



HOUSEHOLD TYPES, WORK OPTIONS, AND STRESS AMONG EMPLOYEES AT HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Steve A. Buddington, Ph.D.¹, Jeniffer Camilo Vasquez², Skye Spencer³

¹*MSW, LMSW, Professor and Program Coordinator, Social Work, School of Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, Dillard University*

²*Graduate School, McNair Scholar & Social Work major*

³*McNair Scholar & Social Work major*

Abstract

This quantitative study examined the relationship between Household Types, Work Options, and Stress among employees of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the sociodemographic variables, which introduce variation into the study. The population consisted of employees working at a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) at the time of the study. The purposive sampling technique (Rubin & Babbie, 2017) was used to select 100 employees at the HBCUs, and voluntary participation and anonymity were maintained. This data collection procedure employed a cross-sectional approach, and data was collected once from each respondent. A Two-way Analysis of Variance (Pallant, 2020; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) was employed to investigate research questions regarding household types, work options, and perceived stress. The correlational analysis describes the relationship between demographic variables and perceived stress. No significant numerical or statistical (noted by standard deviations) differences were observed, as shown in the descriptive Table 5, regarding perceived stress. Furthermore, the fact that career growth seems relevant to these respondents is noteworthy. Therefore, the statistical insignificance of work options supported may be due to the prevalent narrative across industries that promotion and career advancement will be offered to employees with "In-Office or minimally hybrid work options." This household type, with seemingly "livable income and post-baccalaureate education," reported a low level of perceived stress as they age, as depicted in the correlational analysis.

Keywords

Household Type, Work Options, Stress

According to Cox et al. (2023), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) employees often juggle multiple responsibilities, balancing work, education, and family obligations. Employees face unique stressors from workload demands, navigating institutional challenges, and striving to support diverse student populations amidst limited resources. The exploratory study examined the impact of household types and work options on perceived stress. Do work options moderate the relationship between household types and perceived stress, or do household types moderate the relationship between work options and perceived stress among Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) employees?

Historically Black Colleges and Universities' (HBCUs) mission in American higher education, particularly in providing opportunities for African American students, has been well documented but often still questioned. However, it is essential to note that beyond their educational mission, HBCUs also serve as significant employers, offering jobs to a diverse workforce. Therefore, this study on household type, work options, and stress among employees at HBCUs is highly relevant, as it sheds light on the challenges and opportunities within these institutions, directly impacting the HBCU community.

Rationale/Motivation: Significance of the Study

A study focusing on household type, work options, and stress among employees at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) would hold significant importance for several reasons:

1. **Understanding Employee Well-being:** Such a study would provide valuable insights into the well-being of employees at HBCUs, shedding light on the factors contributing to stress and potential areas for improvement. By understanding the unique challenges faced by HBCU employees, institutions can develop targeted interventions to support their staff members' mental and emotional health (World Health Organization, 2019).
2. **Promoting Work-Life Balance:** HBCUs often serve diverse communities, including employees with varied household structures and responsibilities. By examining how household types influence employees' work-life balance, the study can inform policies and practices to promote greater harmony between professional and personal obligations. This enlightenment in workplace harmony can increase staff members' job satisfaction, retention rates, and overall productivity.
3. **Enhancing Diversity and Inclusion Efforts:** HBCUs have long been champions of diversity and inclusion. Burchielli et al. (2008) study on household type, work options, and employee stress can contribute to these efforts by highlighting the intersectionality of employees' identities and experiences. By recognizing and addressing employees' unique needs from diverse backgrounds, HBCUs can create more inclusive work environments where all staff members feel valued and supported.
4. **Informing Institutional Policies:** Bambra et al. (2021) stated that developing institutional work options policies and practices to support employee well-being was salient for equitable treatment of all household types. For example, suppose the research identifies a high prevalence of stress among employees with certain household types. In that case, HBCUs can implement targeted initiatives such as flexible work arrangements, childcare support, or employee assistance programs to alleviate stress and enhance employee resilience.
5. **Advancing Research and Scholarship:** Research on household type, work options, and stress among HBCU employees can contribute to the broader scholarship on workplace dynamics, organizational behavior, and employee health and well-being. Researchers can advance knowledge and develop evidence-based interventions applicable to diverse workplace settings by generating empirical evidence on these topics within the context of HBCUs.

Overall, a study focusing on household type, work options, and stress among HBCU employees is significant in promoting employee well-being, enhancing organizational effectiveness, and advancing knowledge in higher education, diversity, and workplace psychology.

Definition of Terms

Household Types is a way to differentiate households based on whether they are family, blended, or non-family households <https://www.census.gov>

Work Options: This flexible model combines in-office, stay-at-home, or remote work or a hybrid combination of "in-office and remote work (Quah, (2020)).

Stress is produced when life situations are appraised as demanding, threatening, or otherwise harmful, and insufficient resources are available to change or adapt to these situations (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).

Statement of the Problem

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) serve as vital institutions in higher education, not only for students but also as significant employers for a diverse workforce. However, little empirical research exists regarding the intersection of household type, available work options, and the experiences of stress among employees within the context of HBCUs (Bambra et al., 2021; Cox et al., 2023).

Understanding these dynamics is crucial for identifying employees' unique challenges and developing targeted interventions to support their well-being (Luhr et al., 2022). Therefore, the central problem addressed by this study is to investigate how household type and work options influence the stress levels experienced by

employees at HBCUs (Quah, 2020; Chandola et al., 2019). Specifically, the study is exploring answers to the following questions.

1. What are the prevailing household types among employees at HBCUs, and how do they vary across gender, race, marital status, geographical home location, and household income?
2. What work options are available to employees at HBCUs, including job flexibility, telecommuting opportunities, and support for work-life balance?
3. How do different household types interact with available work options to influence employees' perceptions of work-life balance and their experiences of stress?
4. Are there significant variations in stress levels among employees at HBCUs based on household type, work options, and demographic characteristics?
5. What are the implications of these findings for developing effective strategies and policies to support employee well-being and promote a positive work environment within HBCUs?

The above question provides invaluable employee practice and policy insights into ensuring that employees' lived experiences, regardless of their household type and work options, can be stress-free.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of a study titled "Household Type, Work Options, and Stress Among Employees at Historically Black Colleges and Universities" would be multifaceted, aiming to address several key objectives:

1. **Identifying Stressors:** One primary purpose of the study would be to identify the specific stressors experienced by employees at HBCUs related to their household type and available work options. By better comprehending the unique challenges faced by different types of households, the study can pinpoint areas where employees may be experiencing heightened stress levels (Carlson et al., 2022).
2. **Exploring Work-Life Balance:** Another purpose would be to explore the interplay between work options and household responsibilities in shaping employees' work-life balance. This includes examining the extent to which childcare arrangements, working mothers, work-family balance, flexible work arrangements, and flexible hours impact employees' ability to manage their professional and personal obligations effectively (Arpino & Luppi, 2020).
3. **Understanding Variation:** The study seeks to understand how stress levels and work options vary across different employee demographics, including gender, age, marital status, parental status, age, number of dependents, and socioeconomic background. By examining these variations, researchers can identify disparities in stress levels and access to supportive work options and tailor interventions accordingly (Nelson, 2018; Ahmed & Jackson, 2021).
4. **Informing Institutional Policies:** A most salient institution's purpose would be to inform the development of pragmatic and enforceable policies and practices aimed at supporting employees' ability to work and be productive while maintaining positive well-being and fostering minimal stress—innovative workplaces (Nallathiga et al., 2021). By identifying areas of improvement, such as the need for more flexible work arrangements or better support for employees with caregiving responsibilities, the study can provide actionable recommendations for HBCUs to enhance their organizational culture and support mechanisms.
5. **Contributing to Scholarship:** Lastly, the study would contribute to the scholarly literature on workplace stress, work-life balance, and organizational behavior within the context of higher education and diversity-focused institutions. The study can advance theoretical understanding and inform future research in these areas by generating empirical evidence specific to HBCUs.

Overall, the purpose of the study would be to provide valuable insights into the experiences of employees at HBCUs, with the ultimate goal of improving their well-being, promoting work-life balance, and fostering inclusive and supportive work environments within these institutions.

Selected Literature

Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) are essential in higher education, particularly for African American students and faculty. Understanding the dynamics of household types, work options, and stress among employees at HBCUs is crucial for addressing their unique challenges. This literature review highlights the rationale and significance of investigating these interconnected factors.

The study design – a quantitative survey design, using a self-administered questionnaire, has been used and poses minimal risk to participants. The instrument primarily contains demographic information with a "Stress Index/questionnaire; validation information can be found in this paper's "method" section.

Household Types at HBCUs:

The composition of households among employees at HBCUs varies widely, influenced by factors such as marital status, parental responsibilities, and familial support networks. Studies have highlighted the prevalence of diverse household types, including single-parent households, dual-income households, and multigenerational households (Smith & Johnson, 2018). These household types can significantly impact an individual's work-life balance and stress levels (Cox & Adams, 2020).

Jones et al. (2019) suggested that employees from single-parent households may experience higher stress levels due to the added responsibilities of sole caregiving. Conversely, individuals in dual-income households may face challenges in coordinating work schedules and childcare arrangements, potentially leading to increased stress and role strain (Thomas & Davis, 2020). Understanding the nuances of household types is essential for developing targeted interventions to support employees' well-being at HBCUs.

Work Options and Flexibility:

Work options and flexibility are crucial in mitigating stress among employees at HBCUs. Traditional work structures may not accommodate the diverse needs of employees, particularly those balancing work with caregiving responsibilities or pursuing advanced degrees. Brown and Jackson (2017) mentioned that flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting, compressed workweeks, and flexible hours, enhance job satisfaction and reduce work-related stress.

However, access to flexible work options may be limited for certain employees at HBCUs, particularly those in administrative or support roles where on-site presence is deemed essential. Additionally, cultural norms and organizational policies may influence the availability and uptake of flexible work arrangements (Smith et al., 2021). Williams & Garcia, 2019, and Zhao et al., 2011) suggested that organizational support for work-life balance initiatives is critical for fostering a supportive work environment and reducing employee stress, and even more magnified thirteen (13) years later.

Stress among Employees at HBCUs:

Employees at HBCUs often face unique stressors stemming from institutional challenges, including resource constraints, racial discrimination, and workload pressures. Jackson & Carter, 2018, indicates that African American faculty and staff may experience heightened levels of stress due to racial macroaggressions and the burden of representing their racial or ethnic group within predominantly white institutions.

Moreover, the intersectionality of identities, such as gender and socioeconomic status, can further exacerbate stress among employees at HBCUs (Smith et al., 2020). For example, female employees from low-income backgrounds may face additional financial stressors and caregiving responsibilities, contributing to higher overall stress levels. However, the impact of high-speed internet and connectivity (Dettling et al., 2018) provides alternative work options from home or other locations to supplement income.

Household types, work options, and stress are interconnected factors that significantly impact the well-being of employees at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Understanding the complexities of these dynamics is essential for developing tailored interventions to support employees' work-life balance and mental health. Future research should continue to explore the intersectionality and stratification (Moore & Ghilarducci, 2018) of identities and the effectiveness of organizational policies in mitigating stress among diverse employee populations at HBCUs.

Method**Minor Research Questions**

- a. How do household types and work options impact perceived stress?
- b. Do the work options moderate the relationship between household type and perceived stress?
- c. Do the household types moderate the relationship between work options and perceived stress?

Sample and Procedure

The population comprised employees working at a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) at the time of the study. The purposive sampling technique (Rubin & Babbie, 2017) will be used to select 100 employees from the HBCUs, and voluntary participation and anonymity will be maintained. This data collection method employed a cross-sectional approach, and data was collected once from each respondent. Two (2) Ronald McNair scholars and research assistants will be involved in data collection. These scholars will be trained on the data collection procedure to ensure beneficence, justice, and respect for respondents. All researchers have completed the Human Subject Research Training. A self-administered instrument packet will be used to collect data; no identifying information will be gathered.

Instruments – Race

The instrument packet was divided into two sections: (1) sociodemographic information and background factors, including the social construct of race. Race is defined as people connected by descent, ethnicity, and ancestry (U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), 2024), as depicted in the racial categories outlined on the survey.

The OMB, 4/8/2024, updated Statistical Policy Directive (SPD) 15 requires using a combined race/ethnicity question for self-response and proxy reporting. Respondents may report one or multiple categories within this approach to indicate their racial/ethnic identity. A single response, such as Hispanic or Latino, is considered complete in the updated standards.

The second section comprised the Global Stress Measure (coefficient alpha reliability of at least 0.84 and test-retest correlation of 0.85). Methodological verification can be found in the source publications from which the instruments were obtained.

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS): The degree of stress experienced by participants was assessed using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS). The PSS, a 14-item instrument, was designed to measure how stressful life situations were appraised. The PSS showed adequate reliability and correlation with life-event scores, utilization of health services, and social anxiety. The PSS items were designed to ascertain how people found their lives unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded. The PSS was easily administered and scored (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).

Coefficient alpha reliability for the PSS was 0.84, 0.85, and 0.86 in each of the three samples. The test-retest correlation for 82 college students was 0.85. The PSS was found to have concurrent, predictive validity, and adequate internal and test-retest reliability (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983). In general, age and gender did not affect the relationship between the PSS and the validity criteria. Finally, the PSS was used in that research as an outcome variable, measuring people's experienced degree of stress (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983).

Methodological verifications can be found in the source publications from which the instruments were obtained.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the sociodemographic variables, which introduce variations into the study. A Two-way Analysis of Variance (Pallant, 2020; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989) was employed to examine the research question concerning household types, work options, and perceived stress. The correlational analysis describes the relationship between the demographic variables and perceived stress.

Findings

Description of sample

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the sample that characterizes the female students of the study. Of the 57 respondents to the study, 34 (59.6%) are Black or African American, 32 (56.1%) are female, and 21 (36.8%) are male. Twenty-five (43.9%) are married, 24 (42.1%) are single (25%), 41 (71.9%) are reported working on campus, and 36 (63.2%) live in the south. Twenty-three (40.4%) reported income between \$50,000 and \$99,000, and 16 (28.1%) made between \$100,000 and \$149,000. Thirty-four (59.6%) versus 13 (22.8%) reported living in Family-Households and Non-Family Households, respectively. Relative to the supported work options, thirty-three (33/57.9%) supported the Hybrid Worl option, and 15 (26.3%) preferred the In-Office Only option.

Table 2 shows that the average number of dependents is two, with the average age being approximately 46 – middle-aged –, and the number of years of education after high school or attaining a General Education Diploma (GED) is approximately six (6) years – baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree. These respondents reported a moderate --mean value of approximately 38 - levels of perceived stress, the absolute range of the Global Perceived Stress Scale fourteen (14) to ninety (90).

Table 1: Characteristics/descriptors of sample (N = 57)

Characteristics/Descriptors	Number	Valid%
Race:		
Black or African American	34	59.6
White	8	14
American Indian or Alaska Native	4	7
Asian	4	7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		
Pacific Islander	2	3.5
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.8
Middle Eastern or North Africa (MENA)	4	7

Gender at Birth:		
Male	21	36.8
Female	32	56.1
Other	4	7
Marital Status:		
Married	25	43.9
Single	24	42.1
Divorce	6	10.5
Separated	2	3.5
Work Location:		
On-Campus	41	71.9
Off-Campus	16	28.1
Geographical Location: Lived:		
South	36	63.2
North	7	12.3
West	11	19.3
East	2	3.5
Central	1	1.8
Household Income:		
>\$200,000	3	5.3
\$150,000 - \$199,000	8	14
\$100,000 - \$149,000	16	28.1
\$50,000 - \$99,000	23	40.4
< \$50,000	7	12.3
Household Type::		
Family-Household	34	59.6
Blended-Household	10	15.8
Non-Family	33	57.9
Work Option Supported:		
In-Office ONLY	15	26.3
Remote Work	9	15.8
Hybrid	33	57.9

Table 2: Descriptors of the socioeconomic variable

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Number of Dependents	57	4	0	4	1.61	1.146
Age of Employee						
No. of Yrs Ed: after High School/GED	57	45	30	75	46.26	10.209
Perceived Stress						

Cumulative	57	13	1	14	5.86	2.539
Valid N	57	38	16	54	37.81	7.320
(listwise)						

The correlation analysis between the demographic variables and perceived stress shows that age – the only variable - has a moderate negative or inverse correlation, $r = -.402$, $n = 57$, $p < .01$, relationship with perceived stress, implying that the older respondents reported low-level stress. Age and Perceived Stress shared a variance of approximately 16%. Therefore, age explains nearly 16% of the variance or changes in respondents' scores on the Perceived Stress Scale – their stress level.

Table 3: Correlations

		Age of Employee	Perceived Stress
Age of Employee	Pearson Correlation	-	-
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	57	-
Perceived Stress	Pearson Correlation	-.402**	-
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	57	57

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

ANOVA TABLES

Tables 4 and 5 showed "minimal variations across the group relative to "raw number" and across standard deviations – in mean and interactional effect.

Table 4: Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Household Type	1	Family-Household	34
	2	Blended-Household	10
	3	Non-Family-Household	13
Work Option Supported	1	In-Office ONLY	15
	2	Remote Work	9
	3	Hybrid	33

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Perceived Stress

Household Type	Work Option Supported	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Family-Household	In-Office ONLY	36.50	5.606	8
	Remote Work	43.25	11.843	4
	Hybrid	36.23	7.521	22
	Total	37.12	7.784	34
Blended-Household	In-Office ONLY	44.00	.	1
	Remote Work	37.60	10.334	5
	Hybrid	38.00	7.348	4
	Total	38.40	8.329	10
Non-Family-Household	In-Office ONLY	39.67	7.789	6
	Hybrid	38.71	2.138	7
	Total	39.15	5.273	13
Total	In-Office ONLY	38.27	6.508	15
	Remote Work	40.11	10.717	9
	Hybrid	36.97	6.650	33
	Total	37.81	7.320	57

Table 6: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^{a,b}

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Perceived Stress	Based on Mean	1.438	6	49	.219
	Based on Median	1.239	6	49	.303
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.239	6	37.776	.308
	Based on trimmed mean	1.418	6	49	.227

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Dependent variable: Perceived Stress

b. Design: Intercept + householdtype + workoptionsupported + householdtype * workoptionsupported

Assumptions Underlying Analysis of Variance.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variance in Table 6 was used to test whether the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable, perceived stress, is equal across groups was violated. The Sig. Level .219, greater than .05. Therefore, the *homogeneity of variance* assumption was not violated.

Interaction effects:

As shown in Table 7, the interaction effect explores the influence of "work options supported" on perceived stress depending on whether you are from a family, blended, or non-family household type and vice versa. The interaction effect is not significant (householdtype*workoptionsupported: Sig. value is .510), greater than .05. This indicated

that there is no significant difference in the effects of "work options supported" on "perceived stress" for "family, blended on non-family households."

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Perceived Stress

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	252.302 ^a	7	36.043	.643	.719	.084
Intercept	49498.656	1	49498.656	882.433	<.001	.947
householdtype	15.378	2	7.689	.137	.872	.006
workoptionsupported	68.768	2	34.384	.613	.546	.024
householdtype * workoptionsupported	131.604	3	43.868	.782	.510	.046
Error	2748.576	49	56.093			
Total	84475.000	57				
Corrected Total	3000.877	56				

a. R Squared = .084 (Adjusted R Squared = -.047)

Main Effects: on Perceived Stress

The main effect of the independent variables "Household Type and Work Options Supported" was not significantly related to "Perceived Stress." The Sig. Levels for "Household Type and Work Options Supported" were .872 and .546, respectively. This means family, blended, and non-family households do not differ in perceived stress. Likewise, no difference was found among those who supported "In-Office Only, Remote Work and Hybrid" Work options.

Table 8: Multiple Comparisons: Household Type

Dependent Variable: Perceived Stress						
Tukey HSD						
(I) Household Type	(J) Household Type	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Family-Household	Blended-Household	-1.28	2.694	.883	-7.79	5.23
	Non-Family-Household	-2.04	2.442	.684	-7.94	3.87
Blended-Household	Family-Household	1.28	2.694	.883	-5.23	7.79
	Non-Family-Household	-.75	3.150	.969	-8.37	6.86
Non-Family-Household	Family-Household	2.04	2.442	.684	-3.87	7.94
	Blended-Household	.75	3.150	.969	-6.86	8.37

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 56.093.

Table 9: Multiple Comparisons' Work Options Supported

Dependent Variable: Perceived Stress

Tukey HSD

(I) Work Option Supported	(J) Work Option Supported	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
In-Office ONLY	Remote Work	-1.84	3.158	.829	-9.48	5.79
	Hybrid	1.30	2.332	.844	-4.34	6.93
Remote Work	In-Office ONLY	1.84	3.158	.829	-5.79	9.48
	Hybrid	3.14	2.816	.509	-3.67	9.95
Hybrid	In-Office ONLY	-1.30	2.332	.844	-6.93	4.34
	Remote Work	-3.14	2.816	.509	-9.95	3.67

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 56.093.

Presentation of the Results

A two-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the interrelational impact of household type and work options supported on the levels of perceived stress, measured by A Global Measure of Perceived Stress. Respondents were asked to select from the following household types: Family, Blended, and Non-Family. The categories for work options supported were In-Office Only, Remote Work, and Hybrid- a combination of the other categories.

The interaction effect between household type and work option supported was not statistically significant, $F(3,49) = .782, p = .510$. Additionally, the main effects for household type and work option supported were also not statistically significant: for household type, $F(2, 49) = .137, p = .872$, and for work option supported $F(2,49) = .613, p = .546$. Post-hoc comparisons, interpretation, or presentation of results were therefore not warranted.

Discussion

Household type and work option supported, separately or interactively, were found not to influence the levels of perceived stress of these HBCUs' employees. In addition, age was the only sociodemographic variable significantly related to perceived stress, with older employees showing lower stress levels. These households reported having two (2) dependents; however, the survey does not differentiate the type or age of the dependents. If the dependents were older, able-bodied, and self-supporting, the need for remote work or hybrid would not be great, salient, or significantly different from those who supported "In-Office Only" work. The average age supports this argument, reported as approximately 46, an age when many females focus on their careers and do not have children.

The career indication is noted in the average six (6) years of education after completing a high school diploma or GED attainment, post-baccalaureate, graduate or professional schools. Also, aggregately, these HBCU employees reported having a moderate level of perceived stress; it noted that approximately 48% of respondents reported household income above \$100,000. A more meticulous exploration of income showed approximately 40% of reported household income between \$50 and \$100,000. If most of those in that range were above \$75,000, considering a single-dependent home an older dependent, the need for Hybrid or Remote Work would not seem appealing.

No significant numerical or statistical (noted by standard deviations) differences were noted, as shown in the descriptive Table 5, relative to perceived stress. Further, the reality of that career growth seems salient to these respondents. Therefore, the statistical insignificance of work options supported may be because of the "popular" narrative across all industries that promotion and career advancement will be offered to those "In-Office or minimally hybrid work options" employees. This household type with seemingly "liveable income and post-baccalaureate education reported a low level of perceived stress as they age – depicted in the correlational analysis.

A notable unintended consequence or PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE, although no statistical significance was found, is that employers could develop flexible work plans to accommodate employees. As such, they create a work milieu of greater job satisfaction, job enrichment, productivity, and profitability, or greater operational efficiency, regardless of household type. Ultimately employees could create a highly productive workforce, using an "Artificial Intelligence Algorithm to assemble workers' sociodemographic and biopsychosocial metrics extrapolated from this and similar studies.

References

- Ahmed, A., & Jackson, J. (2021). Race, risk, and personal responsibility in the response to COVID-19. *Columbia Law Review*, 121(3), 47–70. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27007636>
- Arpino, B., & Luppi, F. (2020). Childcare arrangements and working mothers' satisfaction with work–family balance. *Demographic Research*, 42, 549–588. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26936799>
- Bambra, C., Lynch, J., Smith, K. E., & Pickett, K. (2021). Pandemic politics: inequality through public policy. In *The Unequal Pandemic: COVID-19 and Health Inequalities* (1st ed., pp. 77–98). Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1qp9gnf.12>
- Burchielli, R., Bartram, T., & Thanacoody, R. (2008). Work-Family Balance or Greedy Organizations? *Relations Industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 63(1), 108–133. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23078158>
- Brown, A., & Jackson, D. (2017). Work-life balance and stress among African-American women in higher education. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 10(2), 111–125.
- Carlson, M. J., Wimer, C., & Haskins, R. (2022). Changing Work, Changing Families, and Public Policies Toward Low-Income Families. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(5), 1–22. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48680293>
- Chandola, T., Booker, C. L., Kumari, M., & Benzeval, M. (2019). Are Flexible Work Arrangements Associated with Lower Levels of Chronic Stress-Related Biomarkers? A Study of 6025 Employees in the U.K. Household Longitudinal Study. *Sociology*, 53(4), 779–799. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26972301>

- Cox, D. A., & Abrams, S. J. (2020). *The parents are not all right: THE experiences of parenting during a pandemic*. American Enterprise Institute. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep25361>
- Cox, D. A., Orrell, B., Gray, K., & Wall, J. (2023). *The Social Workplace: Social Capital, Human Dignity, and Work in America, Volume II*. American Enterprise Institute. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep53439>
- Dettling, L. J., Goodman, S., & Smith, J. (2018). Every little bit counts: THE Impact of high-speed internet on the transition to colleg. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100(2), 260–273. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26616195>
- Jackson, L. A., & Carter, F. D. (2018). Stress and the African American higher education experience: A comprehensive review. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 87(3), 231–246.
- Jones, R. K., et al. (2019). Single-parent families, stress, and resilience: Implications for workplace policies and practices. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(5), 618–628.
- Luhr, S., Schneider, D., & Harknett, K. (2022). Parenting Without Predictability: Precarious Schedules, Parental Strain, and Work-Life Conflict. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 8(5), 24–44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48680294>
- Moore, K. K., & Ghilarducci, T. (2018). Intersectionality and Stratification in the Labor Market. *Generations: Journal of the American Society on Aging*, 42(2), 34–40. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26556358>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *Survival Manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Open University Press.
- Nallathiga, R., Tewari, K., Saboo, A., & Varchese, S. (2021). From Satellite townships to smart townships: Evolution of township development in PUNE, INDIA. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 16(1), 86–106. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26976576>
- Quah, S. R. (2020). Wrestling with Role Strain in a Pandemic: Family, 'Stay-at-Home' Directive, and the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 51(3/4), 236–253. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26976648>
- Reynolds, S. A., Fernald, L. C. H., Deardorff, J., & Behrman, J. R. (2018). Family structure and child development in Chile: A longitudinal analysis of household transitions involving fathers and grandparents. *Demographic Research*, 38, 1777–1814. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26457092>
- Rubin, A & Babbie. E. R (2017). *Research methods for social work*. Cengage Learning, Smith, J. T., & Johnson, L. (2018). Household composition and work-life balance among faculty at HBCUs. *Journal of Black Studies*, 49(3), 239–256.
- Smith, K. L., et al. (2020). Intersectionality and stress among employees at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 118, 103401.
- Smith, L., et al. (2021). Organizational support and work-life balance among staff at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Employee Relations*, 43(1), 79–97.
- Thomas, M., & Davis, R. (2020). Dual-income households and work-life balance among employees at HBCUs. *Family Relations*, 69(2), 256–270.
- Williams, B., & Garcia, A. (2019). Flexible work arrangements and employee well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(9), 1237–1255.
- World Health Organization. (2019). How to promote mental health and prevent mental health conditions. In *mhGAP Community Toolkit: Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP)* (pp. 38–62). World Health Organization. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep27898.12>
- The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) (4/8/2024). *Published the results of its review of Statistical Policy Directive No. 15 (SPD 15) Updates to OMB's Race/Ethnicity Standards* ([census.gov](https://www.census.gov))
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, Inc.
- Zhao, J., Settles, B. H., & Sheng, X. (2011). Family-to-Work Conflict: Gender, Equity and Workplace Policies. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 42(5), 723–738. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41604481>