

CHILDCARE IN AMERICA:

THE CHURCH'S ROLE

Katherine McFillen  
May 1, 1990  
Senior Thesis  
Conrad Hyers



## Table Of Contents

Introduction.....	i-ii
Part One: The Problem.....	1-6
Part Two: Solutions.....	7-18
Conclusion.....	19-24
Notes.....	25-26
Bibliography.....	27-28

## Introduction

Today in America, more and more parents are entering the work force, especially mothers. Because of higher divorce rates, a lot of families in America are headed by only one adult, usually the mother. The result in some cases, is that no one is home during after-school hours, except the children. Yet a lot of these children are too young to take care of themselves. In the case of the parent(s) with pre-school children, daycare facilities are not keeping up with the demand. Who will take the responsibility? Most day care programs are too costly. But those that aren't expensive often do not meet state requirements.

The problem of childcare includes not only who but at what cost, and who will pay that cost? Should the government subsidize? Should the corporation for whom the parent works offer facilities? Should there be insurance to protect the children against accidents, to protect the facility against lawsuits? These are real questions about real problems. The future of the world is its children. But if these children don't get a good start, how can they be good leaders?

What role should the church play in this dilemma? The churches have excellent facilities which are used for Sunday School classes but which sit idle most of the week. Should these rooms be used for day care? Should the church offer a daycare program or should they just lease the building? If the government subsidizes day care programs, will that money conflict with the separation of Church and State? The church's future

leaders are today's children and these children deserve guidance and an education. Should the church provide these things? What about lobbying the government for subsidized funds for child care? Should the church have a hand in that? Child care could be an opportunity for a religious education. Should it? Would that, again, cause Church/State problems?

The current welfare system discourages mothers from working because the cost of child care well exceeds that of any minimum wage job. These women should not be denied the dignity of working because of economic reasons. How can good child care be made available to those who cannot afford it and not just those who can?

I hope to explain the need for child care, offer some solutions to the problem such as how the church could provide child care, and outline any other ways in which the church can help alleviate this problem.

## Part One: The Problem

"And he took a child and put it in the midst of them; and taking the child in his arms, he said to them, "Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me; and whoever receives me, receives me, receives not me but the one who sent me."

Mark 9:36-37

Child care is a pertinent topic now as more and more women are going into the work force. In 1988, more than 70% of all women between the ages of 25-34 were working. It is estimated that by the year 2000, 61.5% of all women, all ages, will be in the labor force. Three fifths of the new entrants to the labor force between 1986 and 2000 will be women. [1] That's more than half of the new entrants. Many of these women in their prime child bearing years.

Unfortunately, there is not enough child care available to take care of these children while their parents work. In 1985, 3.9% of all children in America took care of themselves. Child care is very expensive. In Atlanta, the city in America with the largest number of Fortune 500 companies, the costs range from \$30-70 per week. That's for supervision in someone else's home or in a day care center. In Boston, it's \$40-160; in Denver it's \$55-105; and in St. Louis it's \$35-80. Full-time babysitters cost 2-3 times more. So most poor families are spending about 25% of their income on child care. [2]

And the scary part is the range of quality. A lot of these kids are getting poor quality care because the standards are not regulated. Some children are cared for in homes of unlicensed care takers, which is illegal if the amount exceeds a set number. Yet these children's parents probably can't afford quality care. But why should they be penalized for not having enough money?

The National Association for the Education of Young Children recommends one adult/caregiver for every four infants; or five for children ages 12-24 months; or for every six children between two and three years old or every nine preschoolers. Yet some states issue licenses to centers with a ratio of one caregiver to every eight infants! [3] And only three states have the recommended 4:1 ratio.

Benefits of child care include health and nutrition services to low-income children, enabling low-income parents to get off welfare and find better jobs, and enhancing children's intellectual and social growth through early childhood development programs. However, the last point is debatable.

Psychologist Jay Belsky at Pennsylvania State University did a study on the effects of child care. He found that babies less than 12 months old receiving nonmaternal care over 20 hours a week are at a greater risk of developing insecure relationships with their mothers. This increases the risk of emotional and behavioral problems in later childhood. The children are likely to be disobedient and aggressive.

Many conservatives use this study to argue that children

are best taken care of in their own homes by their parents. An editorial in Christianity Today magazine [4] argues against federal programs because they "discriminate against the traditional family unit." This is not an accurate portrayal of the situation because it's not the government but the economy which is encouraging mothers to go back to work. Two thirds of all working women are the sole source of support for their families or are married to men who make less than \$15,000 a year. [5]

Another argument against federal regulations is that they would create a new layer of bureaucracy and compliance. These regulations would increase operational expense of the facilities which would then be passed on to the parents.

So if quality is going to go up, it's going to be costly. But how can we not afford to increase quality? These are our children, the future of America. We can pay now or pay later. The statistics show that the future will bring a greater demand for day care. More mothers will be working and more children will be born. In 1988, only 14.7% of all child care was in day-care centers. 41.3% was in another person's home and 29.7% was by someone in the parental home. [6] So most children are being cared for at a home. But how can this continue? I think more day-care centers would be used if there were more available and were managed with considerably higher standards of quality. There are only 60,000 nationwide. [7] Most of them aren't considered quality care because they don't meet high quality



standards. For the most part this is because there isn't enough money to maintain high standards. Child care givers don't receive liveable salaries (on the average, 1988, \$9,931 full-time annual wages) [8] so there is a high turnover rate. And it takes money to start a facility as well as buying liability insurance.

There are many different types of child care. The most obvious is the day-care center, but this accounts for only about 15% of all day care. Child care constitutes any care by someone other than the parent. So child care by a relative or a nonrelative, in a home or in an institution is considered day care and would be eligible for regulation.

The ABC bill, Act for Better Child Care Services of 1989, is designed to establish a comprehensive federal child-care policy. It proposes several things such as health and safety regulations, training requirements, setting a cap on the number of children per non-parent adult caregiver for in-home care, setting a maximum on the child:staff ratio giving money to the states to expand services, train workers, and develop resource and referral programs. However, it also proposes strict regulations for religious groups (religious symbols must be covered or moved; no money for sectarian purposes; and they must comply with federal rules, and state and local licensing) and the bill favors middle-class families (those families making 115% of the state median income would receive most of the aid). This bill was proposed by Senator Dodd (D-Conn) and Representative Kildee (D-Mich). There

is a fear that this bill excludes an important part and prevalent source of child care by prohibiting use of Federal funds for sectarian purposes. Complicated church and State entanglements would also result. This is a valid fear because in 1986, up to 70% of all child care centers were housed in church buildings. That's more than 3 million children. Now not all of these centers are church sponsored. Some centers just rent the space.

Yet no federal policy has been established and one is needed. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences just issued a report entitled "Who Cares for America's Children?" They recommend that the federal government set national child care standards, expand subsidies to make quality care available to low-income families (the ABC bill doesn't do this), expand programs like Head Start which help poor children at risk of early school failure, and require employers to provide unpaid, job-protected leave for parents of infants under the age of one. This could be done through tax incentives.

It's difficult to measure day care quality, to quantify interactions between staff and youngsters, to assess changes in intelligence, to evaluate emotional development, or to account for differences in those who attend day care and those who do not. This is because there are so many variables for which to control: family stress, social support, marital status, marital discord, parents' jobs, motivation for parenting, quality of parent-child interactions, and socioeconomic factors. For this

reason. a blanket policy favoring the middle income family is myopic. The problem is much more complicated.

The cost of day care is at the point now where it costs this nation \$16 billion a year. For 1995 the cost is estimated to be \$48 billion. Quality care costs \$5,267 per year per child. Yet currently only \$2,937 per year per child is being spent. So poor quality care exists!

In 1986, there were 8 million children under the age of 6 who had working parents. Yet there were fewer than 1 million slots available in licensed child care available.

So, there is a problem. Child care is too expensive, overcrowded and not all of good quality. And the future doesn't look bright for our children. This problem needs to be addressed. So in the next section I will propose some solutions and evaluate them.

## Part Two: Solutions

Many parents and others concerned about child care have turned to the government on both the state and national levels. They believe the government should subsidize families with children to help them alleviate the costs, especially for borderline and poverty level, low-income and single-parent families who are in need of financial assistance. The low-income and single-parent families often depend on child care to do their jobs; without day care, they would end up on welfare. And some families do anyway because it is more economical. With the high cost of childcare eating up most of their paycheck, many parents find it cheaper to just stay home and collect welfare payments. This is self-defeating and the system should be changed.

The government has begun to tackle the problem of child care with Project Head Start. This is a program that provides for the educational, medical, nutritional, and dental needs of economically disadvantaged children. [1] However this is not enough. The program is not available for everyone. There are still 5-12 year-olds who need care after school.

I propose an income tax break based on income-level and number and ages of children per household. The amount should be proportionate to the number of children and the current income. For example, a low-income, single-parent family with three children should receive a break higher than that of a middle-income, two-parent family with two children.

Some believe the government should give tax breaks to companies and businesses with child care programs or deduct the start-up costs of an on-site child care center because they are so formidable. [2]

But what constitutes a company child care program? Some companies have only referral services while others have fully equipped facilities on the job site. So who should get the tax break and how much should it be?

The problem with this solution is that it is calling for money from the government that it just doesn't have and those opposed to Federal assistance argue it "is rewarding the decision to work outside the home." [3] Those in favor of Federal assistance would say that it is a practical necessity and an answer to a considerable problem which is not going to go away.

Federal assistance was offered in the past. During World War II, the government was supporting 1500 nursery schools to provide daycare for children of mothers who were needed in the labor force. [4] Yet as soon as the war was over, the support was withdrawn. During the Nixon administration, assistance for the establishment of new services and facilities was approved by Congress, but Nixon would not sign the bill because he believed it would weaken families and encourage communist orientation. [5] The Kennedy and Johnson administrations supported programs for children such as health and nutrition programs for infants and children, funding for special educational programs and health programs for pregnant and lactating mothers. Yet as long as the

government is conservative and high in deficit, it is unlikely that assistance will be granted to working mothers.

An alternative solution is to expand the school system. The classrooms and materials are already there, more staff is all that would be needed. This could be paid for by taxes or it could be run as a private business which would pay rent to the county or state. This also provides our children with an opportunity for a better education in an developmentally-enriched environment. They could get help with homework, play sports and games, take music or dance lessons, work on arts or crafts projects, even take field-trips. [6] There are examples of this being done already in Independence and Platte County, Missouri; Hartford, North Branford, and Killingly, Connecticut; Columbus, Ohio; and in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. It is called the 21st Century School and was created by Edward F. Zigler, Ph.D., Sterling Professor of Psychology at Yale University, in New Haven, Connecticut. His idea was that the public school buildings could provide five other services: on-site day-care for 3-4 year olds, before and after school care for 5-12 year olds, support and training for neighborhood family day-care providers, assistance and home visitation to new parents, and information and referral services for parents from pregnancy on. Zigler says not all these services have to be used; each community can adapt the program to fit its needs. The staff at the school in Independence, Missouri is a blend of certified school teachers, day-care workers and college students in training to be child-

development specialists. The program seems to be working so well that Senator Dodd (Conn-D) included in the ABC bill a proposal for one demonstration school in every state.

Again however, the problem is financial. The government is being asked to spend money it does not have. And as long as it stays conservative, the idea of mothers belonging at home will succeed. To refute the conservative view, once more I will argue that the idea of the traditional family (father, mother, 2.3 children) is uncommon. The typical family in America, 1990, is a single parent household and I do not see how such a household can function without child care. But as long as the government refuses to accept that, governmental child care assistance is out of the question.

Those opposed to this idea claim it is overworking the school system and makes it easy for adults to shirk their parental duties. They feel the schools are already assuming too many duties which should be family responsibilities, such as sex education. But this country has a problem which the families aren't addressing so who should?

Another problem with using the schools is that young children might feel like they spend all their time at school. They could get disoriented as to what home really is. Children need to have a separate facility where they know they are no longer in school and the expectations and opportunities are different.

The government also needs to set standards on child care.

These standards should include a set number of children per caretaker. This should be a low number because research has shown that children do better in smaller groups. [7] Also included should be the amount of space (square feet) per child because children need room to grow and explore. It would not be healthy for children to be cooped up in a small room all day.

Licensing for the caretakers should be a federal standard which should include following up their training with refresher courses and keeping up with the current ideas about child care. The care givers should be trained specialists. They should be required to take classes and pass a test before being licensed, and their licenses should be renewed every few years to make certain they are keeping up with what is new in their field. They should have a year of practical, supervised training before they are licensed. And they should be paid more. The government can assure this by making certain that only these trained specialists are working in day care centers and taking care of the children. Private homes should be closely examined to make sure not just any person is offering child care services. The standards are very important to assure our children's safety and well-being. If high quality standards are implemented, the arguments about nonmaternal care and whether or not it is harmful can be eradicated.

The third solution I propose is that of private sector assistance. The businesses should offer services to their employees who are parents. Mothers should be allowed to take



leave for up to 2 years, without pay, and be guaranteed their jobs back when they return. Child care facilities should be available on site, if possible. These on-site facilities would make it easier for the parents to see their children. They could eat lunch together as well as commute together. The parents would be close and more accessible if an emergency arose. For smaller companies, a referral service should be available with a corporate discount. This service might include a corporate discount with any child care centers listed. Or the company could work with other companies to provide a center with discounts for the employees. This has been done at the Tyson's Corner Play and Learn Center in Tyson's Corner, Virginia. 22 companies pooled their resources to minimize the costs of setting up a child care center for their employees. To get around the insurance liability, this center is run by parents. The companies made tax-exempt charitable donations to the center and reserved spaces for their employees' children.

These child care benefits shouldn't be so great that those not eligible feel penalized or deprived of a benefit. Maybe the company can offer the services at a minimal fee.

There are advantages for the companies to offering these services. Companies who have already done so are finding they have increased worker productivity, more successful recruitment, reduced turnover, absenteeism, and lateness, enhanced morale and positive publicity. [8] It is beneficial to the businesses to have these incentives and financial costs are not a burden

because they are paid for by the employee satisfaction and retention rates. It can be expensive to train people for certain jobs and to lose the employees often can be costly. The only problem with private sector assistance is the quality care level. It isn't regulated or standardized so it might be poor. If the government would set standards this wouldn't be a problem.

My fourth solution is to use the churches. These buildings, like the schools, are already in existence and equipped. Many churches already are being used for day care. In 1986 there were 18,000 church based centers and about half of them were operating as church ministries. [9] The Scriptural basis for this is Luke 9:48, "Whoever receives this child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me, receives him who sent me; for he who is least among you all is the one who is great." However, each congregation is currently responsible for its own program which ranges from babysitting services to a full education. There is no official policy from the national Church. These centers began as a local response to a community need, the product of a grass roots movement. The local congregations were ministering to the community.

But there is an opportunity to make more of it. This is a golden opportunity to bring people into the Church. And it is a prime opportunity to educate our children in the ways of the church. Child care should be more than babysitting, it should be an educational experience. It is an opportunity to teach the children about the church, its doctrines, Christianity, what it

means to be a child of God.

Every time a child is baptized, the church congregation makes a pledge to help this child understand what it means to be a Christian, to understand the faith in which they have just pledged membership and to share that faith with one another. In Mark 9:35-37 it says "And he sat down and called the twelve; and he said to them, "If anyone would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all." And he took a child, and put him in the midst of them; and taking him in his arms he said to them, "Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me receives not me but him who sent me." Day care centers in the churches are an excellent means by which to educate and care for the children of Christ. The little child should be the primary object of the community's care and service because Jesus himself is present to the community in those children whom the community has accepted in baptism. [10]

To do this right, the national Church (ELCA) needs to set forth a policy in which they support working mothers and take an active position on child care. The church is supposed to minister to the needy and America's children are in great need. Especially the low-income and poor families who have children who are not getting the nutrition and medical care they need, as well as the spiritual and emotional needs. The Church must recognize the single-parent families and support them. The support must be more than financial, there must be emotional support as well. This could be done through bible study for single parents, for

example. It would give them an opportunity to fellowship together and support one another. It would also be a reminder that the church cares and is supportive. Some single parents feel discriminated against because they cannot attend meetings during the week. A couple of reasons why they can't go might be that they only get to see their children in the evenings, or they can't afford a babysitter. Maybe if there was care available during the meetings the single parents would come. One possibility is that the parents in the group take turns watching the kids during the meetings. Another alternative is to have the church offer babysitting services during church activities and meetings. The sitters could be members of the congregations or trained outside help, depending on the individual congregation's preference and sources.

The ELCA should also use their lobbyists to support government assisted child care. The church needs to advocate their policy and let the government know their position.

The national church needs to take a position and offer help to the congregations. It can be financially trying to run a day care center. At the American Lutheran Church in Gaylord, Minnesota, they tried to run a child care center. They ran into difficulties when the expenses got too high. For example, the church used to set the thermostat so the temperatures were lower during the week while no one was there. With a day care, the temperatures must be comfortable and in Minnesota that usually means heat. This can be very costly. Another problem was the

accessibility of the church to other groups and events. Funerals are usually held during the week, but with children present for day care, noise can be a problem and accessibility to the kitchen is a problem. The kitchen was too small to accommodate coffee for the other groups and snack- and lunch-time for the day care children. This accessibility problem is also applicable to the (emergency) exits. American Lutheran in Gaylord tried to run a child care center but the financial costs were too great. If the ELCA had had a policy and offered assistance, maybe the center would still exist.

The church must be certain however that they are offering quality care. Poor quality care can be detrimental to the children and that would not be just ministering. There have been some strict guidelines set forth by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). The ELCA should adopt these guidelines or at least try to have the congregations adhere as closely as possible to them. This might help to avoid lawsuits and encourage parents to bring their children to the ELCA child care centers.

All of these solutions are for institutional child care centers. I would like to mention now some alternatives. A live in care taker or someone who comes over every day while the parent(s) work(s). The advantage of having this is that the child is not traumatized by constantly changing care takers. For the child this person often becomes like a member of the family. I know a family with a child suffering from severe brain damage.

Chris requires special care and attention. His mother is usually the one who provides it, but it is very tiresome for one person to always be doing this. So the Thomas family hired a specially trained person to come to the house 5 days a week for 8 hours a day and this person takes care of Chris so his mom can do other things and take a break. Another advantage is the control the parent has over the quality of care the child receives: a well trained nanny or a high school or college student with little training. The disadvantage of this solution is the cost. Few people can afford a full-time nanny.

Another alternative for a two-parent household is both taking part-time jobs so one can watch the child(ren) while the other parent works. The problem with this is the lack of security and benefits with part-time jobs. Another potential problem is the parents never spending time together. This is detrimental to the relationship and threatening to the family.

A different solution is family or home day care. In this situation, care for children is given in one's private home. This is a common source of difficult-to-find services such as infant care, children not yet toilet-trained, or children with special needs. Often these homes provide care for a mixed-age group so it resembles a family. This feature is attractive to some parents and disturbing to others because they feel their child's specific needs might not be addressed. Yet those who prefer family day care like the change in atmosphere for school age children. They believe the child needs a break from the

institution and a home situation is similar enough to the child's own home that s/he can relax comfortably.

And of course there is the option of no child care. This is usually applied to school age children, more commonly known as latch-key kids. Many employers are familiar with the situation because at 3 p.m. the telephone lines become jammed with calls as parents call home to check on their children. There are some serious disadvantages to this alternative, such as safety. Parents fear for their child's ability to respond to strangers, unwanted telephone calls, or household emergencies such as fire, burglary or illness. And the child's activities are unsupervised so the child can basically do what s/he wants. However for many parents this is the only solution because it is cost-free.

The final alternative solution I propose is the non-working family member. For some families there is a relative such as a grandparent who is capable of taking care of children and is willing to do it. However this alternative is for only a rare few because there are fewer people offering family care. Most sisters, brothers, aunts and uncles are working themselves. And because older people are working longer too, it is difficult to find a capable grandparent who is willing to babysit when they could be working and earning money.

All these solutions have valid points as well as problems. In the next section I will propose a final analysis and solution to the child care problem.

### Part Three: The Conclusion

In considering the size of the problem and all of the alternatives proposed, I suggest incorporating all of them to help alleviate the problem.

The state governments need to set forth formal guidelines and high-quality standards. The strict guidelines of the NAEYC should be considered. The infant to child care giver ratio should be four to one. The number of children per center should vary depending on the size of the facility. No child under the age of 12 months should be enrolled in a child care program. The government needs to enforce these standards and update them as necessary. In these ways the state government can help.

The national government needs to evaluate the welfare system and change it so that people in the low-income and poor classes can receive child care financial assistance as well as to help them find better jobs and stay with them. Something also needs to be done to improve the training the care takers receive.

The ABC bill would do all these things but it was never passed because the House and Senate were unable to agree on the tax provisions before the end of the session. [1]

Currently, twenty-nine states subsidize child care through their tax codes. And eight states give tax breaks to employers who give child care assistance to their employees. The states' funding of child care assistance is primarily provided by Federal Social Services Block Grant (Title XX) funds. These funds also allow the States to address the needs of low-income



working parents, parents enrolled in education or training programs, teenage parents, and children receiving other public protective services. So in other words, the amount currently being spent is covering a large variety of needs. Therefore it couldn't possibly be enough. More federal government money needs to be appropriated to social services. For the most part, the government says it is providing child care through the Head Start programs, but it is not enough.

So the government needs to set guidelines for quality care, enforce the guidelines and spend more money on social services, especially child care.

The companies need to offer child care programs as discussed earlier. And maternity leave for mothers should be extended to the first birthday of the child. Because studies have shown day care to be detrimental to infants less than 12 months old. This leave should in no way jeopardize the mother's job, she should be guaranteed her job when she returns. Too many mothers lose their jobs because they have a baby and they often do not get the job back unless they come back to work shortly after having the child.

The available buildings should be facilitated. This includes school and church classrooms. The 21st Century school is a wonderful idea which should be incorporated nation-wide. The program should be privately owned, not government run. With utility and rent payments made to the counties. By making it private, the government does not run into any large operating

expenses and the quality will probably higher.

The churches should make use of their buildings and classrooms if at all possible. Whether the program is run by the church or a private owner, is also something the individual congregations need to decide. Many churches run the programs themselves with great success. An example is my home congregation, Christ Lutheran Church in Mililani, Hawaii. We offer child care for 3 and 4 year olds. This service has expanded our membership. We are the largest church in the state now. A successful example of renting the facility is Epiphany Lutheran Church in Alexandria, Virginia. This program is run independently of the church but the facility is shared. The preschool also shares supplies such as toys and furniture with the Sunday School. Again, the church membership is affected. A lot of the preschoolers and their families are members of Epiphany.

Some churches are not equipped to handle a day care program and these churches should not have to, other congregations may not see a need for such a program in their community. It should depend on the individual congregation to determine whether or not they should offer a day care program. But the ELCA does need to be more aware of this issue and encourage the congregations to look at it and consider it.

I also believe the alternative solutions should be considered by parents looking into child care. People who can afford a nanny and feel it suits their needs best should get one.

By no means do I propose a nation-wide, mandatory attendance, day care program. But this is a valid issue and has been for several years and it can no longer be ignored. With so many mothers as well as fathers working, women can no longer bear the full responsibility for child care. For many "day care" is a service for mothers who can't afford to stay home. But that is an outdated concept. Women are in the working world for a variety of reasons that should be respected. Women's roles are changing and there are things the community needs to do to adapt. Child care is one of those things. Access to quality care should be available for all-urban, suburban, rural, industrial, middle-class and poor. We must all become part of the effort to provide this care. [2]

The issue of childcare is a part of a broader issue, feminism. Feminism has made it possible for women to work more openly and in a wider variety of fields. Feminism has made it possible for women to vote, to attend schools like college universities and graduate schools. Feminism has also made it possible for women to become ministers and obtain higher positions in the churches. But this has also threatened to change a lot of currently existing structures. The old idea about women staying home and raising children is changing. Women are demanding to be heard and respected as equals. Child-rearing is a very important responsibility. Yet women aren't the only ones capable of fulfilling that responsibility. Men are becoming more aware of their fatherly duties and are taking more active roles

Some risks must be taken by the Church and its members to reinforce the radicality of Christianity. Yes, Christianity is very radical. It goes against all the world was saying. And one of the radical ideas is that in God's eyes, men and women are equal. Paul said it in his letter to the Galatians, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3:28)

The Church needs to remember its radical roots and not try to bury them. Yes, the Church needs to work with the society and support it but not at the cost of losing its focus. Having childcare programs in the churches is an example of ministering as I said before. The little child should be the primary focus of the community's care and service because Jesus himself is present to the community in those children whom the community has accepted in baptism. [3]

"Whoever receives this child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me, receives the one who sent me; for he who is least among you all is the one who is great." Luke 9:48.

## Notes

### Part One: The Problem

- [1] Congressional Digest, Feb 90, "Child Care," p. 34.
- [2] Jane Bryant Quinn, Newsweek, Feb 15, 88, "A Crisis in Child Care," p. 57.
- [3] Nation's Business, "Recognizing Quality Child Care," May 88, p. 20.
- [4] Terry Muck, Christianity Today, Sept 16, 88, "The ABC's of Day Care," p. 14.
- [5] Pat Wingert and Barbara Kantrowitz, Newsweek, Sp. Issue 89, "The Day Care Generation," p. 89.
- [6] Ibid. p. 87.
- [7] Karen Berney, Nation's Business, May 88, "Recognizing Quality Child Care," p. 20.
- [8] Pat Wingert and Barbara Kantrowitz, Newsweek, Sp. Issue 89, "The Day Care Generation," p. 92.

### Part Two: Solutions

- [1] Sandra Scarr, Mother Care/Other Care, Basic Books, New York, 1984. p. 41.
- [2] Karen Berney, Nation's Business, May 88, "Public-Private Initiatives," p. 22.
- [3] Congressional Digest, Feb 90, "Child Care," p. 33.
- [4] Nancy M. Robinson, Halbert B. Robinson, Martha A. Darling, and Gretchen Holm, A World of Children, Brooks/Cole Publishing, Monterey, 1979. p. 29-30.
- [5] Ibid. p.37.
- [6] Kathleen P. Watkins and Lucius Durant, Jr., Day Care: A Source Book, Garland Publishing, New York, 1987. p. 135.
- [7] Ellen Ruppel Shell, The Atlantic, Aug. 88, "Babes in Day Care," p. 73-74.
- [8] Roger Thompson, Nation's Business, May 88, "Caring for the Children," p. 20.
- [9] Brenda Hunter, Christianity Today, Feb 21, 86, "Breaking the

Tie That Binds," p. 31.

- [10] Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, In Memory Of Her, Crossroad Publishing, New York, 1984. p. 149.

#### Conclusion

- [1] Congressional Digest, Feb 90, "Child Care," p. 64.
- [2] Gerald Ford, Parade Magazine, Oct 23, 83, "Childcare is for Everybody," p. 16.
- [3] Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, In Memory Of Her, Crossroad Publishing, New York, 1984. p.149.

## Bibliography

### Books

Filstrup, J. M., and Gross, D. W., Monday through Friday: Day Care Alternatives, Teachers College Press, New York. 1982

Fiorenza, E. S., In Memory Of Her, Crossroad Publishing, New York, 1984.

Howe, Louise K., The Future of the Family, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1972.

Robinson, N., Robinson, H., Darling, M., Holm, G., A World of Children, Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., Monterey, 1979.

Scarr, Sandra, Mother Care/ Other Care, Basic Books, Inc. New York, 1984.

Watkins, K. P., and Durant, L., Day Care: A Source Book, Garland Publishing, Inc. New York, 1987.

### Articles

Berney, K., Nation's Business, May 88, "Child-Care By Consortium," p. 24.

Berney, K., Nation's Business, May 88, "Public-Private Initiatives," p. 22.

Congressional Digest, Feb. 90, "Child Care"

Ford, G., Parade, Oct. 23, 83, "Childcare is for Everybody," p.16.

Galinsky, E., and Phillips, D., Parents, Nov. 88, "The Day-Care Debate," p. 113-115.

Hunter, B., Christianity Today, Feb. 21, 86, "Breaking the Tie That Binds," p. 31-33.

Kantrowitz, B., Newsweek, Mar. 28, 88, "Who Cares About Day Care?" p. 73.

Klaven, E., Parents, Sept. 89, "Pick the Best After-School Care," p. 72-82.

Kreyche, G. F., USA Today, Sept. 89, "Day Care: The New Surrogacy," p. 91-93.

Muck, T., Christianity Today, Sept. 16, 88, "The ABC's of Day

- Care," p. 14-15.
- Quinn, J. B., Newsweek, Feb. 15, 88, "A Crisis in Child Care," p. 57.
- Shell, E. R., The Atlantic, Aug. 88, "Babes in Day Care," p. 73-74.
- Thompson, R., Nation's Business, May 88, "Caring for the Children," p. 18-25.
- Walmsley, A., Maclean's, Nov. 6, 89, "The High Cost of Child Care," p. 60.
- Watson, R. E., and FitzGerald, K., Parents, October 1989, "21st Century School," p. 112-116.
- Wingert, P., and Kantrowitz, B. Newsweek, Sp. Issue, "The Day Care Generation," p. 86-92.