Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Sascha Demerjian Date

The Wages of Parenthood: At the Intersection of Gender, Child Caregiving, and Sexual Orientation

By

Sascha Demerjian
Doctor of Philosophy

Sociology

_____
Irene Browne, Ph.D.
Advisor

_____
Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.
Advisor

_____
Cathy Johnson, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
CJ Pascoe, Ph.D.
Committee Member

_____
Melissa Williams, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Accepted:

_____
Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

_____
Date

The Wages of Parenthood: At the Intersection of Gender, Child Caregiving, and Sexual Orientation

By

Sascha Demerjian
M.A., Emory University
M.S.W., University of Michigan
B.A., Brandeis University

Advisors: Irene Browne, Ph.D.
Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology, 2016.

Abstract

The Wages of Parenthood: At the Intersection of Gender, Child Caregiving, and Sexual Orientation

By

Sascha Demerjian

Despite advances made by women in the workplace, mothers have continued to be penalized with regard to job attainment, advancement, and pay. The goal of this project is to disentangle the various aspects at work in this penalty for working mothers by experimentally manipulating characteristics that are contributing to lower expectations for working mothers. For the experiment, I created a vignette where all information presented is identical aside from the manipulated conditions of gender, child caregiving condition, and sexual orientation of fictitious job seekers. After reading this vignette, respondents were asked a series of questions about how they would evaluate the candidate. Results indicate that, among heterosexual parents, primary caregiving parents (both male and female) are evaluated more harshly than secondary caregiving parents. Results also indicate that lesbian secondary caregiving mothers are evaluated more harshly than heterosexual secondary caregiving mothers. A full review of these findings and a discussion of the implications are included.

The Wages of Parenthood: At the Intersection of Gender, Child Caregiving, and Sexual Orientation

By

Sascha Demerjian
M.A., Emory University
M.S.W., University of Michigan
B.A., Brandeis University

Advisors: Irene Browne, Ph.D.
Karen Hegtvedt, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology, 2016.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation chairs, Irene Browne and Karen Hegtvedt, for their comments and feedback on numerous drafts. I would also like to thank my committee members, Cathy Johnson, CJ Pascoe, and Melissa Williams for their helpful feedback and support with the creation of this manuscript. I want to further acknowledge my fellow doctoral program students for their support, advice, and vigorous debates. I would also like to thank my children, Luca and Rilo, who were an inspiration as well as incredibly patient throughout this process. I would be remiss for not thanking my friends, in particular Sara Brackenbury and Robin Critz, and my sister, Isadora Pennington, who counseled and supported me over the years. Finally, I would like to thank my partner, Peter Demerjian, for his feedback on numerous drafts and especially for his continual support and encouragement throughout this process.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION, THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK, AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite profound changes in women's roles in the family and the workplace, normative ideals indicating mothers as caregivers and fathers as breadwinners persist (Ridgeway 2011). Not only is this ideological holdover a problem for gender equality, it presents an issue for gay and lesbian parents in the workplace, for this heteronormative model does not reflect those workers.[1] As the professional workplace in the United States increasingly demands more time and commitment from workers (Correll, Kelly, O'Connor, and Williams 2014), how do primary caregivers (those who have made child caregiving a daily priority) fare, and does this vary depending on their gender and their sexual orientation? Further, when primary caregiving is not simply assumed, but is signaled clearly, do the gender performance penalties and premiums persist? Are gay and lesbian parents able to avoid the caregiver / breadwinner dichotomy that heterosexual couples face? Or do they too face a gendered penalty / premium system? Are gay and lesbian parents evaluated on the basis of anticipated gender performance (feminine or masculine), and are then penalized accordingly? These are the primary research questions I address in this project.

Specifically, I examine implications of assumptions about caregiving with respect to heterosexual, gay, and lesbian couples, as well as whether penalties and premiums depend on gender, sexual orientation, or the caregiving condition (primary or

[1] I utilize Ortyl's (2012) definition of heteronormativity: the norms, ideas, and practices that maintain heterosexuality as well as gender differentiation and the subsequent hierarchy.

secondary).[2] In addressing these research questions, I build on existing literature on the motherhood wage penalty and fatherhood premium. I utilize Expectation States Theory (EST) as my analytic framework (Berger, Rosenholtz, and Zelditch 1980; Ridgeway 2011). I supplement EST by incorporating Queer Theory and considering intersections of gender and sexual orientation (Butler 1990; Lloyd 1999; Ortyl 2011; 2012). My approach also weighs arguments from Human Capital Theory, the leading explanation for workplace inequality among economists (Becker 1954; Olson 2013) as well as Comparable Worth Theory (England, Farkas, Kilbourne, and Dou 1988; Glass 1990).

Drawing on these theories, I argue that assumptions associated with caregiving position (primary or secondary) are derived from an interaction between perceived gender and sexual orientation. Prospective employers are likely to use gender and sexual orientation to make assumptions about the caregiving position of working parents based on expected gender performance (masculine or feminine). I suggest that employers then use those caregiving assumptions to form expectations around worker commitment and competence, which, in turn, leads to workplace rewards and penalties. Today's workplace culture is demanding and I anticipate that prospective employers are invested in assessing applicant's commitment. Though illegal to base workplace decisions on gender, sexual orientation, or caregiving position, these characteristics can still influence assessments, and lead to workplace disparities. I hypothesize that primary caregiving working parents will be penalized compare to workers who do not carry such responsibility. In a similar vein, I propose that employers will invoke assumptions

[2] For this project, caregiving position is categorized as primary (has rearranged work schedules in the past to accommodate childcare and the bulk of the domestic load and has a secondary partner who has not made such accommodations) and secondary (has not rearranged work schedules to accommodate childcare and has a partner who has fulfilled the primary caregiving position), or caregiving position not indicated.

regarding sexual orientation and gender as cues to determine caregiving position when not known. These assumptions, based on gender performance expectations, lead to penalties or premiums for working parents. In the United States, the motherhood penalty of yesterday, where workplace penalties fell along gendered lines, may indeed now be a caregiving penalty of today, where workplace penalties fall along caregiving lines. This caregiving penalty may be equally impacting mothers and fathers — gay, lesbian, or heterosexual.

To empirically examine these questions, I conducted an internet-based survey experiment in which study participants read a vignette of a job candidate and were asked follow-up questions about perceived competence, commitment, and suitability. Respondents were also asked about the likelihood that they would allocate specific workplace rewards to the job candidate (interview, hiring, promotion, and recommended wage). My design allows me to test for the main effects of gender, caregiving position, and sexual orientation, as well as their interactions and my specific hypotheses.

My study contributes to a greater understanding of gender, parenthood, sexual orientation, and inequality in the workplace in the United States, where parents face a workplace that requires increasing availability and commitment (Correll et al. 2014; Hays 1996; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Stone 2007; Williams 2001). Given the ongoing debate over "legitimacy" of lesbian and gay families in the United States (Hopkins, Sorensen, and Taylor 2013; Thomas 2011) and the increasing number of same-sex couples who are not only "out," but often with children, an understanding of how United States employers evaluate caregiving parents—heterosexual, lesbian / gay—is urgently needed.

To do this, I first discuss the theory and literature from which this project developed. Within this section I present five specific hypotheses. I then describe the methodology and data used to test these hypotheses, before moving on to the results from these tests. I conclude with a discussion of the findings and implications for future research.

EXPECTATION STATES THEORY

The professional workplace in the United States demands long work hours and prioritization of work over private life, yet norms of intensive mothering have increased simultaneously (Hays 1998). Working parents seeking a work-family balance have to navigate the two "greedy institutions" of work and family (Correll et al. 2014). These expectations and norms leave many mothers (and an increasing number of fathers) stressed and overworked and can lead to opting out of the workplace altogether if it is financially feasible (Smith 2009; Stone 2007).

In an effort to examine the impact of these expectations and how the characteristics of gender, caregiving, and sexual orientation can differentially impact the lives of working parents, I situate my project in an Expectation States Theory (EST) framework. EST provides a framework for understanding how an individual's salient social characteristics ("status characteristics") can privilege or penalize them in social interactions (Berger et al. 1980; Ridgeway 1991). Status characteristics emerge when cultural beliefs indicate that individuals possessing one state of a characteristic (e.g. white or male) are considered more worthy or capable than individuals possessing an alternate state of that characteristic (e.g. African American or female).

EST was first developed to examine small work group status hierarchy formation and outcomes (Berger et al. 1980). These small, experimental work groups were given shared and specific tasks for completion on which they were evaluated. When individuals in a small work group understand that their outcomes are tethered to those of others in the group, evidence shows reliance on status characteristics to form expectations of group member competence and commitment, particularly when there is no information on workers' specific skills on the task at hand (Berger et al. 1980). During the first few years of research on status characteristics, using EST, very clearly delineated scope conditions emerged. These scope conditions included the following: work groups should be engaged in a goal oriented task (task orientation); groups should include two or more members who are jointly responsible (collective orientation); and the focus should be on the power-prestige order of the group (Berger et al. 1980). This last power-prestige order (or status) condition has several sub-conditions that bear noting. Focus of the study should be on opportunities given to the group members, member performance outputs, group member assessment of other group member performances, and influence of some group members' views over others (Berger et al. 1980).

While these scope conditions indicate fairly rigid experimental parameters, this theory has been expanded beyond a small work group to larger workplace settings in more recent years (Correll and Ridgeway 2003; Correll 2004; Ridgeway 2011). The foundational EST scope conditions, collective orientation and task orientation, are relevant to situations beyond small work task groups as originally delineated by expectation states theorists (Correll and Ridgeway 2003). While a group situation such as friends talking at a party would not constitute a collective task orientation, other socially

significant settings such as sports teams, school groups, committees, advisory panels, or work teams do qualify as everyday group situations in which EST, as more recently expanded, would hold (Correll and Ridgeway 2003).

Characteristics that impact the status ordering of a group can be specific or diffuse, and have various states upon which ordering can occur. A nominal characteristic, such as gender and sexual orientation, is socially recognized to hold categorical differences within group rather than ordinal or graduated differences, such as income or education (Ridgeway 1991). Nominal characteristics are considered diffuse status characteristics when the associated states of the characteristic hold varying levels of worth according to normative cultural beliefs (Ridgeway 1991). A characteristic can be considered diffuse if it meets the following three conditions: 1) the characteristic has at least two states that are valued differently; 2) each state of the characteristic has associated sets of global expectations that are distinct from each other; and 3) each state has an associated generalized expectation state (Berger et al. 1980). Expectation states that are related to a specific situation or skill, upon which individuals will be differentially evaluated, such as logical reasoning or cooking ability, are considered specific status characteristics (Berger et al. 1980). When specific status characteristics are unknown, individuals rely on diffuse status characteristics to inform opinions on others' perceived competence and abilities (Berger et al. 1980; Ridgeway 1991).

The information individuals rely on to assess others, when specific task related information is missing, is often derived from stereotypes about certain diffuse characteristics to form their expectations. Therefore, in the place of actual information on task competence, individuals use diffuse status characteristics to assess which group

member would serve best in specific roles (e.g. the best leader, the best note taker, the best engineer, the best caregiver) (Ridgeway and Correll 2003). These status characteristics can emerge even in very minor unequal structural conditions and can lead to significant differences in expectations and outcomes (Correll 2004; Ridgeway 1991). Unequal conditions can also lead to beliefs that justify those very conditions, thereby reifying the belief structure that helped to create such unequal conditions and outcomes in the first place (Ridgeway 1991). Normative, stereotypical beliefs about diffuse status characteristics, such as race and gender, can have a large impact on status ordering.

GENDER AND MOTHERHOOD AS DIFFUSE STATUS CHARACTERISTICS

In the last several decades, researchers have focused on gender as a primary source of inequality, and though normative beliefs about categories of gender have changed over the years, gender has been an important diffuse status characteristic triggered in a plethora of situations (Hopcroft 2002; Ridgeway 1991). While normative beliefs that inform status hierarchy formations change over time, gender has historically contained all the features of a diffuse status characteristic: there are normatively two primary categories for gender, one associated with lesser valued specific skills, and lower competency in general. Research shows that men are assumed to have specific competency and are afforded more opportunities for leadership and influence within groups (Berger et al. 1980; Carli and Eagly 1999; Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Ridgeway and Smith-Lovin 1999). While these studies speak to small work group settings, these gendered dynamics are echoed in quantitative pay gap data, with women still trailing men in earnings (Campbell and Pearlman 2013). Since the Equal Pay Act in 1972, the gender

gap in pay has been slowly narrowing: the female to male pay gap closed to 71.9% in 1990, 76.9% in 2000, and reached 81.2% in 2010 (Campbell and Pearlman 2013).

Since 2010, progress in gender wage equality has stalled and researchers have learned that a major part of this persisting wage gap is due to the gendered impact of parenthood (Campbell and Pearlman 2013). Before parenthood and the demands of caregiving enter the equation, childless men and women, particularly single ones, find pay approaches parity (Crittendon 2001). However, after adding the demands of the other "greedy" institution of parenthood, a gendered effect clearly becomes visible because parenthood differentially impacts working mothers and fathers.

There are ongoing arguments about whether the root of these different outcomes for mothers and fathers are rooted in different choices mothers and fathers make or in discrimination (Kim 2013). EST approaches aid in understanding how discrimination may play a part in maintaining and reifying these inequalities. Using EST, Ridgeway and Correll (2004) argue that motherhood operates as a status characteristic and, as such, mothers are penalized in the workplace. These authors find that once motherhood is identified as a salient worker descriptor, it leads to lower evaluations of competence, commitment, and suitability, especially for positions of authority (Ridgeway and Correll 2004).

While mothers are routinely assessed as being lower in competence than all non-mothers, they are evaluated as having specific competence when it comes to nurturance (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). Unfortunately, these very (feminized) nurturance traits on which women rate highly tend to be devalued in the workplace (Ridgeway and Correll 2004). Such a pattern of devalued competencies among devalued groups is not surprising.

Lower status groups are commonly assessed as having some competencies, just usually for skills that are themselves devalued, such as childcare for mothers (Berger et al. 1980; Glick and Fiske 2001).

Correll et al. (2007) investigated how the motherhood penalty impacts getting a job. These authors conducted an audit and experimental study to isolate the discrimination mechanism for working mothers. For the experimental portion, these authors gave study participants application materials for two prospective job candidates, who differed in terms of parental status, race, and gender. Study participants then evaluated the candidates in terms of competence and commitment, ability standards, and evaluation measures (such as salary and promotion likelihood). Correll et al. (2007) found that while mothers were penalized widely for parenthood, fathers were not only not penalized for being a parent, they often benefited from that status. It even appears that fathers are given more leniency too, yet for mothers they face harsher standards. Performance and time commitment expectations are significantly lower for men once they become fathers, yet for women, once they become mothers, performance and time commitment expectations are higher (Fuegen, Biernat, Haines, and Deaux 2004). Additionally, mothers are less likely than childless women to be considered for hire and promotion (Fuegen et al. 2004).

The resulting wage differential for mothers versus non-mothers is far from equitable. For every dollar fathers earn, mothers earn a little over 50 cents (Sigle-Rushton and Waldfogel 2007). With additional children, this gap only widens. Budig and England (2001) find that mothers experience a seven percent decrease in wages per child, but that no such effect occurs for fathers. Not only do fathers not find a decrease in wages, they

often experience an increase in wages, called the fatherhood premium (Glauber 2008). Motherhood appears to contain all the features of a diffuse status characteristic, with mothers receiving lower evaluations of competence and fewer opportunities for positions of authority than non-mothers. To test this claim, I hypothesize that mothers will receive lower assessments than fathers:

> *Hypothesis 1***:** When caregiving status is not indicated, mothers should receive lower assessments compared to fathers.

CAREGIVING POSITION AS A DIFFUSE STATUS CHARACTERISTIC

The "demands of today's workplace…do not match the needs of today's workforce, where workers struggle to reconcile competing caregiving and workplace demands" (Correll et al. 2014; p. 3). Correll et al. (2014) argue that we are in a workplace crisis in the United States and that this incongruity leads to negative consequences for gender equality, in as much as women are still expected to, and do, take on the lion's share of the domestic load. Indeed, researchers point to the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium as key contributors to the stalled gender wage gap (Campbell and Pearlman 2013). However, the penalty and premium may be more about assumptions and expectations pertaining to caregiving and workplace commitment than about gendered parental status as historically framed.

In the United States, workplace culture is built around the ideal worker archetype (Correll et al. 2014). The ideal worker archetype is rooted in heteronormative ideals about a primary caregiving mother and a breadwinning father. This archetype has persisted despite changes in society and the ideal worker of today is always able and

willing to prioritize work over family, perhaps even more so than in the past (Acker 1990; Correll et al. 2014; Williams 2001). This single-minded prioritization of work over family is something working parents are hard-pressed to do, and the ability to make work a first priority is more easily done with one parent prioritizes family over work. The fatherhood premium appears to be tied to beliefs not only about father's commitment to work, but beliefs about his spouse's commitment to family (Killewald 2013). While heterosexual, married, residential, biological fathers enjoy a fatherhood premium in the workplace, they do so only when their wives do *not* work full-time: with a full-time working spouse, the fatherhood premium disappears (Killewald 2013).

Not only is the fatherhood premium predicated on a particular heteronormative enactment of fatherhood, but the motherhood penalty too relies on a fairly rigid enactment of motherhood. For example, the motherhood penalty can be eliminated if other information is provided about the mother or her partner that serves to contradict enactment of the "mother" role or primary caregiver position (Aranda and Glick 2014; Demerjian 2014). If a mother succeeds in signaling workplace devotion, she can avoid the motherhood penalty (Aranda and Glick 2014). Additionally, in previous work I have found that mothers who are known to have a primary caregiving husband can also avoid the motherhood penalty, while primary caregiving fathers experience a similar penalty to primary caregiving mothers (Demerjian 2014). These findings could be read as successes for mothers, yet they also could lead to a disadvantage for those parents who cannot or choose to not make child caregiving invisible to the workplace. The findings of Aranda and Glick (2014), Killewald (2013), and Demerjian (2014) lend support to the idea that much of the fatherhood premium and motherhood penalty are based on heteronormative

assumptions about couples and gender roles and that the penalty, which remains for a subset of parents, may reside with the caregiving position not mothers.

Human capital theorists may agree that the source of the penalties resides with caregiving position, which has penalized mothers because they have historically taken on that position in greater numbers. Human Capital Theory (HCT) arguments claim that disparities seen for working mothers and fathers are largely due to a supply-side issue, or a series of different choices made by women and men, and mothers and fathers (Becker 1975). HCT represents the predominant alternative and economic-based explanation of workplace inequality (Becker 1975; England and Farkas 1985). For HCT, wages are the indirect result of different choices in investment in human capital (Becker 1975). According to Becker (1975), individuals make choices about how much to invest in education and training and this directly impacts their productivity, which, in turn directly impacts their wages. Wage differences, then, are the result of not just investment in education and training, but also in which jobs (if any) one chooses to pursue and what characteristics of the job one chooses to prioritize (such as family-friendly or flexible hours) (Mincer and Polacheck 1974).

According to HCT, the persisting wage gap is then a consequence of different choices made by men and women. Specifically, HCT posits that men and women make different investments in their careers, and ultimately attributes the existence of the gap on these differential investment choices (Olson 2013). Lips (2013) argues, however, that HCT alone is insufficient to explain the gap and that HCT and social psychology (such as EST) need to inform one another to truly capture the gap's underlying dynamics. Kupfer (2014) adds that HCT falls short of adequately explaining the maintenance of the gender

hierarchy in the workplace. HCT focuses on the different choices men and women make and their different productivity as a result, while EST focuses on the status expectations that brought them to that choice in the first place.

Choice, or supply-side arguments, and expectations, or demand-side arguments, present the elemental tension between many workplace inequality theorists. Stier and Yaish (2014) investigate this tension by asking whether women choose occupations to provide better conditions that facilitate a dual role in society (mother and worker) as a trade-off for low wages. Their findings support the gendered expectations argument, indicating that women are not simply making different choices than men, but face discrimination in the workplace. Choice is only a piece of the inequality puzzle. Some researchers question the concept of choice in general, given that they find an expectation of dual roles (caregiver and worker) practically forces the "choice" of female-friendly occupations (Reskin and Roos 1990; Stier and Yaish 2014). Glass (1990) highlights a similar trend for occupation allocations broadly. She finds that allocations of occupations are less driven by choice or preference (which supply-side arguments like HCT promote) but rather result from demand-side gendered expectations and other forms of discrimination (Glass 1990).

Comparable Worth Theory (CWT) counters the HCT perspective on the motherhood penalty by arguing that primary caregivers are not less productive, but rather the work that women have historically engaged in, particularly any nurturing work, is devalued by employers (Bielby and Bielby 1988; Glass 1990). For CWT, traditionally feminine work and tasks are devalued, while traditionally masculine work and tasks are highly valued (England et al. 1988). This position on devaluation of traditionally

feminine work dovetails nicely with EST-based claims of gender and motherhood as a status characteristic, both of which hold central the idea that the feminine (gender or tasks/roles) is devalued in contrast to the masculine.

What is clear through these different perspectives is that penalties for caregiving (a traditionally feminine task), and particularly for female caregivers, persist (Budig and England 2001; Stone 2007). Empirical research further indicates that, while the motherhood penalty and the fatherhood premium continue to impact working parents, it primarily holds under certain conditions that are changing as cultural norms shift. When mothers indicate a devotion to work or a primary caregiving spouse, which also indicates non-traditionally feminine gender performance, they can avoid the motherhood penalty (Aranda and Glick 2014; Demerjian 2014). When fathers have a full-time working wife, they do not enjoy the fatherhood premium (Killewald 2013). Further, the impact of gender on workplace inequality is unclear as women without children may find a premium as well, given that the very act of not having children could be a signal of workplace devotion (Correll et al. 2007). These historically gendered penalties and premiums seem to disappear when certain non-traditional gender performances (of the worker or their partner) are indicated. Whether this means the beginning of the end of these disparities, or a new devaluation for the work of primary caregiving (that is no longer tethered to parent gender), however, is yet unclear. To test this claim, I hypothesize that primary caregivers face greater workplace penalties than secondary caregivers.

*Hypothesis 2***:** When caregiving condition is presented, primary caregivers should receive lower assessments than secondary caregivers.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION AS A DIFFUSE STATUS CHARACTERISTIC

Like gender and motherhood, sexual orientation has also been theorized and shown to operate as a diffuse status characteristic, casting gay and lesbian group members in a low status bracket (Johnson 1995; Webster and Hysom 1998; Webster, Hysom, and Fullmer 1998). While this binary understanding of sexual orientation (like gender) is not the most nuanced or accurate reflection of lived experiences, sexual orientation is normatively understood to be a nominal characteristic in the United States and therefore susceptible to these privileged and unprivileged categories in status belief hierarchy formation (Johnson 1995; Ridgeway 1991).

In response to blatant workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian workers, protective policies for gays and lesbians in the workplace have become more prevalent; this has led to increasingly accepting and supportive workplace environments (Giuffre, Kellinger, and Williams 2008). Yet, Giuffre et al. find that gays and lesbians are still at risk for non-conscious workplace penalties, even in purportedly "gay-friendly" organizations. Giuffre et al. (2008) conducted in-depth interviews with gay and lesbian workers, focusing on employees at "gay-friendly" organizations. Penalties for gay and lesbian workers, not unlike the motherhood penalty, are based on stereotypes about these workers and their presumed competencies (Giuffre et al. 2008).

While sexual orientation, like parenthood or caregiving status, is not as easily recognizable as gender normatively, when that information is known in the workplace, it can have deleterious effects for gay and lesbian workers. Gay and lesbian workers are more at risk for workplace hostility than their heterosexual counterparts (Gates and Mitchell 2013), more likely to report workplace discrimination and diminished mobility

(Beatty and Kirby 2006; Buddel 2011), and, if sexual orientation is known, less likely to be hired or promoted than their heterosexual counterparts (Embrick, Walther, and Wickens 2007). Heterosexuals, the dominant status group, enjoy positive status effects from their sexual orientation while gays and lesbians experience these and other associated negative status effects (Webster and Hysom 1998; Webster et al. 1998). Therefore I test whether sexual orientation operates as a diffuse status characteristic for both primary and secondary caregiving positions:

> *Hypothesis 3a***:** For job candidates in the primary caregiving condition, gay fathers should receive lower assessments than heterosexual fathers.
>
> *Hypothesis 3b***:** For job candidates in the secondary caregiving condition, gay fathers should receive lower assessments than heterosexual fathers.
>
> *Hypothesis 3c***:** For job candidates in the primary caregiving condition, lesbian mothers should receive lower assessments than heterosexual mothers.
>
> *Hypothesis 3d***:** For job candidates in the secondary caregiving condition, lesbian mothers should receive lower assessments than heterosexual mothers.

THE RELATION BETWEEN RESPONDENT ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT GENDER, CAREGIVING POSITION, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Prior research showing evaluations of fathers as highly competent and committed flow from a normative understanding of fathers as unencumbered workers. What provides power to the unencumbered working parent is a related assumption about having someone else there to facilitate this full prioritization and devotion to work. This understanding indicates that he is a worker unencumbered by child caregiving

responsibilities (the ideal worker), with the implicit heteronormative assumption being that his wife takes care of these duties (Acker 1990; Hays 1996; Williams 2001). These evaluations imply the expectation of both normative gender roles *and* the expectation of heterosexuality. However, once non-normative gender roles are signaled, the gendered patterns of premiums (for fathers) and penalties (for mothers) do not hold (Aranda and Glick 2014; Demerjian 2014; Killewald 2013).

Given these often taken for granted heteronormative assumptions regarding underlying caregiving roles, casting a light on the impact that heteronormativity has had on these premiums and penalties is of paramount importance. According to Queer Theory, traditional and normative gendered performances were borne from assumptions of heterosexuality and complementary gendered selves. In explaining this heteronormative template, Warner (1993) asserts "heterosexual culture thinks of itself as the elemental form of human association, as the very model of inter-gender relations, as the indivisible basis of all community, and as the means of reproduction without which society wouldn't exist" (xxi). Heteronormativity then would appear to undergird the basis of the ideal worker and ideal mother. This renders heterosexual fathers equal to the ideal worker and heterosexual mothers as ill suited for the workplace and best suited for the home.

Queer theorists such as Judith Butler (1990) argue that gender is not a static category; it is a performance. This performance implies the importance of *what you do* rather than *who you are*. Queer Theory does not provide new categories for measurement or causal models; rather, it provides an argument for theoretical questioning of identity categories and the effects of those categories (Eldeman 1995). Queer Theory's distinction

between what one does and who one is, or more specifically here, to touch back on EST, what one is expected to do and who one is expected to be, is pivotal for this study and for addressing issues of inequality in the workplace today. For example, whether the motherhood penalty flows from women's status as mothers or for what women do (or are assumed to do) as mothers is ambiguous. Are mothers penalized for expectations around anticipated gender performance of motherhood? As seen in Aranda and Glick (2014) and Demerjian (2014), heterosexual mothers who defy that gender performance are not penalized.

Unlike stereotypes about heterosexual men and women workers, gay and lesbian workers are assumed to have characteristics commonly associated with the opposite gender heterosexual worker (Giuffre et al. 2008). Johnson (1995) argues that stereotypes associated with gay men and lesbian women are "intertwined with gender stereotypes" (p.120) and as such, gay men are considered feminine, while lesbians are considered more masculine (Johnson 1995; Williams 2006). It follows that it is not uncommon for gay men to experience penalties that heterosexual women routinely suffer in the workplace (Giuffre et al. 2008).

Expectations for how parents will engage in the domestic division of labor also contribute to expectations for commitment to the workplace and differ for gay/lesbian and heterosexual couples. In general, gay and lesbian couples have a more egalitarian view of parenting than do heterosexual parents (Biblarz and Stacey 2010), and as such, the primary/secondary caregiving dichotomy may be less relevant for these couples. Research shows that gay and lesbian couples share more equitably than heterosexual couples in the division of household labor (Goldberg, Smith, and Perry-Jenkins 2012;

Kurdek 2007). In fact, even amongst lesbian couples where one parent is the biological parent and in which the biological mother spent more time in child care tasks when the child was an infant, the biological mother is not also considered the primary caregiver and household tasks are still split more equitably than in heterosexual couples (Goldberg and Perry-Jenkins 2007). While gay and lesbian couples lack a gendered division of labor, expectations of a primary and secondary caregiving parent may still persist.

While a gendered division of household labor is common, and expected, among heterosexual couples, the more equitable arrangement seen in gay and lesbian couples, is less likely to yield the normative primary caregiver/household manager versus secondary caregiver/breadwinner partnership. Fulcher, Sutfin, and Patterson (2008) find that lesbian mothers, in particular, experience a division of household labor equality that heterosexual parents do not enjoy. However, while tasks associated with household labor were not more likely to fall to one parent along gendered lines, Ciano-Boyce and Shelley-Sireci (2003) show that the division of household labor in gay and lesbian couples tracks instead along employment commitments. These authors show that the parent who spends more time in the paid labor market spends less time on household and childcare tasks. This negotiation of the division of labor for gay and lesbian couples is not only driven by commitments to the paid labor market, but also by other factors that impact power dynamics, such as age and wealth (Oreffice 2010). Further, Goldberg (2013) finds that while gay and lesbian couples may indeed take on specialized divisions of labor, not unlike those seen in heterosexual couples, they are not seen as expectations of their feminine or masculine selves, but rather a chosen, practical decision, as such, this choice

challenges the heteronormative beliefs indicating that certain acts are inherently masculine or feminine.

The heteronormative beliefs that influence evaluations of parents in the workplace appear to impact lesbian and gay parents in complex and unexpected ways. In fact, recent research points to benefits in workplace outcomes that are grounded in the ideal worker/ideal mother dichotomous normative perspective for lesbian workers as well, but in a way that may even benefit some lesbian mothers (Baumle 2009). Schneebaum (2013) posits, "If employers expect that straight women are more likely to leave their job or make less of a workplace commitment because of family responsibilities, employers would prefer lesbians to equally qualified straight women. In other words, discrimination against straight women can benefit lesbians" (p. 5).

In fact, lesbian women are at times finding they enjoy workplace benefits generally associated with heterosexual men. Gedro (2006) argues that while "homosexuality is the last acceptable prejudice," lesbian workers can still find advantages in the workplace. Lesbians, in contrast to heterosexual women, tend to demonstrate non-traditional gender roles (Fassinger 1996). According to Gedro (2006), it is these non-traditional gender roles, paths, and choices that serve to open more doors for lesbians. As lesbians are not as likely as heterosexual women to make career and life choices based on accommodating or relying on a male partner, Gedro's supply-side argument posits that lesbians make different choices than heterosexual women all along. Lesbians may be making different choices, which also may be based on different expectations, but it also bears noting how others perceive and evaluate lesbians. Lesbians are often seen as aggressive, reliable, tough, and non-emotional, not unlike heterosexual men, and

therefore considered well suited for management and other positions of power (Friskopp and Silverstein 1995).

Lesbians are not only regarded as, and expected to be, aggressive and reliable like heterosexual men, they are often remunerated as such (Blandford 2003). Analyzing 2000 U.S. Census data, Baumle (2009) finds a lesbian wage premium over heterosexual women. She finds that this wage premium is due in large part to a lesbian *motherhood* advantage implying that perhaps the "motherhood penalty" is more accurately a heterosexual motherhood penalty. According to Baumle (2009) "35 percent of the wage differential between lesbian and heterosexual women is attributable to differences in returns to child rearing" (p. 983). When turning an eye toward gay men's and lesbian women's earnings, Baumle and Poston (2011) find that gay men earn 10.7 percent less than married heterosexual men. For lesbians, partnering comes with a more modest 3.5 percent advantage when contrasted with married heterosexual women (Baumle and Poston 2011).

It may be that full-time employed lesbian mothers are assumed to be performing masculinity and male tasks associated with breadwinning, and may, therefore, reap the benefits of this breadwinning role traditionally associated with heterosexual fathers. This prediction arises from the links between normative assumptions about gender and sexuality posited in queer theory. That is, in the heterosexual template, women=feminine=attracted to men and men=masculine=attracted to women (Giuffre et al. 2008). Lesbians and gays disrupt these equivalencies. With a change in the individual's sexual orientation, the assumed gender performance (and associated caregiving expectation) shifts to the other side of the masculine/feminine binary. Since

being gay is normatively associated with femininity, employers may view working gay fathers as performing femininity, and enacting female gender tasks associated with caregiving, and gay fathers may be penalized for this, unlike heterosexual fathers.

I argue that employers make assumptions about what employees do based on which groups employees appear to, or are known to, have membership. This leads employers to make assumptions about caregiving position (primary or secondary) based on information about sexual orientation and gender of the parent. From these assumptions, expectations about gender performance are formed, and I hypothesize that these assumptions differ for gay, lesbian, and heterosexual mothers and fathers.

Hypothesis 4: When caregiving position is not indicated, lesbian mothers should receive higher assessments than heterosexual mothers.

Hypothesis 5: When caregiving position is not indicated, gay fathers should receive lower assessments than heterosexual fathers.

CHAPTER II: DATA AND METHODS

DESIGN OVERVIEW

In order to test these hypotheses, I conducted a vignette experiment (see Appendix 1). The vignettes were distributed to a nationally representative sample of United States adults via Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) and GfK (formerly Knowledge Networks). 1013 respondents were asked to review and rate a profile of one job candidate. The job candidates in the vignettes are all parents, coupled, of the same race (all implied white), and equally qualified for the position, but vary in terms of gender (male/female), sexual orientation (heterosexual/homosexual), and caregiving position (not indicated/primary/secondary). Male and female respondents were randomly assigned to one of the twelve conditions of the 2x2x3 experimental design. While I make no prediction about respondent gender on job candidate ratings, this design allows for investigating if and how male and female evaluators respond differently to these manipulations.

This design allows me to tackle an issue that still plagues the U.S. workplace but from a novel perspective. While Correll et al. (2007) focus on comparing parents to non-parents and looking at the intersection with race of worker, I focus solely on white, partnered parents to test how worker evaluations are impacted by job candidate gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving position and their interactions. Further, while there is a growing literature on gay and lesbian couples in the workplace, studies typically employ census data. This approach is very helpful for analyzing trends and shifts in earnings over time and between groups, but does not offer the benefits of an experimental design, which allows for control of potentially confounding variables.

Determining whether penalties and premiums arise from differences in choices or expectations around gender performance is possible in an experimental design. In such a design, all parents can be presented as having made the same choices, save for the experimentally manipulated ones. Further, while it is increasingly relevant to today's workplace, there is scant research at this point in time on how and whether gay and lesbian parents face workplace penalties and premiums associated with parenthood. To isolate these particular main effects and interactions of gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving, I hold other variables constant. The variables that were held constant for each vignette include race (which is manipulated as white by using U.S. birth certificate data from the mid-1970s and finding common names for white babies and is adapted from Bertrand and Mullainathan [2004]), age, coupled status, parental status, education, work history, and performance review.

This experimental design extends the current experimental research on parenthood penalties and premiums and work by presenting only one vignette to each respondent. Correll et al. (2007) employ a vignette design but with two for each respondent. In such studies, as in Correll et al. (2007), respondents are asked to choose one vignette over the other. While there are numerous benefits to presenting competing vignettes, such as a clear ranking within each respondent's evaluations, there are limitations too. Correll et al. (2007) discuss this drawback: "one challenge of this study was to create two sets of materials that were of equivalent quality without being suspiciously similar" (p. 1312). In this design, with only one vignette per respondent, I

am able to eliminate that challenge and reduce any potentially confounding elements to the vignette.

This study also extends beyond small work groups to explore the impact of status characteristics on hiring recommendations. My study omits the small group original scope condition in favor of a more recent explanation of EST conditions of advisory panels (Ridgeway and Correll 2003). Respondents were told they are a part of an advisory panel evaluating this employee in terms of perceived competence and commitment, as well as hiring, wage, and promotion recommendations. This setting constitutes a shared task orientation under EST scope conditions and such online evaluations are highly relevant to today's workforce. Respondents in my study were also told that their supervisor would look favorably upon a recommendation for an employee who does get quickly promoted, which constitutes a collective orientation. I investigate the extent to which certain characteristics (gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving position) impact the prospective employee's evaluations. Such evaluations are based on normative knowledge about these diffuse status characteristics.

In this 2x2x3 experimental vignette design I experimentally manipulate three characteristics: gender (2 categories), sexual orientation (2 categories), and caregiving position (3 categories). All vignettes have the same work, education, family, and spousal information. Guided by my hypotheses, I first look at the main effects of gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving position on evaluations. I then look at interaction effects between caregiving position and gender and sexual orientation.

Figure 1: Experimental Design

	Target Gender: Male		Target Gender: Female	
	Heterosexual	Gay	Heterosexual	Lesbian
Caregiving not indicated				
Primary Caregiver				
Secondary Caregiver				

Following Aranda and Glick (2014), Correll et al. (2007), and Cuddy, Fiske, and Glick (2004), my dependent variables include perceived competence, commitment, and evaluation measures (candidate's suitability, likelihood of interview, likelihood of hire, likelihood of promotion, and pay range).

PROCEDURES AND DATA

These data were obtained via GfK/TESS. GfK has a nationally representative online research panel, and this panel is used to gather data for social policy, health, marketing, media, as well as academic research. GfK recruits members into their panel by utilizing address and probability-based sampling methods. Upon becoming a panel member, panelists are notified when they are assigned to a study either by email or by visiting an online member page.

Once GfK/TESS accepts a study to field, GfK randomly assigns via probability-based sampling a sub-sample within the larger panel for each study. The number of assignments is based upon power analysis findings. A power analysis for this study revealed that the minimum sample size needed per cell for robust inference in hypothesis

testing (with 0.40 delta and 0.80 power) is approximately 40. Given this, in June of 2015, GfK randomly recruited more than 40 responses per vignette for both male and female respondents to account for an expected lower than 100% completion rate. 1,600 surveys were fielded resulting in 1,013 total completed surveys and a completion rate of 63.3%. 67 respondents were eliminated from the sample because their responses to manipulation checks, described in more detail in survey measures below, were incorrect. Thus, the analysis includes a sample size of 946.

Four vignettes test for the impact of gender and sexual orientation on evaluation, competence, and commitment measures when caregiving position is not indicated. These four vignettes are exactly the same except for sexual orientation and gender of the hypothetical job candidate and do not indicate caregiving position. The respondents receiving one of these vignettes were asked questions measuring competence and commitment and evaluation measures to test *Hypotheses 1, 4,* and *5*. The remaining vignettes focus on testing evaluations when caregiving position is signaled and include eight vignettes that vary on sexual orientation and gender, with caregiving positions indicated (primary or secondary). The respondents receiving one of these vignettes were asked to evaluate and reward the employee described in the vignette. These vignettes allow me to test *Hypotheses 2* and *3*.

THE VIGNETTES

Following the design in Correll et al. (2007) and Demerjian (2014), I have created a cover story and three vignettes (caregiving position not indicated, primary, and secondary) and within those three, gender and sexual orientation of the job candidate are

manipulated. Consistent in all is education, work history, familial description. Replicated below are the cover story and three vignettes from the instrument. The experimentally manipulated central explanatory variables are gender, caregiving condition, and sexual orientation:

Gender: To signal gender, I used gender non-neutral names that were popular for white baby boys and girls according to birth record data in the mid-1970s (Matthew, Brendan, Kristen, Sarah) and refer to the candidate and his/her partner with gendered pronouns.

Caregiving Condition: Adapted from Gaunt (2013), I signaled primary child caregiving by describing the parent as having taken time out of the workforce to care for children and then working the past year part-time to accommodate child and household responsibilities. To signal secondary caregiving, I used the same descriptive strategy for primary caregiving but in describing the job candidate's significant other. For not indicated, I eliminated these details entirely.

Sexual Orientation: To signal sexual orientation, I described the candidate as having a spouse of a particular gender using the strategies highlighted for candidate gender. I did not use the terms lesbian or gay in my prompt, just as I would not use heterosexual in my prompt.

The Cover Story

In this scenario, imagine that you are a manager at a large company and your boss selected you to be a part of an advisory panel for new hires. You have been eager to be a part of this advisory panel for new hires and know that you are more likely to be asked to

be on this panel again in the future if the employee you recommend does well on the job and gets quickly promoted. You received resumes from human resources, but for a couple of job candidates you also received information via email from fellow coworkers who know the candidates from outside of work. The candidates are applying for a full-time accountant position and, if all goes well, whoever is hired could be tracked for promotion to move up to senior accountant. Though the position is full-time, the actual work schedule varies week to week, depending upon client needs. Because this position has a varying schedule, it can also accommodate familial needs during typical business hours from time to time.

The following is an excerpt from an email you received from a coworker about one job candidate you are reviewing. You already have this candidate's resume, which tells you much of the information, however, your coworker knows this candidate and just wanted to share some information also. Typically, your firm has trusted the impressions, even based on little information, made by its managers. Please read the excerpted message about this candidate and then respond to the following questions with your first, uncensored impressions.

Caregiving Position Not Indicated

Sarah/Matthew received her/his BA in 2004. She/he has worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where she/he has been responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. Her/his reference letter indicates that she/he consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker.

She/he is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan. They have two children, a 2 year-old son, Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza.

Caregiving Position Primary

Sarah/Matthew received her/his BA in 2003. She/he worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where she/he was responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. Her/his reference letter indicates that she/he consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker. She/he is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan. Together they have a 2 year-old son, Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza. In 2013 she/he decided to stay home with her/his daughter. She/he has been working part-time on a contractual basis for the last 6 months. During this time, Sarah/Matthew has worked until 1pm when she/he picks up the children from preschool and takes care of housework and childcare responsibilities. She is now applying for full time positions.

Caregiving Position Secondary

Matthew/Sarah received his/her BA in 2005. He/She has worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where he/she is responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. His/Her reference letter indicates that he/she consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker. He/She is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan, and they have a 2 year-old son,

Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza. Matthew's/Sarah's spouse decided to stay at home with their daughter in 2013, and in this past year, Kristen/Brendan has been working part time until 1pm when she picks up the children from preschool and takes care of the housework and childcare responsibilities, however Kristen/Brendan has just accepted a fulltime position her/himself.

SURVEY MEASURES

Variables

After reading the vignette, respondents were asked a series of questions. I examine the hypotheses by focusing on each dependent variable to capture potential variation across each indicator. A correlation matrix of all dependent variables is presented in Appendix 2. Following are descriptions of the variables I use in my analysis to address my hypotheses.

Dependent variables

Evaluations of Competence and Commitment: To better understand what determines workplace evaluations and assumptions of primary caregiving, I follow Cuddy et al. (2004) and Correll et al. (2007) in asking respondents to rate candidates on measures of competence and commitment.

Competent: To measure competence, respondents were given the statement "this candidate is competent." They were then asked to rate this statement on accuracy, with 1 being not at all accurate and 7 being extremely

accurate. I also asked similarly formatted questions about two other traits related to competence: organized, capable.

Committed: To measure commitment, respondents were asked a single question about how committed they believe this candidate would be to this job relative to other similarly positioned employees in the company (Correll et al. 2007).[3]

Workplace Evaluations: To ascertain how these key characteristics (gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving position) impact employment, I asked respondents to rate the candidate on suitability for position, likelihood of interview, likelihood of hire, likelihood of promotion track, and recommended salary. Following Correll et al. (2007) and Aranda and Glick (2014), I utilize the following workplace evaluation measures:

Suitability: To measure suitability, respondents were asked how suitable they perceived the candidate to be for a full time accountant position. They were given a 7-point scale ranging from not at all suitable (1) to extremely suitable (7).

Interview: Respondents were asked how likely they would be to see this candidate for an interview. They responded on a 7-point scale ranging from not at all likely (1) to extremely likely (7).

Hire: To measure likelihood of hire, respondents indicated how likely they would be to hire this candidate for the full time accountant position on a 7-point scale ranging from not at all likely (1) to extremely likely (7).

[3] I ran both an exploratory factor analysis of all dependent variables, and a subsequent confirmatory factor analysis of these four dependent variables: organized, capable, committed, and competent. As the reliability score for these four dependent variables was .95, a composite scale was created: the capability scale. Results from which are detailed in Appendix 3.

Promotion: To measure likelihood of promotion track, respondents were asked whether this candidate should be considered for the promotion track upon hire on a 7-point scale ranging from not at all likely (1) to extremely likely (7).[4]

Salary: Respondents were told that this company has a set pay range for this position and that the exact salary will be decided after reviewing the candidate's file. The respondent was then asked to indicate where on the scale he/she believes the candidate should be paid. The pay scale is in $15,000 increments, there are five categories and the range begins at $40,000 and ends at $114,999.

Manipulation checks

To assess whether caregiving status and sexual orientation were successfully manipulated, manipulation checks are included. These checks come at the end of the survey and are phrased as follows, respectively: "Who has primary responsibility for caring for this candidate's children? The candidate, the candidate's spouse, don't know," "Was this job candidate in a heterosexual relationship?" and "Was this job candidate in a gay or lesbian relationship?" Answers to these last two manipulation checks regarding sexual orientation were "Yes, No, Don't know."

Only two-thirds of the respondents could have accurately responded to the manipulation check for caregiving, as one-third was in the caregiving not indicated condition. Thus, of the 670 who could have passed, 85%, or 570, correctly identified who

[4] I ran both an exploratory factor analysis of all dependent variables, and a subsequent confirmatory factor analysis of these four dependent variables: suitable, interview, hire, and promotion. As the reliability score for these four dependent variables was .94, a composite scale was created: the suitability scale. Results from which are detailed in Appendix 3.

in the vignette was the primary or secondary caregiver (e.g. the vignette was primary caregiving and the respondent indicated that the job applicant had primary responsibility of the children). The remaining 15% comprised both "don't know" as well as incorrect responses.

There were two sexual orientation manipulation checks. All respondents could have responded to the manipulation check, according to the experimental design. Only 519 respondents, however, answered these manipulation check questions. Of these 519, some correctly identified the sexual orientation of the target in both sexual orientation manipulation checks, some accurately responded to just one, and some said "don't know" for one or both. Because of the number who incorrectly identified important information in the vignette, I developed rules regarding which participants would remain in the sample.

Starting conservatively, I created a dataset comprised of only those respondents who accurately answered all three manipulation checks (and in the case of caregiving I included those in the not indicated condition as well). The sample size for this dataset was 172 and lacked the power to test these hypotheses given the 12 cells of the experimental design.

As a result, I created a less conservative dataset for analysis that included the 172 who passed all three manipulation checks, those who did not answer or said they did not know, as well as those who correctly identified the level of caregiving indicated in their vignette and accurately assessed the target's sexual orientation in one of the manipulation checks. After imposing these decision rules, 67 respondents were eliminated from the sample for failing manipulation checks, leaving a sample size of 946 for analysis. The

findings for the analysis involving the larger, less conservative sample are reported in the next chapter. The patterns that emerge in the larger sample are likewise apparent in analyses using data from the conservative sample of 172, but owing to the lack of power, the effects rarely reach significance.

Control variables

In this project, *respondent gender* and *respondent child status* are salient characteristics to control for in regression analyses. Respondent gender has produced different evaluation trends in prior research (Demerjian 2014), therefore respondent gender is included as a control variable here where female respondents are coded 1 and male respondents are coded 0. Whether a respondent has a child her/himself could inform a respondent's impression of the competence, commitment, or other evaluation variables of a parent in a vignette. For this reason, controlling for respondent child status is vital as well. Respondent parent status is coded as 1 for respondents with children and 0 for respondents without children.

In addition to these two controls, there is a risk of homophobia in this nationally representative sample. In an effort to control for this impact, I asked respondents whether sexual relations between two adults of the same sex is "always wrong," "almost always wrong," "wrong only sometimes," or "not wrong at all." This variable, *respondent homophobia*, for regression analyses is collapsed into a binary variable, with the former two options constituting a respondent homophobia score of 1, with the latter two options resulting in a respondent homophobia score of 0.

ANALYSIS

My analytic strategy builds on Cuddy et al. (2004) and Correll et al. (2007), both of which use experimental methodology. As this study builds on previous work on the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium, I use measures similar to those used in previous research on workplace evaluations. Following Correll et al. (2007) and Cuddy et al. (2004), my dependent variables include evaluation measures (suitable, interview, hire, promotion, and salary), and perceived competence and commitment. I test whether and how employer perceptions and evaluations of a job candidate depend on the candidate's sexual orientation, gender, or caregiving position, or a combination of these characteristics.

This design allows me to examine the main effects of sexual orientation, gender, and primary caregiving as well as their interactions. I use ANOVA to test for the main and interactive effects of gender, sexual orientation, and caregiving position on evaluation, competence, and commitment measures. Then, using multivariate regression analysis, I examine the same effects on competence and evaluation measures while controlling for respondent demographics (respondent gender, respondent parent status, respondent homophobia).

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

I present results of my hypothesis tests in two steps. First, I present the main effect findings for gender, caregiving condition, and sexual orientation as well as findings for the related *Hypotheses 1* and *2*. Second, I focus on the intersections of gender, caregiving, and sexual orientation that were hypothesized to grant the fictitious job seeker binds or freedoms in the job market (*Hypotheses 3, 4,* and *5*). These analyses allow me to examine the ways these characteristics differentially impact job seekers at intersecting social locations where sexual orientation, caregiver status, and gender depart from the heteronormative ideal.

As the presentation of my results below shows, little support for the hypotheses arises, and no main effects of gender, caregiving condition, or sexual orientation are significant. Two interesting patterns, however, do emerge. Heterosexual breadwinners (secondary caregiving condition) are consistently rated higher than gay/lesbian breadwinners. In particular, among women who are the breadwinners, heterosexual mothers are rated more favorably than lesbian mothers. This difference in the effect of sexual orientation does not exist for mothers who are the primary caregivers of children or for fathers. In addition, heterosexual parents – but not gay/lesbian parents – appear to experience a penalty for being primary caregivers compared to being breadwinners. Additional tests using regression analysis and controlling for respondent characteristics show that the impact of sexual orientation for breadwinning mothers is robust. As I discuss in the next chapter, these findings support the contentions of intersectional theory that specific *combinations* of social identity can yield different outcomes.

MAIN EFFECTS

When considering the main effects in this experiment, I expect the results to replicate past research showing that gender influences the evaluation outcome measures for job seekers. *Hypothesis 1* predicts that when caregiver status is not indicated, mothers would receive lower assessments compared to fathers. However, I find neither a main effect for gender (including all caregiving conditions), nor support for *Hypothesis 1*. I present the results of ANOVA and F tests of main effects for gender in Table 1. These non-significant findings are surprising given past research on gender inequities in the workplace for mothers and fathers (Correll et al 2007; Stone 2007; Cuddy et al 2004; Corse 1990; Tiedje 2004; Correll and Benard 2005; Fuegen et al, 2004). In the next chapter I discuss possible reasons why these results differ from the prior literature on the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium.

[Table 1 about here]

A main prediction in my study is that rather than a motherhood penalty (i.e., a penalty based on gender), there would be a caregiving penalty (i.e., a penalty based on the caregiving status, regardless of gender). As predicted by *Hypothesis 2*, I expect a negative impact of primary caregiving on assessments compared to those for secondary caregivers. As I show in Table 1, I find only marginal support for *Hypothesis 2*, as respondents rate primary caregivers as less committed to work than secondary caregivers ($F(1, 631)= 3.3$, $p < .10$). However, when the not indicated caregiving condition is included in the analyses of the main effect of caregiving condition, caregiver status does affect how respondents rate suitability ($F(2, 945)= 2.9$, $p < .10$) and commitment ($F(2, 948)= 3.4$, $p < .05$) in the expected direction. Not indicated and secondary caregiving

positions have higher mean scores than primary caregiving position for suitable (5.42 and 5.24, respectively, versus 5.17) and committed (5.35 and 5.28, respectively, versus 5.10). While suitable only approaches significance, this suggests that respondents are rating parents differently due to caregiving condition. In order to clarify the basis for this significance, as it was not found in analyses of primary versus secondary caregivers, I include ANOVA and F tests results for indicated versus not indicated caregiving conditions as well in Table 1.[5]

Including results from indicated versus not indicated caregiving conditions illustrates that some of the significance seen in the caregiving main effect was not entirely due to the primary versus secondary contrast, as hypothesized, but may stem from whether the caregiving condition was or was not revealed in the vignette. For example, in the case of the dependent variable suitable, not indicated caregivers (m=5.42) were rated significantly higher than indicated caregivers (m=5.21) ($F(1,946)= 5.4$, $p < .05$). The other three dependent variables approaching significance, hire (not indicated m=5.27, indicated m=5.12; $F(1,947)= 2.7$, $p < .10$), committed (not indicated m=5.35, indicated m=5.19; $F(1,949)= 3.4$, $p < .10$), and competent (not indicated m=5.53, indicated m=5.37; $F(1,944)= 3.7$, $p < .10$) also report higher evaluations for not indicated caregivers over indicated (primary and secondary) caregivers.

This pattern of findings highlights concerns around divulging personal, familial information when pursuing a job; parents whose caregiving condition was not indicated fared better than those whose caregiving condition (primary or secondary) was reported. A key and purposeful component of this experimental design is to present not only the

[5] Results from these tests on the composite scales are included in Appendix 3. While similar patterns emerge for both analyses of all dependent variables as well as the scales, some important nuance is lost with the scales, so they are not presented here in the main text.

caregiving condition of the applicant, but also of his or her spouse. However, in the case of not indicated caregiving vignettes, no information regarding caregiving was included for either the applicant or the spouse. My hypotheses predicted that in the absence of stated information regarding caregiving condition, normative assumptions would fill in gaps and lead to penalties for women and primary caregivers. However, disconfirmation of these hypotheses casts doubt on this reasoning.

The analysis to this point has focused on penalties and premiums without addressing another normative assumption that parents face related to sexual orientation. This is the third main effect that I investigate. In accordance with prior theorizing and empirical research (Johnson 1995; Webster and Hysom 1998; Giuffre et al. 2008), I expect to find lower assessments for job seekers represented in the vignettes as gay and lesbian compared to heterosexual job seekers. Means for gay or lesbian job candidates were lower than for heterosexual job candidates for every dependent variable: Means for likelihood of interview (m=5.47 for gay or lesbian job candidates, m=5.67 for heterosexual job candidates) and promotion (m=4.91 for gay or lesbian job candidates, m=5.07 for heterosexual job candidates) show the biggest disparities. Respondents indicate they are significantly more likely to interview a heterosexual job candidate than a gay or lesbian job candidate ($F(1, 948)= 4.7$, $p < .05$). Results approach significance for promotion as well ($F(1, 949)=3.2$, $p < .10$). While I find some evidence of a penalty associated with sexual orientation (Table 1), this main effect does not provide insights into how evaluations may differ for gay fathers and lesbian mothers, as predicted in *Hypotheses 4* and *5*. I address these comparisons in the next section.

To summarize, I find no evidence of a gender penalty on evaluations of a job candidate. When caregiving is not indicated, no differences emerge between male and female job seekers, thus disconfirming *Hypothesis 1*. Additionally, the non-significant main effect of gender of job seeker suggests that mothers are not evaluated lower than fathers. Although the direct test of *Hypothesis 2* comparing primary and secondary caregivers suggests disconfirmation of the hypotheses, results from additional tests hint at some support. Further tests reveal that significant findings involving the caregiving main effect stem from comparisons between conditions indicating caregiving status and the condition not indicating such status; additional tests described below clarify the basis for this significance. Last, I find that sexual orientation seems to exert a penalty on two of the outcomes, though further analyses are required to fully investigate these effects.

EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION INTERACTIONS AND COMPARISONS

Hypotheses 3 through *5* address specific comparison involving the intersections of conditions of caregiving, sexual orientation, and gender. I discuss each interaction below, followed by a discussion of multivariate regression analyses. While the anticipated main effects for gender, caregiving, and sexual orientation were not found across all dependent variables, I observed a focal two-way interaction effect. Breaking down the interaction between caregiving condition and sexual orientation shows how these two factors, and sometimes gender within a particular factor, significantly impact assessments for job seekers. While one of these combinations was hypothesized via *Hypothesis 3d*, the remainder were unanticipated.

My analysis examines how specific categories of the three-level caregiving condition and the two-level sexual orientation inform these workplace evaluations outcome measures. Table 2 presents ANOVA results of the interaction between caregiving conditions and sexual orientation. This interaction is significant for the dependent variables hire ($F(5,943)= 3.4$, $p < .05$), organized ($F(5, 940)= 3.4$, $p < .05$), capable ($F(5, 943)= 3.6$, $p < .05$) and competent ($F(5, 940)= 3.3$, $p < .05$). Results approach significance for promotion ($F(5, 945)= 2.8$, $p < .10$). Means shown in Table 3 illustrate the patterns of effects for these outcome evaluations. Differences for not indicated and primary caregiving between heterosexual and gay/lesbian parents are negligible. However, for secondary caregivers, this is not the case. Mean scores for gay/lesbian secondary caregivers are consistently lower than those for heterosexual secondary caregivers. A closer look at how categories of sexual orientation interact with caregiving condition follows.

[Tables 2 and 3 about here]

Hypothesis 3 states that within each caregiving condition (primary and secondary) and within gender, gay and lesbian parents will receive lower assessments than their heterosexual counterparts (Table 2). *Hypothesis 3a* states that primary caregiving, gay fathers will receive lower assessments than primary caregiving, heterosexual fathers. No difference is seen when contrasting these two subgroupings of job seekers. *Hypothesis 3b* states that secondary caregiving, gay fathers will receive lower evaluations than secondary caregiving, heterosexual fathers. Similarly, no difference is found between these two vignettes. This non-significant finding for secondary caregiving fathers is notable, given the consistently lower mean scores for gay/lesbian secondary caregivers

seen in Table 3. *Hypothesis 3c* states that primary caregiving lesbian mothers will receive lower assessments than primary caregiving, heterosexual mothers. Again, no difference is found between these two sets of job seekers. *Hypothesis 3d* indicates that secondary caregiving, lesbian mothers will receive lower assessments than secondary caregiving, heterosexual mothers and here differences emerge. The striking differences in means between heterosexual and gay/lesbian secondary caregivers seen in Table 3 appear to trace back to high evaluations for heterosexual breadwinning mothers paired with low evaluations for lesbian breadwinning mothers.

In contrast to results for *3a*, *3b*, and *3c*, the evaluations for secondary caregiving lesbian and heterosexual mothers are significantly different. Means (Table 4) show that respondents rate secondary caregiving, lesbian mothers significantly lower than secondary caregiving, heterosexual mothers in interview, organized, capable, and competent, and results approach significance for suitable, hire, and committed. Of note, secondary caregiving, heterosexual fathers, the heteronormative ideal, do not differ significantly from secondary caregiving, gay fathers. While sexual orientation appears to not be salient for secondary fathers (as seen in results for *Hypothesis 3b*), sexual orientation status leads to lower assessments for lesbian secondary mothers when compared to heterosexual secondary mothers on suitable ($F(1, 157)=3.3$, $p <.10$), interview ($F(1, 157)=6.2$, $p < .05$), hire ($F(1,156)=3.7$, $p <.10$), organized ($F(1, 154)=4.7$, $p < .05$), capable ($F(1, 154)=5.1$, $p < .05$), committed ($F(1, 153)=3.8$, $p < .10$), and competent ($F(1, 153)=6$, $p < .05$) measures.

[Table 4 about here]

In summary, while I do not find support for *Hypotheses 3a, 3b,* or *3c*, I do find support for a penalty for secondary caregiving lesbian mothers when compared to heterosexual secondary caregiving mothers as predicted in *Hypothesis 3d*. This significant finding counters much prior research indicating a lesbian wage premium (Baumle 2009). Expectations from prior research indicate that a lesbian wage premium would be seen in secondary caregiving as much as if not more than other subcategories of lesbian working mothers. However, this is not the case. Further investigation into this finding follows.

To better understand how indicated caregiving condition may interact with sexual orientation shown in Table 2, I performed an ANOVA for primary versus secondary caregivers within each sexual orientation category. Primary caregivers are hypothesized to receive lower assessments than secondary caregivers per *Hypothesis 2* and lesbian or gay parents are hypothesized to receive lower assessments than heterosexual parents as stated in *Hypotheses 3a-3d*. As seen in *Hypothesis 3a-d*, penalties for gay and lesbian parents can differ depending upon colocation with caregiving position and gender. For this reason, I investigate how a caregiving penalty may differ depending upon colocation with sexual orientation by testing primary versus secondary caregiving gay and lesbian parents as well as primary versus secondary caregiving heterosexual parents separately (seen in Table 2). These two additional tests aid in illustrating these interactions.

[Table 5 about here]

I find that means do not differ between primary caregiving and secondary caregiving, gay and lesbian parents. In contrast, as seen in Table 5, means do differ between primary caregiving and secondary caregiving heterosexual parents. Primary

caregiving heterosexual parents received lower assessments than secondary caregiving heterosexual parents in organized ($F(1, 327)=3.5$, $p <.10$), capable ($F(1, 327)=3.6$, $p <.10$), committed ($F(1, 329)=10.3$, $p < .01$), and competent ($F(1, 327)=3.7$, $p <.10$). While organized, capable, and competent only approach significance, committed is highly significant for primary caregiving heterosexual parents as compared to secondary caregiving heterosexual parents. This significant relationship indicates that for heterosexual parents, primary caregiving condition yields lower evaluations of commitment, which is consistent with the caregiving penalty predicted by Hypothesis 2 (albeit across sexual orientation conditions). I derive the predictions for *Hypotheses 4* and *5* from prior work that illustrates the lesbian wage premium and gay male wage penalty (Baumle 2009; Baumle and Poston 2011). As a result, in *Hypothesis 4* I predict that, when caregiving is not indicated, lesbian mothers receive higher evaluations than heterosexual mothers. Conversely, in *Hypothesis 5* I predict that, when caregiving is not indicated, gay fathers receive lower evaluations than heterosexual fathers. However, as seen in Table 2, I find no support for either *Hypothesis 4* or *5*. In fact, only the organized measure ($F(1, 159)=3.1$, $p < .10$) approaches significance, showing that gay fathers receive higher evaluations than heterosexual fathers (m=5.28 vs. m=4.94, respectively), contrary to prediction.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

In the second section of analysis, I investigate whether the significant interaction of sexual orientation and caregiving status was robust when respondent characteristics were controlled. I ran several regression models to investigate two-way interactions and to

control for other variables. The inclusion of controls reduces the likelihood that results are driven by other factors, such as respondent gender, respondent child status, and respondent homophobia. I use these models to better illustrate the significant results from ANOVA testing. In Table 6, I include main effects of gender (1=female) and sexual orientation (1=gay/lesbian) and two dummy variables measuring caregiving, with "not indicated" as the comparison category. I also include dummy variables to control for respondent gender (1=female), respondent parental status (1=parent), and respondent homophobic status (1=homophobic).[6]

[Table 6 about here]

Once controlling for the significant effects of respondent gender and respondent child status, sexual orientation and caregiving impacts emerge. When controlling for respondent gender and child status, respondents rate gay and lesbian parent job candidates as significantly less likely to be seen for an interview or to be considered for the promotion track than heterosexual parent job candidates. Respondents rate primary caregivers as significantly less suitable, less capable, less committed, and less competent than not indicated caregivers. Interestingly, secondary caregivers also were rated significantly less suitable than not indicated caregivers. In results presented in table 1, not indicated caregivers receive higher scores than both primary and secondary caregivers. This finding appears to be echoing that result.

The control variables, especially, respondent gender and respondent parent status, are significant for numerous dependent variables, indicating a consistent effect. However, vignette gender is non-significant for all dependent variables. In Table 6, Respondent

[6] In additional analyses, age was added to these models as a control. Similar patterns to those seen in the presented models emerged with the inclusion of this control.

Female mean scores reveal higher scores from female respondents than from male respondents (see Table 7) for the dependent variables suitable ($p < .01$), interview ($p < .10$), hire ($p < .05$), promotion ($p < .05$), salary ($p < .05$), organized ($p < .05$), capable ($p < .01$), committed ($p < .05$), and competent ($p < .01$). Further, respondents who are themselves parents rate vignette candidates (all of whom are also parents) significantly more organized ($p < .01$), capable ($p < .05$), and competent ($p < .05$) than do non-parent respondents. Respondent homophobia has no effect.[7]

[Table 7 about here]

As seen in ANOVA results for *Hypothesis 3d*, interactions may be driving the significance presented in Table 6. Therefore, I run Model 2 (Table 8) with these items and the interaction terms included. In Model 2, respondent gender and respondent parent status continue to have the same significant effects as described previously. Likewise, vignette gender and respondent homophobia remain non-significant. The sexual orientation x gender interaction and the gender x primary caregiving and gender x secondary caregiving interactions are also non-significant across all dependent variables.

[Table 8 about here]

Notable, even with controls, the interaction between sexual orientation and secondary caregiving status continues to emerge as significant, reflecting the pattern of means captured by the sexual orientation x caregiving interaction effect illustrated in the ANOVA results. However, the sexual orientation, primary, and secondary main effects

[7] Possible moderating effects arising from respondent characteristics were tested in additional analyses: age, political party affiliation, and homophobia. I ran Model 1 within subgroups of each of these possible moderators after creating a binary variable for each (younger/older, democrat/republican, homophobic/not homophobic). Within these subcategories I find slight differences, though the overall patterns of findings presented here in Model 1 are consistent throughout.

significance do not remain significant from Model 1 to Model 2. The significance seen in Model 1 disappears in Model 2 owing to the specific sexual orientation x secondary caregiving interaction. The sexual orientation x secondary caregiving interaction highlights significant differences in scores for suitable ($p < .05$), hire ($p < .01$), promotion ($p < .05$), organized ($p < .05$), capable ($p < .05$), committed ($p < .05$), and competent ($p < .05$). As shown in table 3, gay and lesbian breadwinners are evaluated significantly lower than heterosexual breadwinners on all but two of the main dependent variables.

In summary, these multivariate and ANOVA analyses indicate that *Hypothesis 1, 2, 3a-c, and Hypotheses 4* and *5* are not supported, however strong effects are found for *Hypotheses 3d*. Given that there is a significant effect of sexual orientation among secondary caregiving mothers (Hypothesis 3d), the lack of a similar finding for gay primary caregiving fathers is noteworthy, as is the lack of a premium for the ideal worker prototype, heterosexual secondary caregiving fathers. These data and multivariate regression analyses reveal a strong impact of sexual orientation among secondary caregivers. ANOVA testing shows a strong effect for sexual orientation especially among secondary caregiving mothers where lesbian breadwinners are more heavily penalized than heterosexual breadwinning mothers. *Hypothesis 2* was not supported and a penalty for primary caregivers when compared to secondary caregivers was not found. However, when looking within the two sexual orientation categories (gay/lesbian and heterosexual), a penalty for primary caregiving parents when compared to secondary caregiving parents emerges, but only among heterosexual parents. A discussion of these findings and suggestions for future research follows.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

In this study, I examine how caregiving status impacts workplace evaluations and how this interacts with both gender and sexual orientation. Overall, my study generates two key sets of findings, which pose two puzzles. First, the significant main effects found in the literature do not emerge in my study. Most striking, there is no motherhood penalty or fatherhood premium for the full sample in my results. Second, my study shows significant relations for specific *combinations* of gender, parenting status, and sexual orientation. In particular, the effect of sexual orientation on employer evaluations is contingent upon gender and caregiving condition. These findings suggest a more nuanced pattern of premiums and penalties that differ depending jointly on gender, caregiving status, and sexual orientation.

Historically, research has explained the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium within the context of heterosexuality and gendered assumptions regarding caregiving. Mothers are presumed to be the primary caregiver and in a heterosexual relationship with a secondary caregiving husband, while fathers are presumed to be the secondary caregiver and in a heterosexual relationship with a primary caregiving wife. In this current work, by experimentally manipulating gender, caregiving position, and sexual orientation, I create conditions that provide explicit information that may not conform to these gender normative assumptions.

My goal is to build on the body of prior work, much of it framed in terms of Expectation States Theory (EST), where these gender normative assumptions operate, suggesting a motherhood penalty and a fatherhood premium, at least for heterosexual parents. This study makes two contributions to this literature. First, for heterosexual

parents, there is a penalty associated with primary caregiving. This underscores the mechanism that fuels the traditionally conceived motherhood penalty: not gender, but rather caregiving status. For heterosexual primary caregiving parents, the negative evaluations when contrasted with heterosexual secondary caregiving parents, emerges not in the workplace evaluations of interview and hire, but rather in the evaluations of competence and commitment. This underscores the importance of training hiring managers to consider the impact of implicit bias on perceptions.

Second, for gay and lesbian parents (and particularly for lesbian parents) there is a penalty associated with secondary caregiving. In summary, heterosexual parents who do not show commitment to work by prioritizing the work sphere over the home sphere suffer negative consequences in the workplace. In contrast, female parents in same-sex couples endure negative workplace outcomes when they do not show commitment to child caregiving. For lesbian breadwinning mothers, negative evaluations, when contrasted to heterosexual breadwinning mothers, are striking and are not limited to perceptions of competence and commitment. Not only would interventions and policies need to address getting such potential employees in the door, they would need to address implicit bias that hiring managers may have about lesbian breadwinning mothers.

Employers, though legally bound to be non-discriminatory, still form impressions of potential workers based on presented characteristics. These impressions lead to differing evaluations of competence, commitment, and the likelihood of hire or promotion track placement. In this study's experimental design, unlike previous work in this area, I present more information to respondents. Investigating how more information leads to a different set of penalties and premiums contributes to a greater understanding

of the underlying penalties that often plague working parents in the United States. Below, I contribute to this more nuanced understanding by presenting possible explanations for these two sets of findings. I start by discussing how these findings are inconsistent with prior work in terms of the lack of significant main effects. Then, I discuss the significant contingent effects I find in the test results. I conclude with theoretical implications as well as suggestions for future research.

I: WHY ARE THERE LIMITED MAIN EFFECTS?

Expectation States Theory (EST) provides a framework for understanding how individuals, such as employers, develop differing expectations depending upon the characteristics of others, such as a potential job candidate. In the absence of specific, task-related information, EST contends that diffuse characteristics, such as gender, provide evaluators with enough information to fill in the gaps and form differing assessments (for example, of men versus women.) However, this information is based on assumptions and stereotypes about groups of people holding that particular characteristic. Thus, the stereotypes and cultural normative expectations associated with characteristics can impact assessments of competence and other workplace evaluations. Following EST, several of the hypotheses in this study propose lower evaluations for job applicants described in terms of the more devalued level of status characteristics represented by gender, caregiving, and sexual orientation. Analyses examine both main effects for each of the status characteristics as well as specific predictions focused on particular configurations of the characteristics. No significant main effects emerged for any of these status characteristics.

Prior research on mothers and fathers in the workplace shows that mothers are penalized in evaluations while fathers enjoy higher evaluations (Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Correll et al. 2007; Fuegen et al. 2004; Glauber 2008). These studies focus on mothers and fathers compared to each other or to non-parents. It is important to note that in these studies the caregiving conditions of these mothers and fathers are not indicated. Thus, as described in EST, when information is missing, stereotypes fill the gaps, leading to assumptions and, as a result, mothers are often penalized while fathers are rewarded. The intervening mechanism, I argue, is an expectation of primary caregiving for mothers and an expectation of secondary caregiving for fathers.

In this study, I find a non-significant result for gender as a main effect in the full sample; that is, even when controlling for respondent gender and child status, there does not appear to be either a motherhood penalty or a fatherhood premium. This is surprising, given the literature documenting both of these effects (Ridgeway and Correll 2004; Correll et al. 2007; Fuegen et al. 2004; Glauber 2008). One reason the present results differ from those documented in the literature is the framing in this study of parenthood penalties not around gender but around caregiving roles, which necessitate different manipulations. Prior studies that examine the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium compare male and female parents to male and female non-parents.

Past research comparing parents to non-parents reveals a striking difference between mothers and fathers. When women become mothers, they experience wage penalties and have fewer opportunities for advancement (Stone 2007; Fuegen et al. 2004). In contrast, when men become fathers, they experience a workplace benefit, being seen as even more of an ideal worker. Fathers' private sphere identity is more aligned with the

breadwinning ideal (relative to men without children) allowing these fathers to reap additional rewards (Budig and England 2001; Glauber 2008). On the other hand, when working women become mothers, their private sphere identity does not yield workplace benefits. Instead working mothers experience dueling ideal expectations, and are often viewed as failing each (Stone 2007). This disparity between men and women who are parents stands in sharp contrast to childless men and women, where workplace gender equality approaches parity (Crittendon 2001).

Rather than comparing parents to non-parents, I contrast finer subsets of parents to each other, for example primary caregivers versus secondary caregivers as in *Hypothesis 2*. While I still anticipate finding an overall effect for gender when comparing mothers and fathers, this experimental design specifically addresses an issue that has not been considered in the previous literature on the motherhood penalty: the normative assumptions of the evaluator regarding mothers and fathers. In prior research, respondents compare working mothers and fathers without information that clearly identifies which parent has primary or secondary caregiving responsibility. The findings of these studies, therefore, rely on an assumption based on the parent's gender as to which parent is primary (mothers) and which is secondary (fathers). This assumption is rooted in heteronormative beliefs as well. Evaluators will assume, when other information is not presented, that mothers are the primary caregivers; this has deleterious effects with regard to career for working mothers. By relying on these heteronormative, gendered caregiving assumptions in research when finding penalties for mothers and premiums for fathers, it is difficult to discern whether the penalty mothers face is due to gender or an assumption of primary caregiving, as both are assumed to be present for

women. By clearly delineating the caregiving status of both mothers and fathers (either as primary or secondary caregivers) in my experimental design, I preempt the traditionally conceived motherhood penalty comparing men and women. The lack of a significant result in testing the gender main effect suggests that this design innovation is effective: With equal numbers of primary and secondary mothers and fathers in these data, the motherhood penalty disappears. However, it is surprising that a gendered effect does not emerge in the "not specified" caregiving condition in *Hypothesis 1*, where gendered assumptions are anticipated.

The non-significance for a gender penalty is fitting when looking at the lack of a main gendered effect finding through the lens of a supply side perspective with Human Capital Theory (HCT). In my study's experimental design, I assign each male or female candidate a caregiving status: primary, secondary, or not indicated. As a result, women and men are evenly represented in each caregiving condition vignette, representing a different set of choices. HCT explains differing career opportunities and wage disparities among men and women as a result of different choices made by men and women. In my vignettes, I essentially have set these choices for men and women as equal (same education and work experience, equal representation in primary and secondary caregiving vignettes), and doing so may suppress the appearance of the penalty. Therefore, in this study, with explicit and equal experience and education, gender does not have a strong effect.

In EST terms, these findings suggest that information on diffuse status characteristics, such as gender, has less of an impact than information on specific status characteristics. In this study, specific status characteristics, like education and relevant

work experience, were held constant for all job applicant vignettes. In the absence of specific status characteristics, EST indicates that evaluators will look to diffuse status characteristics to assess perceived competence and abilities (Berger et al. 1980; Ridgeway 1991). Yet *Hypothesis 1* only includes the not indicated caregivers, where theoretically according to EST, expectations of a gender penalty would emerge as no caregiving position is indicated. HCT does not, however, provide an argument for why women would receive lower evaluations than men given the same information provided.

Queer Theory also emphasizes the relevance of *what you do* over *who you are*. This performativity of gender is most salient according to Queer Theory, and as such the gender categories will be less relevant than the performances, or conditions, of each vignette. Therefore, when these traditional gender roles are spread evenly across gender categories, the lack of a significant gender main effect on evaluations is also not surprising. Yet, like EST, Queer Theory would anticipate a performance expectation based penalty for mothers over fathers in the workplace. Thus, the non-results for *Hypothesis 1* are surprising when viewed from an EST or Queer Theory lens. It is possible that respondents working with Time-Sharing Experiments for the Social Sciences (TESS) are more politically correct, or as they have done other online experiments, they are more aware of desirable answers to such questions and may be more generous with mothers and tougher on fathers than they would be in a real work scenario. It is also possible that this is a signal that over time even deeply held and firmly entrenched gendered assumptions do change and associated evaluations along with them.

While HCT and Queer Theory provide arguments as to why no main effect emerges for gender, they do not provide any insights regarding the non-significance of

Hypothesis 2. In my test of *Hypothesis 2*, I examine the prediction that primary caregiving parents receive lower evaluations than their secondary caregiving parent counterparts. Although there is some support indicating lower evaluations for primary caregivers as compared to secondary caregivers for commitment to work, on other dimensions the tests do not support *Hypothesis 2*. It bears noting, however, that these results include evaluations for both gay and lesbian parents as well as heterosexual parents, and it would follow from an EST and Queer Theory perspective that evaluations may differ depending upon both characteristics. Gender performance expectations and the associated assessments may differ depending upon a combination of gender and sexual orientation.

The sexual orientation main effect is marginally significant, with heterosexual parents rated more highly than gay/lesbian parents for likelihood of interview and promotion track. While some support for this main effect emerges, it is not significant across most of the dependent measures. EST arguments lead to an expectation of a penalty for the gay/lesbian parents, as being gay or lesbian is considered the lesser-valued characteristic of sexual orientation and deviates from the ideal, which is heterosexual. Similar to the findings for gender, it is possible that the stronger impact of specific status characteristics (education, work history) is suppressing any diffuse status characteristic (sexual orientation) impact. However, while strong main effects do not emerge, results from other tests show that penalties are found. These penalties do appear to operate differently depending upon colocation with sexual orientation and gender categories.

Before investigating these colocation and contingent effects, it is also worth noting the possibility that these null findings are a result of measurement issues or the

nature of the sample. As noted earlier, it is possible that respondents are savvy survey takers and are aware of desirable, politically correct answers, thus skewing these data. However, given that these data were collected via TESS and their data collection protocol ensured that these data were collected under high standards of methodological rigor, I expect that this sort of measurement error is unlikely.

II: HIDDEN BINDS AND FREEDOMS IN CONTINGENT EFFECTS

Both Queer Theory and Expectation States Theory predict potentially differing experiences for gay/lesbian and heterosexual parents, due to gendered performance expectations and the subsequent devaluation of non-ideal performances and characteristics. These two hierarchies may overlap to create unique binds or freedoms for working parents, depending upon their set of characteristics and gender performance expectations. Such binds are illustrated in the results from *Hypothesis 3d,* indicating a penalty against lesbian breadwinner mothers when compared to heterosexual breadwinner mothers, as well as the penalty only within heterosexual parents against primary caregivers. Caregiving condition and sexual orientation hierarchies appear to be overlapping in such a way to create binds for primary caregiving heterosexual parents (male and female) as well as lesbian secondary caregiving mothers.

Hypotheses 3a-d, 4, and *5* address the combinations of sexual orientation, gender, and caregiving position. *Hypotheses 3a-d* predict that within caregiving position and gender groups, gay and lesbian parents will receive lower evaluations than heterosexual parents. The results do not support *Hypotheses 3a-c*. Not only were both primary and secondary caregiving gay and heterosexual male comparisons insignificant, but also the

primary caregiving female lesbian and heterosexual contrast was non-significant. It is possible that I do not find a difference between gay/lesbian primary caregiving parents and heterosexual primary caregiving parents in *Hypothesis 3a* and *Hypothesis 3c* because heterosexual primary caregiving parents are also evaluated less favorably as well. For the secondary caregiving father contrast in *Hypothesis 3b*, it is possible that breadwinning gay fathers, while not meeting the heteronormative ideal, only deviate from this ideal on one dimension, sexual orientation. It appears that if one deviates from the worker ideal, in what ways, and in how many ways can lead to different workplace outcomes.

Only results relevant to *Hypothesis 3d* are statistically significant. The pattern indicates that respondents evaluate lesbian breadwinning mothers much more harshly than heterosexual breadwinning mothers in measures of competence, commitment, capability, organization, suitability, likelihood of interview, and likelihood of hire. This result contradicts prior research; specifically past research on gay and lesbian workers indicates a lesbian wage premium (Baumle 2009) and a gay male penalty (Baumle and Poston 2011). In this study, and for parents in the not indicated caregiving condition, *Hypothesis 4* predicted a lesbian premium over heterosexual mothers, while *Hypothesis 5* predicted a gay male penalty compared to heterosexual fathers. I do not find support for *Hypotheses 4* or *5*. While my findings do not support a gay male penalty in contrast to heterosexual males, they also do not provide evidence to contradict these claims. My findings regarding lesbian breadwinning mothers, however, do contradict prior claims that lesbians enjoy a strong wage premium relative to heterosexual breadwinning mothers.

There are several possible explanations for these findings. One relates to the hidden binds experienced by lesbian breadwinning mothers and the hidden freedoms for heterosexual breadwinning mothers. Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz (2013) investigate the hidden binds and freedoms that can occur for individuals along intersecting characteristic axes. When individuals deviate from a prototype or ideal, this can create unexpected opportunities or penalties. Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz argue that people interact within multiple systems of inequality, such as race, class, and gender. Just as in EST, each characteristic-based system includes both privileged and unprivileged subgroupings.

In Ridgeway and Kricheli-Katz (2013), more than one system was operating simultaneously, allowing for an intersectional look at the unexpected binds or freedoms emerging at these intersections. The authors note that these systems of inequality are embedded in hegemonic belief systems designed to support and perpetuate dominant groups. It is therefore imperative to understand, in the context of my study, the underlying belief systems (i.e., the ideal) of the dominant groups. The hierarchies of inequality I propose in my study are gender, caregiving, and sexual orientation, where heteronormativity is considered the ideal. I argue that the standard findings that apply to heteronormative, heterosexual parents cannot be easily applied to gay and lesbian parents.

Indeed, ANOVA results comparing primary and secondary caregiving heterosexual parents provide a different pattern than the results comparing primary and secondary caregiving gay and lesbian parents. Caregiving position (i.e., primary versus secondary) appears to have no effect within the group of gay and lesbian parents. For heterosexual parents, in contrast, caregiving position has a very strong effect on

perceived commitment to work, and results approaching significance for other workplace evaluations (organized, capable, and competent), with primary caregivers being rated more harshly than secondary.

Expectations for heterosexual primary caregiving parents' workplace commitment and competence are lower than for heterosexual secondary caregiving parents. The resulting evaluations—organized, capable, committed, competent—have been directly linked to workplace success or failure (Correll and Benard, 2005). Just as gendered performance expectations may differ between gay/lesbian and heterosexual parents, the dichotomous ideal expectations for work and parenthood may also differ or interact in ways not seen for heterosexual parents. When I examine heterosexual parents alone, a primary caregiving penalty in lieu of a motherhood penalty emerges and appears to equally affect heterosexual mothers and fathers when the research design clearly indicates caregiving position.

In past research on the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium, when sexual orientation is left unspecified, heteronormative assumptions fill in the gaps (Foster 2008). However, when sexual orientation is specified, as my results show, evaluations for and the experiences of gay and lesbian parents are quite different than those for and of heterosexual parents. By clearly specifying and experimentally manipulating both sexual orientation and caregiving position, I isolate and identify the intersecting categories that fuel the motherhood penalty seen in the broader literature. It appears that the motherhood penalty is built on a number of assumptions, including (but not limited to) primary caregiving and heterosexuality. Evidence for the primary caregiving penalty found in heterosexual parents highlights one aspect of the penalty. However, the findings of my

study are not meant to suggest that gay and lesbian parents escape penalty with regard to caregiving position. Rather, it appears that while a moderate penalty for heterosexual parents falls on primary caregiving parents, lesbian secondary caregiving parents may face an even greater penalty.

Another possible explanation for the significantly lower evaluations for lesbian breadwinning mothers when compared to heterosexual breadwinning mothers may trace back to homophobia. Even though the homophobia measure was non-significant, it is quite possible and quite likely that respondents are simultaneously able to indicate a socially-desirable response with regard to same-sex couples, while penalizing lesbian breadwinners due to latent homophobia. Indeed, Doan, Loehr, and Miller (2014) find a pattern of latent homophobia. These authors find that even among heterosexual individuals who cite support of formal rights, such as partnership benefits, these same individuals are likely not to support informal rights, such as public displays of affection. It is quite possible that the coupled support of same-sex relationships with the low workplace evaluations for lesbian breadwinners reflects just this kind of homophobic and prejudiced response.

Based on literature showing a lesbian wage premium, lesbian breadwinning mothers should be granted freedoms for their similarities to heterosexual breadwinning fathers. Theoretically, an expectation of a masculine gender performance, by virtue of both caregiving position (secondary) as well as sexual orientation and gender interaction (lesbian), should yield a premium for these mothers. In the results, I find no effect for gender and a moderate effect for sexual orientation. When there are penalties for caregiving they are concentrated among primary caregivers. Yet, lesbian secondary

caregiving mothers, in contrast to heterosexual secondary caregiving mothers, experience a significant penalty.

Using a Queer Theory lens, I argue that the caregiving system of inequality is rooted in heteronormative beliefs and thus our understanding of caregiving conditions are gendered. As a consequence, understandings of primary caregivers, which are closely associated with traditional motherhood, are feminized. Yet, the sexual orientation system of inequality is also gendered, where gay men are feminized and lesbian women are masculinized. Taken together, gay men and heterosexual women would be considered feminine, and primary caregiving would be considered a feminine role; lesbian women and heterosexual men would be considered masculine, with secondary caregiving similarly being a masculine role.

What then explains the lesbian breadwinning mother penalty and the heterosexual breadwinning mother premium? And why is a primary caregiving penalty not experienced for gay and lesbian parents? Lesbian breadwinning mothers differ from normative breadwinners in two ways, sexual orientation and gender. This dual-divergence may lead to a penalty for these mothers, as seen in *Hypothesis 3d.* The prototypical worker and prototypical mother archetypes rest upon heteronormative ideals (breadwinning father, primary caregiving mother). While these archetypes have helped explain the underlying penalties and premiums for heterosexual mothers and fathers historically, they may not be useful to analyze the intersecting penalties faced by lesbian breadwinning mothers. Interestingly, however, a similar penalty is not found for dually-divergent gay primary caregiving fathers, as seen in *Hypothesis 3a*, who also deviate from the same two ideals.

It is possible that the *way* in which the candidates deviate from ideals is as important as *whether* deviation from ideals occurred or not. Encroaching on the devalued and feminized primary caregiving characteristic state does not yield an incremental penalty for gay fathers who are already perceived as feminine. In contrast, lesbian breadwinning mothers are perceived to be coopting the more highly-valued breadwinning (or secondary caregiving) and masculinized characteristic state. Alternatively, if heterosexual breadwinning fathers have historically not been judged in such evaluations for not fulfilling the mother ideal and are only revered for satisfying all expected components of the worker ideal, it is possible that lesbian parents are simultaneously judged in accordance to the mother ideal and the worker ideal, and penalized for not adhering to either.

Pedulla (2014) investigates how status characteristics (such as gender and sexual orientation) can combine to create unexpected opportunities or penalties. Pedulla looks at the ways stereotypes inform and interact to create these opportunities and penalties. For example, he finds that while being gay creates negative workplace outcomes for white men, and being black creates negative workplace outcomes for men. However, being a black, gay male creates hidden opportunities. He argues that the stereotypes associated with gay men, being effeminate, and black men, as being threatening, will counteract and create this window of opportunity for black, gay men that does not exist for black heterosexual men or gay white men. It is possible that a similar effect is occurring for the dually-divergent gay primary caregiving fathers and lesbian secondary caregiving mothers. While gay primary caregiving fathers deviate in terms of sexual orientation from a heteronormative mother ideal, they also deviate in terms of caregiving condition

by occupying a space that has historically (and in accordance to ideals) been occupied by heterosexual women.

It bears noting that this penalty for lesbian breadwinning mothers is most clear when contrasted with heterosexual breadwinning mothers. Therefore a potential hidden freedom or premium for heterosexual breadwinning mothers needs to be considered. This may further explain the significance between lesbian breadwinning mothers and heterosexual breadwinning mothers, as means for the latter group are the highest of all 12 vignettes. While means are low for lesbian breadwinning mothers, they are especially low in contrast to the surprisingly high competence and commitment means for heterosexual breadwinning mother. It is possible that these heterosexual breadwinning mothers find a hidden freedom amongst these systems of inequality. Being just feminine enough as to not deviate too drastically from a mother ideal, yet fulfilling the masculinized role of breadwinning, may provide these mothers with unexpected premiums.

III: LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

One limitation of this study is that the vignettes present a clearly a fictitious workplace scenario. An audit study, where the hiring practices of actual companies could be analyzed, would provide greater depth and understanding into these penalties and premiums based on parent sexual orientation and caregiving status. Another limitation of this study, and thus an area for future research, is its focus on white, upper-middle class couples. We may not be able to generalize the findings to couples of other races or socioeconomic classes.

The research suggests several avenues for future research. Further research could incorporate sexual orientation and caregiving condition explicitly, rather than relying on assumptions. Such work could investigate the double standard for gay and lesbian and heterosexual parents in more depth. Ascertaining whether gay/lesbian parents are held to similar or harsher standards as heterosexual parents would aid in our understanding of the binds many working parents experience. Also, respondent characteristics, such as gender and parental status have a significant impact on evaluations in this study. Specifically, parent respondents and female respondents rate parent applicants more favorably than do non-parent respondents and male respondents. Investigating the implications of this in a real work scenario could be enlightening. When companies have more women and parents in positions of power vis-à-vis hiring and promotion, perhaps other parents experience more just and favorable outcomes.

While it is difficult to include all the relevant factors and characteristics that affect a working parent, the growing literature would benefit from work that investigates the intersections of sexual orientation, gender, caregiving, race, class and coupled status. It is also worth revisiting social perceptions of "ideals": are the mother ideal and worker ideal, traditionally conceived, still relevant in today's workplace? It is possible with a more diverse workplace and more policies aimed at encouraging work/life balance that these models are shifting away from the heteronormative, gendered model of the past. Last, theoretical implications borne of this body of work include a reminder to push beyond categories and consider the importance of what we do rather than who we are. Often embedded within these categories of *who we are* that are considered salient in our research, are assumptions about *what we do.* Much of what defines us, such as caregiving

condition, could be considered *both* a specific status characteristic according to EST (such as the parent who spends less time caretaking children) and a diffuse status characteristic (such as a breadwinning parent). Given the demonstrated impact of specific status characteristics over diffuse status characteristics, it is imperative to investigate how what we do and are known to be able to do shapes our outcomes. Focusing our research explicitly on what we do in addition to the categorical spaces in which we live will aid in our greater understanding of why some working parents have a more challenging experience navigating the workplace than others.

TABLES

Table 1: ANALYISIS OF VARIANCE FOR MAIN EFFECTS OF GENDER, CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON EVALUATION VARIABLES

	Suitable	*Interview*	*Hire*	*Promotion*	*Salary*	*Organized*	*Capable*	*Committed*	*Competent*
Gender Main Effect	1.842 (1.04) 1, 946	0.938 (0.46) 1, 948	0.484 (0.28) 1, 947	0.272 (0.16) 1, 949	0.000 (0.00) 1, 944	2.117 (1.30) 1, 944	0.046 (0.03) 1, 947	0.264 (0.18) 1, 949	0.245 (0.15) 1, 944
Gender within Not-Indicated Caregiving (H1)	0.000 (0.00) 1, 313	0.449 (0.20) 1, 314	0.007 (0.00) 1, 311	0.005 (0.00) 1, 312	0.508 (0.65) 1, 315	3.748 (2.08) 1, 310	0.415 (0.26) 1, 313	0.350 (0.23) 1, 316	0.108 (0.07) 1, 311
Primary vs. Secondary (H2)	0.779 (0.45) 1, 631	0.015 (0.01) 1, 632	0.199 (0.11) 1, 634	0.104 (0.06) 1, 635	0.585 (0.81) 1, 627	1.050 (0.68) 1, 632	1.433 (0.85) 1, 632	4.947+ (3.33) 1, 631	1.476 (0.93) 1, 631
Caregiving Main Effect	5.191+ (2.93) 2, 945	0.929 (0.46) 2, 947	2.477 (1.42) 2, 946	1.739 (1.02) 2, 948	0.293 (0.39) 2, 943	0.971 (0.60) 2, 943	2.652 (1.60) 2, 946	5.008* (3.37) 2, 948	3.660 (2.30) 2, 943
Indicated vs. Not Indicated Caregiving	9.603* (5.42) 1, 946	1.843 (0.91) 1, 948	4.754+ (2.74) 1, 947	3.375 (1.97) 1, 949	0.001 (0.00) 1, 944	0.882 (0.54) 1, 944	3.869 (2.33) 1, 947	5.069+ (3.40) 1, 949	5.844+ (3.67) 1, 944
Sexual Orientation Main Effect	1.388 (0.78) 1, 946	9.439* (4.67) 1, 948	2.560 (1.47) 1, 947	5.497+ (3.22) 1, 949	0.084 (0.11) 1, 944	0.312 (0.19) 1, 944	1.769 (1.07) 1, 947	0.464 (0.31) 1, 949	2.738 (1.71) 1, 944

Note: Mean Square values presented with F values in parentheses. DF presented below F values. Bolded tests represent hypotheses indicated. For variable descriptions see text.

+ $p < .10$ * $p < .05$

Table 2: ANALYISIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE INTERACTION OF CAREGIVING CONDITION AND SEXUAL ORIENATION AND THE EFFECTS OF SUBCATEGORIES OF CAREGIVING CONDITION AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON EVALUATION VARIABLES

	Suitable	*Interview*	*Hire*	*Promotion*	*Salary*	*Organized*	*Capable*	*Committed*	*Competent*
	3.830	3.980	5.941*	4.769+	0.189	5.538*	5.999*	5.752	5.214*
Caregiving Condition x Sexual Orientation	(2.17)	(1.97)	(3.44)	(2.80)	(0.25)	(3.40)	(3.64)	(3.89)	(3.29)
	5, 942	5, 944	5, 943	5, 945	5, 940	5, 940	5, 943	5, 945	5, 940
	1.313	1.919	1.629	3.278	0.010	0.212	0.279	0.012	0.302
Gay Primary Father vs. Heterosexual Primary Father (H3a)	(0.79)	(1.13)	(1.04)	(2.39)	(0.02)	(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.01)	(0.25)
	1, 157	1, 155	1, 157	1, 157	1, 154	1, 157	1, 157	1, 157	1, 157
	0.430	4.069	5.120	5.748+	0.409	1.783	4.065	4.046	3.449
Gay Secondary Father vs. Heterosexual Secondary Father (H3b)	(0.25)	(1.93)	(2.70)	(2.98)	(0.55)	(1.02)	(2.07)	(2.46)	(1.78)
	1, 155	1, 155	1, 157	1, 157	1, 155	1, 156	1, 156	1, 157	1, 156
	0.633	0.189	0.025	0.764	1.051	0.096	0.000	0.908	0.046
Lesbian Primary Mother vs. Heterosexual Primary Mother (H3c)	(0.37)	(0.10)	(0.01)	(0.48)	(1.49)	(0.06)	(0.00)	(0.62)	(0.03)
	1, 156	1, 159	1, 158	1, 159	1, 159	1, 159	1, 159	1, 158	1, 159
	5.909+	12.786*	6.716+	4.507	0.225	7.086*	7.525*	5.901+	8.622*
Lesbian Secondary Mother vs. Heterosexual Secondary Mother (H3d)	(3.32)	(6.22)	(3.68)	(2.59)	(0.27)	(4.69)	(5.14)	(3.84)	(5.99)
	1, 157	1, 157	1, 156	1, 156	1, 153	1, 154	1, 154	1, 153	1, 153
	0.055	1.636	1.066	0.780	0.848	0.623	0.493	0.199	0.398
Primary vs. Secondary Gay or Lesbian Parents	(0.03)	(0.75)	(0.54)	(0.42)	(1.13)	(0.36)	(0.27)	(0.11)	(0.23)
	1, 301	1, 300	1, 302	1, 302	1, 300	1, 303	1, 303	1, 300	1, 302
	0.982	1.883	2.533	0.151	0.033	4.787+	5.459+	12.287**	5.216+
Primary vs. Secondary Heterosexual Parents	(0.61)	(1.12)	(1.69)	(0.10)	(0.05)	(3.45)	(3.55)	(10.29)	(3.70)
	1, 328	1, 330	1, 330	1, 331	1, 325	1, 327	1, 327	1, 329	1, 327
	0.069	0.125	2.15	0.568	0.321	0.124	0.138	0.068	0.055
Lesbian vs. Heterosexual Not Indicated Mothers (H4)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(1.08)	(0.27)	(0.43)	(0.06	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.03)
	1, 151	1, 152	1, 150	1, 150	1, 152	1, 149	1, 151	1, 152	1, 150
	3.312	0.249	0.329	0.482	0.400	4.755+	2.745	1.976	2.860
Gay vs. Heterosexual Not Indicated Fathers (H5)	(1.98)	(0.12)	(0.22)	(0.31)	(0.49)	(3.06)	(2.00)	(1.46)	(2.09)
	1, 160	1, 160	1, 159	1, 160	1, 161	1, 159	1, 160	1, 162	1, 159

Note: Mean Square values with F values in parentheses. DF presented below F values. Bolded tests represent hypotheses indicated. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 3: MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR CAREGIVING X SEXUAL ORIENTATION

	Caregiving Not Indicated		*Primary Caregiving*		*Secondary Caregiving*	
	Heterosexual	*Gay/Lesbian*	*Heterosexual*	*Gay/Lesbian*	*Heterosexual*	*Gay/Lesbian*
*Hire**	5.20 (1.33)	5.36 (1.30)	5.15 (1.23)	5.06 (1.31)	5.33 (1.22)	4.94 (1.50)
Promotion+	5.02 (1.32)	5.14 (1.37)	5.07 (1.16)	4.85 (1.27)	5.11 (1.26)	4.75 (1.44)
*Organized**	5.12 (1.33)	5.32 (1.35)	5.11 (1.55)	5.12 (1.26)	5.35 (1.20)	5.03 (1.36)
*Capable**	5.41 (1.34)	5.57 (1.20)	5.33 (1.27)	5.29 (1.28)	5.59 (1.21)	5.21 (1.41)
*Competent**	5.47 (1.33)	5.59 (1.22)	5.35 (1.17)	5.29 (1.24)	5.60 (1.20)	5.21 (1.40)
n	155	154	165	151	161	150

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$

Table 4: MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR SECONDARY CAREGIVING MOTHERS

	Heterosexual	*Lesbian*
Suitable+	5.40 (1.22)	5.01 (1.46)
*Interview**	5.81 (1.24)	5.24 (1.63)
Hire+	5.32 (1.14)	4.90 (1.56)
*Organized**	5.48 (1.17)	5.06 (1.29)
*Capable**	5.69 (1.15)	5.25 (1.28)
Committed+	5.53 (1.06)	5.14 (1.42)
*Competent**	5.72 (1.14)	5.25 (1.26)
n	82	72

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses.
$+p < .10$ $*p < .05$

Table 5: MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR HETEROSEXUAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CAREGIVERS

	Heterosexual Primary Caregivers	*Heterosexual Secondary Caregivers*
Organized+	5.11 (1.15)	5.35 (1.20)
Capable+	5.33 (1.27)	5.59 (1.21)
*Committed***	5.07 (1.10)	5.45 (1.09)
Competent+	5.35 (1.17)	5.60 (1.20)
n	165	161

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses.
+$p < .10$ **$p < .01$

Table 6: ESTIMATED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, PRIMARY V. SECONDARY CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND CONTROLS ON EVALUATION VARIABLES

	Suitable	*Interview*	*Hire*	*Promotion*	*Salary*	*Organized*	*Capable*	*Committed*	*Competent*
Female	-0.071	-0.032	-0.035	-0.030	0.005	0.096	0.016	-0.040	0.028
	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.083)	(0.083)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.082)
Gay/Lesbian	-0.120	-0.242**	-0.035	-0.182*	-0.027	-0.050	-0.103	-0.068	-0.122
	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.057)	(0.083)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.082)
Primary	-0.249*	-0.150	-0.199+	-0.112	-0.068	-0.127	-0.211*	-0.248*	-0.242*
Caregiving	(0.110)	(0.117)	(0.108)	(0.109)	(0.072)	(0.106)	(0.106)	(0.101)	(0.104)
Secondary	-0.217*	-0.143	-0.188+	-0.160	0.009	-0.057	-0.138	-0.087	-0.166+
Caregiving	(0.106)	(0.113)	(0.105)	(0.105)	(0.070)	(0.102)	(0.103)	(0.098)	(0.101)
Respondent	0.257**	0.161+	0.234**	0.259**	0.156**	0.172*	0.203*	0.182*	0.212**
Female	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.057)	(0.083)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.082)
Respondent	0.094	0.165+	0.144	0.070	0.008	0.313***	0.255**	0.159+	0.261**
Parent	(0.090)	(0.096)	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.059)	(0.087)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.085)
Respondent	0.145	0.073	0.094	0.125	-0.035	0.021	0.025	0.090	0.014
Homophobic	(0.093)	(0.099)	(0.092)	(0.093)	(0.061)	(0.090)	(0.091)	(0.086)	(0.089)

Note: df = 7, 906. Regression Coefficients with SEs in parentheses. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ ** p< .01 *** p<.001

Table 7: MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR SIGNIFICANT DEPENDENT VARIABLES BY RESPONDENT GENDER

	Female Respondents	*Male Respondents*
*Suitable***	5.39 (1.32)	5.16 (1.34)
Interview+	5.63 (1.41)	5.51 (1.44)
*Hire***	5.27 (1.34)	5.08 (1.30)
*Promotion***	5.10 (1.30)	4.88 (1.32)
*Salary***	2.10 (0.88)	1.97 (0.84)
*Organized**	5.25 (1.29)	5.09 (1.26)
*Capable**	5.50 (1.26)	5.30 (1.31)
*Committed**	5.32 (1.23)	5.16 (1.21)
*Competent***	5.53 (1.24)	5.31 (1.28)
n	479	465

Note: Standard deviations in parentheses.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$

Table 8: ESTIMATED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND INTERACTIONS ON EVALUATION VARIABLES

	Suitable	*Interview*	*Hire*	*Promotion*	*Salary*	*Organized*	*Capable*	*Committed*	*Competent*
Female	0.127	-0.032	-0.001	0.006	-0.007	0.320	0.131	-0.034	0.112
	(0.174)	(0.185)	(0.171)	(0.173)	(0.114)	(0.167)	(0.169)	(0.160)	(0.152)
Gay/Lesbian	0.208	-0.130	0.047	0.025	0.054	0.244	0.143	0.106	0.131
	(0.173)	(0.184)	(0.170)	(0.172)	(0.114)	(0.166)	(0.168)	(0.159)	(0.164)
Primary	0.059	-0.091	-0.017	0.102	-0.077	0.112	-0.012	-0.172	-0.104
Caregiving	(0.186)	(0.197)	(0.182)	(0.183)	(0.121)	(0.177)	(0.179)	(0.170)	(0.175)
Secondary	0.048	0.002	0.137	0.070	-0.137	0.180	0.056	0.054	-0.023
Caregiving	(0.186)	(0.198)	(0.183)	(0.184)	(0.122)	(0.179)	(0.180)	(0.171)	(0.176
Gay/Lesbian x	-0.298	-0.000	-0.152	-0.243	-0.047	-0.082	-0.076	0.028	-0.060
Primary	(0.213)	(0.226)	(0.209)	(0.211)	(0.140)	(0.204)	(0.206)	(0.195)	(0.201)
Caregiving									
Gay/Lesbian x	-0.445*	-0.351	-0.559**	-0.443*	0.069	-0.462*	-0.479*	-0.463*	0.441*
Secondary	(0.217)	(0.226)	(0.213)	(0.215)	(0.142)	(0.208)	(0.209)	(0.199)	(0.205)
Caregiving									
Female x	-0.153	0.011	0.109	0.048	-0.173	-0.217	-0.113	-0.054	-0.166
Gay/Lesbian	(0.173)	(0.184)	(0.170)	(0.172)	(0.114)	(0.166)	(0.167)	(0.159)	(0.164)
Female x Primary	-0.281	-0.088	-0.176	-0.161	0.067	-0.350+	-0.178	-0.134	-0.174
Caregiving	(0.212)	(0.226)	(0.209)	(0.210)	(0.139)	(0.204)	(0.205)	(0.195)	(0.201)
Female x	-0.088	0.056	-0.098	-0.020	0.227	-0.021	0.084	0.174	0.150
Secondary	(0.212)	(0.226)	(0.209)	(0.211)	(0.140)	(0.204)	(0.206)	(0.195)	(0.201)
Caregiving									
Respondent	0.256**	0.163+	0.235**	0.261**	0.157**	0.170*	0.203*	0.184*	0.213**
Female	(0.087)	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.086)	(0.057)	(0.083)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.082)
Respondent Parent	0.084	0.165+	0.137	0.063	0.010	0.309***	0.253**	0.162+	0.260**
	(0.090)	(0.096)	(0.089)	(0.089)	(0.059)	(0.087)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.085)
Respondent	0.183+	0.108	0.145	0.162+	-0.044	0.067	0.071	0.136	0.057
Homophobic	(0.095)	(0.102)	(0.094)	(0.095)	(0.063)	(0.092)	(0.092)	(0.088)	(0.090)

Note: df = 12, 901. Regression Coefficients with SEs in parentheses. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ ** p< .01 *** p<.001

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4:139-159.

Aranda, Beatriz and Peter Glick. 2014. "Signaling devotion to work over family undermines the motherhood penalty." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 17(1): 91-99.

Badgett, M. V. Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48(4): 726-39.

Badgett, M. V. Lee. (1999). "Income inflation: The myth of affluence among gay, lesbian, and bisexual Americans." Washington, DC: Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force and the Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies.

Badgett, M.V.Lee., Gates. G.J., & Maisel, N.C. (2008). "Registered domestic partnerships among gay men and lesbians: The role of economic factors." *Review of Economics of the Household,* 6, 327-346.

Baumle, Amanda K. 2009. "The Cost of Parenthood: Unraveling the Effects of Sexual Orientation and Gender on Income." *Social Science Quarterly* 90(4): 983-1002.

Baumle, Amanda K. and Dudley L. Poston, Jr. 2011. "The Economic Cost of Homosexuality: Multilevel Analysis." *Social Forces* 89(3):1005-1031.

Beatty, J.E. and S. L. Kirby. 2006. "Beyond the Legal Environment: How Stigma Influences Invisible Identity Groups in the Workplace." *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 18(1): 29-44.

Becker, Gary S. 1975. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education, 2d edition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Berg, Nathan and Donald Lien. 2002. "Measuring the Effect of Sexual Orientation on Income: Evidence of Discrimination?" *Contemporary Economic Policy* 20(4): 394-414.

Berger, J., S. Rosenholtz, and M. Zelditch Jr. 1980. "Status Organizing Processes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6:479-508.

Bertrand, Marianne and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market

Discrimination." *The American Economic Review:* Sept 2004:991-1011.

Bianchi, Suzanne and Melissa Milkie. 2010. "Work and Family Research in the First Decade of the 21st Century." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72: 705-725.

Biblarz, Timothy and Judith Stacey. 2010. "How does the gender of parents matter?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72: 3-22.

Bielby, Denise D. and William T. Bielby. 1993. "She Works Hard for the Money: Household Responsibilities and the Allocation of Work Effort. *American Journal of Sociology* 93(5):1031-1059.

Blandford, J. "The Nexus of Sexual Orientation and Gender in the Determination of Earnings." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 56(4), 622–643.

Bridges, Judith and Claire Etaugh. 1995. "College Students' Perceptions of Mothers: Effects of Maternal Employment-Childrearing Pattern and Motive for Employment." *Sex Roles 32*:735—751.

Browne, Irene and Joya Misra. 2003. "The Intersection of Gender and Race in The Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:487-513.

Buchanan, Tom. 2014. "The Influence of Gender Role Attitudes on Perceptions of Women's Work Performance and the Importance of Fair Pay," Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association, 34:3:203-221, DOI: 10.1080/02732173.2014.895637

Buddel, Neil. 2011. "Queering the Workplace." *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 23(1): 131-146.

Budig, Michelle and Paula England. 2001. "The Wage Penalty for Motherhood." *American Sociological Review* 66: 204-225.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Cahill, Sean and Sarah Tobias. 2007. *Policy Issues Affecting Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Families.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Campbell, Colin and Jessica Pearlman. 2013. "Period effects, cohort effects, and the narrowing gender wage gap." *Social Science Research* 42:1693-1711.

Carli, Linda L, and Alice H, Eagly, 1999, "Gender Effects on Social Influence and Emergent Leadership," Pp, 203-22 in *Handbook of Gender and Work,* edited by Gary N, Powell, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carpenter, C.S. (2008). Sexual orientation, work, and income in Canada. *Canadian*

Journal of Economics 41:1239-1261.

Cha, Youngjoo. 2013. "Overwork and the Persistence of Gender Segregation in Occupations." *Gender & Society* 27(2):158-184.

Childers, Kevin. 2000. "Status Characteristics Theory and Sexual Orientation: Explaining Gender Differences in Responses to Sexual Orientation." *Current Research in Social Psychology* 5(11): 191-206.

Ciano-Boyce, Claudia and Lynn Shelley-Sireci. 2003. "Who is Mommy Tonight? Lesbian Parenting Issues." *Journal of Homosexuality* 43(2):1-13.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment, 2nd Edition.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Correll, Shelley J. and Cecilia L. Ridgeway. 2003. "Expectation States Theory." Pp. 29-52 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by J. Delamater. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Correll, Shelley, Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2007. "Getting a Job: Is there a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5): 1297-1338.

Correll, Shelley, Erin Kelly, Lindsey Trimble O'Connor, and Joan C. Williams. 2014. "Redesigning, Redefining Work." *Work and Occupations* 41(1):3-17.

Crenshaw, Kimberle Williams. 1988. "Race, Reform, and Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Antidiscrimination Law." *Harvard Law Review* 101(7):1331-1387.

Crittendon, Ann. 2001. *The Price of Motherhood: Why the Most Important Job in the World is Still the Least Valued*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Cuddy, Amy J.C., Susan T. Fiske, and Peter Glick. 2004. "When Professionals Become Mothers, Warmth Doesn't Cut the Ice." *Journal of Social Issues* 60:701-718.

Damaske, Sarah. 2011. *For the Family? How Class and Gender Shape Women's Work.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Demerjian, Sascha W. 2014. "Parenthood and Penalties in the Workplace: Gender and Primary Caregiving Dynamics." Working paper—Emory University Sociology.

Doan, Long, Annalise Loehr, and Lisa R. Miller. 2014. "Formal Rights and Informal Privileges for Same-Sex Couples: Evidence from a National Survey Experiment."

American Sociological Review 79(6):1172-1195.

Eldeman, Lee. 1995. 'Queer Theory: Unstating Desire." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 2(4):343-346.

Embrick, D.G., C.S. Walther, and C.M. Wickens. 2007. "Working Class Masculinity: Keeping Gay Men and Lesbians out of the Workplace." *Sex Roles* 56: 757-766.

England, Paula. 1982. "The Failure of Human Capital Theory to Explain Occupational Sex Segregation." *The Journal of Human Resources* 17(3):358-370.

England, Paula and George Farkas. 1985. *Households, Employment and Gender: A Social, Economic and Demographic View."* New York, NY: Aldine.

England, Paula, George Farkas, Barbara Stanek Kilbourne and Thomas Dou. 1988. "Explaining Occupational Sex Segregation and Wages: Findings from a Model with Fixed Effects." *American Sociological Review* 53:544-558.

Etaugh, Claire and Karen Nekolny. 1990. "Effects of Employment Status and Marital Status on Perceptions of Mothers." *Sex Roles* 23:273-280.

Fassinger, R. 1996. "Notes from the Margins: Integrating Lesbian Experience into the Vocational Psychology of Women." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 48:160–175.

Foster, Elissa. 2008. "Commitment, Communication, and Contending with Heteronormativity: An Invitation to Greater Reflexivity in Interpersonal Research." *Southern Communication Journal* 73(1):84-101.

Fuegen, Kathleen, Monica Biernat, Elizabeth Haines, and Kay Deaux. 2004. "Mothers and Fathers in the Workplace: How Gender and Parental Status Influence Judgments of Job-Related Competence." *Journal of Social Issues* 60(4): 737-754.

Friskopp, A., and S. Silverstein. 1995. *Straight Jobs, Gay Lives*. New York: Scribner.

Fulcher, M., E. Sutfin, and C.J. Patterson. 2008. "Individual Differences in Gender Development: Associations with Parental Sexual Orientation, Attitudes, and Division of Labor." *Sex Roles* 58:330-341.

Gates, Trevor and Christopher Mitchell. 2013. "Workplace Stigma-Related Experiences Among Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Workers: Implications for Social Policy and Practice." *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health* 28(3): 159-171.

Gaunt, Ruth. 2012. "Breadwinning Moms, Caregiving Dads: Double Standard in Social Judgments of Gender Norm Violators." *Journal of Family Issues* 34(1):3-24.

Gedro, Julie. 2006. “Lesbians: Identifying, Facing, and Navigating the Double Bind of Sexual Orientation and Gender in Organizational Settings.” Pp. 41-50 in *Challenging Homophobia and Heterosexism: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Issues in Organizational Settings, number 112 (winter),* edited by Robert J. Hill. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Glauber, Rebecca. 2008. “Race and Gender in Families and at Work: The Fatherhood Wage Premium.” *Gender and Society* 22:8-30.

Giuffre, Patti, Kirsten Dellinger, and Christine L. Williams. 2008. “’No Retribution for Being Gay?’: Inequality in Gay-Friendly Workplaces.” *Sociological Spectrum* 28:254-277.

Glass, Jennifer.1990. “The Impact of Occupational Segregation on Working Conditions.” *Social Forces* 68(3): 779-796.

Glick, Peter and Susan T. Fiske. 2001. “An Ambivalent Alliance: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism as Complementary Justifications for Gender Inequality.” *American Psychologist* 56(2):109-118.

Goldberg, Abbie E. 2012. *Gay dads: Transitions to adoptive fatherhood.* New York: New York University Press.

Goldberg, Abbie E. 2013. "“Doing” and “Undoing” Gender: The Meaning and Division of Housework in Same- Sex Couples." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5.2: 85-104.

Goldberg, Abbie E. and Maureen Perry-Jenkins. 2007. "The division of labor and perceptions of parental roles: Lesbian couples across the transition to parenthood." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 24.2: 297-318.

Goldberg, Abbie E., JuliAnna Z. Smith, and Maureen Perry-Jenkins. 2012. “The Division of Labor in Lesbian, Gay and Heterosexual New Adoptive Parents.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74:812-828.

Goldberg, Abbie E. and JuliAnna Z. Smith. 2013. “Work Conditions and Mental Health in Lesbian and Gay Dual-Earner Parents.” *Family Relations* 62:727-740.

Griffin, P. 1998. *Strong Women, Deep Closets*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics.

Hays, Sharon. 1996. *Cultural Contradictions of Motherhood.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hopcroft, Rosemary. 2002. “Is Gender Still a Status Characteristic?” *Current Research in Social Psychology* 7(20): 339-346.

Hopkins, Jason J., Anna Sorensen, and Verta Taylor. 2013. “Same-Sex Couples, Families, and Marriage: Embracing and Resisting Heteronormativity.” *Sociology Compass* 7(2): 97-110.

Jepsen, Lisa K. 2007. “Comparing the Earnings of Cohabiting Lesbians, Cohabiting Heterosexual Women, and Married Women: Evidence from the 2000 Census.” *Industrial Relations* 46(4): 699-727.

Johnson, Cathryn. 1995. “Sexual Orientation as a Diffuse Status Characteristic: Implications for Small Group Interaction.” Pp. 115-37 in *Advances in Group Processes, vol. 12,* edited by B. Markovsky, M. Lovaglia, and K. Heimer. Greenwich, Ct: JAI Press.

Kahn, Lawrence M. 2014. “New Evidence on Gender and the Labor Market: A Symposium.” *ILRReview* 67(2):283-286.

Kanji, Shireen. 2013. “Do fathers work fewer paid hours when their female partner is the main or an equal earner? *Work, Employment &Society* 27:326-342.

Killewald, Alexandra. 2013. “A Reconsideration of the Fatherhood Premium: Marriage, Coresidence, Biology, and Fathers’ Wages.” *American Sociological Review* 78(1):96-116.

Kim, Marlene. 2013. “Policies to End the Gender Wage Gap in the United States.” *Review of Radical Political Economics* 45(3): 278-283.

Klawitter, Marieka M. and Victor Flatt. 1998. “The Effects of State and Local Antidiscrimination Policies on Earnings for Gays and Lesbians.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17(4): 658-686.

Kupfer, Antonia. 2014. “The interrelation of twenty-first-century education and work from a gender perspective.” *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 24(1):113-125.

Kurdek, L. A. 2007. “The Allocation of Household Labor by Partners in Gay and Lesbian Couples.” *Journal of Family Issues* 28:132-148.

Lips, Hilary M. 2013. “The Gender Pay Gap: Challenging the Rationalizations. Perceived Equity, Discrimination, and the Limits of Human Capital Models.” *Sex Roles* 68:169-185.

Lloyd, Moya. 1999. “Performativity, Parody, Politics.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 16:195-213.

Mincer, Jacob and Solomon Polachek. 1974. "Family Investments in Human Capital: Earnings of Women." *Journal of Political Economy* 82 (2):S76-S108.

Olson, Josephine E. 2013. “Human Capital Models and the Gender Pay Gap.” *Sex Roles* 68:186-197.

Oreffice, Sonia. 2011. "Sexual orientation and household decision making: Same-sex couples' balance of power and labor supply choices." *Labour Economics* 18.2:145-158.

Ortyl, Timothy A. 2011. “Heterosexual Subjectivities & Heteronormativity in the Study of Sexualities & Gender.” Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Unpublished manuscript.

Ortyl, Timothy A. 2012. ‘Polyamory and the ‘Pure Relationship’ Thesis.’ Paper Presented at the Crossing Boundaries, Workshopping Sexualities Conference, August 16, Denver, CO.

Paolacci, Gabriele, Jesse Chandler, and Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis. 2010. “Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk.” *Judgment and Decision Making* 5(5):411-419.

Pedulla, David S. 2014. "The Positive Consequences of Negative Stereotypes: Race, Sexual Orientation, and the Job Application Process." Social Psychology Quarterly 77:75-94.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos. 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Richardson, Hannah B, April M. Moyer, and Abbie E. Goldberg. 2012. “’You Try to Be Superman and You Don’t Have To Be’: Gay Adoptive Fathers’ Challenges and Tensions in Balancing Work and Family.” *Fathering* 10(3):314-336.

Ridgeway, Cecilia. 1991. “The Social Construction of Status Value: Gender and other Nominal Characteristics.” *Social Forces* 70:367-386.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L., Cathryn Johnson, and David Diekema.1994. "External status, legitimacy, and compliance in male and female groups." *Social Forces,* 72:1,051-1,077.

Ridgeway, Cecilia. 1997. “Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality.” *American Sociological Review* 62:218-235.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Lynn Smith-Lovin. 1999. "Gender and Interaction." Pp. 247-74 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender,* edited by Janet S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer.

Ridgeway, Cecilia and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. “Motherhood as a Status Characteristic.” *Journal of Social Issues* 60:683-700.

Ridgeway, Cecilia. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Schneebaum, Alyssa. 2013. "Motherhood and the Lesbian Wage Premium." Working Paper—University of Massachusetts Amherst Economics.

Sigle-Rushton, Wendy and Jane Waldfogel. 2007. "Motherhood and Women's Earnings in Anglo-American, Continental European, and Nordic Countries." *Feminist Economics* 13: 55-91.

Smith, Jeremy Adam. 2009. *The Daddy Shift: How Stay-at-Home Dads, Breadwinning Moms, and Shared Parenting are Transforming the American Family.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Stier, Haya and Meir Yaish. 2014. "Occupational segregation and gender inequality in job quality: a multi-level approach." *Work, employment and society* 28(2):225-243.

Stone, Pamela. 2007. *Opting Out? Why Women Really Quit Careers and Head Home.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Thomas, Susan L. 2011. "The Rise and Fall of Civil Unions: Lessons From the Connecticut Legislature's Abandonment of Gay and Lesbian Citizens." *Journal of Homosexuality* 58:315-329.

Warner, Michael. 1993. "Introduction." Pp. vii-xxviii in *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory*, edited by Michael Warner. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Webster, Murray, Jr., and Stuart J. Hysom. 1998. "Creating Status Characteristics." *American Sociological Review* 63(3): 351-378.

Webster, Murray, Jr., Stuart J. Hysom, and Elise M. Mullmer. 1998. "Sexual Orientation and Occupation as Status." *Advances in Group Processes* 15: 1-21.

Williams, C. Erik. 2006. "Reframing the Status Effect of Sexual Orientation: The Fundamental Significance of Gender." *ASA Conference Paper 2006 Annual Meeting.*

Williams, Joan. 2001. *Unbending Gender: Why Work and Family Conflict and What to Do About It.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

APPENDIX 1: THE VIGNETTES AND SURVEY

Evaluation of Job Candidates

In this study I am interested in understanding more about hiring choices and workplace dynamics. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. This study consists of two parts: a hiring scenario with follow up questions, and demographic questions. This survey will take about 5 minutes to complete.

The Hiring Scenario

In this scenario, imagine that you are a manager at a large company and your boss selected you to be a part of an advisory panel for new hires. You have been eager to be a part of this advisory panel for new hires and know that you are more likely to be asked to be on this panel again in the future if the employee you recommend does well on the job and gets quickly promoted. You received resumes from human resources, but for a couple of job candidates you also received information via email from fellow coworkers who know the candidates from outside of work. The candidates are applying for a full-time accountant position and, if all goes well, whoever is hired could be tracked for promotion to move up to senior accountant. Though the position is full-time, the actual work schedule varies week to week, depending upon client needs. Because this position has a varying schedule, it can also accommodate familial needs during typical business hours from time to time.

The following is an excerpt from an email you received from a coworker about one job candidate you are reviewing. You already have this candidate's resume, which tells you much of the information, however, your coworker knows this candidate and just wanted to share some information also. Typically, your firm has trusted the impressions, even based on little information, made by its managers. Please read the excerpted message about this candidate and then respond to the following questions with your first, uncensored impressions.

The Candidate *[Each respondent will receive just one of 12 variations, resulting from the Caregiving (3) x Gender (2) x Sexual Orientation (2) factorial design]*[8]

[Caregiving not indicated: Gender x Sexual Orientation manipulated]

Sarah/Matthew received her/his BA in 2004. She/he has worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where she/he has been responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. Her/his reference letter indicates that she/he consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker. She/he is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan. They have two children, a 2 year-old son, Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza.

---

[8] Notes in brackets will not be shown to respondents.

[Secondary Caregiving condition: Gender x Sexual Orientation manipulated]

Matthew/Sarah received his/her BA in 2005. He/She has worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where he/she is responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. His/Her reference letter indicates that he/she consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker. He/She is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan, and they have a 2 year-old son, Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza. Matthew's/Sarah's spouse decided to stay at home with their daughter in 2013, and in this past year, Kristen/Brendan has been working part time until she/he picks up the children from preschool, however Kristen/Brendan has just accepted a fulltime position her/himself.

[Primary Caregiving condition: Gender x Sexual Orientation manipulated]

Sarah/Matthew received her/his BA in 2003. She/he worked as an accountant for a local chain of bookstores where she/he was responsible for managing the accounts for four locations and the overall company. Her/his reference letter indicates that she/he consistently met established performance expectations. Her/his former boss said she/he could always be counted on and a former colleague said she/he was a pleasant coworker. She/he is married to a graphic designer, Kristen/Brendan. Together they have a 2 year-old son, Alex, and a 3 year-old daughter, Eliza. In 2013 Sarah/Matthew decided to stay home with her/his daughter. In the past year Sarah/Matthew has been working part time until she/he picks up the children from preschool. Sarah/Matthew is now applying for full time positions.

[Workplace evaluation measures]
For the following questions, please indicate the answer that best fits:

How suitable do you perceive this candidate to be for the full time accountant position?
Not at all suitable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely suitable

How likely would you be to invite this candidate for an interview?
Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely likely

How likely would you be to hire this candidate for the full time accountant position?
Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely likely

How likely would you be to recommend this candidate for the promotion track upon hire?
Not at all likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely likely

This company has a set salary range for this position, which is as follows, but the exact salary will be decided after reviewing the candidate's file. What more specific salary range would you expect for this candidate? (please indicate one)

$40,000-$54,999 $55,000-$69,999 $70,000-$84,999 $85,000-$99,999 $100,000-$114,999

[Competence and Commitment measures]
For the following questions, please indicate how accurately you believe that each of these traits describes the candidate:

	Not at all Accurate						Extremely Accurate
This candidate is…							
organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
capable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How committed do you believe this candidate would be to this job relative to other similarly positioned employees in the company?
Not at all committed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely committed

How frequently do you believe that this candidate would rearrange his/her schedule to accommodate childcare and household responsibilities?
Not at all frequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely frequently

How frequently do you believe that this candidate would rearrange his/her schedule to accommodate work responsibilities?
Not at all frequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely frequently

On a scale of 1 to 7 how masculine would you describe this job candidate?

Not at all masculine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely masculine

On a scale of 1 to 7, how feminine would you describe this job candidate?
Not at all feminine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely feminine

[Manipulation Checks]

Was this job candidate Caucasian? Yes No Don't know
Was this job candidate in a heterosexual relationship? Yes No Don't know
Was this job candidate in a gay or lesbian relationship? Yes No Don't know
Who has primary responsibility for caring for this candidate's children?
The candidate The candidate's spouse Don't know

Demographic and Background Questions

1. Age:

2. Race:
    a. Black, African-American
    b. Hispanic/Latino/Spanish origin
    c. White, Caucasian
    d. American Indian/Alaska native
    e. Asian
    f. Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
    g. Some other race or origin:_____

3. Gender:
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Other:_____

4. Sexual Orientation:
    a. Gay or lesbian
    b. Heterosexual
    c. Bisexual
    d. Other:_____

5. Marital Status:
    a. Married
    b. Cohabitating with a partner
    c. Single
    d. Divorced
    e. Other:_____

6. Do you have children?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Other:_____

        i. If yes, respondent has children:

            1. Do your children live with you?
                a. Yes, all the time
                b. Yes, most of the time
                c. Approximately half of the time
                d. Less than half of the time
                e. No, never

            2. Are there other adults in the house aside form yourself and/or a partner mentioned above who help care for the children?
                a. Yes
                b. No
                c. Other:_____

            3. How frequently do you arrange your schedule to accommodate childcare or household responsibilities?

Not at all frequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely frequently

7. Highest level of education attained:
    a. Less than high school
    b. High school/some college
    c. College degree
    d. Some graduate education
    e. Graduate degree

8. Current employment status:
    a. Unemployed and looking for paid work
    b. Unemployed and not looking for paid work
    c. Employed full-time
    d. Employed part-time
    e. Other:_____

9. How frequently have you rearranged your schedule to accommodate childcare or household responsibilities?

Not at all frequently 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Extremely frequently

10. How would you describe your political party affiliation:
    a. Democrat
    b. Republican
    c. Independent
    d. Other:_____

11. Regarding sexual relations between two adults of the same sex--do you think it is:
    a. Always wrong
    b. Almost always wrong
    c. Wrong only sometimes
    d. Not wrong at all

APPENDIX 2: CORRELATION MATRIX

CORRELATION MATRIX OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	Suitable	*Interview*	*Hire*	*Promotion*	*Salary*	*Organized*	*Capable*	*Committed*	*Competent*
Suitable	1.000	0.838	0.828	0.732	0.197	0.652	0.706	0.701	0.704
	(948)	(943)	(941)	(942)	(937)	(937)	(940)	(942)	(937)
Interview	0.838	1.000	0.824	0.740	0.194	0.694	0.762	0.733	0.768
	(943)	(950)	(943)	(944)	(939)	(939)	(942)	(945)	(939)
Hire	0.828	0.824	1.000	0.827	0.225	0.683	0.733	0.753	0.741
	(941)	(943)	(949)	(945)	(940)	(938)	(941)	(944)	(938)
Promotion	0.732	0.740	0.827	1.000	0.267	0.630	0.692	0.725	0.700
	(942)	(944)	(945)	951	(941)	(941)	(943)	(946)	(941
Salary	0.197	0.194	0.225	0.267	1.000	0.235	0.223	0.228	0.231
	(937)	(939)	(940)	(941)	(946)	(939)	(942)	(943)	(939)
Organized	0.652	0.694	0.683	0.630	0.235	1.000	0.851	0.744	0.841
	(937)	(939)	(938)	(941)	(939)	(946)	(945)	(942)	(945)
Capable	0.706	0.762	0.733	0.692	0.224	0.851	1.000	0.751	0.940
	(940)	(942)	(941)	(943)	(942)	(945)	(949)	(945)	(945)
Committed	0.701	0.733	0.753	0.725	0.228	0.744	0.751	1.000	0.771
	942	(945)	(944)	(946)	(943)	(942)	(945)	(951)	(942)
Competent	0.703	0.768	0.741	0.700	0.231	0.841	0.940	0.771	1.000
	(937)	(939)	(938)	(941)	(939)	(945)	(945)	(942)	(946)

Note: Pearson correlation coefficients presented with number of observations in parentheses.

APPENDIX 3: COMPOSITE VARIABLE ANALYSIS

As several of these dependent variables are likely to be correlated, I ran both an exploratory factor analysis of all dependent variables as well as a subsequent confirmatory factor analysis of theoretically aligned dependent variables to determine whether composite scales could be created. Factor analyses reveal that two composite scales could be created, though the dependent variable salary (communality score of .09) does not load on either scale and is, therefore, not included. Workplace evaluation measures (suitable, interview, hire, promotion) load onto one factor, and have communality scores ranging from .79 to .89. The four dependent variables measuring assessments of capability and competence (organized, capability, commitment, competence) load onto a second factor, and have communality scores ranging from .76 to .91.

Reliability tests, using Cronbach's Alpha, find that the workplace evaluation measures have a standardized reliability score of .94 and that the capability and competence measures have a standardized reliability score of .95. As such, two additive scales, standardized by the number of indicators in each were created: Suitability Scale and Capability Scale. Suitability Scale includes data from the dependent variables suitable, interview, hire, and promotion, while Capability Scale includes data from the dependent variables organized, capability, commitment, and competence. I replicate the ANOVA reported for single indicators (i.e., Tables 1 and 2), using these scales as the dependent variables, to examine main effects and the effects predicted by the hypotheses. Regression models 1 and 2 were also replicated with these scales.

Tests of main effects with the Suitability and Capability Scales indicate no support (see Appendix 3, Table 1). Whereas with the full set of independent indicators as the dependent variables, some significance emerged for sexual orientation and caregiving; the analysis using the scales shows none of this significance. A test of Hypothesis 1 reveals no significance, echoing the results seen without the use of scales. The Hypothesis 2 test and the test for indicated vs. not indicated caregivers lose the nuance and slight significance seen in the tests including all dependent variables when presented independently.

Appendix 3, Table 2, shows results for Hypotheses 3a-d. Similarly to the results presented in the main text, no significance emerges for Hypotheses 3a-c. Consistent with the analyses using the individual dependent variables, significant findings for the scales emerge for Hypothesis 3d, contrasting lesbian secondary caregiving mothers with heterosexual secondary caregiving mothers for both the Suitability Scale ($F(1, 158)=7.2$, $p < .05$) and the Capability Scale ($F(1, 156)=7.9$, $p < .05$). The Capability Scale is also significant for the interaction of sexual orientation and caregiving condition ($F(3, 636)=5.3$, $p < .05$), and approaches significance for primary versus secondary caregiving heterosexual parents ($F(1, 491)=4.0$, $p < .10$). These results are also found in the analyses with the individual independent variables.

Multivariate regression analysis on these scales shows similar patterns but lacks some significance seen in the results with the full set of dependent variables assessed individually. Appendix 3, Table 3, shows the results from replicating model 1 from the main text with the two scales. Model 1 tests for the effects of gender, sexual orientation, primary caregiving, secondary caregiving, and control variables on the suitability and

capability scales. Not unlike the results discussed in the main text, these show significance for respondent gender for both scales ($p < .05$), as well as significance for respondent parent status for the Capability Scale ($p < .05$). Results approach significance for sexual orientation for the Suitability Scale ($p < .10$) and results also approach significance for primary caregiving for the Capability Scale ($p < .10$). These findings are similar to those seen in the table and results presented in the main text, even though some detail and significance is lost in the analyses involving the scales.

Appendix 3, Table 4, presents the results from replicating model 2 from the main text with the two scales. Model 2 tests for the effects of gender, sexual orientation, primary caregiving, secondary caregiving, control variables, as well as interactions on the suitability and capability scales. Similar overall patterns emerge with the Suitability Scale and Capability Scale both being significant for the interaction of sexual orientation and secondary caregiving condition ($p < .01$), as well as for respondent gender ($p < .05$). The Capability Scale is significant for respondent parent status as well ($p < .01$). While this pattern of significance exactly mirrors what is seen in Model 2, Table 6 in the full text, it lacks the detail and contrast between significance of suitability versus interview, for example, that could be helpful when considering needed steps to address these issues. For example, interview was not significant for the interaction between sexual orientation and secondary caregiving, yet the scale is significant. From an intervention or policy perspective, the issue here then is not a matter of getting diverse applicants in the door for an interview, but rather a baseline assessment of suitability that may be guiding hiring decisions. Given these concerns as well as the fact that these findings reveal largely the same pattern as that emerging with the full slate of dependent variables presented in the

main text, but without the nuance, I chose to present the dependent variables independently in the main text.

Table 1: ANALYISIS OF VARIANCE FOR MAIN EFFECTS OF GENDER, CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON SUITABILITY AND CAPABILITY SCALES

	Suitability Scale	*Capability Scale*
Gender Main Effect	0.814 (0.53) 5, 956	0.125 (0.09) 5, 954
Gender within Not-Indicated Caregiving (H1)	0.089 (0.05) 1, 317	0.208 (0.14) 1, 317
Primary vs. Secondary (H2)	0.057 (0.04) 1, 638	1.830 (1.35) 1, 636
Caregiving Main Effect	2.062 (1.34) 5, 956	2.590 (1.87) 5, 954
Indicated vs. Not Indicated Caregiving	4.068 (2.64) 5, 956	3.350 (2.42) 5, 954
Sexual Orientation Main Effect	4.097 (2.65) 5, 956	0.888 (0.54) 5, 954

Note: Mean Square values presented with F values in parentheses. DF presented below F values. Bolded tests represent hypotheses indicated. For variable descriptions see text.

Table 2: ANALYISIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE INTERACTION OF CAREGIVING CONDITION AND SEXUAL ORIENATION AND THE EFFECTS OF SUBCATEGORIES OF CAREGIVING CONDITION AND SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON SUITABILITY AND CAPABILITY SCALES

	Suitability Scale	*Capability Scale*
Caregiving Condition x Sexual Orientation	1.741 (1.17) 3, 638	5.303* (3.94) 3, 636
Gay Primary Father vs. Heterosexual Primary Father (H3a)	1.793 (1.31) 1, 159	0.001 (0.00) 1, 159
Gay Secondary Father vs. Heterosexual Secondary Father (H3b)	3.554 (2.18) 1, 158	2.985 (1.85) 1, 158
Lesbian Primary Mother vs. Heterosexual Primary Mother (H3c)	0.293 (0.21) 1, 160	0.012 (0.01) 1, 160
Lesbian Secondary Mother vs. Heterosexual Secondary Mother (H3d)	7.170* (4.55) 1, 158	7.883* (6.03) 1, 156
Primary vs. Secondary Gay or Lesbian Parents	1.043 (0.63) 1, 462	0.913 (0.62) 1, 462
Primary vs. Secondary Heterosexual Parents	0.521 (0.36) 1,493	3.966+ (3.06) 1, 491
Lesbian vs. Heterosexual Not Indicated Mothers (H4)	0.532 (0.28) 1, 153	0.156 (0.09) 1, 153
Gay vs. Heterosexual Not Indicated Fathers (H5)	0.531 (0.38) 1, 163	3.087 (2.61) 1, 163

Note: Mean Square values with F values in parentheses. DF presented below F values. Bolded tests represent hypotheses indicated. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$

Table 3: ESTIMATED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, PRIMARY V. SECONDARY CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND CONTROLS ON SUITABILITY AND CAPABILITY SCALES

	Suitability Scale	*Capability Scale*
Female	-0.064 (0.080)	0.013 (0.076)
Gay/Lesbian	0.141+ (0.080)	-0.066 (0.075)
Primary Caregiving	-0.114 (0.102)	-0.165+ (0.096)
Secondary Caregiving	-0.125 (0.099)	-0.078 (0.093)
Respondent Female	0.189* (0.081)	0.163* (0.076)
Respondent Parent	0.107 (0.083)	0.079** (0.079)
Respondent Homophobic	0.112 (0.087)	0.082 (0.082)

Note: df = 7, 954. Regression Coefficients with SEs in parentheses. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 4: ESTIMATED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, PRIMARY AND SECONDARY CAREGIVING CONDITION, AND INTERACTIONS ON SUITABILITY AND CAPABILITY SCALES

	Suitability Scale	*Capability Scale*
Female	-0.053 (0.160)	0.079 (0.151)
Gay/Lesbian	0.131 (0.160)	0.220 (0.151)
Primary Caregiving	0.071 (0.170)	0.003 (0.160)
Secondary Caregiving	0.119 (0.171)	0.127 (0.161)
Gay/Lesbian x Primary Caregiving	-0.265 (0.197)	-0.138 (-0.185)
Gay/Lesbian x Secondary Caregiving	-0.545** (0.201)	-0.549** (0.189)
Female x Gay/Lesbian	-0.006 (0.160)	-0.117 (0.151)
Female x Primary Caregiving	-0.078 (0.196)	-0.163 (0.185)
Female x Secondary Caregiving	0.048 (0.197)	0.129 (0.185)
Respondent Female	0.190* (0.080)	0.164* (0.076)
Respondent Parent	0.097 (0.089)	0.236** (0.079)
Respondent Homophobic	0.159 (0.089)	0.101 (0.083)

Note: df = 12, 901. Regression Coefficients with SEs in parentheses. For variable descriptions see text.
+$p < .10$ *$p < .05$ ** $p < .01$