
Corporate Daycare: Motivation, Performance, Satisfaction and Retention of Employees

Dr. Rupa Rathee¹
(Assistant Professor)
DCRUST, Murthal

Ms. Pallavi Rajain²
(Research Scholar)
DCRUST, Murthal

Ms. Ritu³
(MBA Student)
DCRUST, Murthal

Abstract:

Workplace day care is an important benefit for many employees but still daycare facilities for working parents are relatively scarce in India. Therefore, the present study aims to find motivation, satisfaction, performance and retention of employees in relation to on-site daycare facility. Descriptive research design was used in the present study whereby structured questionnaires were distributed to employees of IT industry (TCS, Infosys, Wipro) located in NCR and a sample of 101 was collected. The data was analyzed using SPSS version 23. Mean, standard deviation and t-test were used for assessing the level of motivation, satisfaction, performance and retention from childcare services received. It was found that most of the employees were satisfied with the services provided, although the satisfaction level was not very high. The males and females had similar opinion in most of the cases except the impact on their performance.

Keywords: Daycare, IT industry, Motivation, Performance, Satisfaction

Introduction

Providing child care in the workplace can have many benefits for companies, including improving employee morale, lowering turnover and attracting a wider variety of applicants. Although providing workplace day care can be expensive, many companies find that it actually saves money in decreasing employee absenteeism and turnover. Several options exist, from bring-your-baby-to-work programs to on-site day care and cooperatives between small companies. Workplace day care is an important benefit for many employees, allowing them to spend more time with their children during the workday. Some on-site programs allow employees to spend lunch and breaks with their children. Workplace day care also decreases anxiety for some parents, improving their ability to concentrate on their jobs.

A large company with a high number of employees may opt to open an on-site day care center serving only its own employees. For other companies, a better option may be to partner with a local organization or school to provide services. Smaller companies located near each other can consider joining to open a nearby day care cooperative. Another option is partnering with a local day care to accept employee children at a discount. Before opting for a workplace day care program, companies need to consider if it is indeed the best option. If too few employees take up the day care places, it could end up costing a lot of money. The day care center must have the flexibility to appeal to a wide variety of parents. On-site day care is not an option for parents with older children. The company needs to think of ways to accommodate parents with younger school-age children who cannot use day care but still need supervision after school. Providing for workplace day care should be a comprehensive policy, which can take time and resources to develop.

Benefits of Corporate Daycare

One advantage of having childcare available in the workplace is immediately apparent: convenience. Instead of dropping the kids off at daycare before work – and having to rush out at the end of the day to pick them up -employee can bring the kids right to the office and retrieve them at the end of the day. Employee will not only save time in the car and fuel, but when little kid develops a raging stomach bug in the middle of the day employee can get to his side immediately.

Work and Childcare

Until recently, the custom of the joint family was still strong, thus ensuring that children with two working parents were tended by a family member. However, this is no longer the case. The idea of the nuclear family has become increasingly common, with more and more couples opting to live on their own. Those in the higher-income brackets can afford to hire full-time maids or nannies, or enroll their children in private childcare facilities. But those from lower socioeconomic communities are forced to find other means, such as removing an older child from school to look after the younger children. For the majority of working women who are in the unorganized sector (about 94 per cent), their children are often themselves absorbed into the informal economy due to lack of education or are deployed as child helpers so that adults earn more (for example, as home-based workers, vendors or self-employed). The many informal workers who make up 92 per cent of India's total workforce do not benefit from the protection of labor legislation. And even for the minority in the organized sector, legislative provisions exist mostly on paper and not in practice. Although crèches for working women are mandated by law in different sectors, no figures are available on the implementation of this legislation. It would seem that, in practice, very few crèches exist. A recent report notes that employers either refrain from employing women if it is mandatory for them to provide daycare for their children or they avoid the obligation by failing to show the employment of women in their official records. The report also notes underutilization of the existing crèches because fathers cannot use them. The childcare needs of a father are not recognized.

It is recognized that crèche facilities need to expand and that some expansion could occur if the obligatory legal stipulation for provision of crèches at the place or site of work were strictly enforced. A recent government report notes that, "learning from the past experiences, it is amply clear that placing the entire liability on employers is a nonstarter and thus, under the Eleventh Five Year Plan, some form of shared liability is required to be designed". While the concept of early childhood care and education (ECCE) is not new, it is only now slowly coming more into focus. Government initiatives in the field of ECCE for children below the age of 6 began with the National Policy for Children (1974). This was

strengthened by the National Education Policy (1986), the adoption of the World Fit for Children Declaration and Plan of Action, and ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1992. Very recently, the total responsibility for ECCE has been shifted from the Department of Education to the newly created Ministry of Women and Child Development. The Government has taken a number of childcare initiatives for children up to age 6, the most important being preschool education for disadvantaged children aged 3 to 6 as part of the Integrated Child Development Service (ICDS).

On-Site Day Care in Indian Context

Childcare facilities for working parents are still relatively scarce in India. The Government, through its Integrated Child Development Service, has made a major effort to provide half-day preschool education for disadvantaged children aged 3–6 and this program is estimated to reach about 33 million children, perhaps about 30 per cent of the age group.

For younger children, there are few publicly supported facilities. In some sectors, legislation has long existed requiring employers of a certain number of women to provide a crèche, but implementation has been weak. Few figures are available on the extent of childcare provision, whether by employers, NGOs or commercial organizations. Nevertheless, it is clear that with the increase in nuclear families and the increasing employment of women, more facilities are required. These are especially needed by poor parents working in the unorganized sector, who constitute the majority of workers.

Review of Literature

Friedman (1983) conducted a study to identify a range of strategies that New York State government could adopt to stimulate business and industry to provide supportive family benefits, services, and work policies. The investigation included a national survey of state and local government initiatives and a special analysis of policies appropriate for New York State; inquiries were sent to approximately 500 state government agencies, to the mayors of the 100 largest cities in the United States, and to a network of community-based organizations and academic institutions that have been encouraging local employers to consider the family needs of their employees. While final recommendations were targeted for New York State, the criteria applied to their development were seen to provide a framework for any state or locality to use in the creation of policy objectives and strategies to encourage employer support to working parents. Employer-sponsored daycare programs must be recognized as one way to meet childcare needs realizing that these programs serve relatively few people and fail to meet the needs of unskilled, low income workers. **Emlen and Koren (1984)** focused on effects of childcare on the workplace, addressed several questions: (1) What kinds of child care arrangements do employed parents make, and why do they make them? (2) Are these parents having difficulty finding child care? (3) Does their ability to manage child care affect their absenteeism and stress? (4) What roles do occupation and personnel policies play in this issue? The study was based on a May 1983 survey of a workforce of 20,000 from 33 companies and agencies chosen to represent a broad cross section of industries, occupations, and income levels in the Portland, Oregon, area. Participants included large and small manufacturing concerns, hospitals, service industries, and retail concerns, as well as several public agencies. Of the 8,121 employees who responded to the survey, 54 percent were women, 44 percent had children under the age of 18, and 30 percent had children under the age of 12. Findings, which mainly concerned families with children under 12, indicated that child care is hard to find and difficult to manage. Family structure and ability to arrange child care have an impact on the workplace in the form of absenteeism and stress. Company policies and work requirements also affect families, and employee stress level and ability to be at work. **Dawson et al. (1984)** determined whether different

kinds of employer-supported childcare services had differing effects on the-users of these services: Data were gathered on a year's attendance and turnover rates for 891 female employees who had used employer- provided child care. Subjects were randomly selected-from 39 Midwestern and Northeastern companies and hospitals offering no services on-site or off-site child care. Results indicated that provision of on-site and off-site child care services by the employer had a positive effect on user's turnover rates; their morale; their perceptions. With their job performance; and their decisions to accept and continue employment, to recommend their employer, and to, work overtime: Information and referral services did not have as positive an effect as provision of child care. **Galinsky (1986)** found that more than 50 child care experts were asked (1) What aspects of child care are most likely to ensure high quality? (2) What are the current barriers to achieving quality in child care? And (3) What corporate or labor initiative would make the greatest difference in improving the quality of child care services? Recommendations generated from the inquiry form the basis of this report. Contents additionally provided highlights from research on working parents and companies with child care programs, assumptions and facts about child care, and recommendations to improve the quality of child care. Concluding material lists four ways the business community could improve the quality of childcare and describe business initiatives in child care services. Such initiatives include resource and referral at the IBM Corporation, efforts of the American Express Company and BankAmerica Foundation to expand the supply of community family day care, American Savings and Loan Association's establishment of a near-site child care center, and Baxter Travenol Laboratories, Inc.'s voucher program. **Goldberg et al. (1989)** stated that changing demographics in the family and in the labor force necessitate creative solutions to the child care coordination problems that face employed parents with young children. The present study explores the appeal to 321 employed parents of various corporate-supported benefits and policies that enable parents to coordinate employment and child care. Major findings from the survey were that fathers as well as single and married mothers find corporate assistance with family matters to be desirable. Employer-supported child care benefits and work schedule policies could motivate a sizable number of employed parents to change jobs in order to receive such assistance. Parents' satisfaction with corporate benefits and policies are related to their job satisfaction, organizational commitment, experience of role strain, and frequency of health symptoms.

Johnson and Bank (1991) measured the effectiveness of employer sponsored childcare center. Their study reported the results of questionnaire measuring employee perceptions of a child care facility and its impact on productivity, morale, satisfaction, absenteeism and recruitment ease. Actual absenteeism data was also gathered from personnel files. Survey results indicated positive attitudes regarding the facility's impact on mentioned factors. Analysis of absenteeism records indicated that child care facility significantly reduced absenteeism. **Kossek & Nichol (1992)** collected data from two mid-western hospitals (same corporation) that have provided on-site child care. A quasi-experimental posttest design (with control group) was used. On-site child care positively influenced management of work-family conflict as well as employee views of company. The study showed that users of an on-site center were more likely to recommend employment at the firm to a friend than nonusers. Employees who used on-site child care also had higher tenure. **Rosenberg (1993)** addressed the problem of separation of generations. An inter-generational program was designed to provide elders at a long-term care facility and children at the on-site daycare center with opportunities to interact with one another for the social and emotional betterment of both groups. Participants in the program included 17 children and 30 elderly adults, 12 from the facility's adult daycare program and 18 facility residents. Data were gathered from pre and post-program surveys completed by the children's parents and the elders, and a post-program director's and administrator's survey. As projected at the beginning of the program, results

indicated: (1) the program was beneficial to the children and the elders; (2) the children demonstrated a positive attitude toward the elders; (3) the elderly participants enjoyed the children and the inter-generational program; and (4) the program helped create a home-like, family atmosphere at the long-term care facility. **Frone and Yardley (1996)** examined the relationship of gender, parenting demands (number of children living at home and age of youngest child), family-related tangible support (spouse tangible support and other-family tangible support), and work-family conflict (work→family and family→work conflict) to the perceived importance of six family-supportive programmes (flextime, compressed work week, job sharing, child-care assistance, work at home and reduced work hours). Survey data were obtained from a sample of 252 employed parents. Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that age of youngest child and family→work conflict were the most consistent predictors. **Rothausen (1998)** found employer offerings of on-site child care benefits have grown tremendously in the past few decades; both beneficial and detrimental effects on worker attitudes and behaviors have been noted. Some research suggests that offering on-site child care benefits can cause resentment among childless workers and/or workers with children who do not use the center. In a field sample of 271 employees, current and past use of the on-site child care center, as well as anticipated future use of the on-site child care center, were related to more positive proximal reactions such as attitudes closely related to the on-site child care center, but not to more general attitudes or behaviors. Results indicated that any “family-friendly backlash” may be limited to proximal reactions.

Mocan and Tekin (2001) used a rich employer-employee matched data set to investigate the existence and the extent of nonprofit and part-time wage and compensation differentials in child care. The empirical strategy adjusted for workers’ self-selection into the for-profit or nonprofit sectors, into full-time or part-time work, as well as for unobserved worker heterogeneity used a discrete factor model. There was substantial variation in wages as a function of employee characteristics, and there was variation in wages within sectors. The results indicated that part-time jobs were “good” jobs in center-based child care, and there existed nonprofit wage and compensation premiums, which supported the property rights hypothesis. These results indicated that part-time jobs were good jobs in child care. The observed wage differences between full-time and part-time workers was not explained by differences in workers’ human capital or by differences in firm’s characteristics. **Batt and Valcour (2003)** drew a non-random sample of 557 dual-earner white collar employees, explored the relationship between human resource practices and three outcomes of interest to firms and employees: work family conflict, employees’ control over managing work and family demands, and employees’ turnover intentions. They analyzed three types of human resource practices: work-family policies, HR incentives designed to induce attachment to the firm, and the design of work. In a series of hierarchical regression equations, they found that work design characteristics explained the most variance in employees’ control over managing work and family demands, while HR incentives explained the most variance in work-family conflict and turnover intentions. They found significant gender differences in each of the three models. Their results suggested that the most effective organizational responses to work-family conflict and to turnover are those that combine work family policies with other human resource practices, including work redesign and commitment-enhancing incentives. **Kelly (2003)** examined the development and diffusion of two “family friendly” employment benefits: dependent care expense accounts and employer-sponsored child care centers. Using over-time analysis of the adoption of these programs in 389 U.S. organizations, historical research, and interviews with human resources managers, this study demonstrates that organizations added dependent care expense accounts in response to changes in tax law and, in particular, to the creative interpretation by benefits consultants of a seemingly concrete and clear law. This article extended institutional theories of law and organizations by arguing that interested

actors create, as well as respond to, uncertainty in the law. **Musgrave (2003)** drew upon survey and interview data grounded in Canadian women's experiences with and perceptions of, on-site workplace child care services. It utilized a feminist lens in exploring how employer-supported daycare initiatives affect the participation of mothers in paid employment. The research revealed that worksite childcare favourably affected opportunities for women in the workforce and offered needed supports for employed parents even though such child care arrangements were not always accommodating of diverse family needs. Workplace daycare has the potential to reinforce, transform, or transcend attitudes toward maternal employment, non-maternal child care and women's traditional roles as child bearers and child rearers. Therefore, this project has many important implications for women's economic and social equity. It can be of use to policy makers, daycare workers, employers, and employees (both men and women) in their efforts to make workplaces more accommodating of women's child care needs. **Connelly et al. (2004)** in the study on Employer-sponsored on-site child care found that a small percentage of the U.S child care market, is of substantial interest to families, firms and governments searching for relief from work/family conflicts. The paper analyzed employee survey data from three firms in the same industry and local labor market, two of which offer on-site child care while one does not. The employees represented by data work for one of three light manufacturing firms in the same industry in a small city in the Southeast of the United States. The vast majority of production workers in this industry were women. Two of the firms, Action Industries and Bell Manufacturing, offered onsite child care to employees while the third, Central Products, did not. Researcher interviewed approximately 60 percent of the Action Industries workers of about 600, 75 percent of the Bell Manufacturing workforce of about 300, and 65 percent of the Central Products workforce of about 640. The paper concluded that the location, convenience, and reliability of the arrangement are candidates' motivating factors for on-site center use that outweigh concerns about cost. Another outcome was that the eighteen percent of the users of the Action (on-site daycare) center report having a zero-cost alternative available to them; at Bell, the corresponding number was 42.9 percent. **Immervoll & Barber (2005)** quantified the net cost of purchasing full-time centre-based childcare in OECD countries taking into account a wide range of influences on household budgets, including fees charged by childcare providers as well as childcare-related tax concessions and cash benefits available to parents. Building on these calculations, family resources are evaluated for different employment situations in order to assess the financial trade-offs between work and staying at home. Results were disaggregated to identify the policy features that present barriers to work for parents whose employment decisions are known to be particularly responsive to financial work incentives: lone parents and second earners with young children requiring care. The results indicated that the cost of purchasing childcare services should be analysed in conjunction with other social and fiscal policies that affect family incomes. **Hoobler (2007)** used social identity theory to make the argument that family-friendly policies blurring the lines between work roles and family/caregiver roles serve to reinforce gender biases that degrade women's status on the job. "Family-friendly" initiatives were gaining in popularity as employers attempted to ease the fit between work and family. A number of organizations offered on- or near-site child care facilities to employees with young children. Because women are the primary users of on-site child care services, and family roles are devalued in managerial employment, such "family-friendly" programs force women to sacrifice the quest for workplace equality, opting instead for short-term solutions. When family-friendly programs entice women to bring their children with them to on- or near-site workplace child care facilities, women's secondary status in a business environment that favors the rational, productive man over the emotional, reproductive woman is reinforced. **Morrissey and Warner (2009)** carried out an empirical research, in which workers participate in their employer's child-care programs. In this exploratory study, employees with children

at 1 large university completed questionnaires to gather information on their child-care arrangements and their experience with the employer's child-care voucher program (N = 949). Results indicated that the employees who were most in need of child-care assistance in terms of family structure, job type, and child-care expenses were more likely to receive vouchers. Federal policy limiting the structure of employer-sponsored voucher programs appeared to present barriers to participation for certain groups of employees. This study indicated that employer-supported child-care vouchers can reach those employees most in need of childcare assistance, particularly hourly and single parent employees, and that program design can encourage participation by those employees facing greater child-care challenges.

Anderson and Geldenhuys (2011) reported on exploratory research that was done to examine the relationship between absenteeism and on-site employer-sponsored child care. The dimensions of absenteeism examined over a period of one year were as follows: absence frequency, absence severity, attitudinal absence and medical absence. The results of two companies, one with a facility and one without a facility, were then compared in order to establish the relationship between absenteeism and an on-site facility. The results indicated a significant negative relationship between onsite employer-sponsored child care and absenteeism. **Payne et al. (2012)** proposed and demonstrated empirical support for a convenience dimension of childcare satisfaction (CCS). Satisfaction with caregiver convenience refers to a parent's evaluation of the caregiver's location and availability. He hypothesized that time related dimensions of CCS (caregiver dependability and convenience) relate to employee well-being and withdrawal, because they diminish time-based family interfering with work (FIW). He also proposed quality-related CCS dimensions relate to psychological well-being, because they reduce strain based FIW. Survey data from a sample of 316 university employees who were parents of under school-age children revealed time based FIW as an explanatory mechanism for the relationships between satisfaction with caregiver convenience and both turnover intentions and absenteeism (due to childcare issues). In addition, strain-based FIW mediated the effects of satisfaction with caregiver attentiveness on well-being and satisfaction with caregiver cost on well-being. This study expanded previous research on CCS by demonstrating that CCS is related to important work outcomes in part because it reduces time- and strain-based FIW. **Paul (2014)** explored the fact that childcare is not like other goods and services. Its inherent nature created unusual challenges for efficient delivery by the market, while its usage can have social as well as private consequences. Government involvement in childcare therefore would be justified to improve the efficiency of delivery or achieve social objectives, but its effectiveness depends on whether policy measures can better address the challenges of childcare provision than the market. This reviewed the justification for the recent rapid development of childcare policy in the UK and considered the potential benefits and drawbacks of this growing government intervention. **Correll et al. (2014)** explored that the demands of today's workplace—long hours, constant availability, self-sacrificial dedication—do not match the needs of today's workforce, where workers struggle to reconcile competing caregiving and workplace demands. This mismatch has negative consequences for gender equality and workers' health. Here, the authors put forth a call to action: to redesign work to better meet the needs of today's workforce and to redefine successful work. The authors propose two avenues for future research to achieve these goals: research that (a) builds a more rigorous business case for work redesign/redefinition and (b) exposes the underlying gender and class dynamics of current work arrangements. **Herbst and Tekin (2014)** explored that a complete account of the U.S. child care subsidy system requires an understanding of its implications for both parental and child well-being. The author attempted to fill this gap by examining the impact of child care subsidy receipt on maternal health and the quality of child-parent interactions. The empirical analyses use data from three

nationally representative surveys, providing access to numerous measures of family well-being. In addition, the author attempted to handle the possibility of non-random selection into subsidy receipt by using several identification strategies both within and across the surveys. The results consistently indicated that child care subsidies are associated with worse maternal health and poorer interactions between parents and their children. In particular, subsidized mothers report lower levels of overall health and are more likely to show symptoms consistent with anxiety, depression, and parenting stress. Such mothers also reveal more psychological and physical aggression toward their children and are more likely to utilize spanking as a disciplinary tool. Together, these findings suggest that work-based public policies aimed at economically disadvantaged mothers may ultimately undermine family well-being.

Objectives of the Study

- To study the relationship of on-site childcare with employees' motivation.
- To study the satisfaction level of employees regarding on-site childcare.
- To study effect of on-site childcare on employees' performance and retention.

Hypothesis

In view of information collected by reviewing the existing literature, the following hypotheses had been developed.

H₀₁: No significant difference exists between male and female employees regarding the effect of employer-supported childcare on their motivation level.

H₀₂: No significant difference exists between male and female employees regarding the effect of employer-supported childcare on their satisfaction level.

H₀₃: No significant difference exists between male and female employees regarding the effect of employer-supported childcare on employees' performance as well as retention in the IT company.

Research Methodology

Descriptive research design was used in the present study and survey method had been employed whereby structured questionnaires were distributed to employees of IT industry (TCS, Infosys, Wipro) located in NCR. The respondents were asked to provide responses to items on a five-point Likert scale to measure the strength of their opinion from 1 'Strongly Disagree' to 5 'Strongly Agree'. The sample for the study comprised 101 employees who were selected randomly. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha. The data was analysed using mean, standard deviation and t-test with the help of SPSS ver. 23.

Findings and Discussion

Respondents' Profile

The demographic profile of the respondents is presented in table 1:

Table1 Demographic profile

| Demographic Factors | Category | Percentage |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| Age | 25-30 years | 34.0 |
| | 30-35 years | 44.0 |
| | 35-40 years | 20.0 |
| | Above 40 years | 2.0 |
| Gender | Male | 43 |
| | Female | 58 |
| Annual salary | 6 lakh | 29.0 |
| | Less than 6 lakh | 44.0 |
| | More than 6 lakh. | 27.0 |
| Level of education | Under graduate | 72.0 |
| | Post graduate | 28.0 |
| No. of years at present place of employment | 15 years or longer | 9.0 |
| | 10 - 14 years | 32.0 |
| | 5 - 9 years | 30.0 |
| | 1 - 4 years | 21.0 |
| | less than 1 year | 8.0 |

Table 1 shows that majority of the respondents belonged to the age group of 30-35 years. There were 43 % male and 58 % female respondents. The annual salary of most of the respondents was less than 6 lakhs. 72 % of the respondents were graduates and most of the respondents had an experience of 10-14 years.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics for Job Motivation through childcare

| Statements | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|-------|----------------|
| Your morale has improved after using childcare benefit. | 3.337 | 1.1686 |
| Childcare benefit influences your motivation level at work. | 3.178 | 1.2759 |
| Childcare benefit creates a positive work culture. | 3.168 | 1.2733 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to work for longer hours in the organization. | 3.198 | 1.2729 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to engage in more tasks of the organisation besides your job. | 3.178 | 1.3145 |
| Childcare benefit increases your loyalty toward the organization. | 3.307 | 1.2629 |
| Childcare benefit increases your level of commitment to work within the organization. | 3.446 | 1.2040 |

Table 2 shows the values of means for the motivation of employees provided by childcare services. It was found that the level of motivation is low. Even though the morale of the employees has improved and their commitment has increased but still the motivation is low.

Table 3 *Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction Level*

| Statements | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| You are overall satisfied with your job (Consider schedule, pay rate, childcare arrangements, the workload, etc.). | 3.911 | 1.0592 |
| Currently you are satisfied with childcare arrangement provided to you. | 3.644 | 1.1712 |
| You are pleased with employer supported childcare services provided to your child. (Consider food, toys, entertainment, Digital education) | 3.386 | 1.3036 |
| You are satisfied with health care arrangements of corporate crèche. | 3.307 | 1.2864 |
| You are satisfied with infrastructure and environment of corporate crèche. | 3.386 | 1.3709 |
| You are satisfied with the attitude and experience of the workers responsible for your child in the childcare programme. | 3.406 | 1.2180 |
| You are satisfied with the expenses the company charge you for childcare. | 3.248 | 1.1524 |
| You feel stress free after leaving your child at workplace childcare. | 3.475 | 1.2296 |

Table 3 shows the values of means for satisfaction level of employees regarding childcare services. It can be seen from the table that the values are greater than 3 showing that the majority of the employees are in agreement with the statements stating their satisfaction. The satisfaction level is least for the expenses the company charges for childcare.

Table 4 *Descriptive Statistics for Employees performance and retention*

| Statements | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|-------------|-----------------------|
| Your quality of work has improved by using childcare benefit. | 3.891 | 1.0188 |
| You accomplish enough quantity of work for the company's success. | 3.594 | 1.0879 |
| You feel more specialized in your job after using the childcare. | 3.465 | 1.2212 |
| You think your level of performance has been increased with childcare arrangement. | 3.376 | 1.2558 |
| Childcare act as a factor in accepting employment in the company. | 3.426 | 1.2911 |
| Childcare acts as a factor for being enrolled in the job for longer time period. | 3.406 | 1.2504 |

Table 4 shows the impact of on-site childcare services on employee performance and retention. It shows that the majority of the employees are of the view that their quality of work has improved by using childcare benefit.

In order to test the hypothesis t-test was employed on the various statements for satisfaction, motivation, performance and retention. Table 5 shows the group statistics for these statements.

Independent Samples t-test

Table 5 Group Statistics

| Statements | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|--|--------|----|-------|----------------|------------|
| Motivation | | | | | |
| Your morale has improved after using childcare benefit. | Female | 43 | 3.628 | 1.0471 | .1597 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.121 | 1.2151 | .1595 |
| Childcare benefit influences your motivation level at work. | Female | 43 | 3.372 | 1.2154 | .1854 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.034 | 1.3108 | .1721 |
| Childcare benefit creates a positive work culture. | Female | 43 | 3.372 | 1.2914 | .1969 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.017 | 1.2494 | .1641 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to work for longer hours in the organization. | Female | 43 | 3.349 | 1.2322 | .1879 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.086 | 1.3016 | .1709 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to engage in more tasks of the organisation besides your job. | Female | 43 | 3.419 | 1.2953 | .1975 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.000 | 1.3112 | .1722 |
| Childcare benefit increases your loyalty toward the organization. | Female | 43 | 3.465 | 1.1619 | .1772 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.190 | 1.3306 | .1747 |
| Childcare benefit increases your level of commitment to work within the organization. | Female | 43 | 3.674 | 1.0850 | .1655 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.276 | 1.2676 | .1664 |
| Satisfaction | | | | | |
| You are overall satisfied with your job (Consider schedule, pay rate, childcare arrangements, the workload, etc.). | Female | 43 | 4.093 | .9210 | .1405 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.776 | 1.1401 | .1497 |
| Currently you are satisfied with childcare arrangement provided to you. | Female | 43 | 3.837 | 1.0675 | .1628 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.500 | 1.2319 | .1618 |
| You are pleased with employer supported childcare services provided to your child. (Consider food, toys, entertainment, Digital education) | Female | 43 | 3.395 | 1.3477 | .2055 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.379 | 1.2818 | .1683 |
| You are satisfied with health care arrangements of corporate crèche. | Female | 43 | 3.488 | 1.2026 | .1834 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.172 | 1.3395 | .1759 |
| You are satisfied with infrastructure and environment of corporate crèche. | Female | 43 | 3.605 | 1.2936 | .1973 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.224 | 1.4147 | .1858 |
| You are satisfied with the attitude and experience of the workers responsible for your child in the childcare programme. | Female | 43 | 3.814 | .9576 | .1460 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.103 | 1.3071 | .1716 |
| You are satisfied with the expenses the company charge you for childcare. | Female | 43 | 3.512 | 1.0322 | .1574 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.052 | 1.2056 | .1583 |
| You feel stress free after leaving your child at workplace childcare. | Female | 43 | 3.628 | 1.1344 | .1730 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.362 | 1.2937 | .1699 |
| Performance and Retention | | | | | |
| Your quality of work has improved by using childcare benefit. | Female | 43 | 4.093 | .6836 | .1043 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.741 | 1.1930 | .1566 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|----|-------|--------|-------|
| You accomplish enough quantity of work for the company's success. | Female | 43 | 3.674 | 1.0850 | .1655 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.534 | 1.0957 | .1439 |
| You feel more specialized in your job after using the childcare. | Female | 43 | 3.512 | 1.2416 | .1893 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.431 | 1.2156 | .1596 |
| You think your level of performance has been increased with childcare arrangement. | Female | 43 | 3.791 | .9401 | .1434 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.069 | 1.3747 | .1805 |
| Childcare act as a factor in accepting employment in the company. | Female | 43 | 3.767 | 1.1513 | .1756 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.172 | 1.3395 | .1759 |
| Childcare acts as a factor for being enrolled in the job for longer time period. | Female | 43 | 3.721 | 1.1817 | .1802 |
| | Male | 58 | 3.172 | 1.2585 | .1652 |

Table 6 Independent Samples Test

| Statements | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|-------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Motivation | | | | | | |
| Your morale has improved after using childcare benefit. | Equal variances assumed | 1.391 | 0.241 | 2.198 | 99 | 0.03 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.247 | 96.704 | 0.027 |
| Childcare benefit influences your motivation level at work. | Equal variances assumed | 0.352 | 0.555 | 1.32 | 99 | 0.19 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.335 | 94.102 | 0.185 |
| Childcare benefit creates a positive work culture. | Equal variances assumed | 0.345 | 0.558 | 1.391 | 99 | 0.167 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.384 | 88.954 | 0.17 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to work for longer hours in the organization. | Equal variances assumed | 0.088 | 0.767 | 1.025 | 99 | 0.308 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.034 | 93.224 | 0.304 |
| Childcare benefit motivates you to engage in more tasks of the organisation besides your job. | Equal variances assumed | 0.064 | 0.8 | 1.595 | 99 | 0.114 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.598 | 91.251 | 0.114 |
| Childcare benefit increases your loyalty toward the organization. | Equal variances assumed | 1.194 | 0.277 | 1.085 | 99 | 0.281 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.107 | 96.298 | 0.271 |
| Childcare benefit increases your level of commitment to work within the organization. | Equal variances assumed | 2.39 | 0.125 | 1.659 | 99 | 0.1 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.698 | 96.898 | 0.093 |
| Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| You are overall satisfied with your job (Consider schedule, pay rate, childcare arrangements, the workload, etc.). | Equal variances assumed | 4.74 | 0.052 | 1.497 | 99 | 0.138 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.545 | 98.224 | 0.126 |
| Currently you are satisfied | Equal variances assumed | 1.257 | 0.265 | 1.438 | 99 | 0.153 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------------|
| with childcare arrangement provided to you. | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.469 | 96.537 | 0.145 |
| You are pleased with employer supported childcare services provided to your child. (Consider food, toys, entertainment, Digital education) | Equal variances assumed | 0.35 | 0.555 | 0.061 | 99 | 0.952 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.06 | 88.049 | 0.952 |
| You are satisfied with health care arrangements of corporate crèche. | Equal variances assumed | 0.785 | 0.378 | 1.224 | 99 | 0.224 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.243 | 95.353 | 0.217 |
| You are satisfied with infrastructure and environment of corporate crèche. | Equal variances assumed | 1.165 | 0.283 | 1.386 | 99 | 0.169 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.404 | 94.665 | 0.164 |
| You are satisfied with the attitude and experience of the workers responsible for your child in the childcare programme. | Equal variances assumed | 5.346 | 0.053 | 3.014 | 99 | 0.003 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 3.153 | 98.992 | 0.002 |
| You are satisfied with the expenses the company charge you for childcare. | Equal variances assumed | 0.682 | 0.411 | 2.013 | 99 | 0.047 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.06 | 96.891 | 0.042 |
| You feel stress free after leaving your child at workplace childcare. | Equal variances assumed | 1.537 | 0.218 | 1.075 | 99 | 0.285 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.096 | 96.165 | 0.276 |
| Performance and Retention | | | | | | |
| Your quality of work has improved by using childcare benefit. | Equal variances assumed | 1.771 | 0.051 | 1.732 | 99 | 0.086 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.869 | 93.722 | 0.065 |
| You accomplish enough quantity of work for the company's success. | Equal variances assumed | 0.103 | 0.749 | 0.637 | 99 | 0.525 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.638 | 91.133 | 0.525 |
| You feel more specialized in your job after using the childcare. | Equal variances assumed | 0.224 | 0.637 | 0.326 | 99 | 0.745 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.325 | 89.573 | 0.746 |
| You think your level of performance has been increased with childcare arrangement. | Equal variances assumed | 1.67 | 0.051 | 2.965 | 99 | 0.004 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 3.131 | 98.434 | 0.002 |
| Childcare acts as a factor in accepting employment in the company. | Equal variances assumed | 1.74 | 0.19 | 2.341 | 99 | 0.021 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.394 | 96.779 | 0.019 |
| Childcare acts as a factor for being enrolled in the job for longer time period. | Equal variances assumed | 0.279 | 0.599 | 2.222 | 99 | 0.029 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.243 | 93.576 | 0.027 |

For ascertaining whether significant difference exists between the male and female employees' satisfaction, motivation, performance and retention t-test was employed. Levene's test checks for equality of variance among various groups. Significance value of Levene's test > 0.05 indicates that equal

variance is assumed. In the given table 6, all groups have equal variances. T-test statistics (significance value) less than level of significance (0.05) indicate that the two categories of independent variables (male and female) differ significantly towards their response to the various statements.

In this case, no significant difference was observed in case of satisfaction and motivation levels as all significance value are greater than 0.05. However, in case of performance and retention there was significant difference regarding male and female opinion as many statements had significance values lower than .05. Thus, it can be concluded that male and female respondents have significant difference in their opinion. Hence, null hypothesis H_{01} and H_{02} is accepted whereas H_{03} is partially accepted.

Conclusion

Offering access to on-site child care is one of the best ways employer help employees find a successful balance in their work and home lives. The on-site child care gives employees peace of mind knowing their children are well cared while they are at work. Offering employees easy-to-access child care eliminates a major distraction for working parents and as a result builds great workforce that are more productive, focused and committed to the organizations for the long haul.

Majority of the employees working in TCS, WIPRO and INFOSYS are satisfied with the on-site childcare. A larger number of employees are motivated with the use of on-site childcare. A great number of employees strongly agree that their performance level is increased by using on-site childcare. Most of the employees agree that childcare act as a factor for being enrolled in the job for longer time period. The on-site childcare increases productivity of employees. The users of on-site daycare feel more engaged and committed to the organization.

The study also showed that overall there was no significant difference regarding the impact of childcare services based on gender. However, some difference existed regarding the impact on performance and retention.

References

1. Anderson, B., & Geldenhuys, D. J. (2011). 'The relationship between absenteeism and employer-sponsored child care'. *Southern African Business Review*, Vol. 15(3), 21–45.
2. Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). 'Human Resource Practices as Predictors of Work- Family Outcomes and Employee Turnover'. *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 42(2), 189–220.
3. Connelly, R., Degraff, D. S., & Willis, R. A. (2004). 'The Value of Employer-Sponsored Child Care to Employees'. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, Vol. 43(4), 759-792.
4. Correll, S. J., Kelly, E. L., Connor, L. T. O., & Williams, J. C. (2014). 'Redesigning, Redefining work. *Work and Occupations*', Vol. 41(1), 3–17. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0730888413515250>
5. Dawson, A. G., Mikel, C. S., Lorenz, C. S., & King, J. (1984). 'An Experimental Study of the Effects of Employer Sponsored Child Care Services on Selected Employee Behaviors.'
6. Emlen, A. C., & Koren, P. E. (1984). 'Hard To Find and Difficult To Manage: The Effects of Child Care on the Workplace.'
7. Friedman, D. E. (1983). 'Government Initiatives to Encourage Employer-Supported Child Care: The State and Local Perspective.'
8. Frone, M. R., & Yardley, J. K. (1996). 'Workplace family-supportive programs: Predictors of employed parents' importance ratings'. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69(May), 351–366. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1996.tb00621.x>
9. Galinsky, E. (1986). 'Investing in Quality Child Care: A Report for AT&T.'

10. Goldberg, W. A., Greenberger, E., Koch-Jones, J., O'Neil, R., & Hamill, S. (1989). 'Attractiveness of child care and related employer-supported benefits and policies to married and single parents. *Child and Youth Care Quarterly*', Vol. 18(1), 23-37.
11. Herbst, C. M., & Tekin, E. (2012). 'Child Care Subsidies, Maternal Well-Being, and Child-Parent Interactions: Evidence from Three Nationally Represented Datasets'. Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Research Paper Series, (12-01).
12. Hoobler, J. M. (2007). 'On-site or out-of-sight? Family-friendly child care provisions and the status of working mothers. *Journal of Management Inquiry*', Vol. 16(4), 372-380.
13. Immervoll, H., & Barber, D. (2005). 'Can parents afford to work?'
14. Johnson, L. A., & Bank, C. (1991). 'Effectiveness of an Employer Sponsored Child Care Center'. *Applied HRM Research*, Vol. 2(1), 38-67.
15. Kelly, E. L. (2003). 'The Strange History of Employer-Sponsored Child Care: Interested Actors, Uncertainty, and the Transformation of Law in Organizational fields'. *AJS*, Vol. 109(3), 606-649.
16. Kelly, E. L. (2003). 'The Strange History of Employer-Sponsored Child Care: Interested Actors, Uncertainty, and the Transformation of Law in Organizational Fields'. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 109(3), 606-649.
17. Kossek, E. E., & Nichol, V. (1992). 'The effects of on-site child care on employee attitudes and performance'. *Personnel psychology*, Vol. 45(3), 485-509.
18. Mocan, N. H., & Tekin, E. (2001). 'Nonprofit Sector and Part-Time Work: An Analysis of Employer-Employee Matched Data of Child Care Workers'. *IZA Discussion paper series*, Vol. (408).
19. Morrissey, T. W., & Warner, M. E. (2009). 'Employer-Supported Child Care: Who Participates?' *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(December), 1340-1348.
20. Morrissey, T. W., & Warner, M. E. (2011). 'An exploratory study of the impacts of an employer-supported child care program program'. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 26(July), 344-354. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.01.004>
21. Musgrave, S. N. (2000). 'Between Nap-Time and Nine-to-Five: Workplace Daycare as A Step Toward Social and Economic Equity for Employed Mother.'
22. Paull, G. (2014). 'Can government intervention in childcare be justified?' *Economic Affairs*, 34(1), 14-34.
23. Payne, S. C., Cook, A. L., & Diaz, I. (2011). 'Understanding childcare satisfaction and its effect on workplace outcomes: The convenience factor and the mediating role of work-family conflict'. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 1-21. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2011.02026.x>
24. Rosenberg, M. K. (1993). 'The Design and Implementation of an Intergenerational Program at a Private Long-Term Healthcare Facility with On-Site Childcare.'
25. Rothausen, T. J., Gonzalez, J. A., Clarke, N. E., & O'Dell, L. L. (1998). 'Family-friendly backlash—fact or fiction? the case of organizations on-site child care centers. *Personnel Psychology*', Vol. 51(3), 685-706.