

MOTHERS' SATISFACTION WITH CHILDCARE SERVICES

Agata Ruźniak-Lubocka and Artur Sawicki

Institute of Psychology, University of Gdansk

Choosing the right childcare service for one's child to compensate for parents' professional working time is a significantly important decision for a mother. The study aimed to analyze whether parental styles are predictors of satisfaction with childcare services among mothers. This link was tested on a sample that consisted of 200 adult women ($M_{\text{age}} = 32.39$ years; $SD_{\text{age}} = 4.47$) who were mothers of children aged 18 to 36 months. The results indicated that accepting and autonomous parenting styles were related to higher satisfaction with childcare services. In contrast, excessively demanding, protective, and inconsistent parenting styles were related to lower satisfaction with childcare services. However, given the intercorrelations between parenting styles, we found that two of them sufficiently predicted satisfaction with childcare services: acceptance (positively) and overly protective style (negatively).

Keywords: motherhood; parental styles; childcare.

Motherhood is a big challenge. It is a difficult time both mentally and physically, but at the same time it is a period full of milestones (Kotlarska-Michalska, 2011). It is complex and covers a whole range of tasks and responsibilities (Śniegulska,

AGATA RUŻNIAK-LUBOCKA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0197-6254>; ARTUR SAWICKI, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6179-5765>. Correspondence concerning this article can be addressed to AGATA RUŻNIAK-LUBOCKA, Uniwersytet Gdański, Wydział Nauk Społecznych, Instytut Psychologii, ul. Bażyńskiego 4, 80-309, Gdańsk, Poland; email: agata.ruzniak-lubocka@phdstud.ug.edu.pl.

Handling editor: MONIKA WRÓBEL, University of Lodz.

Received 11 December 2020. Received in revised form 28 April 2021. Accepted 16 June 2021.
Published online 13 September 2021.

2016). Mothers become a link between the world and the child, and they describe the world to their children in accordance with their own experiences. In this way they build their own path in motherhood (Łamejko, 2003; Rusiak, 2014; Mądry, 2016). Perceptions of motherhood are often associated with various factors, such as experiences from their own childhood (Plopa, 2009), their own vision of motherhood (Rudman & Phelan, 2010), and social pressures (Desperak, 2001; Gawlina, 2003; Włodarczyk, 2009). It could also be associated with psychological styles of parenting which Plopa described as parental styles (Plopa, 2009).

Parental style is an intellectual (cognitive) and emotional attitude towards the child. It is manifested in behavior towards the child, which is shaped and modified during parenthood (Plopa, 2011). Based on the attitudes described by Ziemska, Plopa (2011) distinguished types of parental styles: positive, i.e. accepting and autonomous, and negative, i.e. rejecting, excessively demanding, inconsistent, and excessively protective (Ziemska, 1997; Plopa, 2011). A mature and healthy attitude towards the child is most often characterized by accepting and autonomous styles. The accepting style is characterized by the parent's acceptance of the child the way she is. The parent gives the child space to express her own feelings and needs. An autonomous attitude is an approach with the awareness that the child needs increasing autonomy and space to make independent decisions. The parent behaves flexibly towards the child and respects her need for privacy (Plopa, 2011). Another parental style described by Plopa (2011) is the rejection style in which the parent does not feel the pleasure and satisfaction of being with their child. In the excessively demanding style, it is characteristic to strictly subordinate the child's behavior to the parent's upbringing model. In the inconsistent style, the parent's attitude towards the child is inconsistent and depends on their mood; we also distinguish the excessively protective style, characterized by anxiety and a lack of faith in the child's independence (Plopa, 2011). According to the child's needs, accepting and autonomous styles are most conducive to safe development (Oleś, 2011).

During motherhood, the mother may present some of the styles described by Plopa through her behavior towards the child. At each stage of child raising, her behavior and the decisions she makes towards the child may be related to some of the parental styles (Plopa, 2009). One of the most challenging decisions in motherhood is the issue of reconciling childcare with professional work performed by the mother (Kotlarska-Michalska, 2011; Krause, 2016). One of the possibilities could be a break from work to provide the child with their own care as a mother. The second option could be continuing professional work and providing the child with daytime care in a facility while the mother is working. If mothers choose to send their child to a daycare facility, they expect it to be of the highest possible standard. Society's awareness regarding a child's development and needs is still growing.

Childcare facilities are no longer treated as “storage rooms” but instead are becoming “centers of education” (Broude, 1996; Vincent & Ball, 2006). Psychologists and educators are constantly developing criteria for standards of care that should be implemented in institutions (Czub & Appelt, 2003; Rościszewska-Woźniak, 2012; Krauze-Sikorska et al., 2016). Emlen et al. (2000) created a framework for assessing the quality of childcare. They constructed a questionnaire featuring components that contribute to the overall assessment of parents' satisfaction with the facility attended by their child. According to Emlen et al., in order to assess the quality of a childcare facility, the following aspects should be measured: caregivers' warmth and interest, caregivers' skills, their relationship with children's parents, the equipment in place, and the child's feelings (Emlen, 2000).

In our study we wanted to verify whether mothers with different parental styles would have a different assessment of the facility's standard of care. The facility, for its part, should take measures to ensure that its quality of care is as high as possible and that the parent is satisfied with it. However, this may not always be possible. The facility provides collective care for many children and has to meet expectations of many parents (Leslie et al., 2000; Kensinger et al., 2008; Riley & Glass, 2002). Depending on the presented parental style, visions regarding raising a child may differ (Plopa, 2009). During the day, many situations in the facility teach children to be independent (Czub & Appelt, 2013). Independent sensory games or toilet training can result in dirty clothes. Learning to walk and run can result in injuries such as abrasions or bruises. These situations can worry mothers and affect their perception of the quality of care in the facility. We assume, therefore, that mothers with an accepting and autonomous style will perceive these situations as favoring the child's development. The common factor for both parenting styles is to treat the child as a separate entity. Mothers who present an autonomous or accepting parenting style are ready to give their children space for their development (Plopa, 2011). Therefore, we formulated the first hypothesis:

H.1. Autonomous and accepting parenting styles are associated with higher satisfaction with care in the facility.

Mothers with an excessively demanding style want to adapt their children to their vision of developmental goals and upbringing. Inconsistent and excessively protective mothers will be afraid of giving the child space for independence. At the same time, those with the rejection style may judge a given situation depending on their mood and not objective premises (Plopa, 2009). The common factor for these three styles is not following the child's needs but the parent's (Plopa, 2011). Therefore, if the children are taken to places during the day or exposed to situations facilitating the development of their independence, they may not be understood by excessively protective and inconsistent mothers. These mothers could react

adversely to dirty clothes, scratches, or bruises on the child's body, ignoring the fact that those could suggest the child's developing independence rather than a low standard of childcare. These situations in the facility could impact the assessment of the quality of care in these places.

Based on these premises, we formulated the second hypothesis:

H.2. Excessively demanding, inconsistent, protective, and rejection styles are associated with lower satisfaction with care in the facility.

There are also many other factors in parental life that may affect the assessment of a given situation. In this study, we also controlled other variables that could affect satisfaction with childcare services. Putting a child in care during the day is associated with a lot of stress and emotions for mothers (Bigras et al., 2002; Kubów, 2012; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2017; Pavlov & Džinović, 2018). These women must trust strangers to do the best for her child and meet his or her needs. A higher level of trust is associated with a lower fear of the unknown (De Cremer, 1999; Siegrist et al., 2005). In such situations occurring during childcare, parents with a higher level of trust may perceive them as favoring the child's development and not harming them (Leventhal et al., 2006). The quality of care may also be related to the care fee. Private institutions offer many extracurricular activities (Kim et al., 2007; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2017). They can also afford to employ staff with different, specialized profiles, such as psychologists, music or gymnastics teachers. The study also covered mothers' general life satisfaction. People who are not satisfied with their lives may assess the situations around them as worse (Antaramian et al., 2008; Cohn et al., 2009). That is why we decided to include this variable in the model to control for mothers' satisfaction of life.

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

The study was conducted on two different samples. Sample 1, consisting of 197 adult parents (186 women [94.4%] and 11 men [5.6%]; $M_{\text{age}} = 32.35$ years; $SD_{\text{age}} = 4.69$; $\text{Range}_{\text{age}} = 21\text{--}45$ years), was used only in the adaptation process of the tool used to measure satisfaction with a daycare facility (Emlen et al. 2000). Sample 2, consisting of 219 adult parents (200 women [91.3%] and 19 men [8.7%]; $M_{\text{age}} = 32.52$ years; $SD_{\text{age}} = 4.65$; $\text{Range}_{\text{age}} = 21\text{--}46$ years), was used to validate factor analysis results obtained in Sample 1. Given the low number of examined men, we used a subsample of 200 women ($M_{\text{age}} = 32.39$ years; $SD_{\text{age}} = 4.47$; $\text{Range}_{\text{age}} = 21\text{--}46$ years). Respondents from both samples were recruited at different daycare

facilities like nurseries and children clubs attended by their children at the time. The respondents' children were aged from 18 to 36 months. Potential respondents were selected based on their declarations (on internet forums) of using such services. Then, they were asked (via an internet communicator) for a short interview which checked if they still used daytime care facilities. Those who declared using these facilities and agreed to participate in the study were given a personal link to an online survey. Participation in the study was voluntary. No monetary or other material rewards were offered. Out of 836 people invited to the study, 197 completed the survey in the first sample. To check the effect of the pilot study, we invited, in a similar manner, next 400 people, 190 of whom completed the survey. Data were collected from February 2019 to June 2019 (Sample 1) and September 2019 to December 2019 (Sample 2). The research procedure was approved by the ethics committee of the authors' institution.

Measures

Satisfaction with Daycare Services

We used a shortened version of six factors (out of 17) to assess the quality of childcare services, assessed by the Emlen Scales (Emlen et al., 2000) (see the sections "Statistical Analyses" and "Structure of the Paraphrase of the Emlen Scales" for details). It consists of 18 items with a 5-point Likert response scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*), followed by two responses indicating unwillingness or inability to respond: "?" (*I don't know*), and "n/a" (*not applicable*). The scale consists of six first-order factors: (i) Warmth and interest in my child, (ii) Rich activities and environment, (iii) Caregiver skills, (iv) Your relationship with the caregiver, (v) How your child feels, and (vi) Risks to health, safety, and Well-being, as well as one second-order factor of general satisfaction with the daycare facility. The full scale's internal consistency was $\alpha = .81$ (see Table 1 for detailed and subscale results). The Warmth and interest in my child factor includes such an item like "My caregiver is happy to see my child". The second factor (Rich activities and environment) contains such statements like "There are lots of creative activities going on". Caregivers' skills factor includes statements regarding caregiver experience in work, for example, "The caregiver knows a lot about children and their needs". The fourth factor is to evaluate the relationship between parents and caregiver, i.e., "The caregiver supports me as a parent". The fifth factor includes statements about the child's feelings, for example, "My child feels safe with a caregiver". The last

factor includes statements about risk factors and safety in the facility, i.e., proper preparation of the space, room equipment, or toys.

Parenting Styles

The Parental Styles Scale was used to assess parents' styles (Plopa, 2011). The tool consists of 50 statements about parents' behavior and thoughts concerning their child. The statements fall into five diagnostic dimensions, corresponding to five parental styles: *acceptance-rejection*, *excessively demanding*, *autonomous*, *inconsistent*, and *excessively protective*. The mother or the father respond to each statement on the 5-point Likert scale, ranging from *a* ("I definitely behave this way and that's how I am") to *e* ("I definitely do not behave this way and I am not like that").

Satisfaction With Life

A single-item measure of satisfaction with life was used: "How much do you enjoy your life?" (Atroszko et al., 2017). It was derived from the WHOQOL-BREF (Skevington et al., 2004). The responses are provided on a 9-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 9 (*an extreme amount*).

Trust. The Generalized Trust Scale (Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994) was used. It consists of 6 items with a 7-point Likert response scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Daytime care expenses were measured using one item: "How much do you spend on care for your child in the facility per month?" The mothers gave open answers to this question, providing the amount in PLN.

Statistical Analyses

Given the highly skewed distribution of results in the Emlen Scales items, we joined Categories 1, 2, and 3 (3, 4, and 5 in items right-skewed). Thus, the original 5-point scale of the Emlen Scales was recoded into a 3-point scale. All "?" and "n/a" responses were recoded as missing data (total of 6.04%).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to investigate the structure of the Emlen scales. We relied on the following recommendations for a good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999): Comparative Fit Index (CFI) > .95, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) < .06, and the Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) > .95. Modification indices were used in estimating the redundancy between items in the item-reduction

process. Because of the ordinal response scale (3-category) used in the Emlen Scales and the sample size, we decided to use Robust Weighted Least Squares (WLSMV) estimator (see Beauducel & Herzberg, 2006). All factor analyses were conducted using Mplus 7.2.

To estimate the relationship between the studied variables, Pearson's r correlation coefficients were analyzed. Independent relations between satisfaction with childcare service and parenting styles, trust, satisfaction with life, and daytime care expenses were examined using hierarchical multiple regression analysis. To establish the magnitude of unique and common effects of all variables, we conducted commonality analysis (Ray-Mukherjee et al., 2014). To establish each parental style's relative importance in explaining satisfaction with childcare services, we conducted all possible subsets regression (Kraha et al., 2012). Both were calculated using "yhat" package (Nimon et al., 2020) in R. No violations of assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity (max VIF = 1.76), and homoscedasticity were detected. All tests were two-tailed, and the significance level was set to $\alpha = .05$. Interpretation of effect sizes was based on recent suggestions (Funder & Ozer, 2019). Effect sizes r of .10 were interpreted as small, r of .20 as medium, and $r = .30$ as large.

RESULTS

Structure of the Paraphrase of the Emlen Scales

In our study we paraphrased the Emlen Scales (A packet of Scales for Measuring the Quality of Child Care From a Parent's Point of View) (Emlen et al., 2000). The original version of the tool consists of three scales addressing diversity issues, six scales measuring aspects of childcare quality, three scales measuring sources of parents' flexibility, three scales measuring the accessibility of child care, options, and choice. Finally, two scales measure perceived affordability (Emlen et al., 2000). Translation and paraphrase of the tool into Polish conditions were initiated after obtaining consent from the first author of the original version. In our study, we decided to use the shortened version of the paraphrase, which consists of only six factors to assess the quality of care in the facility, and these were the only ones used in the analyses. These six dimensions contain specific questions about care in a given facility. The remaining areas of the original version of the questionnaire included questions about parents' professional work, financial situation, and reconciling care and work responsibilities.

We searched for model specification of the Emlen Scale's paraphrase using Sample 1 and cross-validated the structure on Sample 2. We aimed at shortening

the scale, and thus, we removed items based on content similarities between items, factor loadings, and reliability of subscales. In Sample 1, the hierarchical model was well fitted to the data, $\chi^2_{(85)} = 96.26$, $p = .189$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, RMSEA = .026 [.000, .049]. Next, the hierarchical model with one second-order factor was rechecked in Sample 2. The model was well fitted to the data, $\chi^2_{(129)} = 219.32$, $p < .001$, CFI = .98, TLI = .97, RMSEA = .057 [.043, .069]. The final model of the paraphrase of the Emlen Scales consisted of 18 items ordered hierarchically. Factor loadings on first-order factors ranged from .65 to .96. Cronbach's internal consistency coefficients ranged from .63 to .86.

Relationships Between Studied Variables

Means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients between studied variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability Coefficients and Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Studied Variables in Sample 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Satisfaction with day-time care									
2. Acceptance	.20**								
3. Excessively demanding	-.15*	-.14*							
4. Autonomy	.21**	.44**	-.36**						
5. Inconsistent	-.11	-.39**	.50**	-.27**					
6. Excessively protective	-.22**	-.01	.48**	-.32**	.28**				
7. Trust	.31**	.29**	-.27**	.22**	-.39**	-.36**			
8. Satisfaction with life	.16*	.23**	-.15*	.24**	-.13	-.10	.22**		
9. Daytime care expenses ^a	.10	.11	-.19**	.02	-.05	-.14	.20**	.07	
α	.81	.86	.87	.65	.89	.81	.88	–	–
M	2.45	4.64	2.57	3.97	2.12	2.74	6.64	4.40	656.82
SD	0.42	0.43	0.7	0.45	0.72	0.71	1.71	0.92	461.18

Note. $N = 200$. ^a $n = 193$. Reliability was not estimated for single-item measures of satisfaction with life and daytime care cost.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Satisfaction with childcare services was related positively to the accepting and autonomous parenting style and negatively to excessively demanding, excessively protective, and inconsistent parenting styles. As expected, it was also related positively to trust and satisfaction with life in general. A positive relationship between

satisfaction with childcare services and the cost of this care was negligible and not statistically significant. Both trust and general satisfaction with life were related to parenting styles in a predictable manner. However, the relationship between general satisfaction with life was only weakly (negatively) linked to “negative” parenting styles: excessively demanding, excessively protective, and inconsistent. Interestingly, an excessively demanding parenting style was negatively related to daytime care expenses.

Unique Links Between Variables

As reported in Table 1, all parenting styles were related to each other. Thus, to establish the relative importance of each, we conducted all possible subsets regression analysis. This technique enabled us to examine how adding one of the predictors (in this case parental styles) to all possible subsets of predictors affects the magnitude of explained variance. Conceptually, all possible subsets regression is similar to conducting all possible hierarchical multiple regression analyses with a chosen set of predictors. We inferred statistical significance using bootstrap confidence intervals (95% CI, percentile-corrected method, 1000 samples). Of the five tested parenting styles, only two were significant: acceptance and excessively protective. This set of predictors explained 9.0% (3.2%, 18.4%) of satisfaction with childcare services, covering the majority of variance explained by all five parenting styles (which explained 9.5% [4.9%, 20.4%] of satisfaction with childcare services). Therefore, for ease of interpretation, we used only these two in subsequent analysis. Complete results of all possible subsets regression are presented in Supplementary Table S1.

Next, we conducted a multiple regression analysis in which we entered two chosen parenting styles (acceptance, excessively protective), trust, satisfaction with life, and satisfaction with childcare services to examine whether they are independently involved in that relationship. These variables explained 13.84% of the variance, $F(5, 187) = 6.01$, $p < .001$, with excessively protective parental style and overall satisfaction with life as significant predictors of satisfaction with childcare services.

Then, using commonality analysis, we decomposed the overall R^2 to establish the magnitude of unique and all common effects of the examined variables on satisfaction with childcare services. Several effects are worth noting. Firstly, although acceptance did not reach the conventional significance threshold ($p < .05$), it uniquely explained 1.24% of the variance, which is similar to the unique effect of excessively protective parental style (1.86%). Satisfaction with life was the strongest of the predictors, both uniquely (3.05%) and commonly (2.68% explained commonly

with excessively protective parenting style, and 1.45% explained commonly with acceptance). Table 2 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis and partial R^2 coefficients derived from commonality analysis to show the direction (regression coefficients) and magnitude (partial R^2 coefficients) of unique links of all studied variables and satisfaction with childcare services. Complete results of commonality analysis are available in Supplementary Table S2.

Table 2

Results of Multiple Regression Analysis With Satisfaction With Childcare Service as Dependent Variable

Predictors	β	95% CI	t	p	Unique variance explained	Common variance explained
Acceptance	0.10	[-.02, .26]	1.64	0.102	1.24%	2.83%
Excessively protective	-0.15	[-.29, -.00]	-2.01	0.046	1.86%	3.66%
Trust	0.08	[-.06, .22]	1.15	0.251	0.61%	2.32%
Satisfaction with life	0.20	[.05, .36]	2.57	0.011	3.05%	6.86%
Day time care expenses ^a	0.02	[-.12, .16]	0.29	0.771	0.04%	0.94%
$R^2 = .138$, $F(5, 187) = 6.01$, $p < .001$						

Note. $N = 193$. Common variance explained is the sum of the variance explained commonly with all other predictors. Magnitude of the variance explained commonly by different combinations of predictors is presented in the Supplemental Materials.

DISCUSSION

Motherhood is a time of making many decisions. Mothers want to provide the child with the best possible development conditions while at the same time reconciling it with other challenges of everyday life, e.g., work career. In these situations, they help themselves by utilizing nurseries or child clubs to help look after their children.

The satisfaction with childcare services was positively related to accepting and autonomous parental styles. The first hypothesis was confirmed. Mothers who present accepting and autonomous parenting styles were more satisfied with the facilities' care than mothers who presented other parental styles. According to the theory of parental styles (Plopa, 2011), they were able to balance their expectations of care and the ability to create space for individual development.

Excessively demanding, excessively protective, and inconsistent parenting styles were related negatively to satisfaction with childcare services. Therefore, the second hypothesis was also confirmed. Mothers who present these three styles are not as satisfied with the standard of care as accepting and autonomous mothers. Exces-

sively demanding, excessively protective, and inconsistent mothers are focused on their own needs and emotions. Often, they are unable to go beyond their vision of parenthood and allow changes in the way they raise their children (Plopa, 2011). Sharing a child's care with others, such as caregivers in the facilities, requires them to reshape their vision of parenthood.

Only acceptance and excessively protective parenting styles were uniquely related to satisfaction with the care in the facilities. These two styles can be walked to the two ends of the continuum of parental styles. Acceptance mothers seem to be more open in their vision of raising a child (Plopa, 2011). They can use other people's advice, not treating them as attacks, but as knowledge, thanks to which they can better raise their children. The way in which cooperation with caregivers is perceived therefore affects the satisfaction with care. On the contrary, excessively protective mothers want to have strict control over the environment in which their child lives. Therefore, their satisfaction with care is closely related to the possibility of influencing the caregivers who look after their children (Soydan & Samur, 2014).

In our study, we have also controlled for additional variables such as trust and satisfaction with life. Predictably, trust and satisfaction with life were positively related to satisfaction with childcare services. Mothers who proved to have a higher level of trust rated the care provided in the facilities higher. This may be due to the premise that people with a higher level of trust are not so afraid of new and unknown situations and are open to new experiences (De Cremer, 1999; Siegrist et al., 2005). Mothers who were more satisfied with their lives also rated their satisfaction with daytime care higher. People satisfied with their lives evaluate the reality around them better than people who are not satisfied with life (Antaramian et al., 2008; Cohn et al., 2009). Perhaps mothers who are not satisfied with their lives and allow that to affect their life satisfaction are not good at evaluating many aspects of their lives, including childcare services. We would probably need more qualitative data to elaborate on these considerations because the relation between trust, satisfaction with life, and satisfaction with childcare services were observed only on a zero-order level. Thus, trust was related to satisfaction with childcare services only in its aspects overlapping with satisfaction with life. Based on these data, we cannot determine specific aspects of mothers' trust or life satisfaction that predict satisfaction with institutional care.

In literature, there are indications that expenses may be related to parental satisfaction regarding the care in a facility (Kim et al., 2007; Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2017). In the case of mothers who took part in the study, this relationship proved not to be significant. The amount of childcare fees in nurseries and children's clubs was not related to mothers' satisfaction with childcare facilities.

Our study verified whether there is a relation between the mothers' parental style, trust, overall satisfaction with life, and their satisfaction with their children's daytime care. Our analyses allowed us to answer this question partially. Among the examined variables: acceptance and excessively protective parental styles and overall satisfaction with life were uniquely linked to satisfaction with daytime care. The common ground of these three variables may be maternal awareness of the child's needs (Soydan & Samur, 2014).

LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

This research has several limitations. It was based on a relatively small sample of mothers who were not chosen randomly. Moreover, a low response rate hinders the possibility of generalizing the results. Follow-up research might consider sampling in a way that maximizes response rate. Moreover, participation of men in research would be an important direction in future studies, indicating the active role of men in raising children.

Further, we could not objectively assess the quality of care in studied facilities, relying only on mothers' opinions. Although the shortened version of several of the Emlen Scales showed good psychometric properties, it still needs to be further validated. Whether parenting styles and satisfaction with life influence satisfaction with childcare services or the other way around is still to be examined, which would be an extremely valuable source of information. However, considering logistical and financial considerations, we are aware that this would significantly impede the data collection process. Finally, only a specific (short) list of predictors was tested. The forward-looking directions of this research should certainly broaden the context with more psychological characteristics of parents that may be relevant to satisfaction with childcare services.

CRedit Author Statement

AGATA RUŻNIAK-LUBOCKA (60%): conceptualization, investigation, resources, data curation, writing (original draft), writing (review and editing), supervision, project administration, funding acquisition.

ARTUR SAWICKI (40%): data curation, writing (original draft), methodology, writing (review and editing), software, validation, formal analysis, visualization.

REFERENCES

- Antaramian, S. P., Huebner, E. S., & Valois, R. F. (2008). Adolescent life satisfaction. *Applied Psychology, 57*, 112–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00357.x>
- Atroszko, P. A., Sawicki, A. J., Mąkinia, A., & Atroszko, B. (2017). Further validation of single-item self-report measure of satisfaction with life. In M. McGreevy & R. Rita (Eds.), *CER Comparative European Research 2017* (pp. 107–110). Sciecee.
- Bigras, N., Lemay, L., & Brunson, L. (2012). Parental stress and daycare attendance. Does daycare quality and parental satisfaction with daycare moderate the relation between family income and stress level among parents of four years old children? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 55*, 894–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.578>
- Broude, G. J. (1996). The realities of day care. *Public Interest, 125*, 95–106.
- Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion, 9*(3), 361. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015952>
- Czub, M., & Appelt, K. (2013). Wczesna edukacja i opieka nad małym dzieckiem jako wyzwanie dla systemu edukacji [Early childhood education and care as a challenge for the education system]. *Studia Edukacyjne, 27*, 113–128.
- De Cremer, D. (1999). Trust and fear of exploitation in a public goods dilemma. *Current Psychology, 18*(2), 153–163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-999-1024-0>
- Desperak, I. (2001). Stereotypy ról kobiet w reklamie telewizyjnej i praktyce rynku pracy [Stereotypes of women's roles in television advertising and labour market practice]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianensis. Folia Sociologica, 29*, 7–71.
- Emlen, A. C., Koren, P. E., & Schultze, K. H. (2000). *A packet of scales for measuring quality of child care from a parent's point of view*. Regional Research Institute for Human Services, Portland State University.
- Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 2*(2), 156–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245919847202>
- Gawlina, Z. (2003). Macierzyństwo jako wartość w kontekście przemian społecznych [Maternity as a value in the context of social transformations]. *Roczniki Socjologii Rodziny, XV*, 33–45.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Kensinger Rose, K., & Elicker, J. (2008). Parental decision making about child care. *Journal of Family Issues, 29*(9), 1161–1184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X07312103>
- Kim E., Shin H., Jeon B., Han S., Jung J., & Won Y. (2007). FRASH: Hierarchical file system for FRAM and Flash. In O. Gervasi & M. L., Gavrilova (Eds.), *Computational science and its applications – ICCSA 2007* (pp. 238–251). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4705. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74472-6_19
- Kotlarska-Michalska, A. (2011). Społeczne role kobiet [Social roles of women]. *Edukacja Humanistyczna, 1*(24), 25–35.

- Kraha, A., Turner, H., Nimon, K., Zientek, L., & Henson, R. (2012). Tools to support interpreting multiple regression in the face of multicollinearity. *Frontiers in Psychology, 3*, 44. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00044>
- Krause, E. (2016). Macierzyństwo kobiet-naukowców – o konflikcie roli rodzicielskiej i zawodowej [The motherhood of women academics – on the motherhood of women academics]. *Szkola – Zawód – Praca, 12*, 153–167.
- Krauze-Sikorska, H., Kuszak, K., Rura, G., & Sadowska, K. (2016). Dziecko do lat trzech w systemie opieki i edukacji. Źródła wsparcia i zagrożeń [A child under three in the care and education system. Sources of support and threats]. UAM.
- Kubów, A. (2012). Rodzicielstwo jako bariera aktywności zawodowej [Parenthood as a barrier to professional activity]. *Nauki Społeczne, 2*(6), 7–22.
- Leslie, L. A., Ettenson, R., & Cumsille, P. (2000). Selecting a child care center: What really matters to parents? In *Child and Youth Care Forum, 29*(5), 299–322. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016609927849>
- Łamejko, D. (2003). Motherhood as a philosophical and moral value. *Etyka, 36*, 193–208
- Mądry, M. (2016). Disturbances in the role of the mother – selected issues. In Matysiak-Błaszczak, A., & Jankowiak, B. (Eds.), *Controversy over the socialisation of girls and women*. UAM.
- Nomaguchi, K., & Milkie, M. A. (2017). Sociological perspectives on parenting stress: How social structure and culture shape parental strain and the well-being of parents and children. In *Parental stress and early child development* (pp. 47–73). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55376-4_3
- Oleś, P. (2011). *Psychologia człowieka dorosłego: Ciągłość – zmiana – integracja* [Adult psychology: Continuity – change – integration]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Pavlov, S. V., & Džinović, D. R. (2018). The structure of parenting sense of competency in parents of preschool children. *Journal Plus Education, 20*(2), 124–134.
- Plopa, M. (2011). *Psychologia rodziny. Teoria i badania* [Family psychology. Theory and Research]. Impuls.
- Riley, L. A., & Glass, J. L. (2002). You can't always get what you want—Infant care preferences and use among employed mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(1), 2–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00002.x>
- Rościszewska-Woźniak, M. (2012). *Standardy jakości opieki i wspierania rozwoju dzieci do lat 3* [Standards of quality of care and supporting the development of children under 3 years of age]. Fundacja Rozwoju Dzieci im. Amosa Komeńskiego.
- Rudman, L., & Phelan, J. E. (2010). The effect of priming gender roles on women's implicit gender beliefs and career aspirations. *Social Psychology, 41*(3), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000027>
- Rusiak, D. (2014). Postawy rodzicielskie rodziców osób we wczesnej dorosłości [Parental attitudes of parents of people in early adulthood]. In Topolewska, E., Skimina, E., & Skrzek, S. (Eds.), *Młoda Psychologia, 2*, 111–124.
- Siegrist, M., Gutscher, H., & Earle, T. C. (2005). Perception of risk: The influence of general trust, and general confidence. *Journal of Risk Research, 8*(2), 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136698032000105315>
- Skevington, S. M., Lotfy, M., & O'Connell, K. A. (2004). The World Health Organization's WHO-QOL-BREF quality of life assessment: Psychometric properties and results of the international

- field trial. A report from the WHOQOL group. *Quality of life Research*, 13(2), 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:QURE.0000018486.91360.00>
- Śniegulska, A. (2016). Rodzice w przestrzeni życia rodzinnego [Parents in the space of family life]. *Edukacyjna Analiza Transakcyjna*, 5, 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.16926/eat.2016.05.10>
- Soydan, S., & Samur, A. O. (2014). A comparative study on the environmental attitudes of 60-66-month-old children and their mothers. *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)*, 4(2), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.13054/mije.14.41.4.2>
- Walther, L., Fuchs, L. M., Schupp, J., & von Scheve, C. (2020). Living conditions and the mental health and well-being of refugees: Evidence from a large-scale german survey. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-019-00968-5>
- Włodarczyk, E. (2009). Młodzież wobec macierzyństwa i jego kulturowej kreacji [Youth in the face of motherhood and its cultural creation]. UAM.
- Vincent, C. & Ball, S. J. (2006). *Childcare, choice and class practices: Middle class parents and their children*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203012413>
- Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and emotion*, 18(2), 129–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249397>
- Ziemska, M. (1997). *Typy postaw rodzicielskich* [Types of parental attitudes]. PWN.

Supplemental Materials

Table S1

All Possible Subsets Regression Results

	Subset of predictors	R^2 of this subset	Incremental predictive value of a predictor over the subset				
			Acceptance	Excessively demanding	Autonomous	Inconsistent	Excessively protective
Acceptance		.042(.006,.107)					
Excessively demanding		.023(.000,.085)	.034(.004,.092)	.015(0,.064)	.017(.000,.069)	.001(0,.032)	.048(.007,.119)
Autonomous		.043(.004,.116)	.016(.000,.067)	.007(0,.054)	.027(.001,.090)	.002(0,.036)	.029(.001,.091)
Inconsistent		.013(.000,.071)	.030(.004,.080)	.012(0,.059)	.033(.001,.102)	.004(0,.049)	.027(.001,.086)
Excessively protective							.039(.004,.101)
.049(.007,.124)							
.041(.007,.106)							
.002(0,.037)							
.020(.000,.073)							
.003(0,.043)							
Acceptance + Excessively demanding		.057(.013,.148)			.009(.000,.057)	.001(0,.026)	.034(.002,.100)
Acceptance + Autonomous		.058(.016,.138)				.000(0,.029)	.035(.002,.101)
Excessively demanding + Autonomous		.049(.011,.130)	.016(.000,.065)	.007(0,.052)		.001(0,.030)	.021(.000,.076)
Acceptance + Inconsistent		.043(.009,.117)			.016(.000,.070)		.048(.008,.116)
Excessively demanding + Inconsistent		.025(.002,.096)	.033(.004,.086)	.014(0,.060)	.025(.001,.091)		.029(.001,.090)
Autonomous + Inconsistent		.046(.009,.125)	.013(.000,.051)	.004(0,.041)		.001(0,.031)	.024(.001,.077)
Acceptance + Excessively protective		.090(.032,.184)			.003(.000,.038)		
Excessively demanding + Excessively protective		.052(.009,.135)	.038(.006,.099)	.000(0,.028)	.018(.000,.073)	.000(0,.025)	.028(.001,.092)
Autonomous + Excessively protective		.070(.017,.153)	.023(.001,.081)	.000(0,.031)	.018(.000,.072)	.001(0,.035)	.035(.002,.101)
Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.052(.009,.134)	.038(.006,.092)	.001(0,.031)		.001(0,.036)	.035(.002,.096)
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Autonomous		.065(.021,.159)			.009(.000,.054)		.021(.000,.076)
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Inconsistent		.057(.016,.151)					
Acceptance + Autonomous + Inconsistent		.059(.019,.144)			.007(0,.048)		
Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Inconsistent		.050(.014,.134)	.016(.000,.061)				
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Excessively protective		.090(.036,.189)					
Acceptance + Autonomous + Excessively protective		.093(.038,.193)			.003(.000,.038)	.002(0,.030)	
Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Excessively protective		.070(.022,.163)	.023(.001,.078)	.000(0,.029)		.001(0,.030)	
Acceptance + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.091(.038,.189)			.003(.000,.038)		
Excessively demanding + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.053(.012,.139)	.039(.007,.094)	.001(0,.031)	.017(.000,.069)		
Autonomous + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.071(.023,.158)	.023(.002,.072)	.000(0,.029)		.001(0,.032)	
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Inconsistent		.066(.025,.164)					.029(.001,.092)
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Excessively protective		.093(.044,.199)					
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.092(.042,.197)				.001(0,.029)	
Acceptance + Autonomous + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.094(.044,.198)			.003(.000,.036)		
Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.071(.028,.169)	.024(.001,.073)				
Acceptance + Excessively demanding + Autonomous + Inconsistent + Excessively protective		.095(.049,.204)					

Note. Values in the brackets are 95% CI derived from bootstrap analysis.

Table S2
Commonality Analysis Results

Examined effect	Coefficient	% Total
Unique to Acceptance	0.0124	8.98
Unique to Excessively protective	0.0186	13.46
Unique to Trust	0.0061	4.41
Unique to Satisfaction with life	0.0305	22.02
Unique to Childcare expenses	0.0004	0.28
Common to Acceptance, and Excessively protective	-0.0031	-2.24
Common to Acceptance, and Trust	0.0035	2.56
Common to Excessively protective, and Trust	0.0006	0.45
Common to Acceptance, and Satisfaction with life	0.0145	10.48
Common to Excessively protective, and Satisfaction with life	0.0268	19.35
Common to Trust, and Satisfaction with life	0.0052	3.74
Common to Acceptance, and Childcare expenses	0.0003	0.23
Common to Excessively protective, and Childcare expenses	0.0005	0.38
Common to Trust, and Childcare expenses	0	0.03
Common to Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0014	1.02
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, and Trust	-0.0004	-0.28
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, and Satisfaction with life	0.0017	1.25
Common to Acceptance, Trust, and Satisfaction with life	0.0064	4.65
Common to Excessively protective, Trust, and Satisfaction with life	0.004	2.86
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, and Childcare expenses	0	0.01
Common to Acceptance, Trust, and Childcare expenses	0.0001	0.06
Common to Excessively protective, Trust, and Childcare expenses	0	0.03
Common to Acceptance, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0014	0.99
Common to Excessively protective, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0027	1.98
Common to Trust, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0003	0.2
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, Trust, and Satisfaction with life	0.0017	1.26
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, Trust, and Childcare expenses	0	0.01
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, satisfaction with life, and childcare expenses	0.0008	0.6
Common to Acceptance, Trust, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0007	0.47
Common to Excessively protective, Trust, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0005	0.37
Common to Acceptance, Excessively protective, Trust, Satisfaction with life, and Childcare expenses	0.0005	0.39
Total effect	0.1384	100

Note. Effects commented in the paper are bolded.

**Kwestionariusz opieki nad dzieckiem. Wersja skrócona.
(Ruźniak-Lubocka, A., Sawicki A., Kaźmierczak, M.)**

Parafraza *The Emlen Scales: A Packet of Scales for Measuring the Quality of Child Care From a Parent's Point of View* (Emlen et al., 2000).

1. Serdeczność oraz zainteresowanie ze strony opiekuna w stosunku do Państwa dziecka.

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

1. Opiekun jest zadowolony, gdy widzi moje dziecko.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
2. Opiekun jest ciepły i czuły w stosunku do mojego dziecka.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
3. Opiekun wykazuje zainteresowanie moim dzieckiem.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND

2. Zróżnicowane środowisko i aktywności przeznaczone dla Państwa dziecka.

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

4. Dziecko ma zapewnione wiele rozmaitych aktywności.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
5. Dziecko ma dostęp do dużej ilości zabawek, książek oraz muzycznych aktywności.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
6. Podczas opieki dziecko uczy się wielu codziennych czynności.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND

3. Umiejętności opiekuna.

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

7. Opiekun dostosowuje aktywności odpowiednio do potrzeb mojego dziecka.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
8. Opiekun ma bogatą wiedzę na temat rozwoju dzieci i ich potrzeb.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
9. Opiekun jest otwarty na nowe informacje i zdobywanie wiedzy.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND

4. Relacje rodziców z opiekunem.

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

10. Zarówno ja, jak i opiekun dzielimy się ze sobą informacjami.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
11. Opiekun wspiera mnie jako rodzica.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
12. Opiekun szanuje mój sposób wychowywania dziecka.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND

5. Jakie są odczucia Państwa dziecka?

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

13. Moje dziecko czuje się bezpieczne w towarzystwie opiekuna.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
14. Moje dziecko czuje się szczęśliwe w tym środowisku.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
15. Moje dziecko lubi opiekuna.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND

6. Czynniki ryzyka dla zdrowia, bezpieczeństwa oraz dobrego samopoczucia dziecka.

Proszę otoczyć kółkiem 1 odpowiedź z propozycji podanych po prawej stronie tabeli.

16. Pod opieką tego opiekuna moje dziecko czuje się bezpiecznie.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
17. Opiekun niewłaściwie pilnuje dzieci.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND
18. Obawiam się, że mojemu dziecku mogą przytrafić się złe rzeczy podczas opieki.	Nigdy	Rzadko	Czasami	Często	Zawsze	?	ND