

3

Analytic Interventions of Multiracial Feminism

Measuring and Modeling Sexism With an Intersectional Approach

“[C]ategories of discrimination may overlap, and . . . individuals may suffer historical exclusion on the basis of both race and gender, age and physical handicap, or some other combination. The situation of individuals who confront multiple grounds of disadvantage is particularly complex. Categorizing such discrimination as primarily racially oriented, or primarily gender-oriented, misconceives the reality of discrimination as it is experienced by individuals.”

~Madam Justice L'Heureux-Dubé (1993; qtd. in Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2001, p. 5)

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I argued that, despite feminist theorists' commitment to interdisciplinary scholarship, disciplinary boundaries remain very significant in survey research on feminism. Disciplinary norms influence the *kinds* of questions that researchers ask, as well as the theoretical perspectives used to *frame* these questions. In addition, disciplinary traditions influence how

scholars answer the questions they pose: the kinds of *data* that are collected and the *techniques* employed to analyze these data. Disciplinary boundaries also work to shape feminist dialogues. Though they may share scholarly interests and political commitments, many feminist scholars remain locked in dialogue with those scholars who share similar academic backgrounds: psychologists with psychologists, sociologists with sociologists, political scientists with political scientists, social scientists with social scientists. There are exceptions to this, of course, but overall disciplinary boundaries remain an integral part of feminist survey research. While each disciplinary approach to social science survey research has limitations, each approach has also yielded significant contributions to scholarly debates and, just as important, to “real world” feminist issues.

In this chapter, I explore the implications of multiracial feminism for survey research on sexism and gender discrimination. Survey research on sexism, like that on feminism, can be grouped into three broad categories: studies that employ large-scale, general surveys; studies that use medium-scale but more focused surveys (often including multi-item scales); and small-scale studies designed to assess sexism as experienced by particular groups. And, just as a multiracial feminist perspective can illuminate the benefits and limitations associated with each approach for measuring and modeling feminism, a multiracial feminist perspective can also shed light on the benefits and limitations of each approach for understanding and analyzing sexism and gender discrimination.

I begin this chapter by reviewing some of the most commonly used measures of sexism in the social sciences. My aim is not to denigrate previous work on sexism but rather to use this work as a springboard, from which researchers might develop a multiracial feminist approach to survey research on gender discrimination. After reviewing the measures of gender discrimination, I turn my attention to issues of statistical modeling. How might a statistical analysis that uses multiracial feminist theory as its starting point look? There are many ways of combining the insights of multiracial feminism with survey research; in this chapter, I use data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to demonstrate one approach.

Situating Gender Discrimination and Harassment Within a Multiracial Feminist Framework

More than thirty years ago, three members of the Combahee River Collective, Barbara Smith, Beverly Smith, and Demita Frazier, wrote a

“A Black Feminist Statement” in which they described the origins and continued need for black feminism. They wrote:

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular task *the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking*. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. (1981 [The statement was originally dated April 1977], p. 210, italics added for emphasis)

The Collective’s description of “interlocking” systems of oppression provided the foundation for intersectional theories that developed over the next three decades. As explained in Chapter 1, theories of intersectionality understand gender as a system of inequality that is deeply connected to—and even shaped by—other systems of inequality. As suggested in “A Black Feminist Statement,” individuals do not experience gender in isolation from race, class, and sexuality. Nor do individuals experience gender separately from age, disability status, or nation. Rather, social statuses are *lived simultaneously*, which means that one’s experiences “as a woman” are simultaneously shaped by one’s racial status, class position, and age, as well as by other social statuses. As Baca Zinn, Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Messner (2007, p. 153) write, “[n]obody experiences themselves as solely gendered. Instead, gender is configured through cross-cutting forms of difference that carry deep social and economic consequences.”

The notion of simultaneity carries several important implications for understanding and analyzing sexism and gender discrimination. The first concerns the particular forms of discrimination that individuals encounter. Multiracial feminist theories posit that gendered stereotypes and sexist practices are oftentimes based not only on gender but also on multiple intersecting social statuses. In so far as discriminatory practices are based on racialized, classed, sexualized, and age-specific gender stereotypes, the particular form of sexism that an individual encounters is, in part, shaped by her location within these intersecting hierarchies. As Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill write (1996, pp. 326–327), “people experience race, class, gender, and sexuality differently depending upon their social location in the structures of race, class, gender, and sexuality.” In other words, while there may be similarities among different groups of women, women of different racial groups tend to experience different kinds of gender discrimination (see, for example, Buchanan, Settles, & Woods, 2008). The same holds true for women of diverse socioeconomic statuses and different age groups.

A second insight of multiracial feminism concerns the social-spatial contexts in which individuals experience gender discrimination. Writing primarily about racial discrimination, sociologist Joe Feagin (1991, p. 102) argued that “there is a spatial dimension to discrimination” and that the probability of encountering racial discrimination depends in part on the environment one is in (see also Feagin & Eckberg, 1980; Roscigno, 2007). A multiracial feminist approach takes this idea one step further, emphasizing that the particular spaces that one moves through on a day-to-day basis are largely determined by intersecting hierarchies of race, gender, class, and age.ⁱ

Though it may seem obvious, it is nonetheless important to note that social-spatial contexts shape both the likelihood that women will face gender discrimination as well as the particular form of discrimination that women ultimately face. Moreover, the contexts that women move through are shaped not only by their gender status but by other social statuses as well: age, race, class, nation, and sexuality. To be the target of gender discrimination in promotion, for example, one must be working in the paid labor force. Working-class women, whose jobs often lack opportunities for advancement, may be less likely than upper-class women to experience gender discrimination in promotion, simply because so few promotion opportunities actually exist in “dead-end” jobs. Women’s experiences with sexual harassment are similarly shaped by social-spatial contexts. Women working in occupations held predominately by women, particularly when their supervisors are also women, are less likely to be tokenized and thus are less likely to be the target of overt sexual harassment. In contrast, women who are disempowered relative to their male coworkers may be targeted more often (Chamberlain, Crowley, Tope, & Hodson, 2008; Fitzgerald, 1993; Kanter, 1977/1993; Kohlman, 2006; Pierce, 2010). Women’s structural location in the labor force influences the type of sexism that women encounter and their structural location in the labor force is linked to a number of other factors. From a multiracial feminist perspective, it is important to consider how social statuses other than gender interact with gender to shape the different social-spatial contexts in which women face discrimination and harassment.

Multiracial feminist theorists’ focus on simultaneity offers a third insight into gender discrimination—one that is particularly important for those who are trying to measure gender discrimination, as opposed to discrimination based on age, race, class, or sexuality. In short, because social statuses are experienced simultaneously, it is sometimes difficult

ⁱ Here I am building on an argument that Mosi Ifatunji and I made concerning the importance of context for understanding racial discrimination (see Harnois & Ifatunji, 2011).

for individuals to discern whether their experiences of mistreatment result from one particular status or another. As suggested in the opening quotation to this chapter, discriminatory practices are oftentimes based on multiple social statuses, and encouraging individuals to identify one (and only one) particular “cause” for their mistreatment may be inappropriate. Legal scholar Kimberle Crenshaw (1991, p. 1244) writes,

[M]any of the experiences Black women face are not subsumed within the traditional boundaries of race or gender discrimination as these boundaries are currently understood. . . . [T]he intersection of racism and sexism factors into Black women’s lives in ways that cannot be captured wholly by looking at the race or gender dimensions of those experiences separately.

In other words, because social statuses are experienced simultaneously, it is often difficult to determine whether one’s experiences result from one particular status or another. This is particularly important when individuals occupy more than one underprivileged position. Imagine a hardworking middle-aged woman who occupies privileged positions on hierarchies of class, able-bodiedness, sexuality, race, and ethnicity. When this particular woman realizes she has been treated unfairly—let’s say she has been denied a promotion in her job despite being the most qualified—she may attribute this mistreatment to her being a woman. “Clearly a sexist act!” she may conclude. But now imagine another woman, a young African American woman, who experiences the same event. She too realizes that she has been treated unfairly but wonders, “Is this because of my gender? Or my race? Or my age? Or maybe all three?” It may be that this second act, too, is mostly—or even entirely—about sexism. It is equally likely—perhaps even more so—that this discrimination was based on race, age, or some combination of the three. The point is that for people who occupy multiple marginalized statuses, the answer is oftentimes not clear-cut. Survey research that asks individuals to attribute their mistreatment to a particular social status may be forcing an inappropriate frame on the respondents’ experiences.

Taken as a whole, multiracial feminist theory urges researchers to consider how social statuses other than gender intersect with gender to shape women’s experiences with sexism and discrimination. It is important to note that this approach stops short of making absolute, universal claims about the particulars of intersectionality, as some social statuses may be more important than others in particular contexts. As Patricia Hill Collins (2000, p. 228) writes, “regardless of how any given matrix [of oppression] is actually organized either across time or from society to society, the concept of a matrix of domination encapsulates the universality of intersecting

oppressions as organized through diverse local realities.” From a theoretical and methodological perspective, it is important to consider the *possibility* of these intersections (Yuval-Davis, 2006). For, as will become clear in the next section, if these intersections are not considered explicitly, they are often either obscured or erased entirely.

Measuring Gender Discrimination and Harassment

To demonstrate the importance of a multiracial approach for understanding and researching sexism, I briefly review three measures of sexism from the social sciences. I first consider Klonoff and Landrine’s (1995) Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE), which is among the most comprehensive and widely used scales of sexism in psychology. I then examine the General Social Survey’s (GSS’s) questions concerning interpersonal discrimination at work. The General Social Survey is one of the most commonly used surveys in American sociology; it contains only a handful of questions pertaining to discrimination, but the survey is administered biennially to a large, diverse sample. Finally, I compare these more general measures with those employed in a more particular survey: the American Association of University Women’s (AAUW’s) Drawing the Line: Sexual Harassment on Campus (Hill & Silva, 2005).

The Schedule of Sexist Events

One of the best measures of gender discrimination, one of the most comprehensive and widely used in contemporary psychology, is Klonoff and Landrine’s (1995) Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE), which is presented in Table 3.1. Klonoff and Landrine developed the SSE in part because they realized the importance of sexism in the everyday lives of women, and they wanted a way to measure empirically the negative impact of sexism on the physical and mental health of women (1995, p. 440). Their measure of interpersonal sexism includes 20 event-specific items, encompassing sexist degradation (such as being called a sexist name), sexist discrimination in distant relationships (for example, being treated unfairly by people in service jobs), sexism in close relationships (for example, being treated unfairly by a boyfriend or husband), and sexist discrimination in the workplace (such as being denied a raise, promotion, or tenure or another such thing at work). Klonoff and Landrine “conceptualize the various domains/types of [gender] discrimination as ‘sexist events,’” viewing them, in their words, “as gender-specific stressors . . . that happen *to women, because they are women*” (1995, p. 441, italics in original). When they introduced the SSE, Klonoff and Landrine presented substantial evidence to document the

Table 3.1 Questions From the Schedule of Sexist Events Survey.

-
1. How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers or professors because you are a woman?
 2. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors because you are a woman?
 3. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your co-workers, fellow students or colleagues because you are a woman?
 4. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (by store clerks, waiters, bartenders, waitresses, bank tellers, mechanics and others) because you are a woman?
 5. How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are a woman?
 6. How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others) because you are a woman?
 7. How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are a woman?
 9. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man in your life because you are a woman?
 10. How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work that you deserved because you are a woman?
 11. How many times have you been treated unfairly by your family because you are a woman?
 13. How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?
 14. How many times have people failed to show you the respect that you deserve because you are a woman?
 15. How many times have you wanted to tell someone off for being sexist?
 16. How many times have you been really angry about something sexist that was done to you?
 17. How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some sexist thing that was done to you?
 18. How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick or other names?
 19. How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something sexist that was done or said to you or done to somebody else?
 20. How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are a woman?

(continued)

Table 3.1 (continued)

-
21. How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes, or degrading sexual jokes?
23. How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a sexist and unfair way?
-

Note: Because items 8, 12, and 22 did not load on any factor, they were omitted from the SSE and are not shown (qtd. from table in Klonoff & Landrine, 1995).

Source: Klonoff and Landrine, 1995.

scale's reliability and validity.ⁱⁱ They conducted factor analyses of the scale for lifetime and recent (within the past year) sexist events; they tested the structure of the scale for various groups of women, including women of different ages, ethnic groups, and marital statuses, and they analyzed the relationship between the SSE and two other measures of stressful events, the Hassles Frequency and the PERI-Life Events scales.

Since its creation, the Schedule of Sexist Events scale has been used in a variety of psychological studies, both to document the pervasiveness of sexism and to assess the negative consequences that arise from sexist events.ⁱⁱⁱ It is a widely used measure for good reason: There is much to like about this scale. Unlike general measures of sexist discrimination, the survey items in the SSE remind women to think about specific kinds of sexist discrimination. One of its questions (Q18), for example, asks women, "How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick or other names?" The question itself may serve as a reminder to those women who don't think regularly about sexist language, that these names are deeply gendered and problematic. Likewise, another question (Q21) asks, "How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes?" For some women, the question in and of itself may serve as a reminder that sexist jokes, though unfortunately ubiquitous, are an example of sexist behavior. Because of these built-in reminders of what sexism entails, women's responses to these survey questions may provide more accurate information

ⁱⁱ "Reliability" refers to the "stability or consistency of an operational definition" and "validity" refers to the "congruence or 'goodness of fit' between an operational definition and the concept it is supposed to measure" (Singleton & Straits, 1999, pp. 565, 570).

ⁱⁱⁱ For example, Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, and Lund (1995) used the SSE to investigate the impact of sexism on women's psychiatric and physical well-being, Sabik and Tylka (2006) used the SSE to examine how feminism mediates the relationship between perceived sexist events and disordered eating, and Yoder and McDonald (1998) used a subscale of the SSE to document sexism aimed at women firefighters.

than general questions about sexism (e.g., “Have you experienced sexism within the past year?”). In addition to prodding for specific sexist events, another merit of the SSE is that it asks women about many different types of sexist events and events that occur in a wide range of interpersonal relationships. For example, it asks respondents about their experiences in work and school settings, in addition to their experiences in their family life and in their public life (e.g., “How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are a woman?” [Q5]). Finally, the SSE is an important tool for documenting sexism because it asks women not only *whether* they have ever experienced a particular sexist event, but also it asks whether they have experienced a particular event recently (i.e., within the past year) and how frequently each event happened.^{iv} As a result, the SSE allows researchers to compare how women respond to isolated incidents of sexism as compared to how they respond to repeated sexist events.

Though the merits of the SSE are numerous, a multiracial feminist analysis of the SSE reveals some important limitations. The first concerns the differing contexts in which people experience discrimination and the ways in which these contexts intersect with differing social statuses. The SSE asks questions concerning respondents’ experiences in school (e.g., Q1, Q3), at work (e.g., Q3, Q2, Q10, Q17), in their home lives (e.g., Q7, Q9, Q11), and in public places (e.g., Q4, Q6). While it is important for surveys to tap a wide range of contexts, doing so generates a potential problem. Because some groups move through particular contexts more than others, questions that focus on experiences within these contexts (e.g., work experiences) will tap the experiences of some groups more than others. These kinds of questions will give more weight to some groups’ experiences with discrimination than to others’ and thus introduce potential bias in the measurement tool.

Consider, for example, the SSE-Recent scale, which asks respondents about their experiences with sexism in the past year. Q10 asks, “How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work that you deserved because you are a woman?” Q17 asks, “How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away and other actions) to deal with some sexist thing that was done to you?” Women who are retired, women who have not yet entered the workforce, and other women who are not currently working would probably indicate that the event has “never happened to you” in the past year.

^{iv} Respondents are asked for lifetime and recent sexist events whether the event occurred “never, once in a while, sometimes, a lot, most of the time, or almost all of the time.”

Women working in low-wage jobs without opportunities for promotion and with few employment opportunities elsewhere may also score low on these questions. (If there are no raises or promotions to be had, one can't be denied in the first place; if there are limited options for employment elsewhere, one may be less likely to respond to sexist events with "drastic" measures.) These women's low score on this variable would then be added to their scores on the other 19 survey items, giving them a total score for recent gender discrimination. While tallying women's experiences in this way can certainly yield important insights, this approach is limited in that the resulting totals (e.g., a total score of 40, 65, or 100) mask the differences in women's opportunities to experience particular types of sexism. As Matteson and Moradi (2005, pp. 53–54) have noted, reliance on total scores of the SSE "might blur important distinctions in specific dimensions of sexist events [e.g., sexist events at work or school vs. sexist events in intimate relationships] when specific outcome variables are considered."

There is, of course, good reason to ask women about their experiences with sexism in a variety of settings. Doing so allows researchers to determine the contexts in which women experience sexism most frequently and can help to determine if sexist events in some contexts are more damaging than those in others. Moreover, because women do experience different kinds of sexism in different settings (being denied a raise at work is a very different experience from being treated unfairly by your family because you are a woman), it is important for researchers who are seeking to assess the prevalence of sexism, to ask women about their experiences in a number of different contexts. From a multiracial feminist perspective, however, a measure that includes questions that tap for sexist events in some contexts and not others is a *potential* source of bias. As mentioned above, the SSE asks questions concerning respondents' experiences in school, at work, in their home lives, and in public places. It does not ask about sexist experiences within religious institutions, it does not ask women about sexist images they have encountered in media, and, increasingly important, it does not ask women about their experience with virtual sexism—sexist events on Facebook, Internet chat rooms, over e-mail, and the like (how many of us who regularly use computers have not encountered sexist images online?). Again, the (potential) problem is not that the SSE does not speak to every social-spatial context in which sexism can possibly occur. But rather, when some social-spatial contexts are over-represented and others are under-represented and when the differing representation correlates with differences in social statuses (e.g., age, racial, class-based statuses), then the measurement tool is potentially biased. It may measure some groups' experiences better than other groups', and if this is the case, then the conclusions we draw across groups can be particularly misleading.

A second potential source of bias concerns the particular types of sexism that individuals may encounter in any given context. A multiracial feminist perspective highlights how social statuses other than gender (e.g., age, class and power, race and ethnicity) influence the particular types of sexism that women encounter (Baca Zinn et al., 2007; Crenshaw, 1991; Crenshaw, 1992; Welsh, Carr, MacQuarrie, & Huntley, 2006). And while the SSE does include questions that cover a wide range of sexist events, none of the questions explicitly tap for sexist events as they intersect with racism, ageism, or homophobia. For example, Q18 asks, “How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick or other names?” The question stops short, though, of including racialized, homophobic, and ageist sexist terms, such as “girl,” “dyke,” or “baby mama.” While these racist-sexist, ageist-sexist, and homophobic-sexist “hybrids” are likely not applied to all—or even most—women, it is also likely that some women experience hybrid forms of discrimination more frequently than they experience “pure” sexism. And this may be particularly true for women who occupy more than one marginal status. In addition to assessing the particular forms of sexism that *are* included in the SSE, then, a multiracial feminist perspective encourages us to think through what types of sexism are *not* included. It may be that women who experience racist-sexist, ageist-sexist, or homophobic-sexist hybrids understand this mistreatment to be a result of their status as a woman, and if this is true, then perhaps these events are indeed represented within the Schedule of Sexist Events survey. However, a multiracial feminist perspective pushes us to consider how the exclusion of specific racialized sexist events and other hybrid types of discrimination may affect researchers’ findings and conclusions.

A third, related limitation of the SSE concerns the lack of attention paid to other types of discrimination and the way in which respondents are asked to classify their mistreatment. On the majority of the survey items (13 of 20), respondents are asked if their mistreatment was due to their status as a woman (for example, Q2 asks, “How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors because you are a woman?”). In fact, this “single-oppression framework” is built into Klonoff and Landrine’s definition of a “sexist event”: “Sexist events . . . are negative events (stressors) that happen *to women, because they are women*” (1995, p. 441). As mentioned above, many multiracial feminist scholars have argued that, for people with multiple minority statuses, it is often difficult, if not impossible, to attribute discriminatory acts to one (and only one) social status. This is because discriminatory acts are often based on multiple intersecting statuses. For example, when asked about her experiences with sexual harassment, one Filipino live-in caregiver in Welsh et al.’s study explained, “It’s like a mix. It’s a mix action. You don’t know if it is

if that person is doing it to you because of the color of your skin and the type of job that you have, you're doing the dirty job in the house so you don't know if it is harassment or sexual harassment" (2006, p. 96). A recent review of complaints filed with the Ontario Human Rights Commission underscores the importance of intersectionality for understanding discrimination and harassment. Of the complaints filed between April 1997 and December 2000, almost half—48%—cited more than one ground of discrimination (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2001, p. 11).

It is of course necessary when studying gender discrimination or sexism to ask respondents what they feel the basis of their mistreatment was. And it is, of course, important to distinguish between those incidents of discrimination based primarily on gender and those based primarily on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or age. However, it is equally important to consider the potential bias that is introduced when asking women to determine the primary cause of their mistreatment. Women with only one marginal status—that is, women who are privileged with respect to age, race, ethnicity, able-bodiedness, and sexual orientation—are perhaps more likely to attribute their mistreatment to their gender status (“I have been mistreated ‘because I am a woman.’”). Women with multiple marginalized statuses may be less likely to attribute their mistreatment to their status “as a woman”—even if they experience a “sexist event.” Instead, women may attribute their mistreatment to their status “as a young woman” or “as a lesbian woman” or “a black woman” (see, for example, Buchanan & Omerod, 2002; Cortina, 2001; Welsh et al., 2006). In short, a multiracial feminist perspective encourages us to examine the broader context of inequality in which discriminatory acts are experienced. It encourages researchers to view sexism as occurring alongside and in combination with other forms of discrimination and harassment.

The General Social Survey

In sharp contrast to the multi-item Schedule of Sexist Events scale, survey researchers in sociology have generally used single-item measures of sexism and gender discrimination, such as those found in the General Social Survey. The GSS, a source commonly used in sociological research, asks a range of questions concerning individuals' attitudes, experiences, and behaviors, as well as a number of questions concerning the respondents' backgrounds (e.g., family income, parents' educational attainment, when the respondent had her or his first child). The GSS has been conducted on a biennial basis in the United States, beginning in 1972. The data for each year represent an independent sample of English-speaking and, in the 2006 through 2010 samples, English- or Spanish-speaking persons 18 years of

age or over who are not living in institutions (e.g., prisons or mental health facilities). In the 2002 and 2006 versions of the GSS, the questionnaire included a special series of questions concerning respondents' quality of working life. Included in this section were five questions concerning discrimination and harassment in the workplace:

Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your age?

Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender?

Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your race or ethnic origin?

In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?

In the last 12 months, were you threatened or harassed in any other way by anyone while you were on the job?

Compared to the numerous and more nuanced Schedule of Sexist Events questions, the GSS's questions on discrimination seem quite meager. The GSS asks only two questions concerning interpersonal sexism, and unlike in the SSE, where respondents report both how often sexist events occurred and how recently, in the GSS, respondents' answers are simply coded "yes," "no," or "I don't know." Whereas the SSE questions remind respondents about the multiple forms of sexism and gender discrimination, the GSS questions do not. Whereas the SSE asks questions about sexist experiences in a variety of contexts, the GSS does not. Though the survey has, over the years, included a number of questions concerning gender-related attitudes and has been used to assess gender-related prejudices and gender inequality more broadly, it is clearly limited in its ability to assess women's experiences with interpersonal sexism.

When analyzed from a multiracial feminist perspective, the GSS questions concerning discrimination share many of the same limitations as the SSE. The GSS questions assess women's experience in only one context—their place of work—and hence cannot be used to understand sexism experienced by women who are not working. Nor are these questions useful for understanding sexism directed at women workers outside of their place of employment (e.g., in schools or in public spaces). As was the case with the SSE, the discrimination and harassment questions in the GSS do not explicitly tap for sexist events as they intersect with racism, ageism, or homophobia. Finally, though the relative generality of the GSS questions might give respondents more room to interpret their experiences with

discrimination and harassment, the GSS questions, like those in the SSE, encourage respondents to view systems of inequality, and the discrimination that results, as distinct. In other words, the survey instrument implies that people experience discrimination based on a single characteristic—gender, or race, or ethnicity, or age.

Despite these limitations, the GSS measures of workplace discrimination have two clear advantages relative to the SSE. First, because the survey is designed to capture diverse forms of workplace discrimination, the GSS includes questions about not only gender discrimination and sexual harassment but also racism, ageism, and “other” types of harassment. In this way, it is possible to analyze women’s experiences with sexism as they intersect with other systems of inequality. Second, because the GSS is a national survey, analyses using the GSS are more generalizable to the overall U.S. population. The diversity of respondents included in the GSS allows researchers to highlight what McCall (2005, p. 1773) calls “inter-categorical complexity”—the “relationships of inequality among social groups and changing configurations of inequality along multiple and conflicting dimensions.”

AAUW: Drawing the Line

In contrast to the SSE and the GSS survey instruments, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) recently conducted a survey designed to examine sexual harassment as experienced by one particular group: “U.S. residents ages 18 to 24 who were enrolled in college between January and May 2005” (Hill & Silva, 2005, p. 42). Like the questions in the GSS, those in the AAUW’s Drawing the Line survey aimed to assess sexism as it occurs within one particular context, American colleges and universities. Researchers asked men and women both about the prevalence of sexual harassment on their school campus, as well as whether and how frequently they themselves had experienced particular types of sexual harassment. Table 3.2 lists the questions concerning respondents’ own experiences of sexual harassment.

When compared to the GSS and SSE, what is perhaps most noticeable about the Drawing the Line survey is the specificity of questions concerning sexual harassment. While the SSE and the GSS contained questions concerning sexual harassment, in these survey instruments sexual harassment was included as one among many types of discrimination (as in the case of the GSS) or sexism (as in the case of the SSE). Since the Drawing the Line survey focuses only on sexual harassment—and only on sexual harassment as experienced by students on American college and university campuses, it is able to be much more specific. Through it, researchers ask questions

Table 3.2 Selected Questions From AAUW’s Drawing the Line Survey.

Types of Sexual Harassment: <i>“During your whole college life, how often, if at all, has anyone (this includes students, teachers, other school employees, or anyone else) done the following things to you when you did not want them to?”</i>	Social-Spatial Contexts: <i>“Thinking about the types of sexual harassment in the previous question that you have experienced during your college life, have you ever been harassed . . . ?”</i>	Perpetrators: <i>Thinking about the types of sexual harassment in the previous question you have experienced during your college life, have you ever been harassed by . . . ? Please select all that apply.</i>
1. Made sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks	1. In a classroom, lecture hall (or laboratory)	1. A student
2. Showed, gave or left me sexual pictures, photographs, webpages, illustrations, messages or notes	2. In the hall, lounge or common area of a campus building	2. A former student
3. Posted sexual messages about me on the Internet (e.g., websites, blogs) or e-mailed, instant messaged or text messaged sexual messages about me	3. In the athletic facility, gym, playing field or pool area	3. A professor
4. Spread sexual rumors about me	4. In a locker room or restroom (other than in a dorm or student housing)	4. A teaching assistant
5. Called me gay or a lesbian or a homophobic name (such as faggot, dyke or queer)	5. In the cafeteria or meal hall	5. A counselor
6. Spied on me as I dressed or showered at school (e.g., in a dorm, in a gym, etc.)	6. In a dorm or student housing	6. A dean
7. Flashed or “moonied” me	7. Outside on campus grounds	7. A coach
8. Touched, grabbed, or pinched me in a sexual way	8. In the library	8. A resident advisor/ dorm advisor

(continued)

Table 3.2 (continued)

9. Intentionally brushed up against me in a sexual way	9. In a professor or teaching assistant's office	9. A security guard
10. Asked me to do something sexual in exchange for giving me something (e.g., a better grade, a recommendation, class notes, etc.)	10. In a college office (e.g., administrative office, work study office, etc.)	10. Another school employee
11. Pulled at my clothing in a sexual way	11. In a fraternity or sorority house	11. Someone else
12. Pulled off or down my clothing	12. Someplace else	
13. Blocked my way, cornered me or followed me in a sexual way		
14. Forced me to kiss him/her		
15. Forced me to do something sexual, other than kissing		

Source: Hill and Silva, 2005.

concerning different kinds of sexual harassment, prod for a variety of social-spatial contexts within colleges and universities, and ask respondents for information about the perpetrator (e.g., student, coach, or professor).

From a multiracial feminist perspective, there are several key advantages of this survey instrument relative to those discussed above. First, implicit in the survey design is the assumption that sexual harassment against college students takes forms that are sometimes similar to, but in many cases different from, sexual harassment experienced by other groups. For example, both the Schedule of Sexist Events and the Drawing the Line surveys include questions about sexual comments or jokes, and both include name calling. However, due to the social organization of college campuses (particularly those that are residential), there are opportunities for sexual harassment in this environment that are not present in other contexts. For example, sexual harassment in the workplace does not often involve the perpetrator spying on someone who is dressing or showering. As Martin and Hummer (1989), and DeSantis (2007) describe, fraternity or sorority houses offer

highly sexualized, secluded environments in which particular forms of sexual harassment (e.g., a man forcing a woman to kiss him; a man pulling at a woman's clothing in a sexual way) and other forms of violence against women become almost normative. The questions about sexual harassment within the Drawing the Line survey clearly reflect the particularity of sexual harassment within the context of the college environment.

Secondly, because the Drawing the Line survey was designed for students aged 18 to 24, the measures of sexual harassment it includes are especially tailored for that age group. We see forms of sexual harassment included in this survey (such as sexual harassment on the Internet or in text messages) that reflect the lived experiences of contemporary young adults. And because of this, the survey is able to capture the intersection of gender and sexuality with age.

The survey's focus on sexual harassment, as opposed to gender discrimination or sexism, allows one further advantage. Namely, respondents are not asked to attribute their experiences with harassment to one particular social status. As a result, women who perceive their harassment as having been driven by a combination of factors, for example, as "racialized sexual harassment" (Teixeira, 2002) or homophobic-sexual harassment, are not forced to choose whether their experiences were driven by one status more than another.

While an excellent tool for understanding college women's experiences with sexual harassment on campus, the Drawing the Line survey is clearly limited in that it is not designed to assess sexual harassment as experienced by women who are not both "college-aged" and currently enrolled in college. While a valuable instrument for assessing sexual harassment in a particular context, and as experienced by a particular group, the very particularity of the survey instrument and the sample to which it was administered makes it difficult to ascertain how sexual harassment within the college environment compares to sexual harassment in other contexts. In addition, although the survey instrument does capture the intersections of gender and sexuality with age, it does not explicitly address potential racial and ethnic differences in women's experiences with sexual harassment.

As a result of both of these factors, the data collected from the Drawing the Line project are limited in their ability to illustrate what sociologist R. W. Connell (1992, p. 736) calls the "relational character of gender"—the ways in which young women's gendered experiences are related to and derive meaning from other groups' gendered experiences. As Baca Zinn et al. (2007, p. 153) explain, "just as masculinity and femininity each depend on the definitions of the other to produce domination, differences *among* women and *among* men are also created in the context of structured relationships." The report *Drawing the Line* highlights the

particularity of college students' experiences, but, used by itself, is less helpful for understanding the relationships, inequalities, and social processes that help create and maintain these differences.

Taken together, a multiracial feminist framework encourages us to think through how sexism, discrimination, and harassment may be experienced differently for different groups of women. Social statuses other than gender may influence the likelihood that women experience any particular form of sexism and also the particular types of sexism that individual women encounter. Social-spatial context matters, as the likelihood of experiencing particular forms of sexism is contingent on the social-spatial contexts through which women move. Further, the social-spatial contexts in which women reside are themselves related to women's social statuses (including gender but also including age, class, race, and ethnicity). Finally, while sexism does sometimes occur in isolation from other types of discrimination, it also occurs alongside and in combination with other forms of discrimination. In other words, the mistreatment of women is not always motivated solely by gender prejudices but by racial, ethnic, class, and sexuality-based prejudices as well.

As seen above, many measures of sexism that are currently used in social science research are limited in that they provide only a partial picture of women's experiences with sexism, harassment, and discrimination. All measures have limitations, however. And because resources are limited and sexism is both pervasive and dynamic, no one scale can possibly capture women's diverse experiences with sexist events. The partiality is not, in itself, problematic. What is problematic from a multiracial feminist perspective, however, is that within each survey instrument, and across all three instruments, the experiences of some women are systematically centralized, and others are marginalized. The experiences of some women are understood to represent the experiences of, in many cases, *all* women. As philosopher Elizabeth Spelman argued in her book *Inessential Woman*, in focusing on women "as women," "feminist theory has confused the condition of one group of women with the condition of all" (1988, p. 4). A similar phenomenon may be at work in much of the survey research on sexism.

While Klonoff and Landrine are careful to report that some groups of women "experience more frequent gender discrimination within specific domains" than do other groups (1995, p. 467), many researchers who have subsequently used the SSE and other similar scales have glossed over these differences. Simply adding up respondents' total experiences with discrimination, researchers have obscured women's varied experiences with particular types of sexist events (for example, see Ayres, Friedman, & Leaper, 2009; Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000; Sabik & Tylka, 2006). What is perhaps even more problematic is that the SSE, originally designed to

capture diverse women's experiences, has been most regularly used to assess college women's experiences with sexism (e.g. Ayres, Friedman, & Leaper 2009; Sabik & Tylka 2006; Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000). With such limited questions about workplace discrimination, the GSS arguably gives us even less insight into diverse women's experiences!

Speaking of African American women's experiences with racism and sexism, sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1990/2000, p. 68) writes, "Intersectionality captures the way in which the particular location of black women in dominant American social relations is unique and in some senses unassimilable into the discursive paradigms of gender and race domination." In a similar way, psychologist Roberta L. Nutt (2004) has drawn attention to the ways in which gender-based prejudices and discrimination affect women differently over the life course. As girls and women mature, their bodies increasingly deviate from the infantilized ideal of femininity. As they age, they spend more or less time within particular institutions (schools, workplaces, homes, medical institutions), and their own positions within each of these institutions change (perhaps from student to teacher, from new employee to manager, from daughter to mother/wife/partner/grandparent). What the above review of these measures makes clear is that our measures of sexism, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment have generally centralized gender and marginalized other systems of difference and inequality. The absence of an intersectional framework limits our potential findings, particularly as it applies to marginalized groups—racial and ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, young and older women. Often, our measures work best for groups that are more privileged and, consequently, help to obscure the experiences of those who are already marginalized.

Re-modeling With Multiracial Feminism: Making the Most of General Surveys

In the previous section, I showed how multiracial feminist theorizing provides a framework for critiquing survey questions concerning sexism, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment. This framework is not, however, simply a tool of critique, and the insights of multiracial feminism are not limited to designing better survey questions. Multiracial feminism can also inform the process by which we analyze existing survey data. Specifically, multiracial feminism's focus on difference and intersecting systems of inequality can help survey researchers construct research models that minimize bias and thus better represent the social world. In more

political terms, a multiracial feminist approach can help to recognize the experiences of marginalized groups and can challenge the reproduction of inequality in social science research.

In the remainder of this chapter, I demonstrate one approach for bringing a multiracial feminist framework to survey research on sexism and gender discrimination. As a methodological framework, multiracial feminist theory pushes me to pay particular attention to how gender intersects with other social statuses (e.g. age, marital, and family status) and with other systems of inequality. My analyses are designed and carried out with an eye toward difference, while I simultaneously search for shared experiences and commonalities. Three analytic interventions are key: disaggregating data to uncover difference, creating models that reflect diverse experiences, and situating gender inequality within a broader social context.

To demonstrate the importance of a multiracial feminist framework, I analyze data from the 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys (GSS), a source commonly used in sociological research and social science research more generally. (In Chapter 4, I show how a multiracial feminist approach might inform data more typical of survey research in psychology and, in Chapter 5, data more characteristic of survey research in women's and gender studies.) In 2002 and 2006, the GSS included a special module focusing on the "Quality of Working Life." The survey was administered to 2,765 individuals in 2002 and 4,510 individuals in 2006, and of those, a subsample of respondents were asked a number of specific questions concerning their work life. Some questions concerned job requirements, such as "How many days per month do you work extra hours beyond your usual schedule?" and "When you work extra hours on your main job, is it mandatory (required by your employer)?" Others were more subjective and tapped how individuals feel about their work. For example, respondents were asked, "Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each of these statements. 'I am proud to be working for my employer.'" And, "My main satisfaction in life comes from work." Also included in this module were questions concerning the relationship between work life and family life (e.g., "How often do the demands of your job interfere with your family life?" and "How often do the demands of your family interfere with your work on the job?") and questions concerning discrimination and harassment in the workplace (e.g., "Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender?" and "In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?"). While I believe a multiracial feminist approach could inform an analysis of any of these issues, it is this latter set of questions—those

concerning gender discrimination and sexual harassment at work—that I focus on here.

Disaggregating Data to Highlight Difference

Table 3.3 shows the frequency distribution of two variables, “Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender?” and “In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?” as they intersect with respondents’ gender. Individuals’ responses were coded into four different categories: (1) “yes,” indicating that they had experienced discrimination or harassment; (2) “no,” indicating that they had not; (3) “don’t know,” and (4) “no answer.” Table 3.3 includes only those respondents who answered “yes” or “no.”^v

Reading across the top row, we can see that when the data from 2002 and 2006 are combined, 46 men surveyed reported that they felt discriminated on the job because of their gender. This represents 2.8% of men who provided answers to the question ($100 * 46/1652 = 2.8\%$). As might be expected, significantly more women ($n = 194$) reported that they had experienced gender discrimination on the job. The percentage of women reporting gender-based discrimination is 4 times higher than that of men. Moving across the table, we see that the percentage of women who report having experienced sexual harassment on the job is also higher—more than double—for women than it is for men. The final two columns indicate the percentage of men and women workers who have experienced gender discrimination or sexual harassment while at work.^{vi}

In and of themselves, these statistics reveal an important story about gender and work in the contemporary United States. Despite the gains made by feminists in recent decades, despite substantial changes in gender-related attitudes, despite federal legislation prohibiting workplace discrimination on the basis of gender, more than 1 in 10 women workers feels she is experiencing gender discrimination at work. Sadly, in the first

^v When asked about gender discrimination at work, 12 respondents answered “Don’t know” (4 men and 8 women), and 30 people provided no answer (17 men and 13 women). When asked about sexual harassment on the job, 11 respondents answered “Don’t know” (3 men and 8 women), and 31 people provided no answer (18 men and 13 women).

^{vi} Fifty respondents, 10 men and 40 women, indicated that they had experienced both sexual harassment and gender discrimination at work.

Table 3.3 Simple Crosstab for Gender Discrimination in the Workplace by Gender. Combined data from the 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys (GSS), full-time and part-time workers.

	<i>“Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your gender?”</i>		<i>“In the last 12 months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?”</i>		<i>“Have you experienced gender discrimination or sexual harassment on the job?”</i>	
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
Yes	46 2.78%	194 11.14%	34 2.06%	98 5.63%	70 4.24%	252 14.46%
No	1606 97.22%	1548 88.86%	1618 97.94%	1644 94.37%	1582 95.76%	1491 85.54%
Total	1652 100%	1742 100%	1652 100%	1742 100%	1652 100%	1743 100%

years of the 21st century nearly 15% of women workers report having experienced either sexual harassment or gender discrimination in their place of employment.^{vii}

But how do experiences with workplace sexual harassment and gender discrimination compare for different groups of women? A multiracial feminist approach encourages us to consider how social statuses other than gender shape women’s experiences, both within and outside the workplace. Table 3.4 disaggregates the information presented in the previous table, and it examines the frequency with which women in different racial, ethnic, class, and age groups report experiencing gender discrimination or sexual harassment. Reading across the first row, for example, we see that 15.5% of non-Hispanic white women (that is, 193 of 1,245 women who consider themselves to be both white and non-Hispanic) who were working either full- or part-time reported having experienced gender discrimination or sexual harassment at their place of work. This percentage is slightly higher than the percentage of non-Hispanic black or African American women who report having experienced workplace sexism (14.4%) and is nearly

^{vii} It is worth noting here that these reports of sexism may not reflect the actual level of discrimination and harassment experienced at the workplace. Some respondents may be discriminated against without their realizing it, while others may perceive actions to be discriminatory when in reality they are not.

Table 3.4 Percentage of Women Respondents Who Report Having Experienced Gender Discrimination or Sexual Harassment in the Workplace Recently. Combined data from the 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys (GSS), full-time and part-time workers.

Racial-Ethnic Group				
Non-Hispanic White	Non-Hispanic Black	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic Other	
15.5%	14.3%	8.0%	8.3%	
(193/1245)	(43/300)	(11/138)	(5/60)	
<i>P</i> -Value for Chi-Square: 0.055				
Educational Attainment				
Less than High School	High School / GED	Junior College	Bachelor's	Graduate Degree
16.4%	12.1%	17.3%	16.4%	18.4%
(20/122)	(110/909)	(33/191)	(57/347)	(32/174)
<i>P</i> -Value for Chi-Square: 0.063				
Respondent's Income Quartile (2002)*				
Q1 (Less than \$15,000 per year)	Q2 (\$15,000 to less than \$30,000)	Q3 (\$30,000 to less than \$50,000)	Q4 (More than \$50,000)	
8.7%	13.6%	22.0%	22.9%	
(19/219)	(33/243)	(42/191)	(24/105)	
<i>P</i> -Value for Chi-Square: 0.000				
Respondent's Income Quartile (2006)*				
Q1 (Less than \$20,000)	Q2 (\$20,000 to less than \$40,000)	Q3 (\$40,000 to less than \$75,000)	Q4 (More than \$75,000)	
10.8%	12.7%	19.0%	23.3%	
(28/260)	(30/237)	(32/168)	(10/43)	
<i>P</i> -Value for Chi-Square: 0.027				
Respondent's Age group				
18–30	31–45	46–60	61+	
16.5%	15.9%	13.0%	7.0%	
(67/406)	(101/634)	(74/568)	(9/129)	
<i>P</i> -Value for Chi-Square: 0.026				

Note: General Social Survey (GSS) 2002 and 2006 (Women working part-time or full-time).

**Note:* Income quartiles are based on the distribution of men's and women's personal incomes. There are fewer women in the upper quartiles because women's personal incomes tend to be lower than men's.

double the percentage of Hispanic women (8.0%) who report having experienced gender-based discrimination or sexual harassment.^{viii}

The differences across personal income and age are particularly significant (as indicated by the *p*-value of the chi-square test, which is below 0.05). In 2002, 8.7% of full- or part-time working women who earned less than \$15,000 reported that they had experienced either gender discrimination or sexual harassment in their workplace. Women who earned more than \$15,000 but less than \$30,000 were more likely to report having experienced sexism at work: 13.6% reported that they had experienced either gender discrimination or sexual harassment in their workplace. Even higher levels of sexism were reported by women who earned more: 22% of women who earned \$30,000 to \$50,000 reported experiencing gender discrimination or sexual harassment, and for women who earned above \$50,000, the figure rose to 22.9%. This is the same pattern we see in the 2006 data: as women's personal income rises, the rates of reported gender-based discrimination and sexual harassment at work increase. Similar differences are seen in age groupings, only here it is younger women who report higher levels of workplace gender discrimination and sexual harassment. Of women aged 18 to 30, 16.5% report having experienced gender-based discrimination or sexual harassment at work, compared to 13% of women aged 46 to 50.

Taken as a whole, the results from Table 3.4 suggest some notable differences in women's workplace experiences. While some of the differences in this table may result from differences in women's perceptions of discrimination, the results nonetheless underscore potentially important differences: Either women in different class, racial-ethnic, and age groups are *experiencing* different levels of gender-based discrimination and harassment, or *perceptions* of workplace experiences differ for different groups of women. A third possibility is that both perceptions and experiences differ for women in different groups.

Creating Models That Reflect Diverse Experiences

Table 3.5 presents the results from more complex statistical analyses, which again highlight how different social statuses shape women's experiences with workplace sexism. Whereas the analyses presented in

^{viii} To assess racial and ethnic differences, I used information from two variables in the GSS. The first, "race," asks respondents, "What race do you consider yourself?" the second, "Hispanic," asks respondents, "Are you Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino/a?"

Table 3.4 examined a series of bivariate relationships (e.g., the relationship between income and gender discrimination or the relationship between age and gender discrimination), the analyses in Table 3.5 are multivariate models, where I examine the relationship among multiple variables simultaneously.^{ix}

The independent variables (i.e., those thought to predict or influence sexism in the workplace) are listed in the leftmost column of the table. I examine racial and ethnic differences in women's reports of workplace sexism by comparing three groups of women: (1) women who identify as being white and who do not identify as being Hispanic or Latina; (2) women who identify as black or African American and who do not identify as being Hispanic or Latina; and (3) those who identify as either being Hispanic and/or Latina or as something other than African American or black or white. I examine educational differences by comparing five groups: (1) those who have earned less than a high school degree or General Equivalency Diploma (GED), (2) those whose highest degree is a high school diploma or GED, (3) those whose highest degree is from a junior college, (4) those whose highest degree is a bachelor's degree, and (5) those whose highest degree is a graduate degree. Marital and family status is also included in Table 3.3. I compare three groups of women based on their marital status: (1) those who are currently married or widowed, (2) those who are divorced or separated, and (3) those who have never been married. I also include a dichotomous variable for whether the respondent has one or more children: Respondents who have had at least one child are coded 1, and those who have not are coded 0. Respondents' ages are also included and are measured in years.

In addition to the sociodemographic variables listed above, I also include several independent variables that speak to the context in which women are working. At the most general level, I include a dichotomous variable for whether the respondent is currently living (and mostly likely working) in the southern United States (1 = living in the southern United States, 0 = living in another part of the United States). I also include a measure of respondents' personal incomes (an ordinal variable with seven categories, where higher values indicate higher personal income) and a measure of occupational prestige. Occupational prestige scores are meant to measure the status or prestige attached to various occupations. On the GSS measure of occupational prestige, physicians, for example, have the occupational prestige score of 86, social workers have an occupational prestige score of 52, and sales workers in the apparel industry have a relatively low occupational prestige

^{ix} For an introduction to multivariate regression analyses, see Allison (1999).

score of 30.^x Finally, I include a dichotomous variable for whether the respondent is working full-time (coded 1) or part-time (coded 0).^{xi}

The dependent variable differs for each of the three models. In Model 1, the dependent variable is a dichotomous variable coded 1 if the respondent reported having experienced either gender discrimination or sexual harassment (or both), and it is coded 0 if the respondent reports having experienced neither gender discrimination nor sexual harassment at work. In Model 2, the dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent reports having experienced gender discrimination, and is coded 0 if the respondent reports no experiences with gender discrimination at work. Similarly, in Model 3 the dependent variable is coded 1 if the respondent reports having experienced sexual harassment at work in the past 12 months and is coded 0 if the respondent reports no experience with workplace sexual harassment in the past year.

The numbers in the body of Table 3.5 are the exponentiated regression coefficients for logistic regression models.^{xii} Statistically significant values *above* 1.0 indicate that higher values on the independent variable increase the likelihood of perceiving sexism at work. Statistically significant values *lower* than 1.0 indicate that higher values on the independent variable decrease the likelihood of having perceived sexism at work. I use the conventional notation of asterisks (*, **, or ***) to denote statistically significant coefficients in the table. If coefficients have no asterisks, this indicates that the independent variable is not a good predictor of sexism, after information from the other variables in the model has been taken into consideration.

Looking at Table 3.5, Model 1 shows the regression coefficients for my analysis of the factors that are associated with experiencing either sexual harassment or gender discrimination at work. In combining information concerning women's experiences with both sexual harassment and gender discrimination, my model makes a similar assumption to that made in the Schedule of Sexist Events survey: Namely, sexual harassment and gender discrimination are both sexist events, and the factors associated with one of these experiences are likely associated with experiencing the other.

^x For women who are working full- or part-time, the correlation between income and prestige is 0.421. See the *General Social Survey Codebook*, Appendix F for information on all occupational prestige scores. Available from <http://www.norc.org>.

^{xi} Respondents who are not currently working are excluded from the analysis.

^{xii} The logistic regression models here are *multivariate* models, in which all of the independent variables are included in the analysis simultaneously.

Table 3.5 Logistic Regression of Workplace Sexism on Selected Variables. Exponentiated Regression Coefficients, 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys (GSS), full-time and part-time workers.

	<i>Model 1: Gender Discrimination or Sexual Harassment</i>	<i>Model 2: Gender Discrimination</i>	<i>Model 3: Sexual Harassment</i>
Race (Reference Group Is Non-Hispanic Whites)			
African American / Black (Non-Hispanic)	.826 (0.220)	.950 (0.244)	.704 (0.333)
Hispanic and Other Racial-Ethnic Groups	0.461** (0.291)	.540 (0.322)	0.375* (0.481)
Age (in Years)	0.980** (0.007)	.993 (0.008)	0.955*** (0.012)
Education (Reference Group Is High School Diploma)			
Less Than High School Degree	1.334 (0.332)	.916 (0.422)	2.257 (0.431)
Junior College Degree	1.342 (0.249)	1.214 (0.277)	1.935 (0.363)
Bachelor's Degree	1.231 (0.217)	1.123 (0.242)	1.734 (0.328)
Graduate Degree	1.346 (0.285)	1.145 (0.313)	1.615 (0.463)
Marital Status (Reference Group Is Married or Widowed)			
Divorced or Separated	2.231*** (0.189)	1.978*** (0.208)	2.859*** (0.305)
Never Married	1.894** (0.218)	1.728* (0.246)	2.263** (0.331)
Child(ren)	1.053 (0.199)	1.058 (0.224)	1.035 (0.298)
Working Full-Time	1.574 (0.238)	1.824* (0.284)	.964 (0.331)

(continued)

Table 3.5 (continued)

	<i>Model 1: Gender Discrimination or Sexual Harassment</i>	<i>Model 2: Gender Discrimination</i>	<i>Model 3: Sexual Harassment</i>
Personal Income	1.194** (0.063)	1.2245** (0.070)	1.197 (0.098)
Occupational Prestige	.997 (0.007)	.999 (0.008)	.991 (0.010)
Currently Living in Southern United States	.804 (0.168)	0.676* (0.192)	1.094 (0.248)
Constant	.117 (0.480)	.044 (0.558)	.150 (0.700)
N	1459	1457	1459

Note: Exponentiated coefficients are presented, standard errors in parentheses. 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys.

In Model 1, the significant factors appear to be race and ethnicity, age, marital status, and personal income. Moving from the top of the table downward, the first coefficient shows that African American women are equally likely to report experiencing sexual harassment or gender discrimination in the workplace, compared to non-Hispanic white women. (Non-Hispanic white women are the reference group, and the coefficient for being African American is not statistically significant, as indicated by the absence of asterisks.) Women who describe themselves as Hispanic or as being part of a different racial-ethnic group, however, are less than half as likely—0.461 times as likely—to report having experienced sexism at work compared to non-Hispanic white women. Controlling for the other variables in the model, age is also very significant—with each additional year of age decreasing the likelihood that women will report experiencing sexism in the workplace. Education appears to be non-significant, but marital status seems to play a big role. Compared to women who are either currently married or widowed (the reference group), women who are currently divorced or separated are more than twice as likely to report having experienced sexism in the workplace. Women who have never been married are also more likely than their married counterparts to experience sexual harassment or gender discrimination: Compared to women who are married or widowed, women who have never married are 89% more

likely to report experiencing sexual harassment or gender discrimination in the workplace. Finally, in this model we also see that personal income has a positive and statistically significant impact on perceived experiences of sexual harassment and/or gender discrimination. Controlling for the other variables in the model, women who earn more are more likely to report having experienced sexism in the workplace.

Without a multiracial feminist framework, it would be reasonable to conclude my analysis with Model 1. The results of this analysis do indicate that social statuses other than gender influence the likelihood of experiencing sexism in the workplace. They point, in particular, to the relevance of age, marital status, personal income, and ethnicity for understanding workplace sexism. A multiracial feminist framework, however, takes this analysis several steps further. It suggests, first, that social statuses influence not only the *likelihood* of an individual experiencing sexism but also the *particular kinds* of sexism that an individual may face. Second, it suggests (or “hypothesizes”) that women may experience particular kinds of sexism more or less, depending on the social context. And finally, a multiracial feminist framework encourages me to situate workplace sexism in a broader context of intersecting inequalities. It pushes me to explore how sexism occurs alongside, and in combination with, other types of discrimination.

In keeping with this framework, the next two models in Table 3.5 disaggregate workplace sexism. Model 2 focuses on the predictors of gender discrimination in the workplace and Model 3 focuses specifically on women’s recent experiences with sexual harassment. When disaggregated in this way, the story becomes more complex, as some of the factors associated with experiencing gender discrimination also are associated with sexual harassment (and vice versa), but some are not. Reading down the column for Model 2, we again see that marital status plays a significant role in women reporting having experienced gender discrimination. Women who appear to be romantically “available” (both those who have never married and those who are divorced or separated) are much more likely—73% and 98% respectively—to report having experienced gender discrimination at work. Controlling for the other variables in the model, women who are working full-time are more likely to report experiencing gender discrimination than are those who are currently working part-time. Women with higher personal incomes are also more likely to report experiencing gender discrimination than are those with lower personal incomes. Finally, living in the South decreases the likelihood that women will report experiencing gender discrimination: Controlling for other variables, women who live in the South are about two thirds as likely (67.6%) to report experiencing gender discrimination, compared to women living in other parts of the United States.

Model 3 tells a different story about sexual harassment in the workplace. While there were no significant differences among racial and ethnic groups uncovered in Model 2, Model 3 suggests strong ethnic differences. While non-Hispanic white and non-Hispanic African American women report similar levels of sexual harassment in the workplace, working women who identify as Hispanic or Latina or as another racial or ethnic group are much less likely (less than half as likely as non-Hispanic whites) to report having experienced sexual harassment in the workplace in the past year.^{xiii} A similar story holds true for age: While age was not a statistically significant predictor of gender discrimination in the workplace, age does seem to affect the likelihood that a woman will experience sexual harassment. For each additional year in age, the likelihood that a woman will report experiencing sexual harassment decreases by 5% (100%–95%). Marital status, however, seems to work similarly for gender discrimination and sexual harassment: Compared to women who are married or widowed, women who have never married are more than twice as likely (2.263 times as likely) to report having experienced sexual harassment at work within the past year. Similarly, working women who are divorced or separated are nearly 3 times as likely (2.859 times) to report experiencing sexual harassment at work, controlling for other variables in the model.^{xvi} Finally, unlike in the previous model, personal income, full-time participation in the workforce, and living in the southern United States are all statistically *non-significant*, meaning that once the other variables in the model are taken into consideration, these three characteristics do not help in determining which women are likely to report experiences of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Taken together, these analyses convey a complicated story about sexism at work—one that connects women’s family lives with their workplace experiences, one that highlights differences across ethnic and age groups but similarities among women despite differences in educational attainment.

^{xiii} Welsh, Carr, MacQuarrie, and Huntley (2006) have argued that women of different racial and citizenship statuses define sexual harassment in different ways. Whether the ethnic differences that emerge in Model 3 result from differing experiences or perceptions, the intersectional analysis suggests that these differences shape women’s reports of sexual harassment more than women’s reports of gender discrimination. See also Essed (2001).

^{xiv} Texeria (2002) reports a similar marriage effect when she investigates sexual harassment of African American women in law enforcement. Kohlman’s (2006) analysis of the 1994 and 1996 General Social Survey finds that women who are divorced or separated are likely to experience more sexual harassment than do married women but finds no statistically significant difference between women who are married and those who have never married.

Model 2 paints a picture of who is likely to report having experienced gender discrimination at work: women who are working full-time, women who are earning relatively high incomes, and women who are divorced, who are separated, or who have never been married. Who is relatively less likely to report having experienced gender discrimination at work? Women who are working part-time, women with relatively lower incomes, and women who are married. Women currently living in the South are also much less likely to report having experienced gender discrimination, though this may stem from regional differences in gender ideology.

Model 3 presents a different picture—one that focuses on age, in addition to marital status and ethnicity. In brief, young women who are unmarried are more likely to report having experienced sexual harassment compared with those who are older and those who are married or widowed. Women who identify as Hispanic or Latina and those who identify as neither white nor African American are much less likely than non-Hispanic white and non-Hispanic black women to report having experienced sexual harassment in the past year. While higher personal income increases the likelihood of experiencing gender discrimination at work, there is no significant income effect for experiences with sexual harassment.

While one must take care not to read beyond the limits of the data, these findings tell a story of the importance of social statuses other than gender for understanding and documenting sexism in the workplace. It may be that women's coworkers view young and unmarried women as "available" and thus sexually harass, threaten, and otherwise mistreat them. It may be that women with high personal incomes have more opportunities for raises and promotion and thus have more opportunities both to experience and to notice gender discrimination and the persistent "glass ceiling." Conversely, the differences may reflect differences in perceptions of sexism: It may be that unmarried women are more dependent on their careers than are married women; thus, they are less able to minimize mistreatment or harassment in the workplace. In any case, what is clear is that there are some important differences that emerge when women's experiences with sexual harassment are disentangled from their experiences with gender discrimination. Women's social statuses help to determine not only the likelihood that they will encounter sexism in the workforce but also the particular forms of sexism that they encounter.

Situating Gender Within a Broader Social Context

Because sexism occurs alongside and in combination with other systems of inequality, my final analyses in this chapter explore the factors associated with other forms of women's mistreatment at work. And these other

forms of mistreatment, though not unique to women, are clearly important to consider when assessing women's experiences at work. While 14.46 % of working women surveyed reported that they had experienced either sexual harassment or gender discrimination at work, 5.4% reported experiencing racial discrimination (among racial- and ethnic-minority women the figure is 12.1%), 8.8% reported experiencing discrimination based on their age, and 11.2% reported experiencing some other type of harassment or threatening behavior in the past 12 months. In total, 27.7% of working women reported experiencing at least one kind of discrimination or harassment at their workplace.

Table 3.6 follows the same format as the previous multivariate models but investigates three different kinds of mistreatment: discrimination based on race or ethnicity, discrimination based on age, and other kinds of threatening or harassing behavior.^{xv} As one might expect, Model 1 suggests that racial- and ethnic-minority women are more likely to report having experienced racial or ethnic discrimination than were non-Hispanic white women. African American women were the most likely to report having experienced racial discrimination (nearly 6 times more likely, as compared to non-Hispanic white women) and women who describe themselves as Hispanic or some other racial-ethnic group were more than twice as likely as non-Hispanic white women to report having experienced racial or ethnic discrimination. A very different pattern emerges for age discrimination. Here, younger and older women are more likely than their middle-aged counterparts to report having experienced age discrimination. Controlling for other factors, women aged 18 to 30 were more than 4 times as likely as middle-aged women (aged 31–60) to report having been discriminated against on the basis of age. Older women were also more likely to report age discrimination, as are women who are working full-time (as opposed to part-time), women who are divorced or separated (as opposed to married), and women with advanced educational degrees. For “other kinds” of harassment, the only significant predictor in the model is marital status. Compared to women who are married, women who have never married are 62.9% more likely to report experiencing “other” types of harassment or threatening behavior at work.

^{xv} Respondents were asked, “Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your race or ethnic origin?” Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your age?” and “In the last 12 months, were you threatened or harassed in any other way by anyone while you were on the job?”

Table 3.6 Logistic Regression of Workplace Discrimination and Harassment on Selected Variables. Exponentiated Regression Coefficients, 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys (GSS), full-time and part-time workers.

	<i>Racial or Ethnic Discrimination</i>	<i>Age Discrimination</i>	<i>Other Kinds of Harassment</i>
Race (Reference Group Is Non-Hispanic Whites)			
African American / Black (Non-Hispanic)	6.919*** (0.295)	.944 (0.283)	.684 (0.259)
Hispanic and Other Racial-Ethnic Groups	2.668* (0.390)	.630 (0.333)	.750 (0.284)
Age (Reference Group Is Aged 31–60)			
Young Women (Aged 18–30)	.943 (0.342)	4.212*** (0.243)	1.157 (0.229)
Older Women (Older Than 60)	1.866 (0.517)	3.604*** (0.351)	.750 (0.392)
Education (Reference Group Is High School Diploma)			
Less Than High School Diploma	.429 (0.630)	1.163 (0.381)	1.015 (0.378)
Junior College Degree	.951 (0.448)	.816 (0.388)	1.264 (0.272)
Bachelor's Degree	.972 (0.381)	1.214 (0.278)	.903 (0.252)
Graduate Degree	1.523 (0.463)	2.183* (0.357)	1.617 (0.297)
Marital Status (Reference Group Is Married or Widowed)			
Divorced or Separated	1.474 (0.308)	2.415*** (0.254)	1.190 (0.213)
Never Married	1.694 (0.344)	1.670 (0.267)	1.629* (0.243)
Child(ren)	1.373 (0.338)	.831 (0.244)	1.395 (0.230)

(Continued)

Table 3.6 (continued)

	<i>Racial or Ethnic Discrimination</i>	<i>Age Discrimination</i>	<i>Other Kinds of Harassment</i>
Working Full-time	1.841 (0.420)	2.026* (0.289)	1.157 (0.238)
Personal Income	1.179 (0.109)	.945 (0.086)	1.096 (0.071)
Occupational Prestige	.983 (0.011)	.993 (0.009)	1.001 (0.008)
Currently Living in Southern United States	1.138 (0.264)	.672 (0.217)	.931 (0.183)
Constant	.012 (0.701)	.040 (0.510)	.057 (0.446)
Number of Respondents in Each Model	1,458	1,458	1,459

Note: Exponentiated coefficients are presented, standard errors in parentheses. 2002 and 2006 General Social Surveys. Working women only.

Conclusion

Taken as a whole, the analyses presented in this chapter help illustrate the importance of a multiracial feminist or intersectional approach to understanding and analyzing sexism. Drawing from multiracial feminist theorizing, I argued at the beginning of this chapter that multiracial feminism offered important and underused insights for survey research on sexism. In particular, I suggested that social statuses other than gender influence the likelihood that women experience sexism, as well as the particular kind of sexism that women experience. In addition, I argued that women's experiences with sexism are shaped by the social-spatial contexts in which women reside and that it was important to consider sexism as occurring alongside and in combination with other forms of discrimination.

The above analyses lend support to each of these claims and, in so doing, reveal the potential limitations of survey research that ignore issues of intersectionality. A multiracial feminist approach highlights the benefits of disaggregating index variables—analyzing the predictors of particular forms of sexism rather than analyzing the predictors of sexism in general—because the predictors of particular forms of sexism themselves may vary. A multiracial feminist approach also highlights the importance of examining sexism within diverse social-spatial contexts, as well as in the broader context of intersecting systems of inequality.

Comparing Table 3.6 with those presented earlier, we can see some interesting similarities and differences. That the significant predictors of particular forms of mistreatment vary shows that some groups perceive more experiences with particular forms of discrimination and harassment than others. That there are some consistencies across tables in the predictors of mistreatment suggests the possibility of intersecting forms of discrimination. Young women (aged 18–30), for example, are the most likely age group to report age discrimination. Younger women are most likely to report sexual harassment, and sexual harassment is also tied to marital status. Those studies that have included sexual harassment as one of many indicators of sexism, risk obscuring the ways in which age and marital status shape women’s experiences. Without systematic attention to the diversity of women’s experiences and the social statuses that shape these experiences, our analyses risk making claims about “gender discrimination” or “women” that reflect only *some* women’s experiences. As Elizabeth Spelman (1988, p. 159) writes of feminist theory,

[t]hose who produce the “story of woman” want to make sure they appear in it. The best way to ensure that is to be the storyteller and hence to be in a position to decide which of all the many facts about women’s lives ought to go into the story, which ought to be left out. Essentialism works well in behalf of these aims, aims that subvert the very process by which women might come to see where and how they wish to make common cause. For essentialism invites me to take what I understand to be true of me “as a woman” for some golden nugget of womanness all women have as women; and it makes the participation of other women inessential to the production of the story. How lovely: the many turn out to be one, and the one that they are is me.

From a multiracial feminist perspective, the participation of diverse women and men is essential to the production of the story. Diversity of experiences and perspectives should be evident in the theories that inform our research, in our statistical analyses, and also in our interpretations of our results. Because these experiences and perspectives are found outside traditional social science canons, incorporating a multiracial feminist perspective will require an interdisciplinary approach. As we will see in the next two chapters, an interdisciplinary multiracial feminist approach is important not only for understanding and analyzing sexism but also for understanding and analyzing racism and feminism.