Chapter 4
Exploring the Double Jeopardy Effect: The Importance of Gender *and* Race in Work–Family Research

Tonya K. Frevert, Satoris S. Culbertson, and Ann H. Huffman

4.1 Historical Background

The passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 created significant economic, political, and social changes within the USA. Title VII of this historic legislation changed the structure of the labor market in the United States by outlawing some forms of discrimination in the workplace, most notably (at least for discussion of work–life issues) in terms of gender and race. For example, the ratio of women to men in the workforce has moved to near equal numbers (Domenico and Jones 2006). As the USA has slowly implemented and adapted to these changes in workforce demographics, researchers have responded in kind, by examining how these changes differentially impact women versus men (e.g., England 2010; Kmec 2005; Padavic and Reskin 2002) and, in a separate but related research stream, how these changes differentially impact individuals from different racial/ethnic groups, such as blacks versus whites (e.g., Collins 1997; Pager et al. 2009) or blacks versus Latinos (e.g., Zamudio and Lichter 2008). While these separate streams of research certainly inform us, there is a pressing need to reframe research such that we categorize individuals according to their multiple identities (e.g., black women, Asian men, upperclass Hispanics) to allow for a better understanding of how experiences differ not only between groups (e.g., women vs. men) but also within groups (e.g., black

T. K. Frevert (✉)
Organizational Science PhD Program, University of North Carolina at Charlotte,
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223, USA
e-mail: tfrevert@uncc.edu

S. S. Culbertson
Department of Management, Kansas State University,
110 Calvin Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA
e-mail: satoris@ksu.edu

A. H. Huffman
Departments of Psychology and Management, Northern Arizona University,
P.O. Box 15106, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA
e-mail: ann.huffman@nau.edu

women vs. white women).[1] For example, whereby some have suggested that all women are already disadvantaged in the workplace (e.g., Hakim 2004), women of color are considered to be in "double jeopardy" for belonging to two disadvantaged status categories—gender and race (King 1988). As such, given their status, it is reasonable to suspect that the work–family needs, resources, and experiences of women of color may be significantly different from the professional white women who have been the primary source of data for work–family researchers. Thus, our goal in this chapter is to demonstrate why using a multiple identities approach is crucial to future work–family research.

4.2 Multiple Identities in Work–Family Research: The Intersection of Gender *and* Race

There appears to be a paucity of work–family research that examines the experiences of people of color, as the majority of research has been conducted on white employees who live in the USA (Casper et al. 2007). Furthermore, in studies directed at women, the emphasis has been on professional white women to the exclusion of women of color. Given the extant research combined with the beliefs espoused in the popular press that women are getting the short end of the work–family stick (so to speak), researchers have attempted to examine the needs of women in particular as they attempt to fit into a work structure that remains best suited for men (Sandler and Rao 2012). One emergent criticism of this research stream, however, is that the existing research has tended to emphasize work–family experiences of professional white women (typically in management positions; Bianchi and Milkie 2010; Blair-Loy 2003), while work–family experiences of women of color have been largely overlooked (for exceptions, see Glauber 2008; Glauber and Gozjolko 2011; Grzywacz et al. 2007; Han et al. 2008). The advancement of theoretical and empirical work–family research rests on developing a meaningful understanding of women of color's work–family experiences that are situated within the complex power relations affecting their daily lives. In the following section, we discuss the possible reasons for this oversight, both in the academic research and in the popular press.

Although all women are linked by their gender (or more specifically, their biological sex), race separates women of color from white women and thus their access to power, such that black women largely remain in the lowest-paid and lowest-status occupations (Branch 2011). Their position at the bottom of the labor market is one potential reason why women of color have been overlooked in work–family research. Holvino (2010) put forth that "women of color have always worked and been seen as workers" (i.e., throughout history as slaves, indentured servants, and domestic service workers) and "have been generally confined to secondary labor

---

[1] For a scholarly debate about why and how organizational scientists and practitioners should study workers' multiple identities, see Ruggs et al. (2013) and its twelve associated commentaries in *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*.

markets and to positions at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy" (p. 252). Holvino further posits that during the early stages of the women's movement, the contentious division between the private and the public spheres primarily reflected the reality of white women. While white women desired for both the role of house-wife or mother to be recognized as work and also for access to the paid workplace, women of color considered "being able to stay at home and being supported by a husband's paycheck…a luxury that only affluent white women have" (p. 252). In contrast to their white peers, women of color—traditionally confined to secondary labor markets and jobs at the bottom—desired better working conditions and more job opportunities. Arguably, all women continue to encounter the effects of sexism. The differences in the daily realities between black women and white women, how-ever, reflect the privileges and deficits that stem not only from sexism but also from the simultaneous intersection with racism.

The omission of women of color has been reflected not only in scholarly re-search, but also within the contemporary popular press, where the ongoing debate of whether women can "have it all" still assumes that the question is most germane to professional white women. For example, while the 2013 bestselling book *Lean In* by Sheryl Sandberg (2013) was widely lauded as helpful career advice for women, dissenters criticized it for being applicable to only a very small percentage of the female workforce (Rottenberg 2013). Sandberg is a Harvard graduate who once worked as Chief of Staff to the US Secretary of the Treasury and has been Face-book's Chief Operating Officer since 2008 (CNBC.com 2012). Critics argue that, while she is certainly credentialed, Sandberg sits in an extremely high position of privilege that precludes her from grasping the day-to-day hurdles that the majority of women face in simply trying to survive in a rough economy (Dowd 2013) where choices and access are often limited. Books such as *Lean In* may help women who have fought their way into the C-suite (i.e., corporate officers and directors), but they do not address the needs and realities of women (regardless of race) working in retail/service/low-wage jobs that typically have low autonomy, low power, and few career ladders. Further, it assumes that all women have the freedom and resources to make choices as women in Sandberg's position do, when the reality for many women is a job that is not due to choice, but merely due to survival. That is not to say that the work–family experiences among all women (and for that matter men) do not share commonalities (e.g., needing time off from work to handle family mat-ters), but the resources available to manage both are far from universal (e.g., actual time-off policies), and thus it behooves work–family researchers to investigate how and when these differences and similarities occur. Ultimately, such research should thus help inform organizations' work–family policies to fit the needs and realities of their workforces, at all levels of the hierarchy.

4.2.1 Gender in Work–Family Research

The role of gender in work–family research has dramatically changed over the years. Historically, within family settings, men were seen as the breadwinners

whereas women were seen as the caretakers, responsible for fulfilling domestic duties (Diekman and Goodfriend 2006; Eagly et al. 2000). These beliefs about where men and women belong—men at work and women at home—persisted long after women joined the paid workforce en masse and began performing alongside their male counterparts. Indeed, whether it is a case of art imitating life or life imitating art, the 1983 comedy-drama film *Mr. Mom* was arguably successful because it depicted what was seen as a seemingly absurd situation at the time: A married man (portrayed by Michael Keaton) takes on the role of a stay-at-home dad while his wife (portrayed by Teri Garr) becomes the primary breadwinner.[2] Thirty years later, the demarcation line persists as men's and women's work and family roles remain relatively divided, particularly at home. Advertisements for cleaning products typically feature women (Lindner 2004) and qualitative research suggests that men who act as primary caregivers to their children are often viewed as an anomaly, despite the practice becoming increasingly common (Rochlen et al. 2008). However, there has been a slow shift away from this traditional framework in which men work outside the home while women work within it, toward a more contemporary one, in which men and women work outside of the home in approximately equal numbers (Friedman and Greenhaus 2000).

Despite the proportion of men and women in the workforce being relatively even in 2013, gender differences persist in terms of family responsibilities as well as perceptions of women who work. The playing field remains far from even, with research demonstrating that women, unlike their male counterparts, face several penalties in both domains. For example, within the workplace, women suffer lower wages compared to men, and remain underrepresented in managerial positions and, in particular, the C-suite (O'Neil et al. 2008). Women also appear to be penalized within the workplace for choices they make outside of the work domain, such as having children. Women with children often suffer a "motherhood penalty"[3] in the workplace whereby their careers stagnate, they are seen as less serious workers, and they are not promoted because people assume they prioritize family over the job, career, or firm (Budig and England 2001). Along with penalties in the workplace, women also face penalties at home. Although men have become more involved as caregivers, women are by and large still the ones that are primarily responsible for childcare (Bianchi et al. 2012), even when they are working outside of the home just as much as or more than their partners. As Duxbury

---

[2] Arguably, the plot device in this film was not only a man being a stay-at-home father or a woman being the primary breadwinner, but also from the difficulties that each faced in his/her new role, which speaks even more to prevailing social norms that these were not "typical" or "natural" roles for these individuals because of their gender. Further, the film presents the switch as forced: the husband is laid off and unable to find a new job, thus the wife dusts off her college degree and gets a job in advertising. At the film's end, he is called back to work and she happily quits her job, insinuating the role reversal was an anomaly and life has returned to "normal."

[3] The persistence of traditional gender norms is further demonstrated by the sharp contrast between the expectations of mothers at work and the expectations of fathers at work, as men appear to be a given a wage premium for fatherhood (Lundberg and Rose 2000, 2002). The "fatherhood premium," however, seems to advantage white and Latino males, but not necessarily black males (Glauber 2008).

and Higgins (1991) aptly noted over two decades ago, and which seems to hold true today, "…there have been very few changes in society's perception of gender-specific work- and family-role responsibilities over the past few decades," and that "…women have fewer options than men for achieving control over competing role demands" (p. 71).

The "gender perspective posits that caregiving responsibilities reflect cultural prescriptions about who *should* perform these tasks" (Maume 2011, p. 414; emphasis in original). For example, when a woman has a child, she is often expected by both her coworkers and her family and friends to reduce her work hours or quit her job, although this assumption is not made about men (Nsiah et al. 2013). In fact, even when women earn more than their husbands, they will often leave their job to care for their children (e.g., Blair-Loy 2003). Moreover, once a woman does leave the workplace for family reasons, research suggests that it is very difficult for her to regain her footing and pick up where she left off in her career (Budig and England 2001).

Of course, it is not just the academics who have noticed these gender discrepancies. In the popular press, a 2012 article in *The Atlantic* generated much controversy when its female author argued that women "cannot have it all"—career and family—given today's economic and social structures (see Slaughter 2012)[4] and must often choose one or the other (Hewlett 2002). Yet men do not face the dilemma of choosing between career or family—it is assumed they will have both. A 2001 survey of ultra-achieving career professionals (i.e., those earning more than $ 100,000) by economist Hewlett (2002) found that 49 % of the women were childless, contrasted with 19 % of the men. Although ambitious careers make high demands of all individuals pursuing them, men often do not have to make tradeoffs, as their likelihood of finding a spouse and having children increases as they become increasingly successful. The opposite is true for women and thus those pursuing careers often put off childbearing until later in life or drop out of the career track if they do have children[5]. It is clear that differences persist between men and women in terms of the work and family expectations that they encounter both in the labor market and in society-at-large.

4.2.2 Race in Work–Family Research

The role of race in work–family research has also been examined, but to a much lesser extent than gender. In 2000, Perry-Jenkins et al. (2000) compiled a review of work–family research conducted in the 1990s, noting that the focus was almost

---

[4] As of 2013, Slaughter's article is the most widely read piece in *The Atlantic's* history (Rottenberg 2013).

[5] Indeed, Hewlett once suggested that women should start having babies in their twenties or risk ending up being childless and sad (see *Creating a Life* 2003). Her controversial message was trumpeted by news media outlets as a dire warning to women to mind their biological clocks (St. John 2002), yet was criticized by the feminist community (Gilbert 2008), attributed to the "baby panic" narrative (Faludi 2007), and lampooned on *Saturday Night Live* (Hewlett 2009).

entirely placed on white families who were typically middle-class professionals. An updated review of work–family research conducted from 2000 to 2010 by Bianchi and Milkie (2010) noted that national changes in the economy and the demographic composition of the US population has driven an expansion in the scope of work–family research. For example, increased immigration from Latin America and Asia has led to increased research on families of color (e.g., Goldberg et al. 2012; Grzywacz et al. 2007; Olson et al. 2013; Roehling et al. 2005). While this expansion is most welcome, it still largely fails to address the experiences of the United States' historically oppressed and largest racial/ethnic minority: black Americans.

It is worth noting at this point that although we are attempting within this chapter to remedy some of the oversight in the work–family literature for not substantially addressing the needs of people of color, the scant research that does exist makes it difficult to paint a precise picture across all racial or ethnic groups (i.e., combining all people of color into a "nonwhite" category), let alone between them (i.e., comparing blacks to Asians to Hispanics/Latinos). Although we do highlight some work–family research studies representing both approaches, our primary frame is comparing and contrasting the experiences of black women to white women. We take this approach for two reasons: (1) although the work–family literature is lacking in its inclusion of all women of color, the parallel inequality literature from sociology does inform our understanding of the experiences of black women (but to the large exclusion of Hispanic/Latina women and Asian women) and (2) it has been hypothesized that *colonized* groups (i.e., in the US, blacks) experience greater prejudice and discrimination than *immigrant* groups (i.e., in the US, Asians and Hispanics/Latinos; Healey 2012). For example, Asian Americans who were schooled in the United States have recently shown an approximate parity in the labor market with whites (Sakamoto et al. 2009). However, while much more empirical research is needed to truly understand these differences, methodological considerations when employing a multiple identities approach pose some hurdles, given the variability that occurs within racial/ethnic groups (as we discuss later). Further, the United States' tumultuous history regarding race relations suggests that the "answers" are embedded within a network of complex relationships at the individual, familial, organizational, and larger social, political, or economic levels that will take some effort to unravel.

Structural inequalities in terms of race and gender stem from centuries ago, when white males colonized the New World and people of color and women had little to no rights. While there certainly have been some significant moves toward equality following the US Civil War and in the 150 years that subsequently followed, these old threads of race and gender inequality unfortunately persist, despite legislation and efforts otherwise. As history marches on, old patterns of discrimination are reinforced—often without our awareness—as they are so deeply embedded in our social, political, and economic structures. Complex power relations shape the experiences of people of color (Wight et al. 2013), as argued by contemporary scholars such as Patricia Hill Collins, Kimberlé Crenshaw, bell hooks, and Charles W. Mills. Because sexism and racism remain embedded in our social structures, those individuals who belong to a dominant social group (i.e., whites) have different experiences than those individuals who do not belong to a dominant social group

(i.e., people of color). To a vast extent, work–family research has acknowledged the complex power relations of sexism by exploring how women manage the work–family interface[6], but at the same time has failed to acknowledge the complex power relations of racism.

Over the course of the last several decades since the passage of the Civil Rights Act, research has consistently demonstrated that women have faced penalties in both the work and home domains. In parallel to women's penalties, individuals in minority racial/ethnic groups have also been penalized in both the work and home domains. For example, upon comparing whites and blacks (without consideration of other racial minority groups for the sake of simplicity and brevity), black individuals have been, and continue to be, at a disadvantage within the workplace. An experimental study found that—all else being equal in terms of education and experience on job applicants' resumes—white applicants were twice as likely than black applicants to get a callback or job offer (Pager et al. 2009). This finding suggests that employers still discriminate against black workers in favor of white workers. Although many blacks have moved into management positions, they remain underrepresented at executive management levels (Collins 1997). Further, despite years of legislation and organizations' well-intentioned attempts to diversify their workforces, affirmative action policies and diversity training programs have been shown to be largely ineffective due to larger structural forces that reinforce discriminatory beliefs and attitudes (Kalev et al. 2006). For example, an individual manager or supervisor may want to promote a black employee, but unspoken barriers within some organizations (e.g., a black person has never been in a position of authority in that organization) prevent career advancement from occurring.

Along with workplace changes following the Civil Rights Act, the subsequent decades also saw shifts in family structures, such as the increased prevalence of single parents (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Indeed, over half of today's children are projected to spend some time living with a single-parent family before the age of 18. What effect this will have on shaping their life chances is beginning to be explored by researchers, as family structure is argued to be a key link between inequality and intergenerational mobility. Although some previous research found that married black couples divide housework and paid work more equally than do married white and Latino couples (Glauber 2008), recent trends indicate that more black households are headed by women and that blacks have also seen a decline in marriage rates (Branch 2011). As such, increases in single motherhood are more prevalent among black women as compared to white women (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Additionally, black women have lower education levels relative to white women and black women are overrepresented in low-wage occupations such as service work (e.g., home health aides)—in 2008, 25 % of black women held such jobs (Branch 2011). This overrepresentation is problematic, because individuals in service work (regardless of race and gender) face higher poverty levels. We must make clear, however, that we are not reporting these recent trends to deem single parenthood as "immoral"—rather, we report these recent trends to demonstrate that

---

[6] For a review on men and work–family research, see Chap. 2.

single parents are often penalized economically, particularly if the single parent is a woman of color. With fewer economic resources available, it stands to reason that single parents will face high levels of work–family conflict. Furthermore, for all individuals who live in precarious economic conditions, the stress of such daily living conditions (often correlated with poverty, crime, and substandard housing) translates into greater disparities in physical and mental health outcomes for those individuals (Jackson et al. 2010). Again, this suggests the potential for work–family conflict to be higher among single parents, especially for women of color.

As empirical research on the work–family experiences of blacks is scant, however, such conclusions are merely speculative and may not be empirically supported. For example, blacks may tap into noneconomic resources to buffer against these stressors, such as social support from extended-kin networks and the larger community (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Until work–family research is extended beyond the experiences of professional white women, however, nuanced differences will remain unknown. As we have outlined above, gender inequality and racial inequality have been traditionally examined as *separate* complex power relations. In the past few decades, however, the recognition that individuals exist in the social structure in multiple categories that differentially affect their individual experiences (e.g., not just as women, but as white women or black women) has spurred researchers to study multiple identities through the *intersection* of gender and race.

4.3 The Consequences of Multiple Identities: The Double Jeopardy Effect

One particularly salient concept for work–family research is *the double jeopardy effect*, which occurs when race and gender intersect in ways that disadvantage individuals in the social structure (King 1988). For example, white men have historically held the most advantages in US society, seconded by black men and white women (often on parallel trajectories), with black women suffering the most disadvantages at the bottom (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). Since 1964, when institutionalized white male privilege began to be officially dismantled, gains in equal opportunity have spread to black men, white women, and black women. However, these gains have been uneven and inconsistent, tempered by varying trends and varying enforcement during each subsequent decade. For example, the strength of the civil rights movement in the 1960s yielded gains primarily for black men. When legal enforcement of Title VII began in earnest in the 1970s, both white women and black women made progress into better jobs. Indeed, as a negative response to affirmative action by some groups, black women were falsely accused of getting a "double advantage" at work, as they fulfilled both race and gender requirements for employers seeking to be compliant with the new laws (Sokoloff 1992). This advantage, however, was a myth. As the civil rights movement declined in the 1980s and corporate human resource practices grew in response to legal oversight, pressures on employers began to wane (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012).

The women's movement was able to maintain pressure on employers until the 1990s, although white women were the primary beneficiaries. For example, although wage inequality between black women and white women had decreased in the 1970s, black women's wages lagged behind white women's wages by 14 % by 1991 (Branch 2011). Additionally, by 1999, the unemployment rate for black women was double that of white women.

Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) argue that without pressures from both the government and affected constituencies today, many organizations are slipping back toward resegregation in terms of race and gender (see also Sokoloff 1992). If this regressive trend persists, black women, holding minority status for both race and gender—*double jeopardy*—are thus most at risk for deleterious treatment within the workforce. For example, black women experience more overall harassment in the workplace than white women (Berdahl and Moore 2006). Overall, research supports the hypothesis that black women are most disadvantaged in the workplace, but how that plays out between the work–family domains remains unclear. As we discuss below, the scant work–family research including women of color has yielded inconsistent findings.

4.4 Work–Family Research Including Gender and Race

Studies considering both gender and race are infrequent in work–family research, although the few studies that have done so categorized participants differently such that patterns are hard to discern. For example, in a study using employed women (those working at least 30 hours per week) from a variety of occupations and income ranges, Bernas and Major (2000) found that women of color (defined as nonwhite) experienced significantly less work-to-family conflict and less job stress compared to the women in their sample who were white. Such findings are contradictory to the expectations posited by the double jeopardy effect, but may be due to grouping all women of color into a nonwhite group, as findings may be different when people of color are distinguished between racial/ethnic groups. Further, Bernas and Major make a point of mentioning that they "found recruiting a sufficient number of working women with families to be quite challenging and, as a result, relied on several convenient sources" (pp. 175–176). We further address methodological considerations and limitations below.

Other studies, however, have distinguished between racial/ethnic groups. For example, Glauber (2008) posits that black women face a second penalty at work beyond the motherhood penalty that all women face. Citing an earlier study by Kennelly (1999)—which found that while employers view *all* women workers as mothers and less capable in their jobs, they also view *all* black women as single mothers—Glauber argues that black women are thus perceived as having children out of wedlock, which exacerbates the motherhood penalty. Yes, recent data indicate that more black women are single mothers than white women (Branch 2011; McLanahan and Percheski 2008), but anti-discrimination laws prohibit employers

from making decisions rooted in both sex-based and race-based stereotyping (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 2011). As men often get a double bonus for both marriage and fatherhood in the workplace, this benefit stands in stark contrast to black women who are often penalized in the workplace not only for motherhood, but also for a perceived lack of marriage. This unequal treatment provides further evidence of the double jeopardy effect for black women.

Compared to their white counterparts, however, African American women who are married and have children are more likely to be employed (Han et al. 2008). Recent research conducted by Glauber and Gozjolko (2011) suggests that wives of white men who hold traditional views (e.g., "a woman's place is in the home") are less likely to work outside of the home compared to wives of white men who hold egalitarian views. In contrast, wives of African American men are equally likely to work outside of the home, regardless of their husbands' beliefs about whether this is acceptable or not. One would imagine that tension would arise for women who are employed and whose husbands are against this. If this is indeed the case, it would not be surprising to discover that African American women experience greater levels of work–family conflict than do white women.

Reflecting Bianchi and Milkie's (2010) earlier finding that since 2000, work–family research has responded to rising immigration rates from Asia and Latin America, studies have started to reflect this growth among their samples. For example, Grzywacz et al. (2007) quantitatively and qualitatively examined work–family conflict and health experiences of immigrant Latino men and Latina women, and found that work–family conflict was greater for the women than it was for the men. As the authors noted, "women described clear examples of work-to-family conflict in their daily life, whereas men saw little connection between their work and their family" (p. 1125). Grzywacz et al., however, did not examine any non-Latino/a individuals in their study. In a study that did contrast work–family conflict between Hispanic Americans and whites, Hispanic individuals reported more strain-based family interference with work (Olson et al. 2013). In another study that included whites, blacks, and Hispanics, larger gender differences in family-to-work and work-to-family spillover were found among Hispanics than among whites or blacks (Roehling et al. 2005).

Due to the limited research on the intersection of gender and race in work–family research, we now turn to recent labor force data to highlight larger trends in the differences between white women and black women that may inform future work–family research.

4.4.1   Labor Force Characteristics of White and Black Women

Progress toward race and gender equality in the workplace is best advanced by increasing the number of women and people of color in management and professional occupations (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). When management and professional positions become increasingly diverse, the odds increase that women and

people of color in these positions will help "pull-up" other women and people of color into these positions. If women and people of color remain underrepresented in these positions, however, opportunities for advancement stall and patterns of work inequality perpetuate; gains are made, but at a very slow pace. Furthermore, these gains are made disproportionately in terms of race. While women are advancing into management and executive positions, white women are gaining over black women. While women's wages are getting closer to those of men, white women are gaining over black women. While women are participating in the labor force at an increasing rate, white women are gaining over black women.

Recent labor force data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS 2011) supports this state of affairs. Among white women, 42 % were employed in management, professional, and related occupations—the highest paying major job category—compared to 34 % of black women. This difference is very important to work–family research, as the emphasis on management/professional participants leads to more white women participating in said research, thus reflecting their experiences more than others. Ideally, work–family research should reflect the experiences of all workers at all levels of the labor market, which would certainly include those in management/professional occupations. If the default remains set to management/professionals occupations, however, we are missing the needs of workers in other jobs and occupations who have work–family issues to tackle too. For example, as black women are more likely than white women to work in service occupations (28.3 % vs. 20.1 %), it is crucial that we do not leave service workers out of work–family research. We recognize, however, that this limitation is partly due to access to and representation of people of color across the labor force, as discussed above. However, researchers can overcome this limitation by examining more occupational and industrial sectors so as to include those on the fringes and lower tiers of the labor market.

The need for work–family research to incorporate racial diversity is also reflected in labor force data about families and mothers (BLS 2011), as previously discussed. "In 2010, nearly one-half (45 %) of black families were maintained by women without a spouse present" (p. 2), compared to about 15 % of white women. Black women are three times as likely as white women to be "going it alone." If we consider Hobfoll's conservation of resources theory (1989) as it pertains to work–family research in terms of resource allocation, black women are thus at a greater disadvantage than white women in terms of resources and support, often lacking a second income and emotional support from a partner.

Although women as a group overall earn less than men, full-time black female employees typically earn about 85 % of what their full-time white female counterparts earn (BLS 2011). The 2008 recession also hit black women harder than white women, as labor force participation for white women fell 2.3 % from 2008 to 2010 (56.3 %−54.0 %), but fell 4.1 % for black women (55.8 %−51.7 %) during the same time period. Further, "among mothers with children under 18, black mothers are more likely to be in the labor force than white mothers" (75 % vs. 71 %; p. 2). For households with children under six years old—arguably when demands for flexible work–family policies are at their highest—black mothers are more likely to be in

the labor force than white mothers (70 % vs. 63 %). In today's global 24/7 economy where the boundary between work and home is diminishing, all employees need tools, skills, and resources to successfully manage their work and personal lives. Since work–family research helps inform the policies that organizations implement for their employees' benefit, knowing the needs of the factory worker on the line are just as important as knowing the call center manager's needs. If we do not know how those needs differ—not only within the organization but also across occupations/industries/locations—and how those needs are compounded by multiple identities that differentially locate individuals within the overarching social structure, then we are only serving a limited subset of the population. Some might argue that policies implemented in one sector will trickle down to another, but only empirical research can answer our questions and tell us if those needs have been met or are yet to be met.

Thus far, we have contrasted the similarities and differences between white women and women of color in terms of their work and family experiences. Next, we address some of the methodological considerations and limitations that arise with intersectional models.

4.5   Methodological Considerations

Because the racial divide in the United States has historically fallen along a black-white dichotomy, there is scant social science research that explicitly includes other racial/ethnic groups, such as Hispanics/Latinos, Asians, or Native Americans. These groups are frequently lumped together with blacks into a "nonwhite" category and findings generalized to minorities as a whole (Ruggs et al. 2013). While this approach is an attempt to include other racial/ethnic groups in research, it fails to not only consider the differences between these racial/ethnic groups (e.g., social class, education, family norms), but also the differences within the various racial/ethnic groups (e.g., outcomes for light-skinned blacks vs. dark-skinned blacks; Marira and Mitra 2013). That said, it is important to remember that researchers rarely have free, easy, and open access to whatever data they desire. As Thompson et al. (2013) point out, researchers are often limited by (1) numerical representation of minority groups, such as Native Americans comprising 1.7 % of the general population and (2) methodological issues that may violate assumptions of sampling, power, and generalizability in such targeted approaches. Nevertheless, given that the overall population of people of color in the United States is projected to become the numerical majority of the total US population by 2043 (Ortman 2013), these limitations should start to ease. Further, as scholarly research usually reflects the larger culture, a greater number of studies will likely give way to more diverse participants in time. If work–family researchers want to be ahead of the curve and not stuck in the past or scrambling to catch up, however, it is incumbent upon us to remedy this oversight sooner rather than later.

A second methodological consideration for intersectional research is that it should be employed as a multiplicative model, not an additive one. One of the

frequent assumptions of measurement in data analyses is that social identities are additive (e.g., black + woman) versus intersectional (e.g., black woman; Bowleg 2008). An additive approach, however, contradicts the central tenet of intersectionality: Social identities and inequality are interdependent for groups such as black women, not mutually exclusive. They do not act independently (i.e., one is never just a person of color without also being of one sex or the other). Intersectionality theory requires that we conceptualize social categories in terms of the stratification that arises through the practices of individuals, institutions, and cultures rather than merely as individual characteristics (Cole 2008). For example, the life experiences of a black woman are a product of the intersection of sexism with racism such that her simultaneous social identity both as a woman and as a person of color marginalizes her in both socially structured categories (Crenshaw 1991).

Moreover, as "psychologists aim to simplify models for parsimony, either by omitting variables or by statistically controlling for membership in categories other than the one of interest" (Cole 2009, p. 170), work–family researchers should move forward by considering "the meaning and consequences of social categories" (p. 176). Cole (2009) urges researchers to ask three pertinent questions during the research process (*Who is included within this category?, What role does inequality play?,* and *Where are the similarities?*), so that we move away from empirical models in which self-evident demographic variables shape how participants are categorized and thus move toward empirical models that employ intersectional frameworks. Intersectional frameworks may increase our understanding of the complex, intertwined relationships that differentially locate individuals within the overarching social structure. That is not to say that work–family researchers must do away with all methodological practices and turn all of their focus onto underrepresented groups. Rather, work–family researchers can use an intersectional framework

> to look for causes of human behavior both upstream and downstream, to notice and hypothesize about the multiple paths that may lead individuals to the same or similar outcomes, and to understand the ways that different social categories depend on each other for meaning and, thus, mutually construct one another and work together to shape outcomes. (Cole 2009, p. 179)

4.6 Broader Impacts and Future Research

Although overt prejudice and discrimination have been substantially tempered over the past 50 years, covert prejudice and discrimination persist. For example, women and people of color still face significant barriers to getting a seat at the boardroom table, and those barriers are fortified by inequalities of place, education, and opportunity. As these inequalities come to a head, however, they are on a collision course with changing definitions of family as well as changing roles and role expectations that men and women have traditionally held. The en masse entry of women into the workforce in the 1960s and 1970s coincided with major shifts in work arrangements

in the post-Fordist era (e.g., the disappearance of career ladders; Rubin 1995). As men and women negotiated new institutional arrangements in both the work domain and the family domain, their race/ethnicity rode along with their gender. The long crusade toward workplace equality cannot be achieved with a sole gender lens or a sole racial/ethnic lens—a proper set of glasses includes both lenses.

To that end, it behooves researchers to expand their populations of study so that the larger conversation taking place among the popular press, public policy makers, and business leaders is not exclusionary. As such, another factor for consideration is differences by occupational and industrial sector. Not only do different occupations have their own unique stressors, but they are also gendered and/or racialized. For example, women of color account for an above-average percentage of representation in the field of nursing aides (Alonso-Villar and del Rio 2013). Research has shown that the job of nursing aide—a job that does not require a college degree—has many characteristics that can lead to high stress. Nursing aides primarily focus on caregiving, are more likely to have shift work, and have lower than average pay. But this pattern also exists for jobs that require college degrees. The field of social work, for example, also has a disproportionate number of employees who are women of color. Similar to nursing aides, social work is also considered a high stress job (Wooten et al. 2011). Work–family research has consistently shown that high demand and low resource jobs are especially susceptible to work–family stress, and thus simply examining different occupations may be one way to diversify work–family research.

Differences in family characteristics should also be considered. The age of becoming a mother for women of color is younger than other women. A report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013) showed that women of color have their first child, on average, at the age of 22.7, compared to white women at the age of 26.0. Research has suggested that this age difference could have several implications. Starting a family at a younger age could introduce some additional stressors for women of color. For example, younger parents are likely to be less financially secure and less mature to handle this responsibility. On the other hand, research has shown that the work–family interface can vary over the life course (Huffman et al. 2013), with the least work–family stressors occurring early in life and then again late in life. This inverted u-shaped curve could mean that individuals who have children early might have fewer stressors since they are not also burdened with extensive job demands. Whatever the case, future research should examine the implications of younger parenting for women of color and their associated work–family stressors.

We suggested earlier that the numerical representation of people of color makes it methodologically more challenging to assess work–family issues based on both gender and race/ethnicity. To overcome these challenges, the work–family community needs to find strategies that will allow these groups to be included in work–family research. For example, qualitative methodologies allow us "to generate new conceptualizations and interpretations of culture that will enable us to make sense of increasingly complex cultural phenomena" (Birkinshaw et al. 2011, p. 574), an approach that seems particularly suited to the complexity of intersectional research. Additionally, archival data sets exist (e.g., *General Social Survey, National Study of the Changing Workforce, Midlife Development in the United States, Panel Study of*

Income Dynamics) that tap into work–family issues and provide demographic information that would allow researchers to answer questions related to the intersection of gender and race. These extensive data sets may provide work–family researchers with the necessary respondents and variables to answer research questions specific to women of color.

Work–family researchers have used different theories to describe race and/or gender differences in work–family experiences (e.g., stress resource perspective, organizational leadership theory; Bernas and Major 2000). Work–family researchers need to continue to build on these different theories to develop a comprehensive model of how the characteristics associated with being a woman of color affect the work–life interface. For example, the demands-resource paradigm has become very relevant in trying to explain work and family experiences. The job demands–resources model (Bakker and Demerouti 2007) suggests that every occupation has its own specific risk factors and resources that are associated with the job, and when the worker experiences high risks/demands and low resources, the individual is likely to experience negative outcomes. Bakker and Demerouti (2007) suggest that this comprehensive model could be applied to various occupational settings. We extend this idea and suggest that this could also be applied to individuals with different personal characteristics. For example, women of color might experience additional demands due to discrimination they endure at work compared to white males (Sokoloff 1992), and these demands that women of color experience may result in increased distress. Although this is just one example of using one theory, we propose that there are others across the social sciences that can provide researchers with a more comprehensive understanding of the workplace experiences of women of color.

Although our chapter focuses on the two minority characteristics of gender and race/ethnicity (specifically women of color), we should also note that there are many other minority characteristics that could further affect women of color. For example, women of color who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) experience additional stressors. Potentially, a lesbian woman of color who has children could face "quadruple jeopardy" since she is dealing with four minority status characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and lesbian parent) that not only carry each of their own disadvantages, but also intersect to compound those disadvantages (Huffman et al. 2012).

4.7 Conclusion

The negotiation between work and family is not a woman's problem; it is a problem that belongs to all of us, as we all interact in the larger social structure that encompasses our work days, our home lives, and the interface between the two. An individual's success in negotiating the increasingly fuzzy work–family boundary depends upon not only her gender, but also upon her race/ethnicity. Work–family researchers have done a commendable job helping organizations understand why

it is in their best interest to offer policies that help workers manage their work and home lives. However, because of structural inequalities that keep women of color out of management/professional positions, not everyone has benefitted from these efforts. As such, if work–family researchers can inform the leaders of work organizations as well as public policy makers about what needs to be done to eradicate these inequalities, then we must ensure that work–family research reflects the experiences of everyone.

References

Alonso-Villar, O., & del Rio, C. (2013). *The occupational segregation of black women in the United States: A look at its evolution from 1940 to 2010*. Number 304, Working Papers, ECINEQ, Society for the Study of Economic Inequality.

Bakker, A., B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22,* 309–328.

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 426–436.

Bernas, K. H., & Major, D. A. (2000). Contributors to stress resistance: Testing a model of women's work–family conflict. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24,* 170–178.

Bianchi, S. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2010). Work and family research in the first decade of the twentyfirst century. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72,* 705–725.

Bianchi, S. M., Sayer, L. C., Milkie, M. A., & Robinson, J. P. (2012). Housework: Who did, does or will do it, and how much does it matter? *Social Forces, 91,* 55–63.

Birkinshaw, J., Brannen, M. Y., & Tung, R. L. (2011). From a distance and generalizable to up close and grounded: Reclaiming a place for qualitative methods in international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies, 42,* 573–581.

Blair-Loy, M. (2003). *Competing devotions: Career and family among women executives*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When black + lesbian + woman ≠ black lesbian women: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59,* 312–325.

Branch, E. H. (2011). *Opportunity denied: Limiting black women to devalued work*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review, 66,* 204–225.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (Aug 2011). *Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity*, *2010*. Report 1032. http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsrace2010.pdf. Accessed 25 Sep 2013.

Casper, W. J., Eby, L. T., Bordeaux, C., Lockwood, A., & Lambert, D. (2007). A review of research methods in IO/OB work–family research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 28–45.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (21 Nov 2013). *Births and natality*. http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/births.htm. Accessed 18 Jan 2014.

CNBC.com. (22 May 2012). *Sheryl Sandberg: Facebook IPO*. http://www.cnbc.com/id/47386998.

Cole, E. R. (2008). Coalitions as a model for intersectionality: From practice to theory. *Sex Roles, 59,* 443–453. Accessed 9 Jan 2014.

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64,* 170–180.

Collins, S. M. (1997). Black mobility in white corporations: Up the corporate ladder but out on a limb. *Social Problems, 44,* 55–67.

Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43,* 1241–1299.

Diekman, A. B., & Goodfriend, W. (2006). Rolling with the changes: A role congruity perspective on gender norms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30,* 369–383.

Domenico, D. M., & Jones, K. H. (2006). Career aspirations of women in the twentieth century. *Journal of Career and Technical Education, 22,* 1–7.

Dowd, M. (23 Feb 2013). Pompom girl for feminism. *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/24/opinion/sunday/dowd-pompom-girl-for-feminism.html?_r=2&.

Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76,* 60–74.

Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekman, A. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123–174). Mahwah: Erlbaum.

England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society, 24,* 149–166.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (8 Feb 2011). Enforcement guidance: Unlawful disparate treatment of workers with caregiving responsibilities. http://www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/caregiving.html.

Faludi, S. (2007). *The terror dream: Fear and fantasy in post-9/11 America*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). *Work and family-allies or enemies?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, N. (2008). *A mother's work: How feminism, the market, and policy shape family life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Glauber, R. (2008). Race and gender in families and at work: The fatherhood wage premium. *Gender and Society, 22,* 8–30.

Glauber, R., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2011). Do traditional fathers always work more? Gender ideology, race, and parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 73,* 1133–1148.

Goldberg, W. A., Kelly, E., Matthews, N. L., Kang, H., Li, W., & Sumaroka, M. (2012). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Gender, culture, and college students' views about work and family. *Journal of Social Issues, 68,* 814–837.

Grzywacz, J. G., Arcury, T. A., Marín, A., Carrillo, L., Burke, B., Coates, M. L., et al. (2007). Work-family conflict: Experiences and health implications among immigrant Latinos. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1119–1130.

Hakim, C. (2004). *Key issues in women's work: Female diversity and the polarisation of women's employment*. London: The Glass House.

Han, W. J., Ruhm, C. J., Waldfogel, J., & Washbrook, E. (2008). The timing of mother's employment after childbirth. *Monthly Labor Review, 131,* 15–27.

Healey, J. F. (2012). *Race, ethnicity, gender, and class: The sociology of group conflict and change*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hewlett, S. A. (April 2002). Executive women and the myth of having it all. *Harvard Business Review*, Reprint R0204E, 1–11.

Hewlett, S. A. (2003). *Creating a life*. New York: Hyperion.

Hewlett, S. A. (2009). *Top talent: Keeping performance up when business is down*. Cambridge: Harvard Business Press.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. *American Psychologist, 44,* 513–524.

Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work & Organization, 17,* 248–277.

Huffman, A. H., Culbertson, S. S., Henning, J., & Goh, A. (2013). Work-family conflict across the lifespan. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28, 761–780*.

Huffman, A. H., King, E., & Goldberg, A. E. (2012). Valuing lesbian and gay parenting in the workplace. In M. Paludi (Ed.), *Managing diversity in today's workplace* (pp. 163–185). Westport: Praeger.

Jackson, J. S., Knight, K. M., & Rafferty, J. A. (2010). Race and unhealthy behaviors: Chronic stress, the HPA axis, and physical and mental health disparities over the life course. *American Journal of Public Health, 100,* 933–939.

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review, 71,* 589–617.

Kennelly, I. (1999). "That single-mother element": How employers typify Black women. *Gender & Society, 13,* 168–192.

King, D. K. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of black feminist ideology. *Signs, 14,* 42–72.

Kmec, J. (2005). Setting occupational sex segregation in motion. *Work and Occupations, 32,* 322–354.

Lindner, K. (2004). Images of women in general interest and fashion magazine advertisements from 1955 to 2002. *Sex Roles, 51,* 409–421.

Lundberg, S., & Rose, E. (2000). Parenthood and the earnings of married men and women. *Labour Economics, 7,* 689–710.

Lundberg, S., & Rose, E. (2002). The effects of sons and daughters on men's labor supply and wages. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 84,* 251–268.

Marira, T. D., & Mitra, P. (2013). Colorism: Ubiquitous yet understudied. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6,* 103–107.

Maume, D. J. (2011). Reconsidering the temporal increase in fathers' time with children. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 32,* 411–423.

McLanahan, S., & Percheski, C. (2008). Family structure and the reproduction of inequalities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34,* 257–276.

Nsiah, C., DeBeaumont, R., & Ryerson, A. (2013). Motherhood and earnings: Wage variability by major occupational category and earnings level. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 34,* 224–234.

Olson, K. J., Huffman, A. H., Leiva, P. I., & Culbertson, S. S. (2013). Acculturation and individualism as predictors of work–family conflict in a diverse workforce. *Human Resource Management, 52,* 741–769.

O'Neil, D. A., Hopkins, M. M., & Bilimoria, D. (2008). Women's careers at the start of the twentyfirst century: Patterns and paradoxes. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80,* 727–743.

Ortman, J. M. (7 Feb 2013). *U.S. population projections: 2012 to 2060*. U.S. Census Bureau presentation for the Federal Forecasters Consortium Brown Bag Seminar Series on Forecasting at George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Padavic, I., & Reskin, B. (2002). *Women and men at work*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge.

Pager, D., Western, B., & Bonikowski, B. (2009). Discrimination in a low-wage labor market: A field experiment. *American Sociological Review, 74,* 777–799.

Perry-Jenkins, Repetti, R. L., & Crouter, A. C. (2000). Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 981–998.

Rochlen, A. B., Suizzo, M., McKelley, R. A., & Scaringi, V. (2008). "I'm just providing for my family": A qualitative study of stay-at-home fathers. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 9,* 193–206.

Roehling, P. V., Jarvis, L. H., & Swope, H. E. (2005). Variations in negative work–family spillover among White, Black, and Hispanic American men and women: Does ethnicity matter? *Journal of Family Issues, 26,* 840–865.

Rottenberg, C. (2013). The rise of neoliberal feminism. *Cultural Studies, 28,* 418–437.

Rubin, B. A. (1995). *Shifts in the social contract*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge.

Ruggs, E. N., Hebl, M. R., Law, C., Cox, C. B., Roehling, M. V., Wiener, R. L., et al. (2013). Gone fishing: I-O psychologists' missed opportunities to understand marginalized employees' experiences with discrimination. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6,* 39–60.

Sakamoto, A., Goyette, K. A., & Kim, C. H. (2009). Socioeconomic attainments of Asian Americans. *Annual Review of Sociology, 35,* 255–276.

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead*. New York: Knopf.

Sandler, J., & Rao, A. (2012). The elephant in the room and the dragons at the gate: Strategising for gender equality in the twentyfirst century. *Gender & Development, 20,* 547–562.

Slaughter, A. (July/Aug 2012). Why women still can't have it all. *The Atlantic*. http://www.the-atlantic.com/magazine/archive/2012/07/why-women-still-cant-have-it-all/309020/.   Accessed 25 Sep 2013.

Sokoloff, N. J. (1992). *Black women and white women in the professions*. New York: Routledge.

John, S. W. (20 May 2002). The talk of the book world still can't sell. *The New York Times*. http://www.nytimes.com/2002/05/20/us/the-talk-of-the-book-world-still-can-t-sell.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm.

Stainback, K., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2012). *Documenting desegregation: Racial and gender segregation in private-sector employment since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Sage.

Thompson, R., Bergman, M., Culbertson, S. S., & Huffman, A. H. (2013). Yes, we're fishing-in rough waters for hard-to-find fish. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 6,* 61–65.

Wight, V. R., Bianchi, S. M., & Hunt, B. R. (2013). Explaining racial/ethnic variation in partnered women's and men's housework: Does one size fit all? *Journal of Family Issues, 34,* 394–427.

Wooten, N. R., Kim, H., & Fakunmoju, S. B. (2011). Occupational stress in social work practice. In J. Langan-Fox & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *New horizons in management. Handbook of stress in the occupations* (pp. 71–87). Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Zamudio, M. M., & Lichter, M. I. (2008). Bad attitudes and good soldiers: Soft skills as a code for tractability in the hiring of immigrant Latina/os over native Blacks in the hotel industry. *Social Problems, 55,* 573–589.