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ABSTRACT

The archives profession has, in recent years, exerted considerable effort to become more welcoming and inclusive to diverse archival professionals. Many of these efforts have focused intensively on recruiting a diverse workforce. In this article, the authors propose a new approach through which to create and sustain inclusive archival work environments: caregiving. National research has shown that caregiving responsibilities affect women more than their male counterparts, and within these gender divides there are aspects of caregiving that impact individuals of different racial and cultural backgrounds unequally. The issue of navigating the demands of caregiving, work responsibilities, and professional engagement must be discussed openly and with the goal of mitigating the long-term consequences on caregivers' health, career advancement, and financial stability. As professionals who care for archival collections, the additional demands and central importance of caregiving for loved ones incur measurable impact on archival careers. If the archival profession desires to be truly inclusive, then the issues surrounding the related factors of development opportunities, wages, and affordable care need to be confronted. This article aims to provide context for the argument that supporting caregiving responsibilities during archival employment is a crucial component of creating a wholly inclusive profession. The authors provide a literature review across disciplines, outline factors that directly influence archivists who are caregivers, and identify areas for further research.

Introduction

National research has shown that caregiving disproportionately impacts women more than their male counterparts, and within these gender divides there are aspects of caregiving that affect individuals of different racial and cultural backgrounds unequally. The issue of navigating the demands of caregiving, work responsibilities, and professional engagement must be discussed openly with the goal of mitigating the long-term consequences on caregivers' health, career advancement, and financial stability. Caregiving responsibilities and caring for collections may seem like a disparate connection. Yet many archival professionals balance professional and personal caregiving and make decisions as a direct result of these responsibilities. In a profession where traditional organizational culture pervades, salaries stagnate, cross-
country moves are often necessary, and part-time or temporary employment may affect access to benefits and career enhancement opportunities, caregiving responsibilities present obstacles for career advancement and participation, and limit who is able to excel within the field. As professionals who care for archival collections, the additional demands and importance of caregiving for the loved ones in our lives and the potential impact on our careers is only starting to receive the kind of attention and discussion that their centrality requires. If the archival profession desires to be truly inclusive, then the issues surrounding the related factors of accessibility of development opportunities, wages, and affordability of care need to be confronted.

At the Midwest Archives Conference (MAC) Annual Meeting in Omaha, Nebraska, April 2017, and the Society of American Archivists (SAA) Annual Meeting in Portland, Oregon, July 2017, the authors and several other panel members presented two sessions to spark conversation about caregiving, professional engagement, advancement obstacles, and advocacy for greater inclusivity within the profession. Based on the thoughts shared by audience members and feedback after the sessions, it became clear that the initial definition of caregiving was too narrow, and that quantifiable information to advocate for meaningful change within the profession was lacking. This article aims to broaden our comprehension of caregiving impacts on archivists by providing a literature review across disciplines, outlining factors that most directly influence archivists who are caregivers, and lastly identifying areas for further research.

As the Caregiving in the U.S. Report published by the National Alliance for Caregiving and the AARP in 2015 notes, “caregivers are as diverse as the United States as a whole: they come from every age, gender, socioeconomic, and racial/ethnic group. They share positive aspects of caregiving. They also share many struggles, but can face different challenges depending on their circumstances. Caregivers may need differing support depending on their loved one’s condition and needs, and their own problems, strengths, and resources.” Given national conversations about workplace equity, advancement of women, and diversity and inclusion, the authors feel it is time to acknowledge that the struggles of care providers—whether caring for children,
spouses, friends, and/or elderly family members—have an impact on inclusion within the archival profession. Caregiving affects opportunities for advancement, acquisition of practical experience, participation in development and leadership activities, and may cause individuals to leave a profession in which wages are often too low to cover the direct costs of care and professional growth. In an effort to advocate for change, this article attempts to address and legitimize these issues.

Acknowledgement of Biases

This article emerged in the wake of two archival conference panels intended to encompass a fuller range of experiences. However, caregiving responsibilities did not permit all who participated in the panel to contribute to the article. We acknowledge that our personal experiences are those of white, cisgender women who provide care to dependents. While this has informed our approach to these issues, we have attempted to address experiences that are not our own. We recognize that there are many factors including gender, race, and culture that impact caregiving on an intrinsic level and have made a concerted effort to incorporate an inclusive range of experiences from the professional literature. That said, our research revealed a series of gaps in precise quantitative and qualitative research data that addresses the relationship between caregiving and professional responsibilities not only for the archival profession but for allied fields. These deficiencies are highlighted throughout the paper.

Cost of Care: Earnings

It was clear from the sessions at the MAC and SAA Annual Meetings that archivists’ salaries play a role in their caregiving choices and experiences. In order to understand the effect finances have on the cost of care for archival professionals, it will help to explore the salary ranges for archivists. According to the A*Census data reported in 2004, the mean salary for all respondents was $49,329, while the mean salary for managers was $57,387. Three surveys conducted since 2014 have collected salary data: an informal survey conducted by Stephanie Bennett in 2014, a formal survey by SAA in 2015, and a 2017 SAA-sponsored survey from the Women Archivists Section (WArS/SAA). All have fewer respondents than A*Census, and while they include questions about full-time and term employment, only the WArS/SAA survey addresses caregiving directly. Bennett’s informal salary survey received 963 responses and the average annual salary reported was $50,968, little higher than the mean annual survey noted ten years earlier in the A*Census. Bennett’s survey also found hourly wage differences between term/temporary/contract positions and full-time

positions, noting that temporary employees earn on average $4.46 less per hour than permanent employees.\textsuperscript{5, 6}

In January 2015, SAA “launched a survey to gather employment data relating to archivists and the archives profession. A total of 3,976 individuals responded.”\textsuperscript{7} The greatest percentage of respondents, 20.70\%, indicated that their salary range was $40,000-$49,999. The second largest group, 17.97\%, fell in the $50,000-$59,999 range.\textsuperscript{8} These ranges mirror national estimates produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) in its semiannual mail-survey-based “Occupational Employment and Wages Report.” The May 2017 BLS filter for “Archivist” identified 6,080 archivists employed across the United States with a mean hourly wage of $26.67 and mean annual wage of $55,470, with institutional affiliation and then geographic placement impacting wages (self-employed archivists are not included).\textsuperscript{9} Each instance reflects salaries similar to those reported in the A*Census. While the BLS survey uses a different collection method, it, like surveys distributed by professional organizations, can be instructive, particularly as it does not rely on membership status for survey enrollment.

Overall these surveys reflect a modest increase in salaries as compared to 2004: the 2004 A*Census mean salary of $49,329 has the same buying power as $66,020 in January 2018. Only the WArS/SAA survey data indicates that salaries have stayed on pace with inflation; the Bennett survey and SAA 2015 Employment Survey indicate that average salaries are behind inflation.\textsuperscript{10} As we will see in the following sections, these adjustments in salaries do not compensate for the rising costs of care.

Lack of data about our colleagues of color makes it difficult to understand how national patterns of wage disparity affect these individuals, who represent somewhere between 9.72\% (in the 2015 SAA Salary Survey) and 15.2\% (in the WArS/SAA salary


\textsuperscript{6.} Ibid., 27.


survey) of the profession. The Economic Policy Institute reports that when "compared with white workers, black workers have been losing ground since 2000, with larger black–white wage gaps across the entire distribution.... Conversely, Hispanic workers have been slowly closing the gap with white workers." The 2017 WArS/SAA salary survey, with 2170 responses, improves our understanding of the impact race plays in the profession. Compared to the other SAA surveys and Bennett’s survey, the WArS/SAA survey requested information on broader salary ranges, indicated that archivists may be earning slightly higher salaries than in 2004, and is the only survey that reported salaries by racial category. The data finds that those

who identified as white had the majority (~34%) of their salaries fall in the middle range of $46-$59,999; they had substantial representations on both sides of that range, though weight skewed to the high range. Asian Americans also tended (~39%) to the middle range, but did not have a similar balance in lower and higher ranges—approximately 52% of Asian Americans were earning in the upper two salary ranges. The proportions of African Americans and Latinx Americans in the middle range of salaries was much lower than other groups, though larger proportions of both groups earned $60-$79,999 annually.

Nationally, Hispanic/Latinx and Black/African American women earn less than their White and Asian counterparts. The assumption is that this trend holds true in the archives profession, but updated comprehensive data is needed to confirm this postulation. If the trend is true, that would mean most archivists of color face the additional burden of financing costs of care in lower wage households. These factors may contribute to people of color leaving the profession or perceiving it as


13. Israel and Eyre, 3.

14. Israel and Eyre, 15. A salary range and race cross-tabulation is presented as Table 9 on pages 15-16 of the report.

inaccessible. To address issues of inclusion in a comprehensive way, it is imperative to address salary disparities that are often compounded by high costs of care.

Cost of Care: Direct Costs

Providing care for loved ones is a responsibility that has intangible benefits but very tangible costs. While logistics vary, the direct cost of care has a significant impact on household expenses of archivists caring for children, a partner or spouse, a close friend or neighbor, extended family, or an elderly loved one. The WArS/SAA survey is the only survey to capture information about caregiving roles in the profession, with 12.7% of respondents serving as the primary caregiver for children, 0.8% as the primary caregiver for another adult (younger than 65 years old), and 2.2% as the primary caregiver for an elderly person (over 65 years of age). In most states the cost of care is high when compared to household income, and as it applies to childcare can vary widely from state to state. Washington, DC, with an average annual cost of infant care at $22,631, and Mississippi, with an average annual cost of infant care at $4,822, represent the range of childcare expenses, but “the average cost of center-based daycare for infants is about $10,468 per year, the average cost of center-based day care for toddlers is about $9,733, and the average cost of a nanny who cares for one child is about $28,905.”

In 2017, "nearly one in three families (32 percent) reported spending 20 percent or more of their annual household income on child care." If we assume the median salary for archivists falls within the $40,000-$49,999 range as reported in the 2015 SAA salary survey, then the average cost of these childcare options exceeds the 10-20% typically budgeted for these expenses for nearly all salaries across the range. This financial burden can be great on a family. When wages earned are weighed against the cost burden of care services, many decide it is more financially prudent to leave the workforce than spend on childcare. Given that previous surveys have not identified the number of archivists who have left the profession because their salary was insufficient to compensate for the cost of childcare, it is difficult to measure the impact this has had on the profession.

While more comprehensive data is available on the costs of childcare, it is important to recognize that the financial impacts of providing care to an adult are also significant. Costs for adult care range widely, depending on the intensity of care required and availability of services. There are a number of service models available for individuals and families requiring long-term care services and supports (LTSS) for

16. Israel and Eyre, 9.
18. Ibid.
activities of daily living (ADLs) such as bathing, dressing, toileting, and eating. Services such as these may be required for a variety of disabilities including older adults with dementia and young adults requiring long-term care. Genworth’s Cost of Care Survey 2017 puts national median annual costs for these services anywhere from $18,200 for adult day care services to $97,455 for a private room in a nursing home, with compound annual growth of 3-4%. LTSS are not generally considered medical care, and as such are not covered by health insurance, or by Medicare. It is estimated that the average American turning 65 today “will incur $138,000 in future LTSS costs.... Families will pay about half of the costs themselves out-of-pocket, with the rest covered by public programs and private insurance.” In addition to paid care options, unpaid care is a critical part of the long-term and eldercare equation. The BLS, drawing upon the American Time Use Survey, reports that an estimated 16% of the general population (41.3 million) provided unpaid eldercare in 2015-2016, the most recent year for which data are available, with women representing the majority of the providers (56%), and all caregivers spending an average of 2.8 hours on caregiving activities on days they provided care. While the use of paid care is directly related to household income and is used more frequently in households with higher incomes, trends in the use of paid help have reversed, with families increasingly providing care without additional outside help: “evidence suggests that more family caregivers are assisting older family members or friends with higher rates of disability than in the past, and are more likely to be providing hands-on and more physically demanding and intimate personal help.”

Race impacts elder caregiving roles; Pinquart and Sorenson found “that caregivers from ethnic minorities were younger than White caregivers. In addition, they were less likely to be a spouse, to be married, and to report high levels of


education and income. Non-White caregivers provided care for more hours per week and reported a larger number of caregiving tasks.\textsuperscript{24} They also "found worse physical health but better psychological health among ethnic minority caregivers than among White caregivers."\textsuperscript{25} Sexual orientation also impacts eldercare. In his report \textit{Out and Visible}, Espinoza notes that "about one in three (34\%) LGBT older people lives alone, as compared to 21\% of non-LGBT people.” Furthermore, “40\% of LGBT older people say that their support networks have become smaller over time, as compared to 27\% of non-LGBT older people.”\textsuperscript{26}

While recipients of unpaid care may not incur monetary costs for that care, caregivers themselves often bear costs as a result of their caring role. A 2007 Evercare/National Alliance for Caregiving study of family caregivers (those caring for a relative or friend over the age of 50 during the month prior to the study) found that respondents have an average annual out-of-pocket expense of $5,531, more than 10\% of the median income of the group.\textsuperscript{27} Annual out-of-pocket expenses are higher for long-distance caregivers ($8,728), with co-resident caregivers and those who care for someone nearby spending less ($5,885 and $4,570, respectively).\textsuperscript{28} Perhaps unsurprisingly, family caregivers in the lowest income brackets often have the highest burden of care with regard to hours expended and proportion of income spent on care.\textsuperscript{29} These averages, however, can often hide some important differences as shown by a Health and Human Services Report that illustrates varying effects based on gender, income bracket, marital status and health. While it shows expected costs that are nearly double for women ($180,000 vs. $90,000), it does not account for the impact of race.\textsuperscript{30}

As the costs for providing care increase, it stands to reason that we as a profession might lose the progress and small milestones in inclusivity that have been

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 100.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 19.
\item \textsuperscript{30} U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Office of Disability, Aging and Long-Term Care Policy, 6.
\end{itemize}
achieved thus far if archivists must choose between professional duties and caregiving responsibilities. Using the WArS/SAA survey results that identify a potential 15.7% of archival professionals currently serving in a caregiving role, we can project that they are also very likely spending 10-20% of their wages on out-of-pocket caregiving costs. The available survey data does not take into consideration how many are in single versus dual income families, and to what extent caregiving poses a financial burden on our colleagues. The overall impact is simple conjecture based on the recognition that these cost of care issues are not unique to the archival profession. Coupling low rates of compensation with trends in life expectancy, incidence of chronic conditions, and disability in old age (both on the rise), complicated by trends in family demographics (smaller families with fewer children to provide care, increasing numbers of childless older women), increased geographical distance in caregiving, and a shortage of direct-care workers to help families who desire assistance, these factors indicate that there is likely to be increased burden on American families providing care in the future. 

Cost of Care: Wage Losses

Given this understanding of stagnant wages in the archival profession and the significant and increasing costs of caregiving, any wage losses incurred by caregivers during the course of care would be burdensome. These losses may include wage penalties, having to use unpaid time off for caregiving responsibilities, and transitioning to a single-income household. It is commonly accepted that there is a wage penalty experienced by working mothers, in which "mothers earn less than women without children." This penalty is influenced by several factors, including a woman’s "human capital (e.g., education, job experience, and workplace seniority)," age, earning level, marital status, and race. How much of a penalty do working mothers face? Estimates vary, but Budig and England find that base penalties are “5% for one child, 11% for the second child, and 15% for three or more children. And, having a second child has a much larger incremental effect than does having the first child.” Glauber, however, finds that “mothers with one child do not pay a wage penalty.”

31. Feinberg, Reinhard, Houser, and Choula, 10.
There are several factors which affect the penalty for women and which directly impact the archival profession.

The first factor is education level. It is increasingly common for archivists to have obtained a master's degree as a base level requirement for employment: "70.7% of A*Census respondents held a master's degree, in comparison to two earlier surveys where 37% of respondents in 1956 noted their highest degree was a master's degree, and 49% of respondents indicated the same in 1982." 36 The more recent WArS/SAA Salary Survey indicates that 92.2% of respondents had a master's degree. Several studies found that those with college degrees experience minimal penalties or even a wage boost. 37

The second factor is earnings. Budig and Hodges found, in a study focusing solely on white women, "wage penalties at all points in the earnings distribution," with "significantly larger penalties in the lower end of the wage distribution," becoming "significantly smaller at successively higher earnings levels," ranging from 2.5% for high earners to 14% for low earners. 38 While few archivist salaries fall on the lowest end of earnings (6.67% of respondents to the SAA 2015 Employment Survey earned less than $20,000 and 2.40% of respondents to the WArS/SAA salary survey earned less than $29,999), some of us may be considered high earners (13.38% of respondents reported earning over $80,000 in the 2015 Employment Survey; according to the WArS/SAA survey, 17.8% of respondents earned more than the $80,000 threshold in 2017). 39, 40

The third factor is race. The wage penalty primarily affects white mothers. Glauber states that "Hispanic mothers do not pay a wage penalty, regardless of their marital status or their number of children." 41 And, that "married African American mothers with one or two children do not pay a wage penalty, whereas married White mothers..."

37. Israel and Eyre, 11.
mothers with one or two children pay a 2% and an 8% wage penalty, respectively. Married African American and White mothers with more than two children, however fare similarly. Additionally, “never-married White mothers pay a wage penalty, but never-married African American mothers do not pay a wage penalty.” The literature questions if this is because of overall lower wages for women of color. Investigating this hypothesis in the archival field requires additional data on how earnings are affected by race, and may have ramifications for a profession predominantly made up of white women.

The final factor is whether or not a mother takes time out of the profession. Staff and Mortimer noted that “the cumulative time spent in activities that do not involve human capital acquisition (no work and no school) was the most important single mediator of the motherhood wage penalty.” Budig and Hodges found that “lost experience accounts for almost half or more of the penalty among women in the upper 50 percent of the wage distribution.” On the other hand, Anderson, Binder, and Krause stated that “mothers who return right away actually experience nearly a 1% wage premium for their infants and toddlers.” The effects of this factor appear to be significant but to measure how this factor impacts the profession would require future study.

Of note, fathers almost universally experience a wage bonus, with earnings increasing when they have children. The size of the bonus is influenced by many factors, including education levels, complexity of the job tasks, and race, with white and Latino men experiencing a higher bonus. Notably, none of these factors serve to alter the fatherhood bonus among African-Americans, which remains the lowest of all racial/ethnic groups in every analysis. An additional factor is the type of familial relationships a man has, e.g., married, residential or biological

42. Glauber, 955-956.
43. Ibid., 958.
45. Staff and Mortimer, 17.
46. Budig and Hodges, 720.
49. Ibid.
50. Ibid., 13.
fatherhood, which are associated with wage gains. Killewald found that “only men married to women working less than full-time receive a statistically significant fatherhood premium,” and “the larger wage premium for married residential fatherhood will tend to advantage demographic groups that spend more time in this privileged status—notably [w]hite men and more educated men who are already advantaged in the labor market.”

These studies suggest that education, earnings, race, and gender all play a role in future earnings. Other than the WArS/SAA Salary survey, no other surveys of archives professionals have addressed caregiving, so it is unclear whether archival salaries have included a wage penalty for mothers, wage bonuses for fathers, or lower bonuses for our colleagues of color. If the profession wants to address wage disparities, it will have to examine the causes for these disparities with a comprehensive survey that may help to understand who is providing care in our profession, and what effect caregiving has on salaries.

**Leaving the Workforce:** The decision to leave the workforce, either temporarily or permanently, can be complicated. As we have noted, mothers who choose this option may incur a wage penalty on returning to the workforce. Those concerned about pathways for women into leadership note that work absences affect a woman’s ability to earn enough experience to qualify her for higher management, thus creating a “leaky pipeline of women who voluntarily opt out of careers or create new career paths to better enable them to combine the rigors of work and home life.” A Pew Research Center report indicates that “10 percent of highly educated mothers (those who earned a master’s degree or greater) stay home.” Hewlett and Luce note that “nearly four in ten highly qualified women (37%) report that they have left work voluntarily at some point in their careers. Among women who have children, that statistic rises to 43%.” Schank and Wallace find that women often “engage in a kind of childcare calculus where they factored in their salary, the cost of childcare, their long-term career prospects, and the degree to which their working would negatively


52. Ibid., 112.

53. Ibid., 112-113.


affect their family. For those with jobs that were either low-paying or unfulfilling, many stated that ‘it just made sense’ for them to stay home.” For others, “the job wasn’t sufficiently flexible for a new parent; it didn’t pay enough to cover the cost of childcare; or it simply wasn’t so fulfilling as to warrant the disruption it would cause the family. So they left.” This was the experience of one respondent to a survey on job search experiences and career satisfaction among recent archives graduates: “I am expecting a child and childcare is likely to cost more than I earn. I’m hoping that flexible work schedules will be able to help reduce the need for daycare, but the reality is I will need a new job and may need to look outside archives to be able to make ends meet.”

Hewlett and Luce note additional differences between men and women leaving the workforce. “Only 24% of men have taken off-ramps (with no statistical difference between those who are fathers and those who are not).... Child-care and elder-care responsibilities are much less important; only 12% of men cite these factors as compared with 44% of women. Instead, they cite switching careers (29%), obtaining additional training (25%), or starting a business (12%).” Hewlett and Luce bring up an important point: women do not just leave the workforce to care for children. “Factors other than having children that pull women away from their jobs include the demands of caring for elderly parents or other family members (reported by 24%) and personal health issues (9%).” Indeed, “[t]he pull of elder care responsibilities is particularly strong for women in the 41 to 55 age group ... positioned as it is between growing children and aging parents.” It is not just care for a young child that causes premature departures from the profession, but also the cost and time commitment of eldercare that coincides with another life event: retirement.

A 2011 MetLife study on Baby Boomers caring for their parents reports that daughters are generally more likely to experience negative effects of caregiving in


59. Hewlett and Luce, 3-4.

60. Ibid., 3.

their own employment than sons who care for parents. Any worker who leaves the labor force early experiences a loss of wages in the immediate day-to-day as well as a loss of future Social Security benefits; women engaged in care work are more likely to exit from the workforce entirely than to reduce hours worked if they made changes in employment status when taking on care. The Metlife study estimates “the cost impact of caregiving on lost wages and Social Security benefits for women equals $274,000” and $233,716 for men. One potential solution is “wider adoption of caregiver friendly [unemployment insurance] rules; better implementation of existing caregiver-friendly rules; and consideration of broader policy changes to provide a more comprehensive safety net for working caregivers.” Whether an off-ramp is temporary or permanent, it is apparent that these career decisions have greater repercussions for women than men. With the archival profession dominated by women, it is likely that caregiving has a stronger influence upon this profession than others that are more male-dominated or in closer balance.

For many families, it is not the caregiver who leaves the workforce but rather the person in need of care who must take the off-ramp, thereby putting the wage-earning burden solely on the shoulders of the caregiver. Individuals caring for spouses or partners face difficult choices when it comes to prioritizing work and caregiving responsibilities. While a healthy spouse may wish to provide care or be available to assist regularly in care activities, there are obvious limits to the time and leave one can take from employment. This has led to “outsourcing” of caregiving responsibilities. Bookman and Kimbrel point out that “families attach differing cultural meanings to care and have widely different resources with which to accomplish their care goals. Although the poorest have access to some subsidized services, and the wealthiest can pay for services, many middle-class families cannot afford services.” Individuals who do bear the responsibility of caring for sick or injured partners—particularly those in late middle age—find themselves with career


64. The MetLife Study of Caregiving Costs, 14.


dilemmas, as they are forced to become the sole breadwinner as their partners are unable to maintain employment due to disability or illness. Without the additional income from their partner, spousal caregivers often have less ability to choose part-time employment options or to exit the workforce temporarily due to the needed income for current living expenses, long-term (retirement) financial needs, and medical insurance benefits associated with employment. In a study of caregivers aged 45 and over from the Canadian Community Health Survey, Lee and Zurlo find that “spousal caregivers have more difficulty in meeting basic expenses compared with those who are not spousal caregivers. Also, compared with males, females have more difficulty in meeting expenses.” In general, spousal caregivers have fewer support resources than non-spousal caregivers, including lower incomes and rates of employment, and “the 2011 NSOC [National Study of Caregiving] found marked differences in employment between those caring for a spouse (24 percent) or a parent (more than 60 percent).”

As we consider the costs of care alongside the access to employment, we see that caregivers experience more limited choices in the types of archival employment they can pursue. If caregivers need to take time off, how are they supported in the profession? How many in the profession rely on single incomes or have transitioned from dual to single incomes while providing care? Without understanding the burdens and choices faced by our colleagues, how can we hope to facilitate the support caregivers need?

**No Paid Time Off (PTO)/Unpaid FMLA:** While providing or receiving care, some are able to utilize the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), a federal program providing up to 12 weeks of unpaid employment-protected leave to guarantee job security, but not income. A significant number of American workers are not covered by the program due to exclusions: those at companies with fewer than 50 employees, those who have been with their current employer for less than year, and those who average fewer than 24 hours per week.

The *Family and Medical Leave in 2012: Technical Report* prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, provides a view into how FMLA is used and the benefits employees receive from it.

---


Most leave taken is for the employee’s own illness (55%), pregnancy or a new child (21%), and for illness of a qualifying relative (spouse, child or parent, 18%); most leave is short, with nearly half of all leave events lasting 10 days or less (42%); and most employees receive some pay while on leave with 48% receiving full pay and another 17% receiving partial pay, usually but not exclusively through regular paid vacation leave, sick leave, or other “paid time off” hours. Rates of full pay drop sharply for leaves of more than 10 days (60% for leaves of 10 days or less, 40% for leaves of more than 10 days). The inability to afford leave is another common reason for returning to work (40%).

Whether leave is paid is almost entirely determined by the employer. The 2014 National Study of Employers finds that “58 percent of employers claim to provide ‘at least some pay’ for maternity leave, 9% offer full pay, and 14% claim to offer ‘at least some pay’ to an employee who is the partner of a woman who has given birth or is adopting.” According to the BLS (2014) National Compensation Survey, “just 12% of workers are reported to have access to paid family leave (maternal or paternal), though others could have access to maternity leave for the period of disability.”

Within the archives profession, the 2015 SAA Employment Survey provides baseline information on the availability of leave to caregivers. Of the respondents’ employers, 31.90% do not offer maternity/paternity leave, 31.10% offer paid maternity leave, 14.56% offer paid paternity leave, and 36.56% of respondents do not know their employer’s policies. Just under 6.66% have employers who subsidize (or partially subsidized) childcare. 92.94% of respondents receive paid vacation leave, and 90.43% receive paid sick leave. Unfortunately, the survey inquired about the availability of leave within the maternity/paternity context only, so it is unclear whether these benefits apply to other care relationships or whether they are specific to childbirth or adoption events. (Some free-text responses do clearly refer to FMLA.)

74. Ibid., 45.
75. Ibid., 48.
benefits, flexible work hours, and caregiving support but those findings were not reported at the time of this writing.\textsuperscript{76}

For those in employment situations eligible for FMLA, coverage is further restricted to certain kinds of family relationships, excluding participation by unmarried partners, daughters- and sons-in-law, step-children, grandchildren, siblings, nieces and nephews, and others who frequently take on roles in caring for older adults.\textsuperscript{77} A Heller School for Social Policy study found that “Nine percent of covered and eligible employees who reported that they needed leave but did not take it said that they needed family leave because of a relative’s health condition (who was not a child, spouse or parent), a non-relative’s health condition, or a domestic partner’s health condition.”\textsuperscript{78} By limiting the kinds of relationships that are eligible to receive time off for caregiving responsibilities, FMLA supports a notion of filial responsibility that is limited and rooted in Western cultural norms and attitudes. Filial responsibility is “the sense of obligation to care for one’s aging parent(s)”\textsuperscript{79} and “[t]he form of care provided and beliefs about filial responsibility in general are influenced strongly by cultural norms and attitudes.”\textsuperscript{80} As cultural groups within the United States have different values related to caregiving, certain segments of American society may find that FMLA coverage has less relevance for the kinds of care they expect to provide and that they have fewer culturally acceptable options for care available to them. For example, “Latino caregivers are most likely to be daughters or daughters-in-law, Caucasian Americans are most likely to be spouses, while African American caregivers are most likely to be adult children, friends, or members of the extended family.”\textsuperscript{81} Within some Asian communities, adult children are expected to care for elderly family members and placement within a care facility is anathema; a failure to care for one’s family members can bring shame on the family as a whole and can result in the exclusion of the younger generation from the community.\textsuperscript{82} Our colleagues of color eligible for FMLA may thus find that the types of care they are culturally expected to provide are excluded from coverage.
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Those who are self-employed or who are working in term positions, which are common throughout the profession (16% of respondents to the 2015 SAA Salary who were employed reported that their position was a term/temporary one), may find themselves with even fewer benefits allowing them to engage in caregiving responsibilities. Likewise, part-time employees, who represented 10.2% of respondents in A*Census and 13% of respondents in the 2015 SAA Employment Survey (those who identified as employed, part-time as well as those who reported employment in multiple part-time positions), are not always afforded the same medical and leave benefits as full-time employees.

The lack of financial and leave resources plays out in a number of ways, including decisions about whether to leave the workforce, who becomes responsible for care, the level of involvement one can maintain, and even decisions to delay or to not have children at all. In a survey about job search experiences and career satisfaction among recent archives program graduates, one respondent, when asked whether career choices affected personal and family life, remarked on the role the lack of benefits played in fertility intentions: "Since my initial employment was grant-funded and I was not eligible for FMLA leave, we had to postpone children until I was hired full-time." A member of the audience for the caregiving panel at the MAC meeting in 2017 described the emotional toll of having to delay childbearing due to lack of benefits. Ultimately, there are both subjective and objective economic circumstances that impact expectations related to childbearing and those who feel pronounced economic uncertainty, such as in part-time or term-limited positions, "are likely to express greater uncertainty regarding childbearing." Children may be perceived as being too costly or too much of a financial strain and the "uncertainty may appear both as doubts about whether they will have children at all and in 'putting off' childbearing for a later date." Comments from recent archives program graduates bear this out: "Children? HAHAHAHA! I had to give up on that long-cherished dream many years ago—the numbers will never add up."

While some states are stepping in to provide more assistance to families (California, New Jersey, and Rhode Island guarantee paid family and medical leave),
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such programs are not yet widespread. *The New America Care Report* finds that, “In most states, employees taking leave are eligible only for a percentage of their weekly compensation, up to a predetermined ceiling. For low-income workers, the partial compensation can be so low as to make taking leave close to impossible.”\(^9\) The national discussion regarding paid parental leave, when this was being written, proposes a system that would allow new parents to receive funds from the Social Security system to help defray costs of parental leave. However, policy experts fear that because “women have lower earnings, smaller Social Security benefits and less financial security in retirement because they spend a disproportionate amount of time away from work to raise children.... Drawing down their Social Security benefits early could compound the problem.”\(^9\) This proposal also has implications for those providing care to a spouse or other elder later in life; with a delayed or reduced Social Security benefit, those who provide spousal or elder care may not have the financial stability to provide the amount of care needed because they may need to continue to work.

What implications do unpaid FMLA or lack of paid time off have for archivists? How many of our colleagues find that their caregiving relationships are excluded by FMLA? Is paid time off available, or are archivists generally relying on unpaid time off? If our profession reflects national trends, up to 60% of our colleagues are not eligible for FMLA. Unfortunately, we have no reliable data on how many institutions with archives have less than 50 employees or how institutions apply FMLA to term or grant funded positions. Archival surveys frequently collect information about the type of institutions for which archivists work, but they do not ask about the overall size of the hiring institution. Lastly, what benefits, if any, are available to part-time employees who work in archives, or those serving in full-time temporary positions? Though the 2015 SAA Employment Survey provides baseline information on numbers of part-time and term employed colleagues, the data was not collected in a way that allows for determining whether these employees receive the same benefits as full-time employees.

Cost of Care: Opportunity Costs

Combining the dual roles of caregiving and employment involves a significant amount of decision-making that can have a ripple effect on advancement and professional growth. These decisions result in opportunity costs: choices that can

---


often lead to an assessment of how dedicated one is to daily work, whether one is available for or capable of special assignments, and how engaged one is in the profession. Ultimately, these assumptions can have repercussions on promotions, funding for professional development, and on salary increases. Societal and cultural influences often impact caregiving, which “may thus lead to differences in the propensity to provide care and the amount of care provided and thus to differences between countries and between men and women.” These workplace perceptions can lead to discrimination based on caregiving responsibilities (known as Family Responsibility Discrimination (FRD)), and apply to workers caring for family members of all ages. To understand how caregiving affects opportunities, we will examine the repercussions on advancement, geographic limitations, relocation decisions, and professional engagement. Much of the literature focuses on gender differences, but the nuance of how caregiving impacts opportunity costs as it pertains to other subdivisions such as race, age, sexual orientation, and other facets of a diverse archival workforce seems to be absent from the literature.

**Advancement:** Those who seek off-ramps, as well as those who remain in the profession while serving in a caregiving role, face roadblocks that impede career advancement. These challenges may be expressed in multiple ways. A caregiver choosing to leave the profession on a temporary basis to care for a parent, child, or spouse will have gaps in employment history that can make it difficult to re-enter the profession or advance in an archival position. In a field where employment options are often limited, a temporary leave may morph into a permanent career change. Caregivers who remain in the workforce may be interested in promotion, but limited by time and finances from participating in assignments or career development activities. If it is true, as McCrea writes, that “Leaders are not born, but develop out of opportunity,” then the occasions of “[p]resenting a paper at a professional meeting, managing a project, facilitating a team, running for office, and volunteering for ‘stretch assignments’ can all result in relevant experience;” but these may not be options for caregivers. Coincidently, the SAA Membership Committee noted in its Survey on Barriers to Participation Report that “the top two barriers to participation [in SAA] are expense and time.” To better understand strategies employed by
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caregivers when facing advancement opportunities, we need to look at studies conducted in library and academic fields in regard to childcare. Graves, Xiong, and Park found that “female librarians tend to feel more strongly than their male colleagues that child-bearing and child-rearing will negatively impact their ability to successfully negotiate the promotion and tenure process.” Additionally, Drago et al., indicate that some professionals engage in bias avoidance strategies, “behaviors designed to escape potential career penalties associated with caregiving commitments.” These behaviors range from staying single or having fewer children, to not asking for parental leave or missing a child’s important events, with women more likely to engage in these behaviors. And yet, Zemon and Bahr, in a study of academic librarians, found that “motherhood does not generally affect the number of prior directorships held by respondents.” Notably, many of the directors cited a helpful partner as key to their success; this has ramifications for those serving as the sole care provider without partner or spousal support.

Contributing to the impediments surrounding advancement opportunities for archivists who are caregivers is the previously mentioned FRD. When defining FRD, the Center for Worklife Law lists “poor assignments [given] to mothers based on stereotypical assumptions about their availability or commitment” as a primary example of how caregivers who continue to work may be impacted. It cannot be denied that some in the profession may have been perceived by employers to be less available or less motivated in their work because they were providing care for a loved one, costing them an opportunity for advancement. Berdahl and Moon find that “[w]orking mothers who are highly involved in caregiving in their homes may be treated with relative kindness in their everyday work lives while at the same time less likely than other employees to receive pay and promotions in recognition of their work.” Additionally, the 2017 CARE survey notes that “73 percent of working parents say their job has been affected because of [childcare] plans falling through at the last minute, with 64 percent having to use sick days and 54 percent being late to
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work as a result. In hindsight, approximately 1 in 5 parents (21 percent) said that they wouldn’t have made the same career decisions.\textsuperscript{104} When institutions maintain an unrealistic expectation of availability and tie constant availability to perceptions of success, those with caregiving responsibilities will not be seen to succeed at the same pace as those with the time and flexibility to accommodate after-hours work duties. Parents and caregivers may need additional support and flexibility in order to balance caregiving and work responsibilities.

**Geographic Limitations and Relocation:** Research shows that “overall mobility rates have declined for individuals of all ages and among all age groups” with the largest declines amongst those between 20 and 29 years of age.\textsuperscript{105} While short-distance mobility rates declined substantially, “long-distance moves have declined less sharply or have even remained unchanged.”\textsuperscript{106} While there is not a clear answer as to why people decide to stay in place or relocate, geographic proximity to family members that allows one to assist with elder care, utilize an older generation as primary full-time or supplemental childcare, or absorb costs for outside care, certainly plays a part in the decision. For those who are part of the “sandwich generation,” taking care of parents or older friends and relatives at the same time as children, a move may not only require additional expenses for childcare, but also increases complications and expenses related to the provision of care for the older generation. It should not be surprising that some people decide a move for professional advancement is not financially or personally feasible and stay in positions that are unfulfilling or leave the profession entirely.

The need to relocate for an archival position is heavily emphasized by career advice boards, and the perception that geographic relocation is essential to have a successful archival career persists.\textsuperscript{107} Those in caregiving roles may find themselves unable to relocate due to the realities of existing care arrangements. Of course, any decision to relocate can be difficult, but in a field where the concentration of professional positions has a distinct geography, a move for caregiving reasons may mean that it is impossible to secure another position within the profession or to do so within a reasonable amount of time. While the WArS/SAA Salary Survey indicates
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that 3% of respondents serve as a primary caregiver in an adult or elder care situation, it is statistically unclear what geographic relationship exists between caregiver and caregiving recipient or what impact geography had on a caregiver’s decision to leave the profession. 108

The reliance on relatives to provide care is pertinent to all discussions of caregiving. For example, a relocation affects the reliance on relatives for childcare, and may reduce the number of available care options. Adema, Clarke, and Frey report that “nearly half of all families in the United States with working mothers regularly rely on relatives to care for pre-primary school-age children.”109 This reliance on unpaid or subsidized childcare arrangements appears to impact communities of color more frequently. A Boston College School of Social Work study finds that “families with unpaid childcare arrangements (including Head Start, family members and friends, and/or the family received a subsidy so there was no cost) were more likely to be African American (39%) or Hispanic (34%) than White (28%).”110 Obviously, there are many reasons why families may choose to rely on one parent for childcare, but as previously described, the household may then only be supported by one income. For some, moving away from relatives means taking on additional costs, either the cost of only one parent working while the other cares for children, or the cost of paying for childcare (generally around 10-20% of the family budget). Of recent surveys, only the WARs/SAA Salary Survey has asked about relocation, with questions such as “Are you living in the same city or state in which you received your professional degree?” and “How many times have you moved to a different city or state for an archives job?” As of this writing that data has not yet been published.

The issue of caregiving may not, of course, be a factor when an archivist considers relocating for a job. There are successful professionals who live at a distance from loved ones who require care and are able to balance work responsibilities with caregiving needs. All caregiving situations require flexibility from employers and an understanding that caregiving needs are changeable and unpredictable. While this is not usually a part of the discussion about inclusivity in the archival profession, flexibility and understanding of unique care situations has the potential to influence who can pursue advancement and who leaves the profession. In a study on the reasons that people leave librarianship, Rathbun-Grubb finds that
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dissatisfaction with a number of aspects of work contributed to decisions to leave and "many LIS organizations and employers do not proactively encourage or enable work-life-family balance, or are unable to respond to employee requests for balance." The complex relationship between relocation, caregiving, and opportunity costs requires more pointed research to understand how they are interconnected.

**Professional Engagement:** For those interested in leadership or management positions, a record of engagement in professional organizations and in career development activities helps to build a strong profile. Just as caregiving responsibilities can play into a decision to relocate, caregiving responsibilities also affect a professional’s ability to participate in education, networking, public speaking, and research opportunities. The cost of attending these events as well as the stress of locating additional services in the absence of a caregiver compounds the burdens for archivists who provide care for loved ones and their families. With decreasing professional development funds provided by employing institutions, more archivists must pay out of pocket to attend conferences. When coupled with cost, the complications that come from transferring caregiving responsibilities while traveling to professional meetings can be challenging, even in the best of circumstances. Some of the issues outlined below are not insurmountable, and could be addressed with creative solutions that shift the responsibility to organizations and institutions rather than adding to the strain of already stressed caregivers.

The 2004 A*Census reported that a significant proportion of archival professionals received no or only partial financial assistance for continuing education opportunities and that this lack of financial support was a barrier to obtaining professional development. A 2010 OCLC research report on archives and special collections libraries indicated that 75% of respondents saw their 2008-09 budgets drop as a result of the decline in the global economy. This trend appears to have continued: the 2017 SAA membership survey finds that funding levels have remained the same or declined for the overwhelming majority of archivists who have been with their employer more than five years. Thus, in order to partake in continuing


education or development activities, which are necessary for staying current with the profession and gaining experience needed for advancement, many archivists have to pay out of pocket and stretch their household budgets to include these costs. Failure or inability to take on this expense may leave archivists feeling isolated, without skills and experiences that enrich their professional practice, and with a smaller network of colleagues upon whom they can rely for advice.

In addition to the direct costs of conference fees, lodging, and travel, caregivers must also arrange for alternate care and face potential added costs. Participation in professional conferences may depend on having strong support networks, including a supportive spouse or partner. However, for those who are the sole care provider either as a single parent or caring for a spouse, finding alternatives to care can be even more challenging. Because of the nature of the spousal relationship, “spousal caregivers are likely to be the primary care coordinator. They typically have fewer resources to draw on for support and perform much more intensive care.”

In some instances, bringing a small child to a conference can be unavoidable or preferred, depending on the age and needs of the child. SAA, in response to the repeated petitions of archivists with young children, began offering consistent childcare at annual meetings in 1985; there is evidence that childcare was also offered at meetings in the early 1970s. “In 1985, council assessed each annual meeting attendee $2 to support childcare,” and at the January 1993 SAA Council meeting, a childcare policy was adopted. This policy remained in place until February 2008, when the Council adopted an approach of putting registrants directly in touch with care providers and subsidizing a portion of the cost from the Annual Meeting Budget:

Child Care Services for Registrants at SAA Annual Meetings—Upon request, SAA will put annual meeting registrants in contact with childcare service providers. SAA will subsidize the cost for childcare and will plan an appropriate amount in each year’s annual meeting budget. The meeting registration material should clearly indicate that a small portion of each registration fee is used to cover the costs of childcare services, pursuant to

actions of the 1984 business meeting and January 1985 and 1993 Council meetings.  

This is the policy that remains in place today, which assigns the responsibility and stress to the caregiver to make one more arrangement and incur one more cost that will likely go unreimbursed to attend a meeting.

While SAA does offer support for childcare during conferences, changing the language and application, as well as implementing a return to previous policies would make conference attendance more inclusive and help to ensure that other types of caregivers receive support as well. Establishing a “Care Services at Annual Meetings” policy would mean that archivists caring for spouses and elders could also seek care subsidies, and would launch a conversation for other caregivers who still have too many barriers to participate in professional development. Solutions could begin with more remote participation options in conjunction with the physical conference to allow caregivers to attend and present remotely. Conference organizations typically place the burden to coordinate remote participation on session presenters or section chairs; instead, remote participation should be a standard option throughout annual conferences at the national and regional levels.

While this change may allow for broader participation by caregivers in sessions, workshops, and the like, opportunities to serve in a leadership capacity on advisory boards, steering committees, and other governing bodies for professional organizations are often perceived as requiring in-person attendance as a condition of service. These opportunities are likely to remain outside the reach of many caregivers when in-person attendance is required. Some organizations, such as MAC, have specifically adjusted bylaws to allow for remote participation in board meetings, and it is clear that SAA’s Council conducts at least some of its business in a virtual manner. Without personal contact with those intimately aware of service requirements, some members of professional organizations may simply assume that attendance is required to participate in a leadership capacity; SAA’s Membership Committee identified such an assumption as a common barrier to participation.
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Those who serve in and recruit others to leadership positions within our professional organizations are often unaware of policies related to attendance and perpetuate the notion of inaccessibility for those for whom travel is difficult, as played out on the SAA Leaders Listserv earlier this year when several individuals currently serving in a volunteer leader capacity indicated that they had been told that travel to the annual meeting was a requirement for service and Governance Program Coordinator Felicia Owens unequivocally replied, “Annual Meeting attendance is NOT required for any SAA positions—whether it be a committee, board, task force, working group, or section.”

For some in the field, busy schedules or lack of employer support may mean that service obligations must be completed outside of normal business hours, competing for the limited time available to many caregivers. As a result, some caregivers may choose to forego service opportunities for mental or physical health reasons. For example, in Cushing’s 2010 survey of professional working archivists under 35, “Many explained that they had no time in their work day to work on committee projects, while others explained they were dissatisfied that they had to spend time outside of work doing committee work: ‘Finding time during the busy work day to take part in this work. I often have to participate on my own time’ (Respondent 627768866).”

Finding time is difficult, but reducing the time needed for travel to and from meetings by relaxing physical presence requirements lowers the barriers to participation and access to leadership positions within professional organizations. In creating a more inclusive environment for leadership, organizations have a larger pool from which to draw upon, which may have a revitalizing, diversifying effect on the organization. Specific and ongoing public awareness campaigns about requirements and expectations for service should be implemented in archival professional organizations, who should also consider—and advertise—when and where the group’s business truly requires the physical presence of every leader. Such promotion and awareness campaigns could start to change this exclusive culture and create more opportunity for those who serve in caregiving roles.

Recommendations

When this discussion started in early 2016, it was a conversation amongst colleagues about the difficulties and challenges related to caregiving and a desire to


lead within the field. Formal conference sessions were an attempt to give space in a public setting to discuss and provide a support network for the issues many of us struggle with but are not addressed in the professional literature. Indeed, these sessions worked to create “room for more voices and more stories” about one’s professional life and its impact on caregiving work. Feedback from the sessions at MAC and SAA indicated that more needs to be done than simply giving space in the program for people to feel connected and included in the conversation. That said, as we conducted our in-depth exploration of these issues, we discovered a lack of profession-specific quantitative research on which to base recommendations through evidence-based data points. Questions ranged from “How does caregiving affect advancement in the profession, and who takes on a promotion and who does not?” to “What caregiving biases exist in the profession, and how do archivists consciously or subconsciously respond to these biases?” and “Who among us has left the profession because of caregiving responsibilities and the cost they bring?”

There has been valuable and timely work performed by other archival professionals that begins to build a picture of the needs of the caregiving population in our profession, most notably the survey conducted by WArS/SAA. However, a collection of data surrounding the intersection of caregiving and professional responsibilities is lacking. It is imperative that we collect data to capture the voices of those who are not part of SAA or who have already left the profession due to factors related to caregiving (and for other reasons); to understand the effect of national patterns of wage disparity and cost of care on archivists, particularly our colleagues of color; to determine how employment status (part-time, limited term employment, etc.) affects access to FMLA and other benefits that create caregiving opportunities; and to ask questions that interrogate how opportunity costs and health implications relate to caregiving. Applying a more focused lens to archivists who are caregivers holds the potential to elicit more practical and profession-specific recommendations, thereby creating a more inclusive working environment for everyone. In order to be more precise about the relationship between caregiving and professional responsibilities, the next logical step in this investigation would be a series of targeted surveys that explore these issues explicitly and lead to informed change within the profession and the organizations who support and employ archivists.

Conversations at both the MAC and SAA sessions reveal that the emotional, physical and psychological stress of balancing responsibilities at home and at work, while also seeking advancement in the profession, takes a toll. The 2017 survey of archivists and their working conditions posed questions about the relationship between gender and stress in the workplace, but did not solicit data that addressed the impact of caregiving on stress levels, time availability, work flexibility, and career

development. Scholars in the fields of sociology, gerontology, and epidemiology note that the unpaid work of caregiving has numerous short-term and long-term mental and physical health effects and attempt to understand how these affect women and men differently.

We can assume, based on Martire and Schulz’s model as presented in Beach et al., that caregiving roles have positive and negative aspects and that there is a relationship between demands on the caregiver, the caregiver’s appraisal of their ability to adapt to and manage those demands, and positive or negative responses (affective, cognitive, physiological, etc.) that in turn relate to risks for physical or mental health problems for the caregiver. In any caregiving situation, there may be demands that lead to positive appraisals (e.g., satisfaction at being able to help a family member with activities of daily living) and others that lead to negative appraisals (e.g., emotional distress at interacting with a loved one who no longer remembers your relationship). A combination of negative and positive responses to caregiving demands may serve to counterbalance health risks. Profession-specific data would allow policy makers to understand if lone arrangers, for example, are impacted differently than their colleagues at larger institutions or whether archivists of color experience greater or reduced burdens compared to their peers and make changes to address those concerns.

There are examples of specific corporations that have enacted changes that allow for greater workforce engagement, retention, and job satisfaction. While workers can advocate for organizational change, employers must first perceive flexible working arrangements as benefits that impact the organization in a positive way. Organizations increasingly understand that “people who are more content, happier, and less afflicted by stress tend to be more productive. In the end, it is the quality of


the work that gets done that matters, not the time spent in the office.” The McKinsey and Company’s Pathways program offers flexible work schedules, as well as job enrichment rotations in other departments and even other industries. The company Best Buy implemented a “results only work environment,” or ROWE, in 2004. The ROWE model “emphasize[s] the value for the organization of moving from a face time culture to a workplace that is focused on work outcomes and that encourages employees to think creatively and collectively about how best to achieve those results.” Implementing changes to the workplace culture is possible, as these corporate examples illustrate. What structural and cultural obstacles hinders the adoption of modernized work environments for archival organizations? Would workplace flexibility and organizational change create more sustainable career trajectories for those balancing archival work and caregiving responsibilities? Corporate examples would seem to suggest so. However, “[c]ollaboration at all levels is key: a combination of bottom-up initiatives and top-down support and strategic vision, with the inclusion of union representatives in decision making, builds widespread ownership of change.” How library and archival organizations might achieve successful implementation of work accommodations has not been extensively explored.

In our reading of the literature, we observed that the power of individual behavioral and attitudinal shifts allows us as professionals to confront vocational awe and imbalanced workplace culture as dangerous threats to our working lives, and to expose the need for more sweeping changes at the regional and national level. For example, when we examine our own implicit biases towards colleagues who provide care, consult with caregiver colleagues about their needs, advocate for flexible leave policies, expand the type of work that can be completed remotely, or support virtual conference attendance, we engage and sustain a more inclusive profession. Flexible work arrangements, which may include flex-time, compressed schedules, job-sharing, and remote work, are possibilities that our profession has explored unofficially, but on the whole, most archival professionals maintain regular schedules. These schedules may incorporate flexibility on an as-needed basis, but it is never a given. The need for regular working hours in the archival profession arises in part from the needs of our user communities. For example, corporate archives are usually connected to the corporations in which they are housed, many of which observe typical 40-hour workweeks. Research and academic archives partner closely with
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campus stakeholders who need access to collections during the hours in which they conduct their work. Yet implementation of flexible work arrangements could still be explored with careful planning and communication; many flexible work arrangement proposals request documentation for how employees will complete their work responsibilities.\footnote{See, for example, Harvard University Human Resources, “Flexible Work Arrangement Proposal Form,” https://hr.harvard.edu/files/humanresources/files/flexwork_proposal_form.pdf (accessed October 12, 2018).}

The adoption of individual changes creates a fertile environment for momentum to build around the issues of work-life integration and career sustainability. Retention and well-being of workers was widely reported to be better when organizations, managers, and co-workers supported flexible work arrangements.\footnote{Amy L. Richman et al., “The Relationship of Perceived Flexibility, Supportive Work-Life policies, and Use of Formal Flexible Arrangements and Occasional Flexibility to Employee Engagement and Expected Retention,” Community, Work & Family 11, no. 2 (2008): 195.} In studying the reasons graduates from North Carolina library science programs departed the profession, Rathbun-Grubb noted that administrators play an important role in creating an environment conducive to retention: “Administrators could accommodate more flexible scheduling, create family-friendly policies, facilitate re-entry to the profession, and retain early- and mid-career professionals by grooming them for future leadership and managerial roles.”\footnote{Rathbun-Grubb, 177.}

Inclusive work arrangements take into account the holistic work experience, as archivists are employees, earning an income, and supporting themselves and their families. Much of life takes place outside of the workplace; when organizations emphasize the importance of work-life integration and include time for caregiving in that comprehensive understanding, it reduces the tensions between caregiving and professional responsibilities. Our analysis of the existing literature has attempted, in part, to expose the “normative patterns of success and autonomy that are at odds with the vulnerability and dependence felt in caregiving.”\footnote{Monika Shafi, “Caregiving, Work, and the Debate on ‘Why Women Still Can’t Have It All,’” Women in German Yearbook 30 (2014): 161.} Archival jobs are just that—jobs. The work we do is important, but we should approach archival work as a reciprocal relationship. Archivists ensure access to collections, but institutions must ensure access to flexible leave policies that enable archival professionals to make time for both caregiving and work responsibilities.

Our professional organizations also have the opportunity to take the lead in making conference and leadership activities more accessible to caregivers. Changes made by one organization to better accommodate caregiver needs are more likely to be adopted by others.
Many of the actions that could be taken to reduce the cost of professional development or to allow involvement at a leadership level for the benefit of caregivers will benefit other members as well. While we recognize that some of these recommendations are expensive to implement, caregivers specifically would benefit from more opportunities to participate virtually, to access educational content in an asynchronous manner, and to seek assistance in establishing and paying for care when attending a conference. Other changes that help to control the costs of meeting-related expenses (direct or indirect), such as shortening the length of the meeting, holding the meeting in a lower-cost locale, or holding more joint meetings with allied professions, benefit all colleagues whose budgets (financial and time) are restricted. Sustained and ongoing informational campaigns about the requirements for organizational service will allow all, caregivers or not, to make informed decisions about their ability to participate.

How might we better support our caregiving colleagues within the profession? Given that some caregivers leave work for extended periods in order to fulfill their caregiving roles, the current bridge-rate offered by SAA for unemployed members may not extend long enough to cover the entire cycle of care. While the bridge-rate “has been extended from a one-year benefit to a benefit that may be exercised in two, nonconsecutive [sic], years,” this may not go far enough in assisting those who do not actively seek employment for an extended period but want to maintain connections to the profession.140 While we recognize that professional organizations solicit dues in order to provide and maintain services, redefining eligibility for the bridge rate would allow those who serve as caregivers to retain access to the benefits of SAA membership while minimizing impact on their personal budget, which is presumably more limited due to lack of employment.

Furthermore, while we have begun to acknowledge and recognize hardships faced by new and ethnic-minorities professionals in becoming active members of professional organizations and have established travel awards and scholarships to assist in making opportunities more widely available in these populations (such as SAA’s Brenda S. Banks Travel Award, the Harold T. Pinkett Minority Student Award, and the Donald Peterson Student Travel Award), there does not appear to be a distinct scholarship or travel award available for those who serve in a caregiving role.141 Other professional organizations, many in the sciences, have begun establishing travel funds specifically for caregivers. For example, the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (ASBMB) provides allowances of up to $1,000.00 toward one of four caregiving scenarios for applicants who are presenting an abstract at their conference. Options include onsite child care at the meeting.


hotel, having a provider travel to the attendee’s home, sending child(ren) to an alternate care provider’s home outside of their community, and having a childcare provider travel to the meeting location to provide care. Recipients do not have to be members, though it is preferred.\textsuperscript{142} The creation of an archives-specific caregivers fund within our profession, in combination with a re-envisioning of SAA’s current childcare services and policies as “Care Services at Annual Meetings,” would provide caregiving archivists with funds needed to remain connected to and a part of the profession.

Caswell and Cifor promote a “feminist ethics of care approach [that] places the archivist in a web of relationships with each of the concerned parties and posits that the archivist has an affective responsibility to responsibly empathize with each of the stakeholders.”\textsuperscript{143} They propose a concept of radical empathy connecting archivists to the records creator, archivist and the subject of the record, archivist and user, and archivist and the larger community; speakers at the 2017 SAA Annual Meeting session “Radical Empathy in Archival Practice” proposed a fifth responsibility, archivist to archivist.\textsuperscript{144} The idea centers on the concept that we not only attempt to empathize with our collections, users, and communities, but with each other. The issues outlined in the previous pages are numerous and intersecting in how, when, and who they touch. Open and accommodating policies must acknowledge these different perspectives and experiences to establish the archival profession as inclusive for those who have caregiving responsibilities. This requires that those without firsthand caregiving experience who can affect policy changes practice the fifth responsibility of radical empathy. Although it is important to reach a point where “family leave ceases to be a ‘women’s issue’ and simply becomes normalized as something that most workers are likely to need, and use, at some point in their working years,” the burden cannot simply fall to those most deeply impacted but should be shouldered by those in positions to create and advocate for change.\textsuperscript{145} The universality of caregiving, and our eventual need to provide or receive future care, makes us all interdependent and responsible for crafting and implementing inclusive policies and behaviors to better support one another.


\textsuperscript{143} Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor, “From Human Rights to Feminist Ethics: Radical Empathy in the Archives,” Archivaria 81 (Spring 2016): 41.
