; "What part of the emerging theory does this category and its properties indicate?"; and "What is actually happening in the data?" (p.57). Second, the researcher analyzed the data line by line, constantly coding each sentence. The researcher did her own coding. Indicators were coded in the margins of the transcribed interviews. Third, after making multiple copies, transcribed interviews were cut up according to categories.

Selective coding identified in vivo codes and sociological constructs. This parallels the concept-indicator model. In vivo codes represent indicators, and concepts were sociological constructs. In vivo codes were referred to as categories in this study (e.g., "valuing their mothering role). "...[I]n vivo codes tend to be the behaviours or process which explain how the basic problem is resolved or processed" (Glaser, 1978, p. 70). Strauss, as cited in Berg (1989), states, "[i]n vivo codes tend to be the behaviours of processes which will explain to the analyst how the basic problem of the actors is resolved or processed." Therefore, these codes are data details and illustrate

a closeness and understanding of the data making the identification of many in vivo codes appealing (Glaser, 1978).

In this study, "sociological constructs" are the four themes entitled "centrality of child care", "work/family stress", "primary child care provider", and "resisting the limitations of family day care". "Sociological constructs are codes formulated by the sociologist [researcher]...They are based on a combination of the analyst's scholarly knowledge and his research knowledge of the substantive field" (Glaser, 1978, p.70). Formulated by the researcher, constructs add the researcher's interpretation to the analysis (Strauss as cited in Berg, 1989). "Thus, sociological constructs add breadth and depth to observations by reaching beyond local meaning to broader social scientific ones" (Berg, 1989, p. 109). Initial sociological constructs (i.e., themes in this study) and categories are outlined in Appendix G. In arriving at the four themes, and to ensure that Glaser's four criteria for data analysis were met, the researcher completed selective coding using the constant comparative method on four separate occasions. Each time constructs and categories were reorganized and relabelled until the themes and categories in chapter 4 were generated.

The researcher also used "hurricane thinking" to complete selective coding (Kirby & McKenna, 1989). This was done by placing the three sections of the original research question (i.e., motivation, benefits and limitations, and reaching and dealing with benefits and limitations) in the centre of three pages. Categories were organized (i.e., either close or further away from the question) around each section in accordance with the importance of each to participants' experiences. This approach

enhanced the development of themes by linking categories according to their differences and similarities (i.e., constant comparison analysis).

One theme, "centrality of child care", was the core category. In choosing a core category (i.e., main pattern), the researcher adopted the eleven criteria identified by Glaser (1978). Also, the core category was chosen on the basis that it defined:

the 'main theme,' for what--in their [researcher's]view--is the main concern or problem for the people in the setting, for what sums up in a pattern of behaviour the substance of the what is going on in the data, for what is the essence of relevance reflected in the data, for gerunds which bring out process and change (Glaser, 1978, p. 94).

Glaser (1978) said that another step of analysis is memo writing and that memos must be highly sortable. Memos helped the researcher organize and conceptualize the data. They were also used to note the presence of existing theory in the data. To make the memos sortable, Glaser suggested several methods the researcher used during analysis. Memos were introduced "by a title or caption which is the category or property that the memo is about" (p. 87). This researcher highlighted categories and their indicators; the researcher used memo cards; and organized the memos in whatever way necessary as opposed to her personal preference. Memos were stored in a separate memo file. Participants' pseudonyms were used to identify memos with transcribed interviews. Following is an example of a memo written for this study:

Parents Helpful

Theresa p. 43

Some parents can be helpful in a lot of ways. Financially, professionally and helping balance work and family roles.

A final stage in data analysis is theoretical sorting which begins after most of the memo writing has been completed (Glaser, 1978). Theoretical sorting puts the researcher's ideas generated from the data (i.e., memos) into a framework that directly affects the writing up of the analysis (Glaser, 1978). The researcher incorporated Glaser's theoretical sorting rules. These rules involve sorting categories in accordance with their relationship to the core category and include: sorting without a predetermined starting point; promoting or demoting categories; continuing memo writing; carrying-forward the more important categories; fitting all categories into an outline; sorting in levels such as sections of the results chapter; stopping the sorting when all memos have been sorted; and providing for uninterruptable time when sorting. The task was to develop the relationship between the core theme and the other themes and categories. In completing, the sorting the researcher developed an outline used to guide the writing up of the emerging themes as detailed in the results chapter (Glaser, 1978).

Strengths and Limitations of Method

A major benefit of grounded theory methodology is that it contributes to the development of theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). This methodology allowed the development of four themes beneficial to the understanding of the participants as FDC providers and mothers. These themes were the initial concepts required for theory development. Grounded theory focuses on explicating participants' experiences. This provides researchers with the opportunity to view participants not as "subjects" to be

studied but as partners in the research. Also, like other qualitative methods, grounded theory allows women to articulate fully their daily lives as experienced by them.

A strength of in-depth interviews is that they provide a rich source of data. "Interviewing is one of the most common and most powerful ways we use to try to understand our fellow human beings" (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p. 361). "Interviewing...take[s] place in the natural setting, rather than controlled environments,....This provides both background and meaning to the behaviour" (Emerson & Davis as cited in Vanance, 1989). Oakley (as cited in Epstein Jayaratne & Stewart, 1991) suggested "interviewing is best achieved when the relationship of interviewer and interviewee is nonhierarchical and when the interviewer is prepared to invest his or her personal identity in the relationship" (p. 90). Using a semi-structured probing design provides the researcher with some flexibility to modify the questions and actual interview concurrently with data analysis.

In this research design theoretical sampling, while completed, was limited to key themes and categories. Consequently, the themes and categories should be viewed mainly as initial statements that require verification through further research. Nevertheless, the material generated provides a richness and depth which clearly paints a picture of the experiences of women FDC providers.

Limiting theoretical sampling was a product of the length of time required to complete research using grounded theory methodology (Huberman & Miles, 1994). The time can be lengthy because it is best to space interviews and seek data to the point of saturation. Spacing interviews would have allowed the researcher to start data

analysis after the completion of an interview and before engaging in another interview. Inclusion of another group of FDC providers, such as unlicensed providers, was not possible in this study. This would have enhanced the diversity of experience, important in grounded theory for theory development. However, this was not possible because of limited time and financial resources. During the time of analysis and writing, the researcher struggled with her own work/family stress. It is possible these experiences influenced the analysis and writing. However, bias was reduced by the researcher keeping "memos" during coding and analysis to note her thoughts and impressions about the process and concepts under study.

Seventeen of the participants were licensed and held professional membership. Such a large portion of the sample could produce a bias toward professionalism. However, the one unlicensed participant held high professional expectations of herself and was highly qualified in the education field. Other licensed participants had little concern in gaining professional status, but licensed mainly for economic and reputation reasons. Therefore, professionalism and licensing need not be positively related, reducing the potential of bias in the results.

Chapter 4 Results

Introduction

This chapter includes a description of the participants and a comprehensive analysis of the data. Data was analyzed according to, and responding to, the original research questions. Theme one, "centrality of child care", responds to participants' primary motivation to enter FDC as a home work arrangement. The themes "work/family stress" and "primary child care provider" reply to the question on benefits and limitations of FDC. Finally, "resisting the limitations of FDC" relates to how women dealt with the drawbacks of FDC.

"Centrality of child care" was identified as the core theme. As such, it summed up what was happening in the data (Glaser, 1978). In this study, "centrality of child care" means women were motivated to become FDC providers because they had a desire to care for their own and day care children. As the main theme, it relates to the other three themes and their categories.

The themes, including "centrality of child care", are sociological constructs. They conceptualize how the categories relate to each other. They add the researcher's interpretation to the data (Berg, 1989; Glaser, 1978).

Categories are in vivo codes and use the participants' own words. In this study, they explain how the participants' behaviours help them deal with problems around providing care to their own and day care children.

Description of Participants

Eighteen participants were purposively selected. The participants ranged in age from 24 to 55, with a mean age of 36. Twelve women were married and one participant was in a common-law relationship at the time of the interviews. One participant was single, two were divorced, and one was separated. All participants had one to three children living with them. The children ranged in age from 1 to 22 years, with a mean age of 10. Two participants also provided care to elderly parents living outside their home.

Five participants had completed Family Day Care Provider Training. Three participants received their Diploma in Child Care through Red River Community College and two participants were in the process of completing their diplomas. Seven participants had completed a variety of child care related courses or workshops. Six participants had undergraduate degrees: one participant had a Bachelor of Arts degree with a psychology major; one participant had a degree in nursing; one participant had a Bachelor of Science; two participants had a degree in education; and another participant had a degree in home economics. One of the respondents had completed some pre-Masters work in education. Two had their teaching certificate. One woman had a Diploma in Business Administration and Accounting. Four other participants had completed some business or secretarial courses.

All participants had worked outside their homes prior to entering family day care work. Seven participants had previously worked in day care centres. One respondent worked as a nanny and one participant worked with mentally challenged

children. Three participants had work experience in teaching. One participant had previous work experience as a nurse.

The participants had worked in FDC from one to 17 years, with a mean of nine years. Seventeen participants were licensed through Manitoba Family Services, Child Day Care office. Sixteen participants were members of the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba and one was a member of the Manitoba Child Care Association. One respondent operated an unlicensed private home day care and did not hold a membership in either of the professional associations.

Theme 1: Centrality of child care

Central is defined as "the centre, leading,...dominant, essential" (The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 1984, p. 149). All the women in this study purposefully made child care a dominant role in their lives. Child care included the daily activities necessary to care for their own and day care children. All participants provided child care prior to entering FDC either as mothers, informal child care providers (i.e., babysitters), or as child care staff in day care centres. Many planned to continue operating their day care after their own children became adults. Therefore, a desire to provide care had been and could most likely continue to be a major factor in these women's lives.

Providers also identified many reasons for entering FDC, including socialization and a need for an income. However, this theme and the researcher's perceptions of the interviews indicated that participants would be offended by a suggestion that their own desire to care was preceded by other factors (e.g.,

socialization). Women were mothers and FDC providers because they wanted to provide care.

For participants, this desire to care for children influenced their experiences as mothers and FDC providers. Therefore, "centrality of child care" was the core theme and was connected to all other themes. There are six categories within this theme including: valuing their mothering role; high demands of mothering; unable to afford and locate child care; preference for a home-like environment over institutional child care; connecting with day care children and their families; and education and training in child care.

Category 1: Valuing their mothering role

With the exception of two participants, all the interviewees stated that they believed so strongly that as mothers they should care for their own children that they stopped working outside the home and entered FDC. All women valued their mothering role and were grateful FDC gave them the opportunity to care for their children. For sixteen providers, mothering their children was the single most important reason for them to start a FDC. Two other women entered FDC primarily so they could care for day care children but once in the home performed mothering responsibilities. No other category details a greater motivation for women to enter FDC.

Women accommodated their personal ideology which valued raising their own children. Given this belief, many felt it necessary that they not work outside the

home. This meant they could care for their own children, thereby reducing feelings of guilt:

I mean that's always been my philosophy and I just thought I can't do this [work outside the home and take son to day care]. I mean I am not happy doing this, I don't want somebody else raising him, which is really kind of funny coming from a daycare provider. I don't mind doing it for other people, but, you know, I guess because he's my only son and I'm sure I'll never have another child so, you know, I didn't want to miss anything. So that's what I like most about it, being able to not feel guilty running to work and leaving your child (Audrey p. 43).

Lee valued being available to her children especially when they were returning home from school or sick. Having this opportunity made her feel very grateful:

...this is a value to me to be at home whenever any of my children are sick, I'm the one who's taking care of them. Whenever they come home from school, I'm here and that gives me a sense of being very grateful that I can do the type of parenting to the extent that I want to...I'm able to be home when my kids need me. So it meets my needs both coming and going so I think that's pretty darn lucky (Lee pp. 58-57).

Feeling a deep sense of responsibility to care for her children was the foundation of Gio's caring belief:

I just wanted to be with them. I really feel strongly that when you have kids, if you want to have kids, you really ought to want to be with them and I know there's always all this stuff about, well, people can't afford it on one income, but, you know, I don't know, I think people are selling their kids short. It's kind of sad (Gio p. 12).

For this woman of Iranian background, her socialization and culture had a major impact on her valuing mothering:

And as I said, especially when my son starts school, I'm happy that I will be home for him when he gets home from school because I remember that my mom was always home when I got home and I guess especially the first few years because he is still very young...I come from a different society. I come from a different culture. In my society, in my culture, family members are very, very, very attached to each other (Amy pp. 46-47).

Susan believed that as a mother she should not leave her children alone:

I guess maybe that's one of the reasons why I wanted to be home with mine because I didn't want them to be one of the kids that's left on the couch, you know (Susan p. 22).

To some participants, being a mother meant they should provide a secure environment for their children. They wanted to become aware of their children's community (e.g., who were the children with whom they played). FDC allowed women to gain the flexibility they wanted to provide for their own children's security:

Being at home with my kids. Being here when they need me. Yeah, you're more flexible and you're able to provide that sort of basic security thing for the kids and for yourself...They [children] can always phone me. They can always just come home. They don't have to make arrangements to be at home basically (Susan p. 60).

These women thought working for an employer prevented them from providing the care they wanted. They required flexibility:

Getting the kids out of the house in the morning and doing what you do at work and then when you pick them up, you still have groceries to buy on the way home and stuff to make and your kids are running around. It was just much easier last year [first year working from home] for me in the home.... traditional office work doesn't allow you the flexibility for your own family... (Diane p. 7)

I think it also makes it a lot easier for me, you know. I have to be a bit selfish here. Like I'm here and I know that if there's a problem, I'm here and I don't have to make arrangements with my employer to get off work early because my kids are sick. (Susan p 61)

Being at home meant Diane and Amy could be reassured they were providing a secure environment to their children:

Being home with my kids, as I said, has been a benefit to me....when I'm feeling kind of scared about the world that's happening around us, it's nice to

be at home with my own kids so I can give them a hug when I need to or if they need a hug, you know. Probably more that I get a hug when I need one (Diane p. 55).

I don't want him to be home alone when he is 9 or 10. Cause unfortunately, the trust is not there anymore in society. You don't trust your neighbour, you don't even trust your uncle (Amy p. 49).

Women were delighted FDC allowed them to be involved with their children. In this way, they could secure a safe community for their children:

I really like the opportunity it gives me to be a really big part of my kids' lives. If I was still working outside the home, I wouldn't have this network. I wouldn't know what kids in the neighbourhood have major problems, what kids don't, what parent are really concerned and involved....the ability to work at the school and to form a relationship with the kids' teachers and so on wouldn't be there. Those are the good things (Gio p. 50-55).

Category 2: High demands of mothering

For participants, particularly single mothers, their mothering role was all-encompassing and constant. A lot of time and energy was required to provide child care. Consequently, working from their home was an attempt by these women to meet the high demands of their own child care:

For my son, as I am a single parent, I am the chief cook, doc, buddy and the reason why everything goes wrong in his life. Basically, I have sole responsibility for the parenting, upbringing and social responsibility of my son (Dee p. 17).

I'm the primary caregiver with respect to the children and because I always have been, they're not always willing to accept my husband doing things for them so even when he's home, I still do most of it (Gisele p. 11).

I don't stop until I tuck them [children] all into bed (Lee p. 17).

Joanne and Susan explained how their availability at home supported their role as primary child care provider. Being the primary child care provider was all-encompassing:

Oh well, I prepare meals, clean up, tidy up, keep the yard intact, make lunches, get the groceries, buy clothing and feed the cat (Joanne p. 6).

Neil [husband] and I share the cleaning and the discipline for the children, but then, of course, being a mom at home and with him at work a fair bit of the time, all of that while I'm here, the caring for the kids and that (Susan p. 9).

Category 3: Unable to afford and locate child care

Caring as a central focus in women's lives was influenced by them having difficulty arranging alternate child care for their own children. Many women had problems accessing affordable and high quality child care services when they worked outside the home. In part, this was due to their low wages as employees. Some women also experienced difficulty in finding child care when their children had special needs.

These practical problems were strongly influenced by their belief that, as mothers, they should care for their own children. Many were uncomfortable having others care for their children. Also, given their financial difficulties, working in FDC meant participants could contribute to their family income and reduce their own child care costs.

A quarter of the providers entered FDC to attend to their children's special needs. For these women, the significance of their mothering role was defined, in part, by their children's medical and educational needs:

...my son requires physiotherapy 3 times a day and that's a half hour each....Basically, you just hit on his chest in 6 different positions and it dislodges the secretions from the walls of the lungs' cause that's what he has more trouble with (Lyn pp. 7-8).

We didn't know he was asthmatic until this past November when we almost lost him (Lee p. 14).

Well, I like being able to be home for my kids and especially with my daughter with her special needs. It's been important for me to be here too. I mean because she was going through a lot, like, through her pre-school years, I had to be here in order for her to be...because she went through different program,...they had her in a nursery school type environment as well so I had to be here in order for her to get on the bus and get off the bus. Like, they had a person come and pick her up and take her in, and, I mean, it was very complicated but for the first year (Nita pp. 69-72).

These women experienced not having affordable community child care resources available to them and weighed the costs of child care against earning a wage:

I wasn't benefiting greatly [wages] or anything like that by the time you work everything out. So this works out much nicer. You don't have to pay a babysitter and you know how they're being cared for too (Lyn p. 5).

I guess primarily because the job that I was in [day care centre worker], it wouldn't have financially made sense for me to have gone back to it after my second child. Because of the combined income that my husband and I had, we wouldn't have really qualified for much subsidy and it would have meant paying most of what my income was (not most of it but a large portion of it) would financially not have worked out for us (Diane pp. 6-7).

Family day care was also an effort to deal with the problems associated with locating appropriate child care:

Primarily because my daughter was born and I was working in the child care field and at that time there were no infant placements (Theresa pp. 5-6).

An unwillingness to place their children in alternate care arrangements was strongly influenced by their desire to parent their children. This woman stated that her

childhood socialization influenced her distrust in child care providers who were not family:

As an immigrant to Canada, I don't have my family here, and recently my husband's family moved to Canada, but I didn't have anybody and I didn't, well, I have a family day care now, but I didn't trust family day care. I don't know especially with infants and younger kids (because they don't talk), I didn't know if something terrible happened, he wouldn't be able to tell me (Amy p. 17).

Unwilling to have people outside her family care for her children, Gisele entered FDC:

...I think the major reason I decided to work in the home was because my mom couldn't do the day care anymore and we just weren't prepared to have somebody else do it. That was the major reason (Gisele, p. 9).

Category 4: Connecting with day care children and their families

Choosing to make child care a dominant role in their lives resulted in participants entering FDC, in part, so their own children could benefit. Connecting with day care children and their families was considered a benefit because it helped women give their own children a social environment. These women considered FDC after becoming concerned about a lack of social opportunities for their children:

...he [has] people his own age because he'd been an only child for so long. He's almost 8 already so he'd been an only child for almost 6 years until I got into this so it really was a positive thing (Lyn pp. 5-6).

...when my two girls started going to school I saw a tremendous loneliness on his [son's] part...if you are used to having regular companionship whenever the mood hits you, you have a friend there and then suddenly those people are no longer there, I think it's a very profound loneliness, and I saw how lonely he was and so when my second child was going to nursery or kindergarten...I mean it would be nice to have a male companion and just that much younger. Not a lot younger, just a little bit younger so that he could have the sensation of being older than somebody (Lee p. 9).

So I had James [a day care child] for that one year, just 3 days a week and another thing, my own little fellow, he really didn't have any boy around to play with...so there wasn't a lot of children around for him to play with so I thought this would be fun for him (Jill pp. 7-8).

Being involved with other children provided an opportunity to instill in their own children the value of caring:

...it's good too, like, they both interact very well with very young children and with our not having the extended family we used to have, like generations ago, that's sort of a real plus. Like I think it's good, especially with them being boys. To be able to interact well with small kids is a bonus (Susan p. 24).

Category 5: Preference for a home-like environment over institutional child care

Many women believed that a home-like environment was superior to that found in day care centres. For most women, FDC was an opportunity to provide care to other children in an environment they approved of, valued, and enjoyed. Further, since they wanted to care for their own children, providing other children with care was easily transferable to their home.

For several women, FDC was believed to be the best out-of-home child care arrangement. Having a "mother" was particularly important for young children. Many women felt mothering could not be institutionalized. It had to be provided in a home environment:

The one big turning point for me. I was substituting at a day care. It was a very nice day care. They had a wonderful staff. They had good equipment. You know, there was not a thing wrong with this centre, but I was sitting with the children [ages 2 to 5] and they were settling for their naps in their little cots, about 3 children all in these little cots and it was very quiet and all of a sudden there was this little muffled sob, sweet little 2 year old trying very hard not to cry but sobbing, 'I want my mommy' and I thought at that time, this is not the right place for very young children. This was just not good enough...I'll never forget that moment because I knew I was going to do something different

from this. And it kind of went from there.... And so, we thought we would have something unique in having a real home environment, like it's very un-institutional looking by choice with people who presumably knew what they were doing (Louise p. 9).

I don't like to see children in centres. That's why I could never work in a day care centre because...Especially little ones. Maybe when they're older and in school that might be different, but I think when they're little, they need to have someone at home...I think it's wholesome for kids to have the mom [at least a mother figure] do things in the home and be around to be with them and to teach them. I think it's neat to teach children as you work with them and as you're just around them and to love them (Jill p. 36).

It was important to provide a home environment because it was thought to help kids feel comfortable. Providing children with comfort gave women a sense of accomplishment:

I always maintain it's a home first and then a day care centre....He likes to talk and chat and he'll come and talk for a long time and he's been coming here since just before he turned 3 [now 10 years old] so he's really used to the place and it's just like home to him (Gisele p. 19).

It's really nice too, the day care kids, and they say it often too, that this is their day care family. So, that's a nice feeling too. And when someone's not feeling good or when a woman's sick or whatever, they see it as a day care family and that's their day care brother or sister that's not feeling good (Theresa p. 59).

Category 6: Education and training in child care

The participants had a variety of formal education and training related to child care, family day care and other human service work. This preparedness shows their commitment to child care. They devoted time, energy and money so they could provide high quality child care:

I worked in child care since 1981 when I graduated from the child care program (Diane p. 9).

I had thought about it for many years. My mother is a child care worker...I felt that I had a lot of experience through the exposure I got from my son....I'd

already worked in the field of child care in a respect...I cared for other people's children and the families that I knew had quite a few children (Bridget p. 6).

I also have the background [home economics degree] to work with kids (Gio p. 6).

Some participants had post secondary education and experience in areas related to child care including nursing, home economics and teaching. One woman had a business administration degree relevant to operating a small business:

I have a degree from the Faculty of Community Colleges of Home Economics in the area of human development, infant and pre-school development. And I have part of an Arts degree (Gio p. 2).

I took 4 years of university at University of Manitoba for my nursing training (Audrey p. 2).

I have a diploma in Business Administration with majors in administration and accounting. (Dee p. 2)

Most participants obtained their diploma in family day care. As a minimum or to supplement their education, providers attended a variety of workshops on topics relevant to child care (e.g., fetal alcohol syndrome):

I took the Family Day Care Provider Training Program in 1991 and then since then in 1993 in January, I began the Red River Child Care Services experience and I am now working on my C.C.W. II (Child Care Worker Two) diploma (Jill p. 2).

I have Grade 10 and I attended a Provider Training Program offered by New Careers and the...Association (Q p. 2).

I have my Grade 12 from Collegiate and then just for the day care I've gone to workshops and stuff. I've never taken any formal training (Kathy p. 2).

I've taken the Introduction to Special Needs at St. Amant, and of course, the First Aid and CPR and everything that you have to have for your licensing and I've continued with different workshops and stuff like that, but none that are

sort of recognized as official training...Some on child development and some on nutrition. On Friday, I was just at a workshop on Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (Gisele p. 2).

Theme 2: Work/family stress

This theme covers the nature of FDC work and some of the job-related factors that contribute to work/family stress. Lero et al, (1993) and Stone (1994) identify work/family interference and role overload as two major sources of work/family stress. Whether or not women could provide the occupational child care service they thought necessary, while being available to their own children, determined the extent to which FDC reduced or increased work/family stress. By using these measurements, women showed how purposeful and central child care was in their daily lives.

As detailed in "centrality of child care", the majority of women were grateful FDC gave them the time and opportunity to be available to their children. This reduced their work/family interference. With the exception of this occasion, FDC primarily increased work/family stress. However, since FDC gave women access and availability to their own children, most considered the work/family stress experienced as an unfortunate, but tolerable drawback. Further, the nature of their occupational caring was described by providers as very similar to mothering. This served to reduce role overload:

I'm a substitute mother. I think that I just give the care to the kids that their mum would if they were home and that included all the things from wiping noses, changing diapers, all the basic physical things. Loving them and cuddling them and giving them the security that they need here (Lorraine pp. 3-4).

These tasks are very similar to the work mothers do:

Well, all aspects of caring for children. I guess as a mother would, you know, feeding and diaper changing and take them out to play, out for walks, reading, we have a creative time, we have dramatic play, we have manipulative play (Bridget p. 4).

Basically jack of all trades. Obviously, my primary responsibility is the direct child care responsibilities. Supervision, preparing, and then doing the activities with the kids.... The preparing of the meals, serving and cleaning up from the meals and snacks and cleaning that's associated with day care messes.... and then going out and doing field trips... and to the library and other places in the community (Diane p. 5).

The fusion between women's child care roles produced numerous job-related stress factors that contributed to work/family stress. Some of these job-related stress factors meant women could not be available to their own children as much as they expected and hoped. This was a major source of work/family interference. The four categories explaining participants' experiences with stress included long work days, physically and mentally challenging work, isolation, and low and fluctuating incomes.

Category 1: Long work days

A long work (i.e., paid work) day is a job-related stress factor that contributes to work/family stress (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994). Working long days in FDC produced stress because day care responsibilities interfered with the time women wanted to spend with their children:

... someday when the kids left, I would just... I had no energy. I would just lie down here even on this couch... It's too overwhelming and it drains you out. Sometimes, I even didn't want to see my husband and my own son (Amy p. 11).

Starting their paid work day early with late closing times produced long work days.

Early morning and evenings were times they would have preferred to spend with their own children:

Well, the children are here from about 7:30 [a.m.], somewhere around there, roughly until 4:30 [p.m.], but there's another good hour, or sometimes two, on top of that if we are going to count in the pre work and the report writing and all that stuff (Louise p 5).

About 10 hours a day with the kids and another 2 anyway with getting ready for the next day and cleaning up from one day and that sort of thing (Audrey p. 3).

...I'll keep him until 6:15 [p.m.], but normally my day ends at 5:30 so I'm not entertaining your child after 5:30.... because I have to prepare supper and everything else. (Bridget p. 31)

Other participants echoed the difficulty in ending their work days. When they weren't performing child care work, they were planning for it:

I mean it's not the kind of job where you go to work at 9:00 and you come home at 5:00 and that's the end of the day. I mean I'm thinking about my job the whole time I'm doing it and I'm thinking about it as soon as the kids are gone about what's going to happen the next day or the next week or whatever, and if I'm not thinking about it, I'm doing something about it. Preparing things or whatever (Diane p. 58).

So, I think that's the down side and never getting away from work. That's a down side because there's always something more I could do...Oh, it's always here. You are literally living with it in your face. Like, I should do this or I should do that and I should be doing a prep for this or whatever, and there's never a point where you can go out and shut the door and leave it behind because this is it (Louise p. 52).

Many women worked in the evenings to complete tasks indirectly and directly related to their day care operation. This made their caring work a never-ending occupation:

I would come down [day care in basement] and do my paperwork or do some preparation for some activities for the next day or some stuff like that (Amy p. 8).

... they'll [parents] phone me in the evening and that's usually the arrangement I have... More often than the parents calling me, I have kids call me in the evening. Once in a while. Well, if something important happened between 5:00 o'clock and bedtime, they need to tell me so they do (Theresa pp. 20-22).

Then, of course, after I do the dishes, I have to tidy up the kitchen and put the toys away somewhat and wash the high chairs and things and then sweep the floor. The floor is always covered with play dough etc., and so then if I walk into a room and there's a bunch of stuff, then I just kind of tidy it while I go through it (Jill pp 15-16).

A few participants had evenings taken up with direct child care services:

The evening work was hard because number one, depending on the types of jobs. I only did it for one family, but I will take the longer hours if their parent wants me to type of thing (Lyn p. 21).

Category 2: Physically and mentally challenging work

Few participants took breaks during their day care operations. This participant described how easily work interferes with her noon break, causing a burdensome and demanding work schedule and increased work/family interference:

Between 1:30 and 3:00 I take a break, at 1:30 I just have a cup of coffee, put my feet up and go. Start organizing the rest of my day. If we are doing a snack that hasn't been prepared, that is when that gets done... bills and everything are separated and recycles are done. Supper prep is started then if we are doing supper (Dee p. 31).

The nature and structure of child care work in a private home meant the work was physically and mentally demanding. One participant had to do some crisis

intervention:

There's a lot of that [crisis intervention]. I had a household full of older school age kids one year and there was a lot of that. When you get into the older kids, there's a lot of that kinda crisis intervention... fights between the kids that are here. Dealing with situations where with school age kids, they come home from school... which isn't always positive. We had an incident which involved a knife one day on the way home from school and the police had to be called...

One of the [day care] kids was threatened with a knife (Susan p. 4).

These participants cared for sick children and children with special needs. This would increase the child care demands:

I had an infant that had febrile seizures so we had to deal with that which I sort of considered at the time a crisis...[went] into convulsions because they [she] had a high fever. So the ambulance had to be called (Susan p. 4).

... I mean he [sexually abused child] was self destructive. He would just take and scratch his face. I mean he licked everything. These are very, I mean, these are behaviours that are very, you know... he would do things that would make people [what's the word I want], he would push you to see how far you would go and then just keeping pushing and pushing and pushing (Nita p. 32).

Category 3: Isolation

Many participants described being isolated as FDC workers. Isolation means less contact with colleagues and has been found to contribute to job-stress and work/family stress (Lero, et al, 1993; Stone, 1994). The women would have liked more contact with adults during the day. Most of their day was spent interacting with children:

Well, there are no more stay-at-homes mums. When my children were young, at least, there were mums in the neighbourhood that we would get together at someone's house once a week and there would be like 12 kids and they wrecked your place. But it didn't matter, you were having tea and you could deal with the mess later. And we would take turns. And nobody stays home anymore, and if I want to have a cup of tea in the afternoon with someone, then is no one there (Lorraine p. 33).

Sometimes I find it, not really lonely, but you feel out of touch with things. Like when you're just talking to 1, 2, 3 and 4-year-olds all day, you wonder what happened on the outside world today...Winter, it's worse. In the summer, at least, we go to the park. We've met a lot of people this summer in the park. So at least you get out and see people. Winter is going to be long (Kathy pp. 27 - 28).

Your vocabulary is very limited with kids. It's great for kids. Every day you see that they're learning and they're using more words and more vocabulary but it's repetition for you. It's just repetition so being the only adult in a home setting....Working with kids, it can be difficult (Amy p. 40).

Little contact with other FDC providers and professionals was described as a limitation. One participant felt evening contact with other providers was, although desirable, not an option because of fatigue:

...then sometimes in the evening I just don't have the energy. I just don't have that professional feeling about me to talk about something at 9:30 at night. Sometimes I do. Or you've just lost it, you've just used up all that stuff during the day. Yeah, I miss that part of it...The lack of contact and support from other professionals...I feel that then is no co-worker support and you don't have people saying to you 'are you feeling okay today?' and being able to talk about stuff like that. Or at a staff meeting you come up with an idea and people would be really enthusiastic (Diane pp. 54-57).

Other participants echoed the isolation of home work and missed the external workplace environment:

It's an extremely isolating way of earning a living...Like every 3 or 4 years, I go somewhere different and learn some place new and so I have always relied on work as contacts for friendship or people to do things with, that sort of thing, and just keeping in touch with what's going on in the world, you know, by listening to people talk about things at break and that sort of thing (Audrey p. 25).

Category 4: Low and fluctuating income

Participants described their income as low, given they worked ten to twelve hours daily in their family day care. Gross annual income ranged from a low of \$10,000 to a high of \$40,000. Low income was also a product of the lack of paid benefits, a highly competitive and fluctuating market, and undervaluing of child care. FDC was viewed by most women as a tenuous financial endeavour. The low income also meant some women, particularly lone parents, had difficulty securing a family

income. The extent to which a job provides financial resources for women to meet family needs has not been considered by Lero et al (1993) and Stone (1994) as a source of work/family stress. However, for these women, this was an added source of work/family stress.

On numerous occasions, women stated their vulnerable economic situation produced stress for themselves and children. Audrey explains how the stress of financial insecurity affected her work:

It's stressful, I won't deny that, I mean, you know, you get irritable and the kids sense that. You know, you can go through days and even a week sometimes where you are on edge and the kids know it and that's really hard and you feel really bad cause you know they're sensing the tension in you (Audrey p. 51).

Susan described how low her income was:

If I'm full, I make approximately \$100.00 a day. Now, if I'm open for 10 and a half hours, that's around the \$9.00 an hour mark which isn't horrible pay, but if I include the hours that I work before and after I'm open and I include the hours that I work on the weekends, like doing the shopping and going to the library and doing all that sort of preparatory work, then it whittles it down to just about minimum wage (Susan p. 78).

Day care children's absence for short terms and difficulty keeping spaces filled meant economic insecurity and anxiety for some women:

Just the only thing is it [income] fluctuates. I mean children sometimes don't come to day care and I mean I don't know what other providers policies are, but...as long as they give me notice by 7:00 o'clock in the morning, I don't get paid for that day which means that's a loss of an income...I mean I don't get to fill that space with another child so... It makes you nervous when the spaces are empty and even the kids [her own children] feel it because it's like 'will I be able to play hockey' or like those extras (Q pp. 54-55).

It can be quite a bit some times if you get a parent or two that transfers away and they have a couple of children each in your care, you can... so you have to be sort of careful that you don't splurge. You have to watch your finances a little bit too (Jill p. 58).

And I mean the thing is I'm paying the price if people can't afford it, I mean I'm taking that risk that I'm going to be for months without somebody able to take the spot so I mean it's either that or give it all up anyway (Audrey p. 53).

A lack of benefits coupled with meagre incomes were described as a limitation of operating a private home business:

You don't have your U.I.C and you don't have your benefit package and all that kind of stuff. You have to pay into that so that's a down side to it when you're working from your home (Bridget pp. 58-59).

Sure when I work at home I don't get paid for sick days. Parents pay for the days they're here whereas at the day care they pay whether they [children] were there or not (Kathy p. 29).

The down side is that I don't have a pension plan. I have to do that myself (Lorraine p. 47).

Some participants viewed competition with unlicensed care as economically detrimental and difficult to alter:

Almost every woman who is not working [outside the home] is looking after kids. So the competition is grim. Babysitters don't charge for holidays, they don't charge for stat days, they don't charge for days the kids don't come so licensed people, they charge for days the kid's absent and for stat days and for holidays. That's what you're up against (Gio p. 57).

At one point, I had an argument with a parent. She had pulled her children... they were in my care for 3 years. She had pulled her children because all of a sudden she felt she was paying too much for the day care and I just explained she's been paying this rate for so long why all of a sudden and, basically, it was she had a school girl come into her home for the summer and that just basically continued after school. Her children were school age by this time so it probably did work out cheaper for her, but she tended to say 'that's crazy, that's ridiculous the way you charge' and well, I'm not even charging the maximum (Q p. 26).

Several participants believed their paid work was accorded low economic status because child care work was undervalued by society in general. The following women linked the undervaluing of child care to their poor economic remuneration and

subsequent frustration:

Well, obviously, I would like to be able to make more money...it's just really frustrating getting paid what we're getting paid, and I'm not thinking that the parents don't pay enough, but it's sad that we do the kind of work we do, and I find that what we do is very valuable work. That sort of the bigger picture that my husband and I spend a lot of time talking about too is how everything in our conversations almost always seem to centre back to young children and the fact that then not enough money spent on anything that has to do with young kids, whether it's day care or whether it's any kind of social service program for them or anything. It's so aggravating (Diane pp. 57-58).

With the pay, the recognition and that's not only from my parents, just the whole society... the fact that subsidized care rates haven't gone up in like 5 or 8 years or what ever,... but the government backing that kind of ideology with the low subsidy rates and the lack of funding. I'm not funded by the government, but those who are funded, it's pitiful, like \$800.00 a year. What

does that amount to: Nothing much... I wish I made a decent wage because I know I don't make what I guess I feel I deserve (Theresa p. 54).

Theme 3: Women as primary child care providers

Social norms underscore the social, economic and political structures in society and are "standards that specify how people should behave" (Hagendom, 1986, p. 19).

A well established norm or ideological belief in Canadian society is that women provide child care and other domestic tasks. Consequently, women are considered primary child care providers for their own and care providers for day care children.

The prevalence of this social norm, and providers' acceptance of it, helps explain why child care was the central focus in their daily lives.

The social norm ascribing women as child care providers means that, in Canada, child care is not recognized as a collective responsibility (Baines, et al, 1991). Similarly, in this study, it was not viewed as the responsibility of others to contribute

to the care of children. Instead, motives to assist women were attempts to reinforce women's role as unpaid primary child care providers for their own children and to maintain women as low cost labour for parents requiring alternate child care arrangements. Belief in this norm also meant the structures (e.g., family, day care parents, professional associations and child Day Care Office and government) in which providers lived and worked stop their support, thereby producing contradictory support. This contradictory support leads to women being socially and economically exploited.

This theme has four categories detailing the contradictory levels of support women received as child care providers. They include: levels of family support, levels of day care parents support; levels of professional association support and levels of child day care office and government support.

Category 1: Levels of family support

Their own family members provided key support to participants in their efforts to complete their paid and personal child care responsibilities. This reinforced women's primary child care provider role. However, family members' expectations of women as primary child care providers for their own children restricted their support. Family support, while key to the day care operations, did not create fundamental changes in the way participants carried out their paid and personal child care responsibilities. The contradictory behaviour of many family members reflected society's undervaluing of child care and domestic work. Consequently, women's caring roles were simultaneously exploited and reinforced.

Participants often felt family members were supportive because they acknowledged the importance of and difficulties in providing care to day care children. In this way family members supported women's role as child care providers:

... in my husband's family, one of the sisters in particular has been very supportive, ...I guess that was just a support for me to have somebody calling regular to see how things were going and always was able to listen with interest about anything that had to do with the day care (Diane p. 34).

But he's [husband] generally very supportive. Like, he's verbally supportive....He would just say I hope those kids [day care children] realize that they're really lucky to have you so it's sort of a round about way of saying you're doing a good job (Diane p. 30).

Some family members, in not viewing child care as real work, expected women to do both paid and unpaid caring work. For participants, this meant that family members devalued child care work. These participants cited a lack of occupational recognition from their husbands and mothers:

Some negative things about working from home. My husband always referred to me as not having a real job. Of course, whenever there was anything that needed to be done [around the house] I had to do it...because he had to get up in the morning to go to a real job and I didn't, so that was a lot of negativity (Bridget p. 37).

But there is something that really bothered me in the beginning was that he [husband] was joking or he meant it in a way. When I kind of complained or when I said I was really tired and I needed some time to myself, he would just say 'what did you do' (Amy p. 26).

I think a lot of men feel that way. I think they always have devalued the (caring) work that women do (Gio p. 32).

My mother doesn't seem to understand what I am doing. She tells me to 'get a job uptown where you would have a 9 - 5 job' (Joanne p. 12).

On occasion participants' family members provided care to the day care children.

Accessing alternate care arrangements for day care children would have helped

participants complete their caring work:

I have a niece actually who I'm very close to and she's also in the child care field coincidentally and is right now at home with her 2 kids and starting family day care herself. So she comes over on occasion for short term [alternate care] (Diane p. 16).

I have a sister-in-law who has come over for an hour or 2...my husband looks after the kids [day care] (Lyn pp. 13-14).

Sometimes I try and arrange things [family responsibilities] so that I don't have to but if I do have to, sometimes my mother will come in and substitute for me. That's about the only person I've got so far (Gisele p. 13).

However, alternate care, especially care provided by the participants' partners, however was often short and limited:

... he does involve himself with the day care. I use him as a substitute. I mean if he's home and I have to run uptown, he will watch the children. Not for any length of time, mind you. Maximum would probably be an hour (Q p. 22).

... and I guess my husband on occasion, maybe 2 or 4 times over the year has been home again for short periods of time (Diane p. 16).

Most negotiations between participants and family members went beyond arranging alternate care for day care children. Family members (children, partners and in-laws) helped in a variety of tasks related to the day care operation. This assistance helped women care for their own and day care children. Jill experienced this when receiving help from her own parents and in-laws:

They are a great support. Peter's [husband] folks. And my own parents too. When they'd come always pitch right in...He'll [father-in-law] come around lunch time or whatever and he sits right with the kids and he'll hold the kids and they'll talk to him and he's grandpa (Jill p. 35).

Other participants explained how family members became integrally involved in daily

operations, allowing them satisfaction in completing day care and family responsibilities:

Summer holidays, my daughter, she definitely joins in with us. She's a great help. She comes and walks with us and sometimes if I just run into the store quickly, she'll watch the younger two in the store and I'll take the older 3 in with me. She'll definitely help me downstairs if I'm starting to prepare lunch. She'll supervise clean up or help out with clean up of the toys downstairs (Q p. 11).

She [mother] has one little girl in the house herself. They walk down and 'oh we made you cookies, we made you cake, we made bread for lunch'. She's always dropping things off for the kids to have (Kathy p. 19).

Arrangements with family members helped to free up time for women to do paid work while still ensuring proper care for their own children. This supported women's role as child care providers:

... she'll [mother] just come down and pick up Jennifer [daughter] and be gone for the day....It gives me a break. Usually they [sister and mother] come and get her [daughter] when she's driving me crazy....So by them taking her, it takes a lot of the stress off (Kathy pp. 19-20).

If I'm busy with the day care she [mother] will even sometimes come like if my daughter had to go to the dentist or something like that, my mom will take her (Gisele p. 25).

Participants' children and partners also supported women's caring roles by helping with household tasks:

Again, the kids are getting older. They have more responsibility, such as their own rooms. They have to clean their own rooms and they help out lots around the house like dusting furniture and doing dishes and stuff like that so no (Q p. 8).

If we have company coming or I have some kind of major anxiety attack, then they'll [children] help me then. They do running around for me that I can't do during the day. Things like pay last minute bills, taking my stats to the day care office, going to the lawyers....anything that if I had time during the day I would do and I can't so (Lorraine p. 8).

Some husbands were helpful when they completed household chores and took care of themselves. Women appreciated this support:

He [husband] helps with every aspect of the household stuff. If the laundry is piling up too high, he'll throw some laundry in and he looks after himself. Like, I don't have to make his lunch and I don't have to make his breakfast or do all of those 1950 wifely things. I don't have to do that. (Susan p. 33).

...so then my husband gets up and he cleans up the whole kitchen after breakfast, does the dishes and cleans up the tables and cleans everything up...he [son] sometimes helps me tidy up (Jill p. 9).

Sharing the responsibilities of their own children was also appreciated and helped women do their paid work:

The physical care [of son], I can say it's 50-50. If I'm very tired, he gives him a bath or he gives him a shower (Amy p. 23).

Yeah, he does the therapy [physiotherapy]. Actually, I would say overall, he probably does half. He will do all when he's off say...well, maybe not half, but he tries to do as much as he can (Lyn p. 26).

A few husbands operated their own home business. This, however, did not mean they shared equally the household and child care tasks. Women were still expected to be the primary child care provider for their own children even though they were engaged in paid work:

My husband is self employed and that takes up a lot of his time...I mean I do the majority of the housework.... I'm the primary caregiver with respect to the children and because I always have been, they're not always willing to accept my husband doing things with them so even when he's home I still do most of it. I look after the household finances, paying all the bills and that kind of thing. I do all the cooking (Gisele pp. 10-11).

The view that child care is women's responsibility means it often relegates women and child care to the private domain. However, being licensed FDC providers meant these participants were subject to government regulations. Some of the providers' husbands

become angry about the government's infringement on their private space. Their upset made it difficult for some women to do their paid child care work:

When I would be after him [husband] for things that needed to be done for regulations, he would say 'this is my home why do I have to do it'. He does it, but he complains (Joanne p. 11).

... the hot water temperature is supposed to be...but I know ours was higher than what the provider training program requested and that was to be changed and he really grumbled about it. 'Well, why' and he was just going on. 'It doesn't make sense, nobody's burned themselves' and it was like it wasn't a big job for him to do, but it was something I had to ask him to do and he just kind of really complained about that (Q pp. 19-20).

Not having access to their own home was also frustrating for some husbands:

But when he [husband] comes in and there are toys all over and kids all over and I'm busy and he's got a trip doing what he needs to do, that's when he complains, or he can't get in the bedroom because someone else is there and he needs to get to his stuff and that is when he [gets upset] (Nita p. 57).

I guess something if it had to do with the house. Like my husband, let's say, didn't want the kids in one certain area of the house or he didn't want the kids to touch this or he didn't want us to use something, but he didn't understand it from the perspective, well, they're just little kids and they're curious and they want to use this and they want to touch this (Bridget p. 20).

Often women's primary goal of providing quality child care took precedence over profit. This was a source of conflict between providers and their husbands:

I had to buy equipment, I had to buy materials. Sometimes when he would see the bills coming in although they were legitimate, I'd pay for them out of the money that I make. It's a business expense. He would think while those... I think because after looking around, there are people who run their family day care more in a business sense and spend less money than I do and make more profit than I do and he could see that, so sometimes that caused a little bit of friction (Theresa p. 33).

Yeah, he just dropped that one on me today. It's so easy for him to say. He sits there and says you'd better tell them we're losing too much money here. He would have no qualms. That's exactly what he would say. He'd just say this is costing me too much. You're going to have to start paying, but I'm

afraid of losing people (Gio p. 37).

Increased expectations and demand centred around family members wanting women to do more and be available more as primary child care providers because they were already home. These factors increased participants' family and paid work load. Ironically, even though women entered FDC in order to be available to their children, these expectations meant this was not always possible. Consequently, they felt their children's needs were not being met and some children resented it when their mother was not available:

There was also the problem of my junior high age children being very resentful of the fact that I was not available to them. I was here in body and that was very hard for them.... But there was still a lot of resentment. Especially at that age. The fact that they were here at 3:30 and I just wasn't always there for them (Louise p. 39).

... although it's hard. Like, I'm sure sometimes she wants more attention than I can give her at that time of the day.... if she comes home angry, then she really needs my full attention until she's resolved her anger, whereas it still is a busy time in between picks ups and I have to be very careful because if the parent decides to put on the stress and the kid runs up to their parent every day in the yard,... so I have to be aware of where all the kids are and stuff like that so it has been sometime really tough and she has gotten upset about that (Theresa p. 24).

Some women stated that their husbands shared equally in the household and child care tasks:

Ross, my husband, and I share a lot of responsibility with the kids as well as the responsibility with the house. I've been told I'm spoiled, but I don't consider it spoiling.... Ross and I share the cleaning and the discipline for the children (Susan p. 8-9).

Laundry, I guess we share that kind of stuff. Most of the stuff around the house he's pretty domestic so dishes and laundry and I do most of the cooking actually (Diane p. 13).

My husband and I have a sort of division of labour as I pointed out. He does

the washing for me all the time and that's really nice because that's a couple of hours you know and that saves me that much and then I do the ironing so that's fine. Then I do the vacuuming upstairs and then he does the vacuuming down in the basement (Jill p. 14).

However, this information was sometimes contradicted by their description of the family responsibilities they completed. For some women, these descriptions did not support their previous claim that husbands shared equally in the family responsibilities: But my husband don't really split it down the middle as far as you do this and I'll do that kind of thing (Diane p. 13).

It's a lot. My husband is gone for work in the morning before we get up. So it's getting her ready for her day plus working in the house, getting meals and stuff ready, doing all the housework (Kathy p. 8).

Yard work is mostly me, but he will do it if he feels like it, if he's in the mood. House work is mostly me. He might help out to do the dishes, but I usually end up doing them over again which sounds terrible, but it's the truth...as far as our daughter is concerned, I would say, well, of course, because I'm home, I'm there in the morning for her before school and I'm there when she get home after school,... mostly the discipline, all the clothes shopping, all the school shopping, haircuts, it's all me. It's all me who takes care of that (Theresa p. 9).

Category 2: Levels of day care parents support

Day care parents supported women's caring roles by supplying resources and expressing appreciation. The parents were also unsupportive of women's efforts to provide care as demonstrated in their lack of recognition for caring work, and failure to pay for services and follow day care policies. These practices frustrated participants' efforts to provide the care they wanted to their own and day care children. Consequently, FDC providers were socially and economically exploited when parents took the view that minimizes caring work and insists that women should provide child care at a low cost to parents.

The many resources provided by the day care parents made the day care operation economically viable and increased participants' economic security. Parents provided resources used for the day care operations:

Mondays and Fridays, the parents bring their lunches so that's always a bonus for me.... if they need to bring something, any kind of craft materials or whatever, they'll do that kind of thing. They'll contribute ideas (Diane pp. 22 & 36).

I have one mom now who brings us goodies once in a while which is very nice. The kids really appreciate that (Gio p. 37).

Sometimes they'll bring toys in and say 'keep these here for the week or a couple of weeks. It's something different for them to play with (Kathy p. 21).

They had cucumbers, he would bring me cucumbers and that sort of thing but then they were always like that (Nita p. 50).

A lot of parents are really good for donations. Two of parents...had a bunch of Scott National products. A whole bunch of Scott products 'Oh, we know that you use these things as wipes.' 'Yeah, sure cool.' And one of my boys is lactose intolerant...and the mom will go shopping, she used the coupons and she will get things that are freebies...like free 4 kgs of sugar if you're going to shopping for over \$40. They don't use but she will bring it to me, well it is free anyways and why shouldn't Safeway give it to you? I just laugh and I will accept it and just give back like two loaves of bread (Dee p. 55).

The support and appreciation provided by some parents was strong at times. These parents showed their appreciation monetarily:

They [parents] paid me a bonus and I have never got a bonus before (Nita p. 50).

My parents are great and they ask me if I want raises. Every year they say 'oh, you should put your wages up' but, I didn't always. This year I did but for lots of years I didn't (Jill p. 42).

One parent helped provide economic stability by keeping her child in care even when unemployed:

... she went on unemployment. She lost her job. She kept her child here through all her unemployment (Nita p. 9).

Day care parents helped participants feel that their caring work was recognized, appreciated and validated. It was important to the women that their work be respected:

The parents are happy because if they come in and say that he is so good here, you know, well when they say, 'it must be something you do,' then you figure okay, well they appreciate what I'm doing (Lorraine p. 28).

If they respect you and respect what you're doing it's usually fine. If they can appreciate that sort of aspect of it, it's usually fine. It boils down to that one little thing (Susan p. 37).

But I think I also get good feedback from the parents so that validates you (Louise p. 36).

However, day care parents at times were unsupportive. The minimization of caring work led to many identifying providers as babysitters. Some women resented this label:

Just attitude problems too, like I say, that babysitting attitude is not helpful (Susan p. 36).

But it's something that a lot of people don't think of. I mean I think a lot of people don't think of us as business people (Q p. 21).

The participants wanted to have their child care work acknowledged and appreciated.

They did not want to be taken for granted:

... but I thought that after a year if you say that you are happy here a thank you card is really nice [when leaving]. I didn't need money or I didn't need jewellery from them and I didn't need them to pay my mortgage or nothing, it's just to say thank you (Amy p. 32).

... parents just don't seem to see that point of it so it is... I had a father one time say to me 'what are you so tired for' and it's like because. I meant it's stressful, it's tiring (Q p. 51).

I dislike that fairly often that sometimes parents seem to take you for granted or how much they will do like the number of times...The kids show up and they haven't had their breakfast (Gisele p. 3).

Many providers also felt parents were reluctant to acknowledge and accept their expertise. This was unsupportive and frustrating to some women because it prevented them from providing the quality care they deemed necessary:

So what happened, I sat with her mother. She had not told me about this child's problems in the past. I was disappointed that she had not been upfront with me. I would have preferred that (Lee p. 47 - 48).

I find it difficult to make parents realize it is important that their kids develop [i.e., intellectually, physically], I just keep reminding them and it is frustrating when they don't take your advice (Joanne p. 12).

Just difficult in the fact that they didn't seem to think that things that I [a trained and experienced nurse] knew were medically important to follow up on....if I had of said I really think she needs to see a doctor and they had taken her, then no problem at all. But I mean one week I think I told them about 3 or 4 times and then she got very sick one day...she had pneumonia (Audrey p. 32).

The expectation that women provide low cost child care services meant there was some difficult obtaining payment from parents:

I rely on that income on a regular basis as much as anyone else who is working outside the home does, and I need to know that when my pay day is such that I'm going to get x amount of money and I want to be able to go to the bank on that day...but sometimes people don't and it makes it a bit difficult for me (Diane p. 6).

I mean if you have inconsiderate parents who either don't pay on time or bounce cheques or aren't considerate of your rules and reason for your rules etc., it can...I mean it drains so much out of you trying to cope with that (Theresa p. 36).

I've had one woman, well, two women actually, walk out owing money which was really unhelpful (Gio p. 31).

Women described numerous incidents where day care parents did not follow policy they outlined in a manual or contract provided to parents. This meant the FDC operation often interfered with participants' family obligations, making it difficult for them to carry out their roles as mothers. Women felt they were being taken for granted by parents since they were already in their home caring for children:

Well, I think people figure 'oh, she won't mind if we're an hour late today. We won't bother phoning'...I think just because it's in the house (Kathy p. 35).

So parents definitely [think] 'well, you're home all day, like, I mean you can do this, you can at least make your supper but they don't realize that's not your responsibility when you have 5 children. Hours is basically mostly the problem (Q p. 27).

Category 3: Levels of professional association support

The professional associations included other FDC providers, as members and a board of directors. Providers also had contact with day care centre workers through their associations or informal arrangements. Two participants, as members of MCCA, had access to staff. The professional associations also provided contradictory support to FDC providers' efforts to do both paid and unpaid child care. Some women attributed this contradictory support to the lack of financial assistance (e.g., to pay for a staff) that their Association received from the provincial government. Professional associations were considered more supportive than unsupportive. Support was received, for example, through consultation with and assistance from local day care centre staff, networking groups, training and benefit packages. This was supportive of

women's caring roles. It demonstrated an appreciation for child care work.

However, participants did not always consider the professional associations as supportive. For example, some participants described the networking groups as unhelpful. The benefits packages, while helpful, were also considered limiting. Consequently, professional associations were considered by a few participants as socially and economically inadequate.

Support was not strong enough to eliminate the problems (e.g., economic) that women experienced. For the majority, however, it was enough support for them to function as child care providers. Consequently, women continued to be socially and economically exploited as low paid child care providers in the public realm and primary child care providers for their own children.

Some participants were able to find support from local day care centre staff through the provision of resources and equipment, and advice on policies and programming:

I've used actually a lot of material from that day care for my parent policies which I just sort of changed a little bit to make sense for family day care. Snack and menu ideas and that kind of stuff. Because actually I had been the supervisor there for years. A lot of that work was mine anyway as far as the theme planning, all that kind of stuff. So I just borrowed it back again (Diane p. 47).

... the director was really really nice to me so when she found out I was opening up my day care, she phoned me and said she had some stuff for me so I went to the day care and I picked up these chairs and some tables for free so they were helping me (Amy pp. 30-31).

... the director of my mother's day care helped me out. They helped me out in terms of contracts, politics. The director let me take a look at her contract and gave me ideas....All when I was setting up. Ideas to take fees in advance and to charge late fees and just helpful hints. How to have good communication

with parents. What to put up with, what not to put up with (Bridget p. 39).

Being members of their professional association provided some opportunities, similar to those available to some paid employees, that helped increase women's self-confidence:

Well, the association has been great for my self esteem and my self confidence really because, through the association, I was public education director for 2 and half years or whatever it was, and I got all kinds of opportunities to speak to different groups and I spoke to the 4th year human ecology department (Jill pp. 39-40).

Professional membership was perceived to increase FDC providers' credibility as care providers to the general public and the Child Day Care office. For "Q" it was important to have child care work recognized as professional work:

I think it's a big thing for me to be as professional [as a member of her professional association] as I can be being, that I work in my home...because a lot of people don't think of my job as a job....Basically, I think a lot of people think that you sit on the couch and the kids have the run of the house. Well, that's not the way it is, but a lot of people think that was and that's frustrating to me and that's why I think it's really important to try and be as professional as possible and to make it known that I am a business, I'm not a babysitter so like I said, I would prefer to have more involvement with the association (Q pp. 25 & 27).

While professional status was not as important to Lorraine, she believed it was in her best interest to impress the Child Day Care office by having a membership:

... because the day care office [provincial] likes us to develop professionally, so if you said that you belonged and you did this and this, they would be more impressed than if you didn't (Lorraine p. 28).

Many women met other FDC providers on their own or through their professional association. Networking groups gave them this opportunity. Professional associations strongly encouraged the development of networking groups. These groups were often

used by women just starting FDC:

But I found the networking was so great because the first few years I was in it, I hardly said a word, but I was just all ears, listening to all the different things, how people handled this and that and all the problems (Jill p. 41).

This group served as a liaison between providers and their association:

We had a networking group and that was great. I loved that. It was once a month...a bunch of day care providers would get together and we would meet and one provider would attend the association and bring back the news to us and that was our involvement (Q p. 28).

Bridget found the group helpful because she was able to get advice from other providers:

When you're having a problem, you're pulling your hair out, you think you're the only person whoever had that problem. Bingo! You're wrong. Somebody else has and they're full of useful advice. That helps. I think networking with other people and the association...my neighbour wasn't the only person I networked with. Just other people on the phone to talk to. Other family day care providers (Bridget p. 38).

Most networking groups also served to increase social support for many participants:

I tried doing it in the afternoon but, I talk to a lot of other providers in the afternoon too. We call it networking (Susan p. 25).

Just the support though, moral and from just getting to know those ladies and just the calls that I get some times from providers that I met through the association because they kind of do networking in each other and if a provider wants can take part in networking (Theresa p. 43).

Some participants received assistance from their professional associations which reduced operating costs. This made FDC a more economically secure occupation.

Both the Manitoba Child Care Association and Family Day Care Association of

Manitoba provided access to liability insurance and other benefits:

...I think that the day care association really accomplished a lot in that we have benefits that other people did not have like the dental plan and things like

that...we had group insurance. It gave me the security that I knew if something happened to me in two months, I wouldn't have to be on welfare (Lorraine pp. 41-42).

There are some benefits to it when you are a member of the association, say, for my license I have to have liability insurance for \$2,000,000.00. So when I am a member of the association my liability is \$84.00 a year but, if I'm not a member and I go to an insurance company, it's \$750.00 so there are benefits (Amy p. 41).

For this woman, a member of the association board, the association supported her caring role by financing alternate care for the day care children. This meant she could attend to association business. This was contradictory support, however, because other members were not given similar assistance:

Well, the office [association] pays for it [alternate care]...But the association pays \$6.00 an hour and I pay her [alternate] \$2.00 more than that (Jill p. 26).

Many participants were grateful for the training provided by the FDCA:

I think one of the greatest things was the Family Day Care Training Program (Bridget p. 64).

Others found the workshops sponsored by the association helpful:

They so sponsor workshops and they notify you about First Aid courses that are helpful (Gio p. 38).

A rural provider was able to connect with other providers and have some fun when she attended workshops:

it was a series of workshops and we all kind of travelled together and got together and we attended workshops and the association that way. That was fun... (Q p. 31).

Some participants considered their professional association as unsupportive. They believed the association was unable to meet providers' needs and was inaccessible because of a lack of government support and its urban location:

The other association has deteriorated the last few years because of government cutbacks to pay the wages to the staff member. It's available, but not easy to access (Joanne p. 13).

With the association, the distance is a problem, I'm not greatly involved with the association because of the distance. I don't drive in the city. That's difficult (Q p. 25).

Believing the association had no relevancy or purpose resulted in some women not accessing their association:

... the girls that started it, you know, I admire because they were pioneers and they had vision, but I think it deteriorated from that...I think the association doesn't have a useful purpose (Lorraine p. 42).

I don't use the association for a lot. I went to meetings and things for a while, but I found that the majority of the problems or the majority of people that were involved with it, were working on the problems dealing with the subsidies and issues related around subsidy and I don't have that. I don't want it and I don't need it and a lot of them were dealing with problems that I don't have (Louise pp. 43-44).

Just entering FDC, Diane, was disappointed with an impersonal introduction to her association. This, she believed, produced poor support:

I guess it [association] would be helpful if there was stronger. I didn't feel that kind of support that I had kind of hoped for from the association, like a welcoming kind of thing. Like I just joined, paid my money, you get your newsletters, but there's no one phoning up, there's no support that way... they're (providers) also as busy as I am so that's not realistic to expect that people are sitting around during the day saying 'let's see who I can call today and chat with' kind of thing and they know that I'm busy too (Diane pp. 43-44).

Category 4: Level of Child Day Care office and government support

This category represents the provincial Child Day Care office staff (i.e., coordinators and subsidy clerks) and the program and policies they enforce for licensed family day cares. Also included are some elements of the federal government income tax and unemployment insurance systems.

These government infrastructures produced primarily contradictory support for participants' efforts to complete their child care responsibilities. Through visits, coordinators produced a positive social climate, support and sensitivity to the participants' paid work. Financial assistance through grants, subsidies, income tax, and the unemployment insurance program supported women's effort to care for their own children and operate a FDC home.

Concurrently, some participants detailed a failure on the part of government to help them complete their caring roles. In particular, some providers described the coordinators' evaluations as intrusive, insensitive and unsupportive. Some women felt economic limitations were placed on them through the administration of subsidies, grants and the licensing of too many spaces.

This contradictory support appears to be a function of efforts by government to maintain low labour costs for child care and the social norm which ascribes women the roles of primary child care provider and domestic labourer. Providers were socially and economically exploited when providing free child care to their own children and low cost labour for parents working in the external labour market.

Participants received some support from their provincial coordinator in completing their paid child care work. The coordinator was viewed as helpful when assisting providers who were in conflict with children's parents:

...if you want to get together, we'll mediate....and that is how they supported me. And then they mediated the rest of the meeting and they kept repeating that. They said she followed the mandate. This is what it is, this was her decision, and we stand behind her (Nita p. 45).

Some participants felt coordinators provided professional status, thereby justifying the significance of caring work to day care parents:

And my coordinator [would say] 'well, I'm your boss, you have to answer to me' which I mean in a sense is true. So it makes it like she's my boss. I have a boss. I'm not just sitting in my home on the couch watching kids. I do have to answer to someone. So in that sense, definitely professionalism (Q p. 35).

Other participants described coordinators as helpful in providing feedback, resources and support used for the delivery of child care services. For these women, providing quality services was very important to them:

It's feedback [from the co-ordinator] and even with the people in our training project, they quickly got addicted to feedback and missed it when they were done their training... And I know that I'm not perfect so I always wonder if there's something that maybe I've slipped back on and when I look around the environment, is there something there that shouldn't be. You know, like sometimes they have the objective viewpoint (Audrey p. 70).

...like all of these relationships that go on between my family and the families that I have in care so at that point I phone my co-ordinator and I said uncle, like 'I needed somebody to come here and pat me on the back and tell me everything is going to be okay tomorrow morning' (Susan p. 47).

I enjoy her visits. If I need help with the matter, whether it be a parent matter, a child matter or just a household matter, I feel comfortable enough just to talk to her. Just to call her up and talk to her about it (Q p. 34).

Availability and quick response by coordinators was described as very helpful by participants. Their expertise and experience was beneficial to the goal of providing child care:

The child care office, we have a wonderful coordinator. She's great! She's really really good. So the day care office, probably because of our coordinator I've found very very helpful... She's got lots of experience with day care so she's got lots of things to share. I have looked after some special needs children and she's given me a lot of information on them or on their conditions (Gisele p. 29).

The coordinator around here. She's been super. She'll come down at the drop of a hat, you know. If I have a question she'll say 'I'll phone you back. I'll phone whoever else who can tell me or look it up'. She's been really helpful that way (Kathy p. 22).

The time of starting a FDC was viewed as a critical time for coordinators to be available to providers:

They were really helpful. Especially at first because there were a lot of things I wouldn't have thought of if they had not told me. Most of the things I had gotten done pretty quick, but there were still those odd little things that I had forgot about or wouldn't have thought about (Lyn p. 40).

The Child Day Care Office was also supportive of women's efforts to provide care by offering training opportunities and print information:

They [provincial day care office] will run workshops to offer the training to the providers so...offering things like first aid courses that are family day care oriented and many little workshops. Like I took 'how to talk so kids will listen' and also 'kids will talk through them' and it was \$20.00 so (Theresa p. 43).

... one of my friends she was taking social work... she was doing her practicum at Family Centre and once we were talking on the phone. She said 'if you want to open up a day care, why don't you open up a special needs family child care?... I phoned them and said 'I'm a student, I'm graduating... They were just so excited (Amy pp. 19-20).

The licensing procedure was a way women could gain support from coordinators.

These participants experienced the evaluation of services required for relicensing by their coordinators as nonthreatening and supportive:

I mean other than that they're just quite unobtrusive and just observing how you interact with kids, what you're doing you know, that you're following the rules for toileting and that sort of thing and then when they come to do the inspection (Audrey p. 37).

... you know, when they come they sort of walk in, you know, and they're always very pleasant and not accusing or not, they're always supportive (Jill p. 46).

Coordinators' show of professional respect and appreciation helped to encourage and support participants:

I don't have to come up against any brick walls. She has a lot of respect for us. She listened. She talked. She shared her own experiences. She shared her own feelings (Susan pp. 44-45).

The Canadian government was helpful through the former U.I.C program by providing financial assistance at the point of entering FDC. Women's financial needs, however, were related to their role as business entrepreneurs rather than as mothers:

Actually, I was really fortunate because I got in on the self employment assistance program through U.I.C....you put in a business plan stating what business you are starting, how you plan to be about implementing it and that sort of thing....So they give you U.I.C. for the first year and they don't take any monies away even though you are bringing money in. It's just to support you through your first year to get your business on line....It was very helpful (Audrey pp. 5 - 6).

The government also helped women attract potential day care parents. The Child Day Care Office assisted with referrals by placing advertisements in local papers:

They have an ad in the paper and when you have spaces, they will put your ad in the paper (Susan p. 55).

Subsidy spaces and grants provided through the Child Day Care Office were helpful, particularly for providers whose clients lived in low income areas:

On the other hand, subsidy can be good because you know you're going to get your money.... Living in this area and with it being so close to downtown though, I mean I have 6 subsidized spaces and 5 of them are taken up....And the subsidy is necessary in this area because it's a lower income area (Susan pp. 52-53).

Funding provided for child care services and participants' educational needs were helpful to Susan:

I get funding. I'm a funded day care. I can't complain about that. I get \$195.00 per year per space and I get that every 6 months....And every 6 months, I have to apply, like they send the forms out to me and I have to apply....there are rules, like you know, videos, computer that kind of stuff, I can't use. I can't purchase. Maintaining my home isn't allowed by maintaining the areas that I use for day care is allowed to a very certain degree....I don't have to [pay it back] unless I quit before the 6 months and then I would pay back any unused portion and if I do decide to leave the day care, I have to return everything that I purchased with the grant money....It helps me....It pays for my insurance and those sorts of costs. I'm allowed to apply some of it toward my education portion of it so it helps (Susan pp. 74 & 76).

Financial and practical assistance to providers caring for special needs children allowed women to reduce the number of children while still receiving payment for one space. This was appreciated because it helped them provide necessary care to special needs children without losing financially:

I reduced [the number of children in day care] it through the support of the government. They [government] paid for one spot and I got him to cover two spots (Nita p. 6).

I've never had any funding from the province for day care and I'm just going to be receiving that some time in the next couple of months....there's a program through the day care office, I don't know the official name of it, but it's sort of 2 for 1 program where special needs children can be put on the program and the day care office will pay the extra to allow them to have two spaces in the program (Gisele pp. 31-32).

Although cumbersome, the income tax system, through various provisions permitted participants to claim business expenses. Full use of the income tax system meant women could increase their net income:

I'm not sure what we're going to classify as all day care expenses until we sit down because I know we can claim part of our mortgage and our monthly bills and grocery bills (Kathy p. 43).

If I were making \$22,000.00 outside the home, I probably wouldn't see much more at the end of the year than I do now and yet my income level would be considered higher because I would be paying income tax on the \$22,000.00 as opposed to the \$13,000.00 so in that way it's okay (Susan p. 78).

For Lorraine, income tax provisions provided her with a sense of being financially recognized. This helped to justify paid child care work as beneficial to her:

But for me it's very good pay for what I do. And the tax breaks are so good that it kind of sucks you in there....Because of the write offs. I claim a percentage of the mortgage and the utilities and things that I buy for the kids and the groceries so that gets me down to a taxable income of \$12,000.00 (Lorraine pp. 43 & 47).

However, the Child Day Care office and provincial government were also unsupportive to participants. All licensed participants were subject to provincial registration and evaluation. Many women viewed these regulations and evaluations as unhelpful to their operations. Providers were frustrated about the lack of appropriate guidance regarding regulations and evaluations:

Well, I think it's silly, I mean it's [child supervision rule] unrealistic. I think it's unrealistic rather than silly and they really haven't looked at that aspect of it. They are taking day care rules for a day care centre and applies them in here and we are going ah, 'excuse me, but we do have'...there is some fundamental differences here (Nita p. 61).

... a lot of the protocol in the government day care, government service sector period, is very convoluted. It is like you have to go and a large amount of dissatisfaction is from what I consider government prying into my personal

affairs and my business affairs. We are very very government regulated (Dee p. 46).

Some participants viewed coordinator visits as an interference in their services. It was seen as disrupting children's activities:

... I think it's the unscheduled ones that bother me more. If I know they're coming, I can feel calm and cool and everything is...I have a chance to look around and make sure, oh I don't know, that there isn't a pair of scissors on the table or something. I try to be very careful about stuff like that but when they drop in, I don't know whether my kids have gone up there and, you know, I can't always watch and inevitably it seems like then is something that's not perfect and I guess it just bugs me because when you try to run as tight a ship as you can, it is irksome to have someone walk in and their eye just falls on the one thing that's not perfect (Gio pp. 41-42).

Inappropriate feedback and a focus on paperwork meant visits were not helping women provide better care. Consequently, coordinator's visits were viewed by some as a waste of time:

They pull apart everything that you do and analyze it and that's their job, but I guess I see things in a more simple way. The things they put down for cognitive, they would say, 'Lorraine told the baby that his shoe is blue'. You have to put that on paper, I mean you do that. It's like, okay, they have 4 pages to fill so let's put in anything that we can (Lorraine pp. 44-45).

... Like they [coordinators] used to provide resources and whatever but they don't have the time or they don't have the skill, but yet they are so bogged down in the paperwork and what is perceived because they need paper things (Dee p. 48).

For some women anxiety over the visits prevented visits from being useful:

I mean I remember the last time after she left, I had burst into tears. I just sat on the floor and cried for about a half an hour and my son just sort of looked at me and it was just I was so tired. You know, with them wanting your attention but you have to be available to that person too (Audrey p. 38).

Payment for child care services rendered to day care parent and providers for children who occupied subsidy spaces was paid by the provincial government. Participants

often described receiving their portion of payments late. This was viewed as disrespectful and caused economic hardship for some women which in turn failed to support their efforts to care for their own children:

And they got backlogged so much two years ago that they didn't pay me for the kids that were subsidized that they didn't pay me for 4 months...I actually had to go to the bank to borrow money (Nita p. 64).

Subsidy can be a real pain. I waited once, like one cheque went missing and in order to get a cheque re-issued here, you have to wait for 3 weeks before you can call them and then it takes 2 weeks after that before they can contact the Department of Finance, and sometimes you end up waiting 2 or 3 months and it's a very small thing but after they finally found out the cheque had gone missing... But you know, just getting around the people down there in the subsidy department is sometimes really annoying. Like they have a tendency to think that it's unimportant. I guess that they forget that it's your pay cheque (Susan p. 53).

These participants resented the power the Child Day Care office had in determining their income through the administration of subsidy spaces:

So don't come in here [coordinator] and give me grief about whether or not I am taking enough subsidized kids or whether or not I am using all my subsidized cases. Or whatever or whatever when there is nothing that you can provide me with any kind of guarantee. My subsidized cases is what I fall back on if I can't get unsubsidized (Dee p. 50).

... they will phone you every 6 months and find out how many of the cases you are using and how many you're not, and if you're not using them, they will pull them on you (Susan p. 72).

Theme 4: Resisting the limitations of family day care

The core finding of this study was that as FDC providers and mothers women purposefully put the care of children at the centre of their daily lives. This effort was strongly influenced by the ideological belief of participants and others that women

should do child care and other domestic responsibilities. The work/family stress and the contradictory support women experienced demonstrated limitations. Drawbacks were experienced, in part, because family members, day care parents, professional associations and the Child Day Care office and government expected and often undervalued women as child care providers. This, in turn, led to women being socially and economically disadvantaged. Women resisted these and other limitations of FDC.

In their resistance, participants continued to strive toward their goal of providing care to their own and day care children. Therefore, participants used strategies that helped them do their work. Eight categories describe women's resistance including: levels of public resistance, setting boundaries; networking; accepting and rationalizing drawbacks; changing household standards; purchasing help and appliances; and self-care.

Category 1: Levels of public resistance

Being licensed and joining their professional association were two attempts by participants to resist numerous drawbacks of FDC. Public resistance was limited, but present in group demonstration and lobbying efforts obtained through their professional association. A few women took parents who refused to pay for child care services to small claims court.

Several women were grateful their professional association lobbied for changes to the administration of subsidies after the government capped subsidized spaces.

After 1993, providers starting a FDC home were requested to sign a letter stating they would not require funding. This included subsidy spaces. The Family Day Care Association objected to this policy. This was a highlight of this woman's public resistance:

So, we went to them [Day Care Office] and we cited cases. We collected cases and so finally they dropped that [signing a letter]. We also told them that we had spoken with a lawyer and making providers sign that silly thing wouldn't hold up in court and they dropped it so now a subsidy case can be transferred to any licensed facility, funded or unfunded. (Theresa p. 50).

Theresa also engaged in public resistance with other child care providers. However, Theresa explained that the lack of support for alternate child care and lack of funding made it impractical for most FDC providers to attend public demonstrations:

... I am out there marching on worthy wage day and passing out pamphlets... 'Early Childhood Educator Worthy Wage Day' and it's across the country actually. And we go to the legislature...I go with whoever is out there and it's mostly centre workers because family day care providers would need to take the day off or pay someone which most of them can't afford because they don't make enough (Theresa p. 60).

Some providers also dealt with the economic insecurity of FDC by holding parents accountable. These women operated on their own without assistance from their professional association or the Child Day Care office when they took these parents to small claims court:

... I had a parent that didn't pay me and I took them to small claims court and garnished his wages (Gisele p. 46).

I took one of them to court and won and the other one, it was \$32.00 when she walked out so it wasn't worth it (Gio p. 31).

Generally, there was a dislike for and hopeless feeling about political activities that made participants' struggles as care providers public:

I have just received a request to be the rural representative for a national child care association. I don't know if I want to talk to politicians. I don't like politics. I could voice my opinion on day care, but I don't like the back stabbing and rig-a-ma-row of politics (Joanne p. 14).

Diane felt a sense of hopelessness about political activity. Making issues public was not considered worth the time and energy required:

... feeling that pumped up feeling. I mean it hasn't happened for a few years now in day care anyway, it's kind of like who wants to go out anyway. You know what you're going to hear anyway and what I read in the paper is pretty

accurate...right now is not my time to be trying to stretch myself in that direction (Diane p. 51).

Category 2: Setting boundaries

Resistance was primarily initiated and carried out individually and within women's homes. Since women worked in their homes, these strategies were also meant to help them function in them. As previously stated, FDC infringed on providers' family life, making it difficult for women to care for their children. Women resisted the problem of FDC infringing on their family life and exploitation by day care parents by setting boundaries. Women received assistance from the provincial Child Day Care office and professional associations to design manuals and service contracts between providers and day care parents. However, providers were expected to act on their own to put these tools in place and attempt to have day care parents abide by the policies outlined.

These women made efforts to ensure their own children's care was not negatively affected by the presence of day care children:

Kids were coming into his home and telling him what to do and he really resent[ed] that and so I really tried to set up his own space (Bridget p. 44).

I realized this was becoming a problem [not being available to her children]. I tried to get them so they [day care children] were doing something at that time so that..I could actually step aside and deal with whatever I had to when they get home and it could be anything from showing me what they did during the day to she had a problem with her friend or something (Nita p. 53).

Some participants refused services to parents when they felt they couldn't handle anymore children:

Well, I am full almost all the time and the only time I am not is because I am fussy. I will not fill a space regardless of the fact that I am a sole income earner, supporter of a family, I will not fill a space simply to fill a space because I don't need the stress of having an ill fitting child or more so than anything else an ill fitting parent (Dee p. 45).

Actually, because of having had him [special needs child], I'm kind of not wanting to invest myself that way for a while (Nita p. 39).

Acting on her own behalf, Bridget held parents responsible for damaged equipment.

She believed that ultimately parents were financially responsible for their child's care:

It [toy] broke so I sent it home with him [day care child] and it came back fixed. It took awhile, but it came back fixed (Bridget p. 61).

Sometimes participants set their own operating guidelines and policies around pick-ups, payment and quality care standards. Advice from other providers, the provincial Child Day Care office and their professional association helped women design their

policies. Standards were detailed in the contract between the FDC provider and day care parents:

I have things set out very clearly in my policy and I expect the children to have breakfast before they come, and I sort of put it down because they're going to be much happier once they are fed and they're not hungry and those kinds of things ... (Gisele p. 38)

My parents are generally very receptive, but, like I said I have a huge policy manual that every parent gets and it is theirs to keep...There is virtually nothing they can tell that they didn't know because it is in the manual. And if they didn't know it I will put it in the manual... (Dee p. 52)

Other policies were not set out in a manual. Many charged for late pick-ups:

But I charged once and I felt really bad, but I said I have to do this otherwise...it's not the money, it's just the fact you have to show them [parents] because you tell them, they don't care, but you have to show them. If you don't get serious, you know (Amy pp. 35-36).

Other participants were more subtle with parents in their attempts to ensure payment:

So now what I do is I make the receipt up ahead of time and I go waltzing out to the front waving the receipt. And then if they've forgotten, at least they know they've forgotten and I just sort of say jokingly, 'well, I'm keeping this until you pay me' and then it's out in the open. I know they're remembering. But it's horrible. Things like talking about raising the rates. I hate doing that. It's hard...I am getting more confrontational with the parents (Gio pp. 55 & 60).

Providers attempted to define "quality" care and threatened to withdraw services if parents did not follow these "quality" care standards. Attempting to ensure children were properly clothed was an important policy for Nita:

Like I had to say, if you don't bring them winter clothing, there's snow on the ground, bring them winter clothing. 'If you don't bring them winter clothing, you can't bring them [children]' (Nita p. 40).

Other participants who were upset with how parents cared for their children challenged them directly:

And I said you take her to a doctor. There is something wrong with her. Her stomach was all bloated and hard...I just felt that's kind of overstepping a daycare provider's boundaries but ethically, I couldn't not say it (Audrey p. 31).

Category 3: Networking

Most providers engaged in networking to gain assistance in dealing with the day to day limitations of FDC. The associations and Child Day Care office supported women's attempts to network together by providing space and encouraging women's attendance. Networking was helpful because it gave women the opportunity to share strategies and solutions on dealing with their problems in FDC:

Yeah, so that they can get a more fresh point of what they're dealing with and what they've done to work through the problems and that (Nita p. 69).

Just someone who can relate to it. To talk to and our group is pretty... there's kind of guidelines for these networking groups where when someone calls you in the middle of the day to say 'I can't handle this parent' or whatever, they know not to push the negative (Theresa p. 45).

On several occasions networking took on the role of providing a social engagement:

Just getting together and talking. We kept it quite informal and we had a supper. I enjoyed that. It was getting out without my own family. Getting out with a bunch of girls and having a meal (Q p. 28).

For the following participants, networking groups helped them deal with their individual financial expenses for day care equipment and training:

But other things like exchanging toys, or sometimes if one of them closes down, she'll pass on all her toys to or just, I don't know, just all kinds of things (Theresa p. 44).

Category 4: Acceptance and rationalization

Providing child care was women's primary motive to enter FDC. This took precedence over monetary rewards. Yet, economic exploitation is evident in FDC. Unable to obtain economic security, these FDC providers resisted economic limitations by explicitly choosing to accept these drawbacks:

Like I say, I've chosen to be poor...Some of my happiest times have been when I have been really poor so, yeah, it's not that important I guess (Audrey p. 57).

...a lot of material things aren't that important to me. I think as long as everybody's kind of happy and we have a little bit of money in the bank and we have a little security, all the material things don't really count, and you can probably tell that when you look around (Jill p. 27).

Other participants stated that the economic costs of FDC were minimal when compared to paid work alternatives available to them outside their home:

...I find that the parents who are really concerned about their children are quite willing to pay me very well for that [toddler care]. So, I think I'm probably making as much money, net, as I would if I were in the public school system (Louise p. 7).

So I can rationalize it by saying that, okay, I don't have to stand at the bus stop. It's harder for the kids to do that but now, I say I can't make this kind of money doing anything else but we always deal with it pretty well. That makes it much easier for me (Lorraine p. 20).

A few women felt their income was low because parents were unable to pay more:

But linked to all of that is the amount that a parent is able to pay. If we decided that we were \$16.00 an hour workers, I don't know who would have it to pay to us (Susan p. 78).

Some accepted the messiness, expense of the wear and tear on their home, and overall infringement on family space as drawbacks of FDC and sources of stress for their own family:

But a lot of it you just ignore and you overlook and you make a few excuses, 'Oh hi, come on in and bring your kid and drop off, sorry I didn't get the vacuuming done last night, I was too tired,' you know sort of thing...The mess and the wear and tear on the house you just go with. It's just part of it (Susan p. 64).

Maybe when I was younger, I felt more guilty about that infringement on their [own children] space. Now, I don't feel guilty, it's just an unfortunate thing that we have to deal with (Lorraine p. 20).

When asked what they liked most about working from their home in FDC, the majority of participants responded that, even with all the limitations (e.g., economic), the best part about FDC was being available to their children. In this way, FDC suited their personal or ideological view that mothers should provide care for their children and took precedence over monetary gain:

Basically, I just suck it up and I say this this is the adult decision that I made. This is a mature decision I made... and I think that number wise, I think that if the dislikes outweighed the likes, the likes are still more important. Each one

individually is more important and I guess it's a just a heart felt decision and I know that was the best thing for our family and it is (Diane p. 62).

I like being with my own children. I guess still even though it's difficult... The dislikes, well it has it's down sides of course. You don't have your U.I.C and you don't have your benefit package and all that kind of stuff. You have to pay into that so that's a down side to it when you're working from your home (Bridget p. 59).

Avoiding the hardships of taking their children to a day care was a rationalization for accepting the drawbacks of operating their own FDC:

I like being home with my daughter so I don't have to worry about getting her up and out of the house and off somewhere for the day.... Sure when I work at home, I don't get paid for sick days. Parents pay for the days they're here, whereas at the day care they paid whether they were there or not (Kathy p. 27 & 29).

Being able to spend time with their children was given priority over possible benefits of working outside the home:

The time. What would I do with my own kids in the morning and at lunch time and after school? When would I do all the other things I do? Right now I can take the kids to the doctor and just troop everybody along or get another mom. If I was working outside the home I wouldn't have that network (Gio p. 63).

Category 5: Changing household standards

In order to deal with increases in housework, some participants prioritized tasks and decreased their standards. They initiated these changes on their own without family assistance. This resistance prevented household tasks from interfering with their child care responsibilities. Prioritizing what needed to be done meant more time was available for their children:

There is just not enough time for everything, so you do the important things like cleaning the kitchen floor and that sort of thing and, well, if the cupboards don't get cleaned twice a year so what? (Joanne p. 13).

Reducing standards of household maintenance prevented some stress:

With the way my house was in the last two months, a year ago I think I would have had a nervous breakdown. But you learn to look over more things just because there's so many. You can't keep things spotless...Yeah, well it's changed things too. Before I tried to be a perfectionist and now things don't bother you [me] quite as much (Lyn p. 16).

Prioritizing children's needs over her housework helped Lee prevent stress:

I have had to learn to live with the house being...being able to have people come into my house knowing that it is probably not going to be tidy. When you walked in, I had to say to myself, it's going to be okay if it's not tidy. I will not allow it to embarrass me or to upset me or to distress me or to put some pressure on my kids to hurry up, tidy up, somebody's coming over. You know, I have to accept that this is the way it is because there is no point in doing this if she [day care child] is going to come right back in while you're

here even and cut up something and the paper always goes on the floor (Lee p. 22).

This provider worked hard at getting her family members to either help or accept how things were done. In this way, she set the standard:

The consensus is if the house is dirty and they're [family members] are not willing to help, that's it. It's going to be that way. I do as much as I can and if it's not up to what standards they think it should be, then they have to pitch in and help. It's taken a long time to get to that point (Nita p. 28).

Category 6: Purchasing help and appliances

Purchasing help and appliances helped participants deal with the time constraints produced by their increased household tasks and unequal division of labour in their home. This made them more available to do child care:

This year I'm going to hire somebody, house cleaner....It's a job (clean-up after day care) that a 12-year-old could do. It's very routine and I want to be finished work by 5:00 o'clock and not have to come in and spend a good hour

putting things back together again. And I can't just leave it there (Louise p. 15).

Household appliances were purchased that would not have been a priority if there was no family day care:

One addition we actually did for the house was that we got ourselves a dishwasher, you know, to take down the load of the dishes. So that's a physical thing I actually did with the house. You know I never found doing dishes a problem until you have 4 [children] of them (Nita p. 19).

Self-cleaning stove. There is no way I would go to a easy cleaning. It is like I bake every day and because on top since it is self-cleaning I broil which I would never do before. I have a frost free fridge I have no freezer. I have dishwasher for two people that you wouldn't usually have (Dee p. 24 - 25).

Category 7: Self-care

Many women engaged in self-care to resist the drawbacks of FDC. Some self-care involved obtaining support from other women and family members. This support was initiated by participants themselves and was an attempt to re-energize themselves so they could continue to function in their role as child care providers. Some women sought support by talking to other day care providers and family members about the stresses of FDC:

Talking about it whether it be with my husband, with my mother, with my provider friend, definitely talking about it. Like I said, I like to talk and talking sometimes makes boo-boos go away so talking helps definitely...Talking about my day basically too, like, 'so and so did this and he was just driving me crazy' and just being able to talk and like you said. I mean you can only talk to certain people about stuff like that because some people will just look at you (Q pp. 47-48).

Participants also engaged in personal interests and physical activities:

I take guitar music lessons once a week which gives me some personal time (Joanne p. 17).

I have more energy than some people do so that 15 to 20 minutes is all I go, but I run most of it and then I'm sort of a spiritual person, for quite a few years and only in the last year of so I've gotten kind of busy and I shouldn't let that go but I've always had sort of a quiet time in the morning (Jill p. 57).

Getting out of the house also helped some women deal with the isolation of working from their home:

So getting out is something I like to do whether it be just for a walk in the morning or even in the evening (Q p. 49).

The dividing line [personal and professional] you were talking about, I think, is more of an emotional dividing line than a physical one. There has been time here where I've said goodbye to the last parent and put my shoes and my coat on and gone out and gone for a walk just to sort of blow out some cobwebs (Susan pp. 31-32).

Several providers scheduled vacation time, at an economic cost to themselves, so they could have a break from the day care operations and spend time with their own children:

I take the month of August off so I didn't have any day care children then and I thought 'do I want to continue looking after special needs kids or what?' and I decided that I would (Gisele p. 42).

I do set aside two weeks in the summer for my holidays because I figure I need to have a break too (Kathy p. 29).

While some respondents hired someone to care for the day care children so they could address family responsibilities, Dee was the only provider to do so for the purpose of self care:

Sometimes I get really picky if I really need the time...I will hire in a sub [alternate care provider] (Dee p. 70).

Another participant changed her day care hours so she could attend to her family's needs:

I used to work until 6:00 or 6:30 and stopping at 5:00 made a big difference because there was always those few, even if there was just one child, you know, you're trying to get supper ready or have supper or go somewhere or whatever, and then that one child although it's not the child's fault and he [partner] didn't see it as the child's fault or anything like that, but just the whole job situation (Theresa p. 35).

Summary

In this study, the participants' behaviour and experiences as mothers and FDC providers originated with their desire to care for children. Similar to other work arrangements, this study found that FDC as a home work arrangement was an opportunity for women to do child care in a way that satisfied their ideological belief.

They believed that, as women, they should provide child care to their own children.

Women also wanted to care for day care children.

As the "centrality of child care" theme indicated, women were clear about their desire to perform personal and occupational child care. For most participants, FDC was chosen over working outside their home because it gave them the opportunity to care for children (i.e., their own and others) while earning an income. As child care providers, women experienced work/family stress, in part, because of the nature of FDC work. There were varying levels of support received from their families, day care parents, professional associations, and the Child Day Care office and government. This support was, in part, a result of the expectation others had of women as primary child care providers. Consequently, women's traditional role as care givers for their own and day care children was socially and economically exploited. With the exception of a few women, providers felt uncomfortable making problems about FDC and caring public. On occasion, through the auspices of their associations, providers lobbied for changes in the administration of child care services (e.g., changes to subsidies) and gained recognition and support from other providers through networking groups. Resistance, however, was restricted primarily in the privacy of their home and individual activities.

Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

In this chapter, the results of this study are compared to previous research about FDC providers and other home workers. The "ethic of care" and feminist political economy theoretical literature helps in understanding participants' experiences and behaviours. The four themes identified in this study are also related to work/family stress literature. The relationship between the study results, participants' and the researcher's recommendations, and FDC policy and administration are also addressed. Finally, recommendations for future research are presented.

This chapter argues that women in this study, similar to those in Nelson's (1988) study, entered FDC so they could care for their children, and earn an income, but in the process experienced social and economic disadvantages. Feminist political economy states that these exploitive experiences are a product of the undervaluing of caring work, and the view that child care is a private responsibility (i.e., between providers and parents). The "ethic of care" framework helps explain that participants value and appreciate the opportunity FDC gives them to care for their own children, and that they experience the boundary between paid and unpaid child care as artificial.

Finally, the researcher argues that if child care work is viewed as a collective and social responsibility, FDC providers will be more economically and socially valued. One step towards this goal is licensing because it assigns some social responsibility for child care. However, to make licensing politically feasible, higher quality control standards (i.e., training) are required. This would facilitate public

accountability and an acceptance of government expenditures for FDC. Additionally, women need social and economic incentives to license (e.g., subsidies). The findings in this study, and the participants' and researcher's recommendations directed these conclusions.

Motivation to Enter Family Day Care

Centrality of Child Care and an Ideological Commitment to Care

The theme "centrality of child care" demonstrated these women purposefully entered FDC so they could care for their own and day care children. This desire to care for children was the dominant focus and was strongly supported by their ideological belief that, as mothers, they should care for their own children. This finding is supported by the "ethic of care" and feminist political economy theoretical frameworks and studies on FDC providers (Atkinson, 1988; Baines, et al, 1991; Ferguson, 1991; Nelson 1988, 1989, 1990; and Rosenberg, 1987).

The prevalence of the ideological belief ascribing to women to the role of primary child care providers is also supported by Canadian studies. In Canada, women engaged in paid labour continue to be the primary child care provider in most homes (Lero, et al, 1993; Lero & Johnson, 1994; Lipowenko, December, 1994). The "ethic of care" literature argues that women's desire to care for children is a central focus in their daily lives (Baldwin & Twigg, 1991). The feminist political economy framework states that society does not view child care as a social responsibility, in part, because it is expected that women be child care providers (Nelson, 1988;

Rosenberg, 1987). Further, this study supports the claim of both frameworks that women's socialization to be child care providers helps direct them to FDC. However, as the "ethic of care" framework states, women do not accept the ideological belief that they are primary child care providers passively (Baldwin & Twigg, 1991).

Women's own desire to care helps place child care as a central focus.

Previous research about FDC providers indicates that women's preference to care for their own children motivates them to do home work (Atkinson, 1988; Christensen, 1988; Henderson, Lee & Birdsall, 1993; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990). Christensen states that women enter home work arrangements so they, not the children's fathers, can be the primary child care provider. Nelson (1988) found that the major reason why FDC providers in her study left wage labour was to prevent the pain of separation from their children. Also, according to Nelson (1990), the "merging of paid and unpaid care for the majority of providers...is rooted in a desire to care for their own children while earning a living" (p. 592).

Being available to care for their own children is identified in previous research on FDC providers and home workers (Atkinson, 1988; Christensen, 1988; Molgaard, 1993; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990; Sanders & Bullen, 1992). Nelson (1988) states that some women find working as employees difficult when they have small children. Some home work studies specifically identify meeting children's health, social, educational and economic needs (e.g., being home when children are sick) and being present at their children's activities (e.g., school play) as reasons women choose home work (Christensen, 1988; Public Service Alliance of Canada, 1993). As demonstrated

in "centrality of child care", this study strongly supports and expands on these findings.

Expanding on the above availability issue is this study's finding that some women start a FDC in order to care for their special needs children. A relatively high number (22%) identify their child's health problems, such as asthma, cystic fibrous, and learning disabilities, as reasons to enter FDC. These women found it too difficult to arrange for alternate child care and perceived external employment as unaccommodating to their demanding caring roles. This study also emphasized that women wanted to be available to their children because they are concerned about their children's safety (e.g., being physically harmed walking to and from school) and so that they could be more aware of their children's friends and community. These findings are related to "centrality of child care" and women's ideological commitment to their caring responsibilities.

Similar to Atkinson's (1988) and Nelson's (1988) findings, most participants in this study enter FDC because they viewed it as the best form of alternate child care. Bainly and Osborne (1994) found that FDC providers consider their two major responsibilities as being a substitute mother and providing a home-like environment for the day care children. Women in this study were also happy to be able to provide mothering to their day care children.

Economic motivation

The majority of women in this study started FDC because they needed to contribute to their family income. Obviously, for women from lone parent families, earning an income was necessary. Also, ironically, several providers who had previously worked in day care centres entered FDC because their income as child care workers was too low for them to pay their own child care. Women in other occupations had similar experiences.

In Canada, women's contribution to the family income averages 29.9% (Statistics Canada, as cited in Lero & Johnson, 1994, p. 13). This prevents many Canadian families from experiencing economic hardship. Other findings indicate women's motivation to enter FDC and other home work arrangements is related to their personal child care arrangements and economic needs (Atkinson, 1988; Baily & Osborne, 1994; Christensen, 1988; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990). In Canada, Logan and Belliveau (1995) point to a shortage of child care spaces and a steady increase in child care costs. It can be argued, therefore, that the shortage and high costs of child care, in part, directs women to FDC. Research states that women enter FDC and other home work arrangements for economic reasons related to supporting their children (Atkinson, 1988; Barnett, 1993; Dimidjian, 1982; Dunster, 1994; Nelson, 1988, 1990).

Nelson (1988) states that FDC appeals to the majority (82%) of women in her study because it is a way they can earn an income while caring for their own children. These women need to eliminate child care costs because their income is too low to afford paying these costs. Also, Christensen's (1988) and Johnson and Johnson's

(1994) findings indicate that women began other home work because they require the income.

Work/family Stress

The theme "work/family stress" indicated that expectations by day care parents of providers produced long work days. FDC was also described by some women as physically and mentally challenging work. These factors, along with professional isolation and low and fluctuating incomes, produced job-related stress for participants. These findings are supported by other research stating that providers and other home workers experience work/family stress.

Failure by parents to adhere to FDC policies relating to the drop off and pick up of children within day care hours and payment schedules influences women's experience with work/family stress (Atkinson, 1988; Lerner & Mitchell, 1991; Leavitt, 1988; Nelson, 1988, 1991). Atkinson (1988) and Nelson (1988) state that the nature of FDC work results in burdensome work schedules and long work hours. Canadian researchers Dunster (1994) and McConnell (1994) also identify FDC as physically and mentally demanding work.

Dimijian (1982), Dunster (1994), Nelson (1988) and Wattenberg (1977) state that FDC providers experience job-related stress because they sometimes lack the support and a positive social climate with colleagues. Christensen's (1988) findings indicate that women home workers also experience professional isolation. According to Lero et al (1993) and Stone (1994), long work days, physically and mentally

challenging work, and a lack of support from colleagues are job-related stress factors that contribute to work/family interference.

FDC providers' connection to the labour market is noted in previous research (Atkinson, 1988; Nelson, 1988). Specifically, Nelson (1988) finds women are economically disadvantaged within FDC operations. She argues that since some day care parents, particularly mothers, receive a low income, it is difficult for them to pay higher FDC rates. Similarly, the gender/sexual division of labour principle of feminist political economy argues that women's connection to the labour market creates their economically disadvantaged position in society (Maroney & Luxton, 1987). This study found that women's unstable economic situation contributed to work/family stress.

Clearly, some women's wages would allow for higher FDC rates. However, participants in this study felt, at times, women's (and men's) incomes made it difficult for them to pay adequate FDC rates. The low and fluctuating income women received produced anxiety, particularly for lone parent families, around their ability to afford resources needed to care for their own children. The extent to which a job allows women (or men) to provide a secure and adequate standard of living for their children has not been identified as a source of work/family stress by Lero, et al (1993) or Stone (1994). Therefore, this study adds economic stress to this list of job-related stress factors.

The Social and Economic Exploitation of Women as Primary Child Care Providers

The theme "women as primary child care providers" indicated that FDC providers, as child care providers, received contradictory support from families, day care parents, their professional associations and the Child Day Care office and government. As the feminist political economy framework explains, the contradictory support was a product of the undervaluing of child care and the expectation that women (not men) be primary child care providers for their own children and alternate care providers for day care children. In turn, the contradictory support meant women's desire to care (i.e., "ethic of caring") was economically and socially exploited. The result that FDC providers received contradictory support is similar to other research findings (Atkinson, 1988; Dunster, 1994; Leavitt, 1991; McConnell 1994; and Nelson, 1988, 1990). This finding is also similar to research on other home workers by Christensen (1988) and Johnson & Johnson (1994). These researchers also discovered women home workers receive limited support in providing child care, for example, from families. This leads to them being socially and economically exploited as well.

Two unique findings of this study related to the support women received from their husbands. In this study, licensed providers were less likely to question government regulations than their husbands. Husbands had difficulty accepting and acknowledging the need for regulations. Husbands often resented these regulations and saw them as interfering in their private matters. Women were more willing to accept the regulations and considered them a necessity. Another new finding was that

even when husbands also worked from their home, they continued to expect women to be the primary child care provider of their own children and to maintain the home. These men could have easily shared more responsibilities. Nelson (1988) states that family members have increased expectations of women as mothers and wives. However, Atkinson (1988) finds that family members help providers by taking care of the day care children to allow them contact with other adults. A Manitoba study indicates many FDC providers perceive family members as very supportive (McConnell, 1994). Some family members in McConnell's study also stated that, on occasion, they resent the intrusion of the day care on their family life.

Participants in this study also make contradictory remarks about the helpfulness of their professional membership, licensing and coordinators. This study is supported by previous FDC research. Many researchers argue professional associations provide FDC providers with resources to deal with professional and social isolation through training and support groups (Cohen, 1992; Leavitt, 1991; McConnell, 1994). Dunster (1994) also claims liability insurance helps FDC providers protect themselves from financial hardship.

McConnell (1994) states that providers perceive support from the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba as helpful because they make providers' efforts known to day care parents and government. This is viewed by providers as helping increase the value of child care work in Canada. Professional associations help providers attain the support of networking groups thereby increasing their job satisfaction. However, McConnell also finds that some providers considered the association as unsupportive,

particularly to rural and northern providers who did not have access to workshops in their home communities.

Similar to Auerbach & Woodill (1993), Cohen (1992), Leavitt (1991) and Nelson's (1991) findings, the debate over the role of government in the relationship between day care parents and FDC providers continues in this study. Consistent with Cohen (1992) and Kyle's (1993) research, some participants describe the income tax system, provincial day care grants and subsidies, assistance for the care of special needs children, regulations, educational opportunities and coordinators' visits as helpful. However, Auerbach and Woodill also state that licensing causes unwanted regulations that interfere with providers' family life. This study supports the opinions of the majority of providers in McConnell's (1994) study who state coordinators and the Child Day Care office provide resources and are supportive to providers. However, a few of these participants described the coordinators visits as disruptive and inconsiderate. Others accused coordinators of attempting to enforce day care centre rules on the day care home. Therefore, contradictory findings were evident in this study.

Nelson's (1988) study indicates that day care parents forget to pay FDC providers on time, refuse to pay entirely, and assume services that extend past closing time are free. Women in this study also experienced these difficulties with day care parents. McConnell (1994) states the majority of providers in her study find day care parents are "supportive of their caring skills, business practices and efforts to communicate about the children" (p. 99). Similarly, parents in this study showed

support by expressing appreciation, bringing supplies (e.g., food), providing alternate care for day care children and paying regularly, on time and, for one woman, giving a bonus.

This study supports the feminist political economy framework that women are expected to be primary child care providers for their own children and care providers of day care children. This, in turn, leads to social and economic exploitation of women as identified in previous research (Atkinson, 1988; Leavitt, 1991; Molgaard, 1993; Nelson, 1988, 1989, 1990). Nelson (1988), using a feminist political economy framework, states that women are exploited because they are free child care providers for their families and low cost labourers for the state and day care parents. This means families, employers and the state gain both economically and socially by women's efforts to raise and nurture children within society (Nelson, 1988). The "ethic of care" literature also argues that women's commitment to caring is exploited (Baines, et, al, 1991; Ferguson, 1991). Ferguson states women's caring is undervalued and not recognized in Canadian society. This study also supports the feminist political economy and "ethic of care" literature view that women cannot "love and relate to children without sentencing themselves to a secondary position in our society" (Armstrong & Armstrong, 1990, p. 32).

Family Day Care Providers' Resistance to Limitations

Reitsma-Street (1991) describes three types of resistance in her study on adolescent girls' caring. These forms of resistance, while applied to girls, are also

relevant to women as care providers. According to Reitsma-Street, the first form of resistance emphasizes women taking care of themselves which may involve straightforward resistance to rules, opposition to daily expectations, and addressing their own needs before others. The second approach involves the use of supportive systems "to minimize the damages of problematic daily life and maximizes the protection of others" (p. 129). Thirdly, resistance involves the ability to change one's situation and thereby develop new opportunities. All three forms of resistance are evidenced in this study.

Women taking care of themselves

Setting boundaries was an attempt by participants to oppose the daily expectations that day care parents and family members had of them as child care providers. In this way women were also addressing their own needs over those of others. Participants set boundaries when selecting children and by designing policy manuals outlining day care hours, late fees, payments, and expectations of day care parents (e.g., ensuring children have proper clothing). This is similar to Nelson's (1988) findings that some women select children they believed would not require special services and would be an appropriate age for the day care operations.

Atkinson (1988) also finds that providers engaged in a detailed selection process that included a discussion with day care parents on the FDC policies.

In addressing their need to care for children in a way they valued, participants practised Reitsma-Street's first form of resistance. Similar to Nelson's (1988) findings,

these women rationalized that even though FDC had drawbacks, it was the best arrangement available to them to care for their own children while earning an income. Atkinson (1988) and Nelson (1988) also state that women rationalize the limitations of FDC on the grounds that is the best way to give their own children a safe social environment. Dunster (1994) suggests that women in FDC use a process of rationalization that recognizes the limitations of FDC.

This study's results echo some of Atkinson's (1988) findings. She states that FDC providers purchase household equipment and schedule time away from the FDC operation by closing. However, unrelated to other FDC research, this study found providers opposed the daily expectations of family members and addressed their own needs by changing their household standards, purchasing help and appliances, and self-care practices.

Creating new opportunities

By entering FDC, participants were changing their situation from one of working outside their home and away from their own children, to providing care to their children while earning an income. It was also important for them to do the caring work they valued and enjoyed. They wanted child care to be the central task in their daily lives. This was supported by their ideological belief that, as mothers, they should care for their children and, as women in a home environment, they could provide quality care for day care children. These results support Nelson's (1988) findings that FDC providers experienced the demands of employers and the wage

labour market as incompatible with their efforts to meet their own child care needs. She also states that providers found using alternate child care both ideologically and practically difficult. Atkinson (1988) and Nelson (1988) state women entered FDC because they wanted to be available to their own children. Studies on other home workers find women want to be home when their children arrive home from school or are sick (Christensen, 1988).

Using supportive systems

Women were also using supportive systems to help them do effective child care work and deal with limitations. By licensing with the provincial government and joining their professional associations, participants were attempting to deal with numerous drawbacks of FDC. Women in this study used professionalism and licensing to resist the undervaluing and economic limitations of child care. Some participants also thought that having FDC providers accountable through government regulations helped them acquire social status and respect, particularly from day care parents. Licensing gave providers access to operating grants and subsidy spaces. Professional membership provided women with numerous resources. Although this study does not directly address the effectiveness of licensing and professionalism, it is clear that the majority of participants considered it helpful in their efforts to gain social and economic status. However, a few considered these practices ineffective, at times detrimental, to their social and economic status as FDC providers.

The effectiveness of licensing (i.e., government monitoring and regulations) and professional membership in addressing the drawbacks of FDC is debated in the literature (Andre, 1992; Auerbach & Woodill, 1993; Cohen, 1992; Kyle 1993; Leavitt, 1991; Nelson, 1991; Pollard & Lockwood Fischer, 1993). Women in this study found both licensing and professional membership as primarily helpful. Auerbach & Woodill (1993) argue that licensing enhances providers pay, and thereby is an attempt to increase the economic status of child care. Pollard & Lockwood Fischer (1993) agree that licensing can increase economic status. These authors also argue that by increasing the economic status the social status, of child care is increased. Women can gain some financial assistance when they care for day care children with special needs (Larner & Mitchell, 1992; Leavitt, 1991; and Nelson, 1988). Professional membership and licensing has been found to assist women by providing training, workshops, insurance coverage, and access to other FDC providers (Cohen, 1992; Kyle, 1993; Leavitt, 1991; and McConnell, 1993). Similar to this study, these supports help providers deal with the drawbacks of economic and social exploitation and professional isolation. For example, the professional associations and Child Day Care office also provide some print material and training opportunities.

Through the use of networking groups, participants were also resisting limitations by using their professional system. Atkinson (1988), Dunster (1994), McConnell (1994) and Nelson (1990) all pointed to the usefulness of networking groups in reducing professional and social isolation by providing ideas on dealing with the everyday problems of providing child care, and in locating and obtaining resources.

Networking groups helped participants receive acknowledgement, understanding and support from other women doing the same work. These groups, for some members, also provided ideas and access to child care materials. For example, some participants received ideas on how to deal with parents paying late. A few were able to obtain day care equipment at a low cost.

Participants negotiated with members of their family on ways they could help them deal with some of the drawback of FDC (e.g., caring for day care children). This is similar to Atkinson's (1988) findings that providers negotiate with their husbands on arranging alternate child care for the day care children. McConnell (1994) also finds that supportive families are key to helping women obtain some satisfaction with the day care work.

Public resistance

Through public resistance, women used some of their supportive systems. Family day care has been dominated by the ideology that child care should be a private arrangement between parents and providers (Auerbach & Woodill, 1993). Nelson (1988) states, of FDC, that "[p]oliticians on the right of the political spectrum can find satisfaction in the fact that the (public) responsibility for child care has remained in the private sphere" (p. 90). Nelson (1991) also argues that women view public involvement in FDC as inappropriately interfering with the home-like, affectionate child care they strive to provide. With FDC firmly entrenched in privacy, public resistance is often limited (Auerbach & Woodill, 1993). Similarly, this study

shows that women are often uncomfortable and hesitant to go public with their concerns.

This group of FDC providers, however, also demonstrated some comfort with public resistance. This was done through their professional associations and on their own. Through their professional association, some participants engaged in public resistance by lobbying for changes in the administration of subsidy spaces. One woman chose to regularly attend an annual public rally that draws attention to the low wages of all child care workers (ie., FDC and day care centre workers). Several women successfully used small claims court to acquire late payment from day care parents. In these ways, some women were resisting economic exploitation publicly.

Implications for Family Day Care Policy and Administration

Family day care policy in Manitoba is set out in the Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983). According to this Act, licensing of FDC homes is directed by the number of children a person cares for in their private home. It does not require mandatory licensing. For licensed providers, this Act gives administrative direction and economic support from coordinators and subsidy clerks employed by the provincial Child Day Care office. For providers who are members of their professional association, they also receive support and guidance from their staff and board of directors. This study has implications in these areas of policy and administration.

Some of the following recommendations from participants imply a need for child care to be recognized as a social responsibility. Arguably, this would help women deal with social and economic disadvantages by obtaining resources (e.g., financial) and social recognition. For example, some participants asked for an increase in subsidies and a government paid salary enhancement. They also want training to support women's transition into FDC. During training, women would be encouraged to assess their own compatibility with home work and child care, and the impact of the day care on their family. Providers want this training so committed and competent women enter FDC, thereby improving what they believe is a poor reputation of FDC by the public. Participants also want more professional development and support in the area of designing and carrying out child care policy (e.g., penalties for late payment) with day care parents. Implementation of these recommendations would provide an incentive for women to license and help to assign a social responsibility to child care.

Participants' Recommendations

Economic and Social Recognition and Support

Government officials responsible for the design of the Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983) and personnel, such as coordinators, must acknowledge and recognize FDC providers are mothers requiring an income. This recognition is a prerequisite to addressing the difficulties around subsidies and the economic needs they have as mothers. These participants make recommendations to

the government Child Day Care office requesting better administrative practices for subsidies:

I think they should start subsidizing the children rather than subsidizing the spaces. I think that would be a really big help for us and for the parents (Susan p. 71).

I just wish they'd find a better system. Hire more people. They made all their cut backs and that's part of the problem too.... With subsidy, I wish there was, definitely a better way (Q p. 52).

These participants state that they need more money and have these suggestions for government:

The reality with the pay is difficult.... A salary enhancement grant where the government paid a portion of it could be instated (Joanne p. 18-19).

We need more money.... Right now there's staggered wages. Children in centres, centres get paid more for children than family day care home (Bridget p. 71).

More subsidy pay (Q p. 51).

Through licensing, child care work is brought to the public realm. This helps promote social responsibility for child care. The following participants recommended that the government tighten up licensing requirements in hopes of attracting competent providers that would improve the overall reputation of FDC providers:

... I think when they do that [license], it really reflects badly on us. There are other people who are really doing... and I don't think it gives credibility to us having a license. You know, so you've got a license but look at when they're licensing... So, I think they should be able to license better than what they are doing and they should be able to have more expertise (Nita p. 87).

I think there could be a minimum training required and I'm not talking, you have to pay a \$300.00 university course or anything like that (Theresa p. 71).

Oh, some follow up, even if there were minimum requirements to be met initially and then gradually phase in further courses or some further training of

some kind.... I would insist that licensed people, licensed child care people have at least some basic minimum requirement of proven...whether it's academic or...probably, at least some academic and some practical as well (Louise pp. 41 & 55).

Transition into Family Day Care

Participants' comments suggest that areas where FDC providers have problems may indicate possible topics for training sessions which can be offered by coordinators and staff of professional associations. For example, during the training of potential FDC providers women can be helped to assess the impact of the FDC on their family. Determining the level of support from family members prior to and during the operating of a FDC was seen as important. These participants have the following recommendations to women interested in entering FDC:

Know how the husband is going to like it and their own children so I always say to maybe start out small and slow (Jill p. 39).

They also have to communicate with their family and learn how to delegate. That's something that is very important and refrain from the 'this is my job list and this is your job' sort of mentality (Susan p. 67).

The following participant suggested assessing community services for later use.

Accessing this support was considered to be key to dealing with the isolation and attaining resources required to provide child care service:

If it is not obvious for people, then maybe they need to determine what type of outside help they need in that direction. They got to think in terms of tapping into the community, getting somebody to help them clean if they can't do it themselves (Lee p. 68).

Participants made a number of suggestions to coordinators interested in helping women make the transfer into FDC work. One suggestion comes from Dee who

recommended women recognize their limitations as FDC providers:

To realize the limitations that it impinges on you. You can't pick up and go (Dee p. 72).

Jill and Audrey spoke of accepting the financial limitations. Pointing out these limitations during training would help women make an informed decision:

If we are talking about day care, I think they should realize that there isn't much money involved in it. They shouldn't do it just for the money. They should do it for the love of kids.... We work for money because we all need money, we all need decent income but day care is not a high paying job at all (Jill p. 54).

I guess it's just that you are not going to get rich, if you are a single person doing it (Audrey p. 62).

Some providers suggest women assess whether or not child care work is what they really want to do and are capable of doing:

I think too many people go into it because they just love children! Well, that's really nice, but you also have to know what you're doing (Louise p. 39).

... you, have to like... don't mind the changing of the diapers and don't mind the... you know, it's those... the making of the food and the questions and the one million one questions a day (Nita p. 83).

Additionally, it is suggested that women assess their compatibility with home work. It would be helpful to potential providers to have assistance assessing their fit with home work:

I mean not everybody can work out of their home, just like not every body can work in an office.... I mean it's a job that only certain people can do and that's the way I look at it too (Q p. 52).

Professional and Social Support

Participants have suggestions for their coordinators and professional association that can help FDC providers increase networking opportunities. These participants recommend their professional association be more proactive in reaching out to FDC providers:

That when unlicensed, they want to give me as much information and a sense of a support system and that will get me more interested in becoming part of their organization, you know.... I think that... let's start with the agencies. I think one thing is that they could take an approach that they are thrilled that I am doing this (Lee p.62).

Finally, just not to forget about the people in the rural and north area (Joanne p. 18).

Another woman feels the Association should place less emphasis on professional classification and more on supporting FDC providers, regardless of their educational and training background:

To remember the diversity of your membership.... to treat everybody like professionals. Sometimes they lose that, I mean [the Association] for the longest time they have had a tendency or it has been reported that day care providers are not as professional as workers in a centre setting (Dee p. 74).

It was also recommended that the association be cognizant of FDC providers' limited time when helping them. Coordinators, as well, need to recognize that the challenges of FDC work make it difficult for providers to be available to them during their visits or in the evening (i.e., for training sessions):

... send us the materials, recognizing that the only time we get to read this stuff is at night after we've tucked everybody into bed. Our brains then are half fried, so you know, don't talk down to anybody, you know, 'ah she's just a babysitter', but talk up to them (Lee p. 62).

Providers would like coordinators and professional associations to encourage women to take care of themselves. Importance of self-care should be stressed during training sessions:

Sometimes I just go, I just get out. So I would suggest that if you work in your home, you definitely have to get out (Q p. 49).

I would recommend definitely don't take things personally.... Different things like people will stop coming and you'll say 'why' and they'll say 'no reason' and you're wondering, 'did I do something or what?' It doesn't make any sense. But maybe somebody else is cheaper or they're 5 blocks closer or whatever (Lyn p. 43).

Participants set out their own policies in an attempt to avoid exploitation by parents.

Some providers recommend women starting a FDC do the same. Kathy states:

I'd say sit down and really think what you want from it. You're not going to start before this time in the morning, you're going to be done at this time. Just really set out what you want and make it clear to... I made a contract at the beginning and we went through it and we both signed it and in there I have I think it's \$10.00 for every 15 minutes they're late (Kathy pp. 34 & 36).

Policy to close the day care for short times would help some providers take care of themselves:

have[ing] times set aside for holidays and, you know, I say in my policy that I take a month off because my family and I need to refresh ourselves to provide better care for the children (Gisele p. 47).

Providers want help in developing and ensuring day care parents adhere to the providers' policies. These suggestions focus on day care parents adhering to policy, paying promptly and showing respect:

Yeah, like, don't bring them sick. If he threw up at 4 o'clock in the morning, keep him at home. Again that's a thing that they have to work out with their employer as well (Diane p. 69).

Well, there are the two things that bother providers the most and that's late payment and late pick up. So always to be prompt. I always think if parents thought of your pay cheque as they think of their own. I mean if their employer just all of a sudden said on Friday, 'I don't have the money today, can I pay you next week?' Well how would you feel? (Jill p. 39)

Realize that she has a family and a life too. I mean, parents need to realize to... when they book off work, they don't care if their boss is short handed that day a lot of the time. For an hour or two, they don't care (Bridget p. 70).

Respect the rules basically. To respect my contract. I try and respect their wishes, I mean, just respect mine. Respect is big [important]... just like I said, a little appreciation. It is hard work we do and just to be noticed for that (Q pp. 50-51).

The following researcher's recommendations expand on the participants' suggestions.

Researcher's Recommendations

The researcher recommends that the Manitoba government take steps to make child care a social responsibility by providing women FDC providers incentives to license and by making licensed providers more accountable to the public. This will help decrease the economic and social exploitation of FDC providers, described in this study and by the feminist political economy and "ethic of care" frameworks. Through licensing, child care becomes a social responsibility and provides women with tools to deal with the drawbacks of FDC. Licensing allows government, as the licensing agent, to maintain quality control standards (e.g., training) through regulations. Standards such as training has been linked to quality child care services (Friendly, 1994). Some women in this study thought licensing was detrimental when untrained women were licensed. These participants wanted training requirements for licensed

providers increased. Further, enforcement of quality control standards such as training and other requirements could increase the overall reputation of FDC providers. Consequently, government can more easily justify to the public use of government funds to pay licensed providers.

While a policy to have all FDC homes licensed would make child care a social responsibility, it is not politically feasible. Also, women in this study did not support mandatory licensing. Emphasis on government restraint, the perpetuation in Canada of the social norm which assigns women the roles of child care providers, and the view that FDC is a private relationship between provider and parent make mandatory licensing politically unacceptable to providers and the public in general. Also, mandatory licensing would most likely drive FDC further underground, perpetuating the exploitation of providers. Therefore, it is recommended that the Manitoba Government continue with the policy of voluntary licensing, but increase training requirements, enhance regulations and provide economic and professional incentives for providers to license.

Similar to Prince Edward Island's regulations, Manitoba providers should, at a minimum, complete a 30 hour child-related training course (Friendly, 1994). Also, in Saskatchewan, women have to complete an orientation training course (Friendly, 1994). This would help Manitoba providers make the transition into FDC. These suggestions would also serve to give providers a more positive and stable professional reputation, and help women obtain tools to deal with some of the disadvantages of FDC. Other requirements that would help regulate quality are found in Nova Scotia's

regulations (Friendly, 1994). The researcher recommends that licensed Manitoba providers cleared by the RCMP or local police as having no criminal record and not be on the child abuse registry.

The Community Child Day Care Standards Act (Manitoba, 1983) provides direction for coordinators to monitor FDC homes and providers. While providers often found coordinators visits unhelpful, they were not necessarily unwanted. Many expressed an appreciation for their coordinator. Coordinators need policy within the Act so they can help women deal with conflict with parents around early drop offs, late pick-ups, and late or no payments. Providing regulations to deal with these problems supports providers and lessens the possibility of exploitation by parents.

Identifying child care as a social responsibility, France has provided economic incentives to encourage women to enter FDC (Moss as cited in Friendly, 1994). Government can also move to make child care a social responsibility by providing women with an incentive to enter FDC and, in doing so, help providers deal with economic exploitation.

Better administration of subsidies will provide women with an incentive to license. The researcher supports the recommendations of some participants related to subsidies. In particular, the Child Day Care office should increase the government portion of subsidies and ensure subsidy payments be received by providers in a timely fashion. Also, especially in low income areas, the number of subsidy spaces need to be increased. These initiatives would help providers deal with economic limitations by helping them fill their spaces and ensure partial payment.

As one participant suggested, instating a salary enhancement policy would economically benefit FDC providers. This would involve the government paying a daily rate for every child over and above subsidy payments and the parents' portion. This would be a very positive and progressive step toward making child care a social responsibility.

Government could offer FDC providers benefits without changing women's designation as home workers. Benefit packages, similar to group and life insurance, should be made available for dental, optical and medical (e.g., prescription drugs) care. In part, this would be in recognition that these parents do not have employee benefits and are often low income earners. By addressing the need for benefits, government can support women's efforts to care for their own children (i.e., "ethic of care") and help them provide their child with economic security.

The "centrality of child care" theme supported the "ethic of care" framework that states child care is a central role in women's lives. Providers wanted to be available to their children prior to and after school, and when children were sick. As well, when providers must close down due to their own illness, they receive no payment from parents. For these reasons, like salaried employees, providers require access to colleagues who can temporarily relieve them of their paid child care responsibilities. Also, providers need time off to attend professional development programs that would support their efforts to give day care children quality care. Consequently, the researcher recommends the Child Day Care office provide paid alternate child care providers to licensed providers. Therefore, the FDC can continue

to operate when women attend to personal, family and work-related responsibilities without losing revenue.

Finally, participants stated that they benefitted from advocacy work completed by their professional association. Women were also able to resist some of the disadvantages of FDC work by engaging in networking groups encouraged and sponsored by their Association. FDC training was also considered beneficial. Criticisms of their Associations were made with the understanding that the organizations had received government cutbacks in recent years. The benefits of the professional associations, however, support the researcher's recommendation that the Manitoba government increase financial assistance to the professional association. Consequently, the Association could enhance their advocacy, support and educational roles with the study participants' and researcher's recommendations.

The researcher's recommendations have staffing, economic and political implications. With more work related to licensing, monitoring and subsidies, the number of Child Day Care staff, including coordinators and subsidy clerks, need to be increased. Providing subsidies, salary enhancement and benefits are costly initiatives. These recommendations require an increase in the Child Day Care office budget. More government involvement in FDC is controversial. Many providers and parents will object to increased regulations and standards. However, increasing quality control standards through effective and efficient regulations and supervision of licensed providers will increase public support. Also, making economic and professional incentives available to women encourages their support for licensing. Consequently,

this will help make child care a social responsibility in Manitoba and reduce the social and economic exploitation of FDC providers.

Recommendations for Home Work in the Human Services

This study also has implications for the use of home-based work in the human services. Much of direct human service work involves caring. Caring work, especially child care, is undervalued in Canada, making human service workers at risk of being exploited. Therefore, it is the researcher's opinion that only under strict conditions should home-based work be used in human services.

Workers who are outside their agency making home visits or doing community work could benefit from home-based work arrangements. These individuals could potentially reduce travel time, allowing them more time to be available to their children. This would be possible if they used their home as an "office" when completing administrative responsibilities. Similarly, women with responsibilities such as designing and completing evaluations, and who are equipped with the required technology, could also benefit from home work. Individuals interested in home work should be assessed prior to entering these arrangements for their compatibility with and expectations of home work.

When human service workers choose home work, they should have equality with their agency colleagues. In particular, they need to have employee status, and the same benefits available to their co-workers. Home workers with children require flexibility to be available to them. However, to help women complete their paid work

during the day, they need to be encouraged and economically supported in obtaining appropriate alternate child care. Finally, regularly scheduling meeting time with agency staff will help prevent professional isolation. Home work can benefit some human service providers, but caution must be exercised to prevent it from being an exploitive experience.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research on this topic, using grounded theory methodology and feminist research perspectives, is warranted. Ultimately, the aim is to build a theoretical explanation detailing the behaviours of women who do paid human service work while caring for their own children. The goal is to identify ways these women can gain administrative assistance, support and training to help them balance work and family responsibilities.

The themes and categories can be used as indicators to direct subsequent interviews and observations when collecting further data. Unlicensed FDC providers with children may bring a different perspective from the unregulated sector. As employees within an institutional setting, day care workers who are also mothers would bring another perspective on administrative practices. Bringing in these perspectives will either support, expand or contradict study results.

Further studies on unlicensed women FDC providers who have their own children, and other providers (e.g., unlicensed and licensed) without their own children would provide interesting results to compare and contrast with the findings in this

study. In particular, research questions could include, what prevents women from licensing, and how can government provide incentives for providers to license? Providers who don't have the responsibility of caring for their own children could increase our understanding on how they view caring. Also, do these providers have other caring responsibilities (e.g., elder, grandchildren) or do they operate a FDC for lack of out of home employment? This information would add very important perspectives and information to the FDC literature.

Summary

The "ethic of care" and feminist political economy literature argues social, economic and political structures provide an exploitive environment for women as child care providers (Baines, Evans & Neysmith, 1991; Bakker, 1988; Baldwin & Twigg, 1991; Leira, 1994; Nelson, 1988; Rosenberg, 1987). In particular, Nelson (1988), using a feminist political economy perspective, states in her study of FDC providers that home-based work, like out of home work arrangements, presents many personal costs for women. This study supports Nelson's findings.

These participants made a choice to enter and remain in FDC because, to them, it was better than working outside the home. FDC was the best alternative, even though it was socially and economically exploitive, because it provided women with an opportunity to care for children (i.e., personal and occupational) while earning an income. Also, using alternate forms of child care was ideologically unacceptable and economically impractical given women's low incomes. By entering FDC, women

adhere to their ideological value that ascribes to them the roles of primary child care providers for their own children and low paid providers for day care children.

The prevalence of this ideology in Canadian society was demonstrated in this study. Based on this ideology, women received contradictory support from their families, day care parents, professional associations, and the Child Day Care office and government.

The inconsistent support and nature of FDC produced work/family stress. However, since the goal was to provide child care, the limitations of FDC, including the economic stress, was rationalized as unfortunate, but manageable. Women resisted the drawbacks of FDC through public, group and individual strategies. Of particular significance was women's political efforts to bring economic problems to the public forum through lobbying the Child Day Care office and accessing small claims court.

When child care is recognized as a collective and social responsibility, women as primary care providers will experience less social and economic exploitation. Licensing which provides economic and social support, while outlining requirements and regulations, makes this goal more possible. However, the government needs to provide women with incentives (i.e., economic and social) to license while ensuring the public that FDC providers are providing quality child care (i.e., training requirements and regulations) at a reasonable cost to government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andre, T. & Neave C. (1992). The Complete Canadian Day Care Guide. Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.
- Armstrong, P. & Armstrong, H. (1990). Theorizing women's work. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.
- Armstrong, P. & Armstrong, H. (1985) Political Economy and the Household: Rejecting Separate Spheres. Studies in Political Economy, 17, 167-177.
- Armstrong, P., Armstrong, H., Connelly P., & Miles, A. Feminist Marxism or Marxist Feminism: a debate. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.
- Atkinson, A. M. (1991). Providers' evaluations of family day care services. Early Child Development and Care 68, 113-123.
- Atkinson, A. M. (1988). Providers' evaluations of the effect of family day care on own family relationships. Family Relations(67) 399-404.
- Auerbach, J. D. & Woodill, G. A. (1993) Historical Perspectives on Familial and Extrafamilial Child Care: Toward a history of family day care. D. Peters, A. Pence (Eds.), Family Day Care: Current Research for Informed Public Policy. (pp 9-27) Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.
- Bailey, S. & Osborne, S. (1994). Provider Perspectives on the Content and Delivery of Trainign for Family Day Care. Child & Youth Care Forum 23(5) 329-339.
- Baines, C., Evans, P., & Neysmith, S. (Eds.). (1991) Women's Caring: Feminist perspectives on social welfare. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.
- Bakker, I. (1988). Women's employment in comparative perspective. In J. Jenson, E. Hagen & C. Reddy (Eds.), Feminization of the Labour Force: Paradoxes and Promises. (pp 17-44) New York; Oxford University Stress.
- Baldwin, S. & Twigg, J. (1991). Women and community care: reflections on a debate. In M. Maclean & D. Groves (Eds.), Women's Issues in Social Policy. (pp 117-135) London: Routledge.
- Barker, R. L. (1991). The social work dictionary. (2nd Ed.) Silver Spring, ML: National Association of Social Workers.
- Barnett, W. S. (1993). An introduction to the economic of family home day care. In

D. Peters & A. Pence (Eds.), Research for Informed Public Policy. (pp 72-91) Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.

Berg, B. L. (1989). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bova, B. (1991). Work at home: Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs leads the way in alternative work options. Public Service Management, pp 6-7.

Bracken, D. & Walmsley, C. (1992). The Canadian Welfare State: Implications for the Continuing Education of Canadian Social Workers. The Social Worker 60(1), 21-24.

Briskin, L. (1992). Socialist Feminism: From the Standpoint of Practice. In M. P. Connelly & P. Armstrong (Eds.), Feminisms in Action: Studies in Political Economy. (pp 267-294) Toronto: ON: Canadian Scholars Press.

Chamot, D. (1988). Blue-Collar, White-Collar: Homeworker Problems. In K. E. Christensen (Ed.), The new era of home-based work: Directions and policies. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Child Day Care, Manitoba Community Services (1986). Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care. Winnipeg, MB

Christensen, K. E. (1993). Reevaluating union policy toward white-collar home-based work. In D. S. Cobble (Ed.), Women and unions: Forging a partnership. (pp 246-259) New York, NY: IL, Press.

Christensen, K. E. (1988). Women and home-based work: The unspoken contract. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.

Christensen, K. E. (1988). (Ed.). The new era of home-based work: Directions and policies. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Coates J. F., Jarratt, J. & Mahaffie, J. B. (1990). Future Work: Seven critical forces reshaping work and the work force in North America. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Coley, S. M. & Scheinberg, C. A. (1990). Proposal Writing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Costello, C. B. (1988). Clerical home-based work: A case study of work and family. In K. Christensen (Ed.), The new era of home-based work. (pp 135-149), Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

- Cude, B. J. (1994). Liability Insurance and Family Day Care Providers: Three Views of the Issues. Child & Youth Care Forum 23(6) pp 377-391).
- Currie, D. (1988). Re-Thinking what we do and how we do it: a study of reproductive decisions. Canadian Review Sociology and Anthropology,25(2), 245-256.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. (pp 500-516), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dimidjian, V. J. (1982). Understand and Combatting Stress in Family Day Care. Journal of Child Care 1(2). 47-59
- Duffy A., Mandell, N., & Pupo, N. (1989). Few choices: women, work and family. Toronto, On: Garamond Press.
- Dunster, L. (1994). Home Child Care: A Caregiver's Guide Ottawa, ON: Child Care Providers Association.
- Duxbury, L. & Haines, G. Jr., (1991). Predicting alternative work arrangements from salient attitudes: A study of decision makers in the public sector. Journal of Business Research, 23, 83-97.
- Epstein Jayaratne, T. & Stewart A. J. (1991). Quantitative and qualitative methods in the social sciences: Current feminist issues and practical strategies. In M. M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.) (pp 85-106) Beyond Methodology. Bloomington, ID: Indiana University Press.
- Facione, N. C. (1994). Role overload and health: the married mother in the wage labour force. Health Care for Women International, 15, 157-167.
- Family Centre of Winnipeg. (n.d.) Handbook for Special Needs Family Child Care Providers [Brochure].
- Family Day Care Association (n.d.) Background Information: FDCA [Brochure].
- Ferguson, E. (1991). The Child-Care Crisis: Realities of Women's Caring. In C. Baines, P. Evans, & S. Neysmith (Eds.), Women's Caring: Feminist Perspectives on Social Welfare. (pp 73-105), Toronto, ON: McClelland & Steward Inc.
- Fernandez, H. C. (1990). "Family sensitive" policies can attract employees to human

service organizations. Administration in Social Work, 14(3), 47-66.

Fischel-Wolovick, L., Cotter, C., Masser, I., Kelman-Bravo, E., Jaffe, R. S., Rosenberg, G. Wittenberg, B. (1989). Alternative work scheduling for professional social workers. Administration in Social Work, 12(4), 93-102.

Fraser, N. (1989). Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Friendly, Martha. (1994). Child Care Policy in Canada: Putting the Pieces Together. Don Mills, ON: Addison-Wesley Publishers Ltd.

Gannage, C. (1987) A World of Difference: The Case of Women Workers in a Canadian Garment Factory. In H. Jon Maroney & M. Luxton (Eds.), Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Work, Women's Struggles. (pp 139-165) Agincourt, ON: Methuen.

Gannage, C. (1986). Double Day, Double Bind: Women Garment Workers. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1978). Theoretical Sensitivity. San Francisco, CA: University of California.

Government of Manitoba (1995). A Guide to Manitoba Labour Employment Standards. Winnipeg, MB.

Government of Saskatchewan (1994). Breaking New Ground in Child Care. Regina, SK.

Graham, H. (1993). Social divisions in caring. Women's Study International Forum, 16(5), 461-470.

Gray, M., Hodson, N., & Gordon, G. (1993). Teleworking Explained. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Gummer, B. (1991). The management careers of men and women: Mommy tracks, daddy tracks, and "new age" leadership. Administration in Social Work, 15(4), 111-128.

Gummer, B. (1990). The politics of social administration: Managing organizational politics in social agencies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hagedorn, R. (1986). Sociology. Toronto, ON: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.

- Hasenfeld, Y. (1983). Human Service Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Heinonen, T. (1994). The meeting of qualitative methods and feminist perspectives in research. Manitoba Social Worker (n.d.), pp 14-15.
- Henderson, L. W., Lee, V. E., & Birdsall, W. C., (1993). Attitudes Toward the Employment of Mothers of Preschoolers: Implications for Child Care. Child & Youth Care Forum 22(1) pp 23-39.
- Herbert, T. A. & Minas, C. (1994). Teleworking perspectives. Women in Management, 15(11), 51-61.
- Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. (pp 428-445), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Johnson, T. (1993). Go Home ...and Stay There? A PSAC response to teleworking the Federal Public Service. Ottawa, ON: Public Service Alliance of Canada.
- Johnson, T. (1994, November). Telework: the challenge to organized labour's agenda. Perception, 18, 4-7.
- Johnson, L. C. & Johnson, R. E. (1982). The Seam Allowance: Industrial Home Sewing in Canada. Toronto, ON: Women's Educational Press.
- Joice, W. H. (1993, Summer). Flexiplace: Getting the job done at home. The Public Manager, pp 22-24.
- Joice, W. H. (1991). Home Based Employment - A Consideration for Public Personnel Management. Public Personnel Management, 20(1), 49-60.
- Joint working group on workers with family responsibilities. (1992, June). Women and men in the workplace: A discussion of workplace supports for workers with family responsibilities. Paper presented at the 12th Annual Conference of Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women, New Brunswick.
- Joshi, H. (1991). Sex and Motherhood as Handicaps. In M. Maclean & D. Groves (Eds.), Women's Issues in Social Policy. pp 179 - 204 New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kadushin, A. (1992). Supervision in social work. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Kammerman, S. B. (1985). Child Care Services: An Issue for Gender Equity and

Women's Solidarity. Child Welfare 114(3), 259-271.

Karambayya, R. (1994) Beyond exit: Exploring women's responses to work-family conflict. Women in Management, 15(11), 62-69.

Kendall, E. D. & Walker, L. H. (1984). Day Care Licensing: The Eroding Regulations. Child Care Quarterly 13(4), 278-290

Kirby, S. & McKenna, K. (1989). Experience, research, social change: Methods from the margins. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.

Kossek, E., Dass P., & DeMarr, B. (1994) The Dominant Logic of Employer-Sponsored Work and Family Initiatives: Human Resource Managers' Institutional Role. Human Relations 47(9), 1121-1149.

Kyle, I. J. (1993). Models of Family Day Care and Support Services in Canada. In D. Peters & A. Pence (Eds.), Family Day Care: Current Research for Informed Public Policy. pp 209-228 Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.

Land, H. (1991). Time to Care. In M. Maclean & D. Groves (Eds.), Women's Issues in Social Policy. pp 7-19 New York, NY: Routledge.

Lang, A. (1995, April). How others see them. Report on Business Magazine, 79-85.

Langford, N. & Keating N. (1987). Social Isolation and Alberta Farm Women. In K. Storrie (Ed.), Women: Isolation and Bonding. (pp 47-58) Toronto, ON: Methuen.

Lamer, M. & Mitchell, A. (1992). Meeting the Child Care Needs of Low-Income Families. Child & Youth Care Forum, 21(5) 317-334.

Leavitt, R. L. (1991). Family Day Care Licensing: Issues and Recommendations. Child and Youth Care Forum, 20(4) 243-254

Lechner, V. M. & Creedon, M. A. (1994). Managing work and family life. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.

Lee, C. Duxbury, L. & Higgins, C. (1994). Employed mothers: Balancing work and family life (Research Paper No. 15). Ottawa, ON: Candian Centre for Management Development.

Lee-Gosselin, H., Burke, R., and Belcourt, M. (1991). The entrepreneurs three demanding roles: truth and consequences. Women and Management, 12(11), 1-10.

Leira, A. (1994, June). Concepts of caring: loving, thinking, and doing. Social Service

Review. 185-201.

Lero, D. S., Brockman, L. M., Pence, A. R., Goelman, H., & Johnson, K. L. (1993). Canadian National Child Care Study Workplace Benefits and Flexibility: A perspective on parents' experiences. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.

Lero, D. S., Johnson, K. L. (1994). 110 Canadian Statistics on Work and Family. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Levin, R. & Leginsky P. (1989). Independent Social Work Practice in Canada. The Social Worker 57,(3), 155-159.

Levin, R. & Rasmussen, P. (1991). Is Independent Practice a Legitimate Form of Social Work? The Social Worker 59(4), 149-153.

Lipovenko, D. (1994, December 23). Clash of job, family doubly hard on women. The Toronto Globe and Mail, pp. A1, A4.

Lipsig-Mumme, C. (1992). Organizing Women in the Clothing Trades: Homework and the 1983 Garment Strike in Canada. In M. P. Connelly & P. Armstrong (Eds.), Feminism in Action: Studies in Political Economy. (pp 121-148) Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.

Loeppky, R. (1994). Personal Conversation. Winnipeg, MB: November.

Logan, R. & Belliveau, J. (1995, Spring). Working mothers. Canadian Social Trends. 24-29.

Lowe, G. S. & Northcott, H. C. (1986). Under pressure: A study of job stress. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.

Lowe, G. S. (1989). Women, paid/unpaid work, and stress: New directions for research. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Luxton, M. (1987). Time for Myself: Women's Work and the "Fight for Shorter Hours". In H. Jon Maroney & M. Luxton (Eds.), Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Struggles. (pp 167-178) Agincourt, ON: Methuen.

Luxton, M. (1983). Two Hands for the Clock: Changing Patterns in the Gendered Division of Labour in the Home. Studies in Political Economy, 12 pp 27-44.

Luxton, M., Rosenberg, H. & Arat-Koc, S. (1990). Through the kitchen window: The politics of home and family. (2nd ed.). Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.

MacDonald, M. & Connelly M. P. (1992). Class and Gender in Fishing Communities in Nova Scotia. In M. P. Connelly & P. Armstrong (Eds.), Feminism in Action: Studies in Political Economy. (pp 23-46) Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Mager, B. (1995). Supervising the homemaker. Unpublished manuscript.

Mager, B. (1995). Human service homeworkers. Unpublished manuscript.

Mandell, N. & Duffy, A. (1988). (Eds.). Reconstructing the Canadian family: Feminist perspectives. Toronto: ON: Butterworths Canada, Ltd.

Manitoba Child Care Association. (1995). Family Daycare Provider: Membership Benefits Checklist [Brochure].

Manitoba Community Services. (1986). Licensing Manual for Homes Day Care [Brochure].

Manitoba Family Services. (1995). Child Day Care Subsidy Program: Helping with Payment of Child Care Fees [Brochure].

Manitoba Family Services. (n.d.) Day Care Facts [Brochure].

Manitoba Regulation 62/86. The Community Child Day Care Standards Act. Winnipeg, MB: Queen's Printer.

Molgaard, V. K., (1993). Caregivers' Perceptions of the Relationship Between the Family Day Care Business and Their Own Families. Child & Youth Care Forum 22(1) pp 55-69

Maroney, H. J., (1985). Embracing Motherhood: New Feminist Theory. Canadian Journal of Political Social Theory, 9(1-2), pp 40-64.

Maroney, H. J., Luxton, M. (1987). From Feminism and Political Economy to Feminist Political Economy. In H. Jon Maroney & H. Luxton (Eds.), Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Work, Women's Struggles. (pp 5-28) Agincourt, ON: Methuen.

Martin, P. Y., & Chernesky, R. H. (1989). Women's Prospects for Leadership in Social Welfare: A Political Economy Perspective. Administration Leadership in the Social Services, pp 117-143.

McConnell, B. (1994). Family Day Care Providers Perceptions of Support and Levels of Job Satisfaction. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Manitoba at Winnipeg.

Minister of Supply and Services Canada. 1995. A 21st Century Employment System

for Canada [Brochure].

Moen, P. (1992). Women's two roles: A contemporary dilemma. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Morse, J. M. (1994). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) (pp 220-236). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Nelson, M. K. (1989). Negotiating Care: Relationships between Family Daycare Providers and Mothers. Feminist Studies, 15(1), 7-35.

Nelson, M. K. (1991). A study of family day care providers: attitudes toward regulations. Child & Youth Care Forum 20(4) 225-242.

Nelson, M. K. (1990). Mothering other children: The experiences of family day-care providers. Journal of Women in Culture and Society 15(31), 586-605.

Nelson, M. K. (1988). Providing family day care: an analysis of home-based work. Social Problems 35(1), 78-91.

Newman, J. (1994) The Limits of Management: Gender and the Politics of Change. Managing Social Policy J. Clarke, A. Cochrane, & E. McLaughlin (Eds), Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Nieva, V. F. & Gutek, B. A. (1981). Women and work: A psychological perspective. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Olesen, V. (1994). Feminisms and models of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research. (pp 158-175) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Olmsted, B., & Smith, S. (1989) Flexiplace. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Opie, A. (1994). The instability of the caring body: Gender and caregivers of confused older people. Qualitative Health Research 4(1), 31-51.

Orser, B. & James, T. (1992). Home Business: A New Reality. National Home-Based Business Project Committee.

Pascall, G. (1986). Social policy: A feminist analysis. New York, NY: Tavistock Publications.

- Pence, A., Goelman, H., Lero, D., & Brockman, L. (1993). Family day care in a socioecological context. In D. Peters & A. Pence (Eds.), Research for Informed Public Policy. (pp 58-71). Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.
- Pollard, J. & Lockwood Fischer, J. (1993). Research Perspectives on Family Day Care. In D. Peters, & A. Pence (Eds). Family Day Care: Current Research for Informed Public Policy. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc. pp 92-112.
- Powell-Cope, G. M. (1995). The experiences of gay couples affected by HIV infection. Qualitative Health Research 5(1), 36-63.
- Reitsma-Street, M. (1991). Girls Learn to Care; Girls Policed to Care. In C. T. Baines, P. M. Evans & S. M. Neysmith (Eds). Women's Caring: Feminist Perspectives On Social Welfare. (pp 106-137) Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart, Inc.
- Reutter, L. I. & Northcott, H. C. (1994). Achieving a sense of control in a context of uncertainty: Nurses and AIDS. Qualitative Health Research 4(1), 51-74.
- Revenue Canada. (1993). Using Your Home for Day Care [Brochure].
- Romzek, B. A. (1991) Balancing work and nonwork obligations. In C. Ban & N. Riccucci (Eds.), Public personnel management: Current concerns - future challenges. (pp227-239). Longman, NY.
- Rosenberg, H. (1987) Motherhood, Stress, and Depression: The Costs of Privatized Social Reproduction. In H. Jon Maroney & M. Luxton (Eds.), Feminism and Political Economy: Women's Work, Women's Struggles. (pp 181-196). Agincourt, ON: Methuen.
- Sanders, D. & Bullen, M. M. (1992). Staying home: From full-time professional to full-time parent. Toronto, ON: Little, Brown and Company.
- Shulman, L. (1991). Interactional social work practice: Toward an empirical theory. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publications, Inc.
- Smith, D. E. (1992). Feminist Reflections on Political Economy. In M. P. Connelly & P. Armstrong (Eds.), Feminism in Action: Studies in Political Economy. (pp 1-22) Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Sorensen, G., Verbrugge, L. M. (1987). Women, Work and Health. Annual Review of Public Health 8, 235-252.

- Statistics Canada. (1993) Work Arrangements. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Stone, L. O. (1994). Dimensions of job-family tension. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research. (pp 273-286), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin J. (1990). Grounded theory methodology: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. Qualitative Sociology,13(1) 3-21.
- Swiss, D. J. & Walker, J. P. (1993). Women and the Work/Family Dilemma: How Today's Professional Women Are Finding Solutions. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Taylor, S. & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: The Search for Meanings. 2nd ed. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tessler, S. 1995. Personal Conversation. Child Day Care, Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, 11 May.
- Vanance, D. (1989). Leadership in nursing: A modified grounded theory approach. Unpublished manuscript.
- Veltmeyer, H. (1986). Canadian Class Structure. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.
- Wattenberg, E. (1977). Characteristics of Family Day Care Providers: Implications for Training. Child Welfare 106(4) 211-225.
- White, J. (1993). Changing Labour Process and the Nursing Crisis in Canadian Hospitals. Studies in Political Economy, 40, 103-134.
- Williams, S. (1995). Surfing the new millennium: Home-based business holds potential for the future. Career News(3),3 1-2.

APPENDIX A

**REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION PUBLISHED
IN THE MASW AND SASW NEWSLETTER**

**A STRATEGY TO
BALANCE WORK AND FAMILY DEMANDS?**

If you are a woman human service worker practicing from your home and are responsible for the care of children or other family members, I am interested in speaking with you.

As a graduate student at University of Manitoba's Faculty of Social Work, I am conducting thesis research on the impact of home-based work arrangements. In particular, I am considering whether such arrangements help or hinder women in balancing home and professional responsibilities. What are the benefits and drawbacks of working from your home? What do you miss or not miss about the office environment? Do you feel isolated from your colleagues? I would like to interview women who work from their homes on a part or full time basis as employees, contractors or private practitioners and who, in their personal lives, care for children or other dependent family members.

My study is the first of its kind in Manitoba and is in response to the rapid development of home-based work; primarily among women. I will share my research results with all participants.

Interviews will be confidential and used only for purposes of my thesis. I am able to travel within Manitoba to meet with participants and have flexibility respecting both date and time of interviews.

If you are interested or are willing to participate, please contact me. Thank you for your help!!!

Brenda L. Mager
62 Fletcher Crescent
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3T 0L1
(204)475-7209 (collect, if necessary)
E-mail address "ummager4@cc.umanitoba.ca"

APPENDIX B**LETTER TO POSSIBLE PARTICIPANTS THROUGH AGENCY/ASSOCIATION**

Dear Participant:

I am a graduate student at the University of Manitoba's Faculty of Social Work, conducting thesis research about women human service workers working from their home. In particular, I am considering women's reasons for choosing home-based work. How do women manage to fulfil their family, personal and work-related responsibilities? What do women like and dislike about working from their homes?

I am contacting you through the agency/association because you have been identified by your association as a possible participant for my study.

I would like to interview women who work from their homes for at least 20 hours per week as employees, contractors or private practitioners and who, in their personal lives, care for children or dependent adults. If you meet these requirements I would be interested in speaking with you about your experiences as a human service home worker. **Please be assured the agency/association will not be informed by me of your participation in my study.**

The research design requires one interview be conducted lasting one and a half to two hours in length. Interviews will be tape recorded. Your confidentiality will be protected through the use of code names in place of your true identity. Also, I will replace "family day care provider" with the title "child care provider". The word "association" will replace the agency/association. Finally, you will not be identified as a Manitoba or Saskatchewan resident and I will not include your address in any thesis documentation.

My study is the first on this topic in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and is in response to the development of home-based work. I am willing to share my research results with all participants.

If you are willing to participate, please contact me at the following address. I am able to meet with you at your convenience. Also, please feel free to pass on this request to women you believe would be interested in participating in the research. Thank you for your help and I hope we can meet to discuss this interesting topic.

Sincerely,

Brenda L. Mager, BSW, RSW

62 Fletcher Crescent, Winnipeg, MB R3T 0L1

Telephone: (call collect) (204)475-7209 E-mail address "ummager4@cc.umanitoba.ca"

After August 28, 1995 please contact me at: P. O. Box 3538, Melfort, SK S0E 1A0

Telephone: (call collect) (306)752-2069 E-mail address "green.mager@sasknet.sk.ca"

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF PERMISSION TO AGENCIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Dear ,

I am a graduate student in the Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba and presently preparing to complete my thesis research study as required for my Masters of Social Work degree. The purpose of my study is to explore the experiences of women human service workers who work from their home, including employees, private practitioners and family day care providers. My thesis proposal have been reviewed and approved by the Faculty of Social Work, Research Ethics Committee on July, 13, 1995. My study is being supervised by a committee of three professors with Dr. Lyn Ferguson as the committee chairperson.

I am writing to you today to request assistance from the agency/association, in identifying possible participants for my study. The criteria for participation in my study include:

1. Participants must be female;
2. Participants must have personal family care responsibilities and;
3. Participants must work at least 20 hours per week based from their home.

It is necessary that I follow the Faculty of Social Work, Research Ethic Committee protocol respecting contact of potential research participants. In adhering to the protocol I am requesting that your agency send a letter from me to possible participants requesting their assistance in my study. All responses to my requests will be returned directly to me.

If you are willing to assist me, please contact me at the following address. I will be contacting you shortly to discuss my request and answer any questions. Thank you for your time and attention.

Yours sincerely,

Brenda L. Mager, BSW, RSW
62 Fletcher Crescent, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 0L1
Telephone (collect) (204) 475-7209 E-mail address "ummager4@cc.umanitoba.ca"
After August 28, 1995 please contact me at:
P. O. Box 3538, Melfort, Saskatchewan, S0E 1A0
Telephone (collect) (306)752-2069
E-mail address "green.mager@sasknet.sk.ca"

APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORM

I understand the goal of the study is to identify the experiences of women human service home workers who have family responsibilities and carry out work-related responsibilities from their homes.

I understand I have been selected for the research because I am a woman who has family responsibilities and I am a human service worker who works from my home.

I understand I will be interviewed once for one and a half to two hours. I further understand interviews will be tape recorded by Ms. Mager.

I understand I may refuse to answer any question(s), stop the interview or ask Ms. Mager to leave at anytime.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the research at anytime without penalty.

I appreciate identification of my participation in Ms. Mager's study could affect my work environment. I understand Ms. Mager will be using the following methods to ensure my confidentiality and anonymity: therefore, the possibility of my identification as a participant is extremely small. I understand my participation will not be shared with my employer, co-workers, professional association staff or membership, the individual who referred me or the thesis committee. I further understand all identifiable information including my real name, occupation title, place of employment and residency will be excluded from my interview, therefore, absent from all tapes, disks and written material.

I understand a code name will replace my real name.

I understand "independent home worker", "employee home worker" or "child care provider" will replace my official title.

I understand the words "employer" and "association" will replace the actual names my employer or professional association.

I understand my residency will be not identified in the interview, tapes, disks or thesis.

I understand my real name, occupation title, code name, place of employment and residency will be kept in Ms. Mager's safety deposit box. Tapes and computer disks will be located in a lock drawer at Ms. Mager's home.

I understand all identifiable information will be destroyed after the acceptance of

Ms. Mager's thesis by her committee and summary information have been sent to participants.

I understand I will not be paid for my participation.

If I request, I understand a summary of the study will be available to me at no cost.

I understand I may contact Ms. Mager should I have any questions or concerns about the study by telephoning her collect at 475-7209 or (306) (752-2069) after August 28, 1995.

This confirms, that I _____ date _____, having met the conditions, agree to participate in the thesis research study conducted by Brenda Mager, a graduate student with the Faculty of Social Work, University of Manitoba. The study is being supervised by a committee of three professors with Dr. Lyn Ferguson (telephone - 474-6670) as the committee chairperson.

APPENDIX E**SCHEDULE OF DATA COLLECTION**

The purpose of this interview is to explore your experiences as a women working from your home while having family responsibilities. I have developed some questions for you to answer. However, please tell me what is important to you even if I don't ask you. Your answers and remembrance of personal experiences shall guide the remaining interview as your role as a home worker is key to the study. Occasionally, I will ask you to expand and clarify your responses. You may at any time refuse to respond to any question or stop the interview.

Demographic Information

I will begin with some questions about yourself.

1. How many children do you have? _____ Ages _____; _____; _____; _____.

Which of these children live with you? _____.

2. How many adults who require physical care live in your home? _____.

Ages _____; _____.

3. Could you describe to me your educational and training background?

Less than grade 12 _____;

Grade 12 _____;

Grade 12 plus technical training _____

Discipline: _____;

Undergraduate Degree:

Discipline: _____;

Masters Degree: Discipline:

_____;

Other training: _____.

4. How many years have you worked in the paid labour force? _____.

How many months/years have you worked from your home? _____.

How many months/years have you been in your present work arrangement? _____.

How many hours a week are you paid to work? _____.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

I would like you to think about your family responsibilities, working conditions and the paid work you do from your home.

1. Could you describe the paid work you regularly do from your home?
2. How did you begin working from your home? Why did you begin working from your home?
3. How long do you plan to work from your home?
4. What are your family responsibilities including the physical and emotional care and social responsibilities? Please include responsibilities for family members that live in your home and outside your home.
5. Please describe what child/elder/adult care arrangements you use when working from your home? For example, do children remain in home, do you use day care,

have a sitter come into your home, or does a family member care for your child/parent? How are these care arrangements managed? For example, who takes and picks up the children from the day care/sitter, talks to the child care provider, makes the lunches, checks the child's book bag, etc? How comfortable are you with your child/elder/adult care arrangements? Do you find these arrangements affordable and accessible?

6. What kind of physical arrangements have you made at home that allow you to work from your home?

7. What household (e.g., tasks like cleaning, cooking, shopping) arrangements have you made since you began working from your home?

8. Please describe to me what a typical day for you involves. Include both paid and unpaid work. (How long is your day? Who does it involve? How do you arrange your time?)

I would now like you to think back to when you began working from your home and how your work and family relationships have developed since then.

1. Could you describe the ways members of your household have been helpful or not helpful to you when working from your home? You may choose to begin by describing the ways members have either been helpful or not helpful. (What about extended family? Friends?)

2. Could you describe the ways contractors (parents), employer, or association have been helpful or not helpful to you when working from your home? Again, you may

choose to begin by describing the ways these people have either been helpful or not helpful.

3. Do you keep in contact with other home workers (family day care providers) and colleagues and if so, how do keep in contact? These contacts do not always have to be related to your paid work. (How satisfied or happy are you with these contacts?)

Expanding on the experiences you have already shared with me:

1. Given all these experiences what do you particularly like and dislike about working from your home?
2. How do you deal with the things you don't like about working from your home?
3. What would you recommend to other women who are considering or who are working from their home? To contractors (parents), employers or associations of home workers?
4. Is there anything you would like to add?

I have just a few remaining demographic questions to ask. Again you may refuse to respond to any of these questions.

1. Please describe your marital status: Single _____; Married _____ Common-law _____;
Separated _____; Divorced _____; Widowed _____; Other _____.
2. Could you please tell me you age: _____.
3. Please indicate your personal income range: Under \$10,000 _____; \$10,000-

20,000 _____; \$20,000-40,000 _____; \$40,000-60,000 _____; Over \$60,000 _____.

4. Please indicate your family income range: Under \$20,000 _____; \$20,000-40,000 _____; \$40,000-60,000 _____; Over \$60,000 _____.

5. Please describe your ethnic origin _____.

APPENDIX F**REVISED SCHEDULE OF DATA COLLECTION**

The purpose of this interview is to explore your experiences as a women working from your home while having family responsibilities. I have developed some questions for you to answer. However, please tell me what is important to you even if I don't ask you. Your answers and remembrance of personal experiences shall guide the remaining interview as your role as a home worker is key to the study. Occasionally, I will ask you to expand and clarify your responses. You may at any time refuse to respond to any question or stop the interview.

Demographic Information

I will begin with some questions about yourself.

1. How many children do you have? _____ Ages _____; _____; _____; _____; _____.

Which of these children live with you? _____.

2. How many adults who require physical care live in your home? _____.

Ages _____; _____.

3. Could you describe to me your educational and training background?

Less than grade 12 _____;

Grade 12 _____;

Grade 12 plus technical training _____

Discipline: _____;

Undergraduate Degree:

Discipline: _____;

Masters Degree: Discipline:

_____;

Other training: _____.

4. How many years have you worked in the paid labour force? _____.

How many months/years have you worked from your home? _____.

How many months/years have you been in your present work arrangement? _____.

How many hours a week are you paid to work? _____.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

I would like you to think about your family responsibilities, working conditions and the paid work you do from your home.

1. Could you describe the paid work you regularly do from your home?
2. How did you begin working from your home? Why did you begin working from your home?
3. How long do you plan to work from your home?
4. What are your family responsibilities including the physical and emotional care and social responsibilities? Please include responsibilities for family members that live in your home and outside your home.
5. Please describe what child care (i.e., for day care children) arrangements you must leave your home for personal, family or work related reasons (e.g., child care courses,

doctors appointments). How comfortable are you with your child/elder/adult care arrangements? Do you find these arrangements affordable and accessible?

6. What kind of physical arrangements have you made at home that allow you to work from your home?

7. What household (e.g., tasks like cleaning, cooking, shopping) arrangements have you made since you began working from your home?

8. Please describe to me what a typical day for you involves. Include both paid and unpaid work. (How long is your day? Who does it involve? How do you arrange your time?)

I would now like you to think back to when you began working from your home and how your work and family relationships have developed since then.

1. Could you describe the ways members of your household have been helpful or not helpful to you when working from your home? You may choose to begin by describing the ways members have either been helpful or not helpful. (What about extended family? Friends?)

2. Could you describe the ways parents, association or the child care office have been helpful or not helpful to you when working from your home? Again, you may choose to begin by describing the ways these people have either been helpful or not helpful.

3. Do you keep in contact with other family day care providers and colleagues and if

so, how do keep in contact? These contacts do not always have to be related to your paid work. (How satisfied or happy are you with these contacts? How did you meet other providers?)

Expanding on the experiences you have already shared with me:

1. Given all these experiences what do you particularly like and dislike about working from your home?
2. How do you deal with the things you don't like about working from your home?
3. What would you recommend to other women who are considering or who are working from their home? To contractors (parents), association, and the child care office?
4. Is there anything you would like to add?

I have just a few remaining demographic questions to ask. Again you may refuse to respond to any of these questions.

1. Please describe your marital status: Single _____; Married _____ Common-law _____;
Separated _____; Divorced _____; Widowed _____; Other _____.
2. Could you please tell me you age: _____.
3. Please indicate your personal income range: Under \$10,000 _____; \$10,000-20,000 _____; \$20,000-40,000 _____; \$40,000-60,000 _____; Over \$60,000 _____.
4. Please indicate your family income range: Under \$20,000 _____; \$20,000-

40,000 _____;

\$40,000-60,000 _____; Over \$60,000 _____.

5. Please describe your ethnic origin _____.

APPENDIX G**SAMPLE OF SOCIOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTS AND INDICATORS****Sociological Constructs 1: Opting out (exiting) process****Indicator 1: women's response to family****Indicator 2: work-related****2: Centrality of caring****Indicator 1: family-related****Indicator 2: work-related****3: Family unit****Indicator 1: alternate care****Indicator 2: operations****Indicator 3: family responsibilities****Indicator 4: economic****4: Professional unit****Indicator 1: direct service****Indicator 2: education/training****Indicator 3: networking****Indicator 4: professionalism****Indicator 5: self-appreciation****5: State****Indicator 1: economic****Indicator 2: education/training****Indicator 3: direct service****Indicator 4: recognition****6: Structural ordering****Indicator 1: payment****Indicator 2: regulations/evaluations****8: Self-reliant****Indicator 1: acceptance****Indicator 2: political reluctance****Indicator 3: rationalization****Indicator 4: standards****Indicator 5: self-care****Indicator 6: purchasing****Indicator 7: setting boundaries**