

ASSUMED REMEDY FOR A PRESUMED PROBLEM— CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION FOR GAYS AND LESBIANS

STEPHEN M. CROW

SANDRA J. HARTMAN

University of New Orleans, Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This article examines the evidence to support the hypothesis that gays and lesbians are victims of widespread, work-related discrimination to the extent that they require special protection under a federal civil rights law. Assumptions and presumptions—rather than fact—appear to be the norm during debate on civil rights for homosexuals. It is our contention that very little is certain about the extent of discrimination against gays and lesbians in the workplace. In this context, we may naively adopt or fail to adopt civil rights legislation for homosexuals when the problem is not fully defined. Additional research is needed to sort out the degree and extent of discrimination.

Discussion, both for and against state and federal civil rights legislation for gays and lesbians, is growing. In early 1993, Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Henry Waxman were in the planning stage of a federal gay civil rights bill modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act [1]. On June 24, 1994 the bill was introduced by Sens. Edward Kennedy and John Chafee and twenty-eight cosponsors [2]. This bill would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in hiring, firing, promotion, and pay. The proposed legislation defines sexual orientation as real or perceived homosexual, bisexual, or heterosexual orientation [2].

How will such an initiative be received? Kennedy and his cosponsors should be prepared for strong reactions from those on both sides of the issue. If the

reaction to President Clinton's initiative in 1993 to end discrimination against homosexuals in the military is any indication, Congress will be confronted with an enormous social and political maelstrom [3]. Probably in an attempt to diffuse the potential upheaval as much as possible, Kennedy and the other sponsors exempted the military from coverage under the proposed legislation.

Many issues will be examined as the gay civil rights bill is debated in Congress. One issue requiring more examination is the extent of work-related discrimination experienced by gays and lesbians. Proponents of the bill argue that homosexuals are victims of widespread discrimination and, therefore, need protection. Opponents argue that to the extent that discrimination does exist, it is minor and does not warrant additional legislated federal protection.

In fact, there is no general consensus regarding the extent of work-related discrimination against homosexuals. The magnitude of discrimination against minorities and females before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was relatively easy to determine; routine statistical analyses of the utilization of minorities and females by an employer could produce evidence of discrimination. It is not as easy to analyze employers' utilization of gays and lesbians. In most organizations, there are *no* relevant statistics. Records based on sexual preference are not kept. Even if there were records, they would not be valid since many homosexuals prefer to keep their sexual preferences hidden.

In the absence of valid statistics, the argument for civil rights for gays and lesbians may be dominated by emotions. In this article, we argue for carefully conducted, scientifically designed studies to determine the extent of and basis for discrimination against gays and lesbians in the American workforce. Fact, not opinion, should underlie policy formulation and planning in this area. At present, too little is known to permit intelligent decisions or rational deductions.

Even the issue of whether there is discrimination in the workplace is not as simple as it may seem. On one side of the debate, Gary Jarmin of the *Christian Voice* suggested, "Discrimination is insignificant. Gays are twice as well off as the average American" [1, p. 46]. How accurate are such assertions? Paradoxically and unlike the situation for females and minorities before the Civil Rights Act of 1964, gays and lesbians are employed in every walk of life and at all levels of employment—from waiters to CEOs to members of the House of Representatives. President Clinton has appointed several openly gay or lesbian people to high-level government positions [4].

The conventional wisdom for the paradox that homosexuals are victims of discrimination and yet gainfully employed in all walks of life is that the gays and lesbians who attain high-level positions and prominence in our society do so by achieving prominence in their field—often a field such as the arts where gays are accepted—or by concealing or disguising their sexual predisposition. But what is the reality?

SIN AND SINNERS

Exactly how deep and widespread is the presumed antipathy toward gays and lesbians? Is it possible that employers may know that some employees are homosexual—even when they are said to be “closeted”—and yet do not discriminate against them? Is it possible that heterosexuals may disapprove of the *act* of homosexuality but not the individual homosexual? In other words, do we condemn the sin but not the sinner?

Many Americans may feel trapped in an ethical dilemma when considering the right thing to do in issues involving homosexuality. Moral and theological traditions appear to pit the sanctity of human dignity against religious traditions that consider homosexuality a violation of divine order [5]. Nowhere is this dilemma more manifest than in a variety of Christian traditions where, for centuries, St. Paul’s admonishment “neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals . . . shall inherit the Kingdom of God” has been the final word on homosexuality.

Richard D. Land, Executive Director of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Christian Life Commission, addresses the dilemma this way, “We deplore gay bashing and homophobia, but we also deplore treating Biblical morality as if it were hatred and bigotry. . . . God hates the sin, not the sinner” [5, p. 33]. Such attitudes, if held by significant numbers of Americans, could encourage a “hate the sin but not the sinner” mentality which, in turn, could act to *discourage* workplace discrimination.

A REACTION TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION?

Perhaps as a reaction to such ethical dilemmas, it is possible that Americans are, in fact, ready to live and let live but are not prepared to endorse homosexuality as equal to heterosexuality [1]. Even in that bastion of heterosexual machismo—the U.S. Marine Corps—there is some indication that at least one-on-one, most Marines do not care if a fellow Marine is gay [6]. The American public appears to agree. A *Wall Street Journal* poll indicated that only 21 percent of those questioned opposed gays and lesbians, whether open or discreet about their preference, serving in the military [7]. A *Newsweek* poll in the fall of 1992 revealed that 65 percent of the respondents think gays and lesbians should have the same employment opportunities as heterosexuals [8].

However, another set of inconsistencies appears almost immediately, and has its basis in terminology. Several recent surveys give indication of the problem. A recent Gallup poll found that 56 percent of women and 35 percent of men agree with extending civil rights protection to gays [9]. But did the term “extending civil rights” influence the response? We can get an idea from a poll conducted by *U.S. News & World Report*. Here, 65 percent of the respondents wanted to ensure equal

rights for homosexuals; however, fully half *opposed* "extending civil rights" to protect gays and lesbians [1].

If Americans are more tolerant of gays and lesbians than is generally assumed, why then is there so much opposition to civil rights legislation for homosexuals? We have to consider the possibility that many Americans resist gay civil rights legislation not because of intolerance for homosexuals, but because they resent what they perceive to be the inherent favoritism associated with any or all civil rights laws. More specifically, there may be so much disenchantment associated with what is perceived as "quota-based" affirmative action programs that Americans are in no mood for the spread of special treatment to *any* group. Kennedy and his cosponsors must have been mindful of Americans' concerns about favoritism. Their proposed civil rights legislation for homosexuals specifically forbids preferential treatment and quotas [2].

Thus far we have endeavored to make two points. First, Americans may be intolerant to the act of homosexuality yet tolerant of homosexuals in the workplace. Second, the reaction against gay civil rights legislation may have its origin more in a reaction against *any* presumed preferential legislation than as a reaction against homosexuals. If these points have merit, the conventional wisdom that widespread discrimination exists against gays and lesbians in the workplace may be overstated.

HOW CREDIBLE IS THE EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMINATION?

Central to the argument of civil rights for homosexuals is evidence of discrimination. In our approach to this article, we were concerned that opinion rather than fact dominates discussions of the presence and extent of discrimination.

Opinion Research

There is an extensive body of research and commentary supporting the position of job-related discrimination against gays and lesbians [e.g., 10-21]. However, much of this research has been conducted by gay and lesbian activist groups [22], a practice suggesting a possible conflict of interest. Practically all of the reported studies involve self-reported discrimination by gays and lesbians [23]. The validity problems associated with self-reported opinion research have been documented among non-gay samples [e.g., 24], and the accuracy of self-reported discrimination by gays and lesbians has not been established.

However, there is evidence that gays and lesbians may be overly sensitive to discrimination and other forms of workplace harassment. In one study, a gay and lesbian sample perceived discrimination against six minority groups (including a homosexual group) significantly more than a general community sample [25].

Schneider found that lesbian workers are more likely than heterosexual female workers to label a variety of specific social-sexual behaviors directed toward them as sexual harassment [26]. What's more, lesbians reported more social-sexual behaviors directed toward them than did heterosexual women [26]. Levine went so far as to suggest that in studying job discrimination against gay persons, gays (because of their emotional involvement with the issues) may be the wrong ones to ask [19].

Exactly how scientific is the related research? Typical of the current discussion of issues is that of Woods in his book *The Corporate Closet: The Professional Lives of Gay Men in America*.

Since 1980 some two dozen studies have documented hiring, promotion, and compensation practices that discriminate against lesbian and gay workers. Of the thousands of gay men surveyed in these reports [27], roughly one in three believed he had experienced some form of job discrimination. The most recent of these reports [28] also suggest that as lesbians and gay men have become more visible in recent years, the rates are climbing [21, p. 8].

Comments such as those made by Woods contribute to the problems of gaining realistic insight into the issues. Much of the data supporting the supposition of widespread discrimination cited by Woods was collected by gay and lesbian groups.

Woods relied heavily on a study by Gross and Aurand [17] to support his opinions. The study by Gross and Aurand is not scholarly research [17, 29]. What's more, the authors stretched the facts substantially when they concluded that, "The present study extends the *grim* [emphasis added] findings of our previous surveys. Lesbians and gay people continue to experience *widespread* [emphasis added] discrimination in employment . . ." [17, p. 19]. There is very little statistical support from the study to justify such a conclusion. Nevertheless, the Gross and Aurand study is frequently cited as evidence of widespread discrimination against homosexuals.

Empirical Research

Empirical research that actually moves into the workplace and considers discrimination against gays and lesbians in organizations or by organizational decision makers is practically nonexistent [see 19, 22, 30, 31]. John P. DeCecco, editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality*, was not aware of any empirical research in organizational frameworks and doubted that any existed [23].

Levine suggested years ago that due to retaliations against homosexuals in the workplace, exact measurements of job discrimination are beyond the grasp of social science [19]. It is virtually impossible to accurately identify all of the potential subjects since many gays and lesbians fear discrimination if they do not keep their sexual orientation hidden. While Americans may be more tolerant of

homosexuals than has been supposed, there is empirical support for homosexuals' fears about revealing their sexual orientation. Regardless of their attitudes about homosexuality in general, heterosexuals who are aware of a person's homosexuality tend to be more negative toward that person than they are to those who hide their homosexuality [32-34]. The result is that the organizational researcher is confronted with a situation where many of the potential research subjects do not wish to be identified.

Furthermore, from an organizational perspective, it is easy to understand why there is no important empirical research. Few managers are willing to open their organizations to research—fewer still to homosexual-related research. Quite naturally, managers are fearful of involvement in research related to gay and lesbian issues, seeing it as a “no win” situation. There is the potential for public controversy if research indicates tolerance or intolerance of homosexuals. Consider, for example, the public outcries associated with gays in the military [e.g., 35-36] and the decision by Cracker Barrel Old Country Store executives to fire homosexual employees [e.g., 37].

Finally, for at least two reasons, it may not be “politically correct” to conduct research in such an emotionally charged arena. First is the taint of homosexuality. People who conduct homosexual-related research should be prepared for unexpected consequences. Specifically, many people may conclude that only homosexuals are involved in homosexual research [38].

Second are the social and political concerns associated with the findings. At present, the debate is most heated in areas somewhat outside the immediate concern of management researchers. In research related to genetic origins of homosexuality, researchers find that their laboratories turn into battlegrounds for opposing viewpoints [39]. The issue of genetic imperatives in sexual orientation is so controversial that politically incorrect findings—from either an anti-gay or pro-gay perspective—could be career-ending.

Considering the obstacles, it is not surprising that almost *no* top quality research is being done. There are some, albeit scant, findings. A frequently cited finding of discrimination in organizational settings against gays and lesbians comes from work by Diamond and his colleagues [40]. To call it a study, however, is a stretch. The book is a collection of observations about executive attitudes and behaviors. Diamond and his colleagues—all good journalists but not research scholars—found that 66 percent of the executives surveyed would hesitate [41] to promote a homosexual to a management committee level. Again, problems in interpretations frustrate an understanding of the findings.

What does “hesitate” mean in the context of Diamond's work? Is it possible that most executives would hesitate before promoting *anyone* to a management committee level? Certainly, most executives might pause before promoting a person whose effectiveness may be limited because of a lifestyle viewed by some as controversial.

Bias Complaints

One indicator of the presence of discrimination may be the number of complaints of bias. There have been reports of such evidence of discrimination against homosexuals in the workplace, but what is their meaning, statistically? Of 4000 bias complaints filed in Wisconsin in 1992, 100 alleged anti-gay discrimination [1]. Does this represent a problem requiring a remedy? A level of 2.5 percent seems small assuming, correctly or incorrectly, that homosexuals constitute 10 percent of the population.

Additionally, one needs to consider the fact that in reality most plaintiffs do not prevail in civil rights complaints—there is insufficient proof of discrimination. Adjusted to reflect only those complaints in which the plaintiff prevails, meaningful levels could be closer to twenty than 100. Twenty legitimate complaints may be viewed by some people as a small problem relative to the total number of complaints or to Wisconsin's population of 4,891,769.

AIDS-Related Litigation

The proliferation of AIDS-related litigation has been cited to support the supposition of widespread discrimination against homosexuals [see 43-44]. What is not clear about the AIDS-related litigation, however, is the intent of employers. Are employers biased against homosexuals due to the sexual preference, their concerns about insurance costs associated with AIDS, pressures from employees about health concerns, or all three? Note that the nature of the "problem" to be solved changes significantly depending on which explanation is more nearly correct, and, again, there is virtually no research to guide us.

Is Discrimination Against Homosexuals Self-Evident?

It is arguable that the U.S. military's policy of rejecting homosexuals for service and ferreting out and discharging gays and lesbians is sufficient evidence of widespread discrimination against homosexuals. This argument assumes that the practices of the U.S. military mirror the methods by which American employers manage their affairs. But how accurate is this assumption? The military establishment has historically been an extremely conservative body which has resisted equal rights and any external pressure to revise its "traditions." The Tailhook incident is only the latest example of the military being pressured by public opinion to clean up its act, suggesting that public opinion has moved well ahead of the military in its approach to such issues.

Thus, we must ask whether the reported attitudes of organizations such as the military, the CIA, the religious right, or the FBI [e.g., 35, 45-47] represent the prevailing views of Americans and American employers. Public opinion, in fact, appears to have moved well ahead of them. Americans' tolerance of gays and

lesbians in the workplace has improved dramatically in a relatively short period of time. For example, while the Vatican remains steadfastly in favor of discrimination against gays and lesbians, a recent Gallup poll indicated that the number of U.S. Catholics who favor equal job opportunities for gays rose from 58 percent in 1978 to 78 percent in 1992 [47].

THE LAWS AND LEGAL SOLUTIONS

At issue is whether a civil rights law for homosexuals represents an effective solution to a presumed bias against gays and lesbians. Job-related bias against homosexuals must be considered *presumed* rather than established. No one has determined with any degree of certainty the magnitude of discrimination against gays and lesbians in the workplace. Furthermore, even if accurate data were available, it would be difficult to determine whether a given level of discrimination constitutes a significant problem. More specifically, without knowing the extent of discrimination in general, how can we be sure that any level of discrimination against homosexuals is a significant work-related problem requiring a remedy?

Suppose, however, that discrimination against gays and lesbians does constitute a problem. Would another civil rights law guarantee an effective solution? The rationale for a gay civil rights law is that homosexuals are victims of widespread discrimination in the workplace. However, do gays and lesbians *require* special protection under a national civil rights law? Some people think not. Sowell suggested that gays are sacrosanct in the media, politics, and academia to the extent that the activists and leaders in the gay lobby have effectively exaggerated the degree of public hostility toward homosexuals [48]. Editors of the *Economist* asserted that gays and lesbians already have adequate protection under existing law, particularly the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution [49]. Simon and Daly suggested that the existing and developing legal frameworks already put employers who discriminate against gays and lesbians at considerable risk [50].

In a ruling that knocked down Colorado's voter-approved initiative outlawing gay rights laws—a ruling favorable to homosexuals—State District Judge Jeffery Bayless questioned the need for civil-rights protection for gays and lesbians.

The court cannot conclude . . . that homosexuals and bisexuals remain vulnerable or politically powerless, and in need of extraordinary protection from the majoritarian political process in today's society [51, p. A-6].

Even gays and lesbians question the need for civil rights legislation. Apparently, all some homosexuals want is the right to be as "open" about their private lives as anyone else without fear of harassment at work. According to John Wofford, a lawyer for Endispute, a mediation firm in Cambridge, Massachusetts, "We don't

need affirmative action—we're already here. We need the freedom to be visible" [42, p. 43].

CONCLUSION

This article examined the evidence for the supposition that gays and lesbians are victims of widespread, work-related discrimination to the extent that they require special protection under a federal civil rights law. It is our sense that the evidence for *widespread* discrimination is weak.

This assertion, like those we have criticized, may be one that cannot be proven. In fact, we have suggested that exact measurements of job discrimination against homosexuals may be beyond the grasp of social science. Consequently, advocates of civil rights for gays and lesbians may have to base their arguments to some extent on ethical, moral, or social grounds. For example, it could be argued that even if work-related discrimination against homosexuals is minimal, there are no moral grounds for denying even a few gays and lesbians equal access to jobs and other work-related benefits simply because of their sexual preference.

In summary, we are concerned that a wide variety of agendas—and not fact—seem to rule the debate on civil rights for homosexuals. The existing evidence indicates that very little is known about the extent or seriousness of discrimination against gays and lesbians. In this context, we may naively adopt or fail to adopt civil rights for homosexuals when the extent of the problem is not defined. If this article does nothing else, perhaps it will spawn rigorous empirical research in some organizational settings.

* * *

Dr. Crow and Dr. Hartman are with the Department of Management at the University of New Orleans. Crow is an associate professor of management and a member of the American Arbitration Association's labor arbitration panel. Hartman is a professor of management. Their research interests encompass a variety of employee-related issues.

ENDNOTES

1. J. P. Shapiro, G. G. Cook, and A. Krackov, Straight Talk about Gays, *U.S. News & World Report*, pp. 42-48, April 5, 1993.
2. "Bill to protect gay workers gains endorsements," (24 June 1994) A2, The Associated Press, *The Times Picayune*, New Orleans, Louisiana.
3. R. Shilts, What's Fair in Love and War, *Newsweek*, pp. 58-59, February 1993. The U.S. military's ostensible policy was to reject homosexuals for service and to ferret out and discharge gays and lesbians already in the service. The new policy of "don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" may have been a political ploy to save face. "Don't ask, don't tell, don't pursue" has probably been the de-facto policy in the military for years.

4. In October 1993, several gay and lesbian presidential appointees held a press conference to publicly declare their homosexuality.
5. J. L. Sheler, A Religious Battle, Too, *U.S. News & World Report*, p. 33, April 5, 1993.
6. P. Cary, Hit by Friendly Fire, *U.S. News & World Report*, p. 31, April 5, 1993.
7. G. F. Seib, Americans Feel Families and Values are Eroding but They Disagree over the Causes and Solutions, *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A12, June 11, 1993.
8. B. Dart, Gay Rights Movement Pushing to the Forefront, Cox News Service report, *The Times Picayune*, New Orleans, Louisiana, p. A-11, February 21, 1993.
9. R. Davis, Poll: Women More Tolerant, *USA Today*, p. A10, April 26, 1993.
10. L. Badgett, Labor Market Discrimination: Economic and Legal Issues for Gay Men and Lesbians, paper delivered at the *Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, New Orleans, January 3, 1992.
11. L. Badgett, C. Donnelly, and J. Kibbe, *Pervasive Patterns of Discrimination Against Lesbians and Gay Men: Evidence from Surveys Across the United States*, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute, Washington, D.C., 1992.
12. A. P. Bell and M. S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1978.
13. J. Brause, Closed Doors: Sexual Orientation Bias in the Anchorage Housing and Employment Markets, in *Identity Reports: Sexual Orientation Bias in Alaska*, Identity Incorporated, Anchorage, Alaska, 1989.
14. J. Dressler, Gay Teachers: A Dis-esteemed Minority in an Overly-esteemed Profession, *Rutgers-Camden Law Journal*, 9:3, pp. 399-445, 1978.
15. J. Dressler, Survey of School Principals Regarding Alleged Homosexual Teachers in the Classroom: How Likely (Really) Is Discharge?, *University of Dayton Law Review*, 10:3, pp. 599-620, 1985.
16. J. Escoffier, Stigmas, Work Environment, and Economic Discrimination Against Homosexuals, *Homosexual Counseling Journal*, 2:1, pp. 8-17, 1975.
17. L. Gross and S. K. Aurand, *Discrimination and Violence Against Lesbian Women and Gay Men in Philadelphia and The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, 1992.
18. M. Hall, The Lesbian Corporate Experience, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12:3/4, pp. 59-75, 1986.
19. M. P. Levine, Employment Discrimination against Gay Men, *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 9, pp. 151-163, July-December, 1979.
20. K. Weston and L. Rofel, Sexuality, Class, and Conflict in a Lesbian Workplace, *Signs*, 9:4, pp. 623-646, 1984.
21. J. D. Woods, *The Corporate Closet: The Professional Lives of Gay Men in America*, Free Press, New York, 1993.
22. A. R. D'Augelli, Lesbians' and Gay Men's Experiences of Discrimination and Harassment in a University Community, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17:3, pp. 317-321, 1989.
23. J. P. DeCecco, Telephone Conversation with the Author, June 15, 1993.
24. J. W. Buckley, M. H. Buckley, and H.-F. Chiang, *Research Methodology & Business Decisions*, National Association of Accountants, New York, 1976.
25. N. J. Beran, C. Claybaker, C. Dillion, and R. J. Haverkamp, Attitudes toward Minorities: A Comparison of Homosexuals and the General Population, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 23:3, pp. 65-83, 1992.

26. B. E. Schneider, Consciousness about Sexual Harassment among Heterosexual and Lesbian Women Workers, *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, pp. 75-98, 1982.
27. These "reports" were self-reported discrimination by homosexuals, none of which were conducted in organizational settings.
28. A methodologically flawed study by Gross and Aurand [17] is described in [29].
29. Gross and Aurand offered no bibliography indicating a review of the related research literature. There is no theoretical framework to draw upon for hypotheses. And while there are many limitations and methodological problems, Gross and Aurand did not address them or show any awareness of the inherent problems. In fact, their "study" reads like an attack on the social and political system of America:

We can only speculate what role the bigotry of politicians and church leaders has played in licensing and encouraging acts of discrimination and violence against lesbian and gay people. What is undeniable is their unforgivable betrayal of fundamental principles of justice and respect for the rights of all people [17, p. 2].
30. T. R. Bohn, Homophobic Violence: Implications for Social Work Practice, *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality*, 2, pp. 91-112, 1983/1984.
31. M. P. Levine and P. Leonard, Discrimination against Lesbians in the Workplace, *Signs*, 9, pp. 700-710, 1984.
32. M. E. Kite and K. Deaux, Attitudes toward Homosexuality: Assessment and Behavioral Consequences, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7:2, pp. 137-162, 1986.
33. A. E. Gross, S. K. Green, J. T. Storck, and J. M. Vanyur, Disclosure of Sexual Orientation and Impressions of Male and Female Homosexuals, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, pp. 307-314, 1980.
34. S. B. Gurwitz and M. Marcus, Effects of Anticipated Interaction, Sex and Homosexual Stereotypes on First Impressions, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 8, pp. 47-56, 1978.
35. B. B. Auster, Shape Up or Ship Out, *U.S. News & World Report*, pp. 24-33, April 5, 1993.
36. T. Morgenthau, Gays and the Military, *Newsweek*, pp. 52-55, February 1, 1993.
37. J. Oleck, Bad Politics, *Restaurant Business*, pp. 80-89, June 10, 1992.
38. For over two years now, one of the authors of this article has been conducting research relative to discrimination against gays and lesbians in organizational settings. During the administration of the survey instruments, he has noticed two effects with respondents not previously experienced in his other research projects. One was a chilling effect he attributed to the respondents' intolerance for homosexuality and their assumption that the researcher was either gay or tolerant of homosexuality. The other was a warm and supportive effect he attributed to the respondents' tolerance for homosexuality and an assumption that the researcher was either gay or tolerant of homosexuality. Heretofore, respondents in his research had been relatively indifferent toward him and the work he was doing.
39. D. J. Jefferson, Studying the Biology of Sexual Orientation has Political Fallout, *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. A1, A5, August 12, 1993.
40. D. Diamond, *The Wall Street Journal Book of Chief Executive Style*, William Morrow and Company, New York, 1989. Other contributors: Bryan Burrough, Cathy Crimmins, Stephen Fenichell, John Marchese, Sara Nelson, James P. Sterba, and Mary Walton.

41. The word "hesitate" is lost on some of the people that cite this study. Typically the impression given is that the executives "would not" promote homosexuals to management committee levels. For example, Stewart substituted "would be reluctant" for "would hesitate" [42]. A small difference, we know, but a difference nevertheless that could skew the interpretation. It is not uncommon to find that those who comment about research do not always read the information carefully. This tendency seems more pronounced when gay and lesbian issues are debated.
42. T. A. Stewart, Gays in Corporate America, *Fortune*, pp. 42-56, December 16, 1991.
43. J. Hyatt, Health Crisis: AIDS is Now Becoming a Legal Epidemic, *Inc.*, pp. 19-20, December 7, 1985.
44. T. J. Pavlak, Stigmatization of Persons with AIDS: Results of a Survey of Public Sector Personnel Managers, *Socio-Economic Planning Science*, 23:4, pp. 195-201, 1989.
45. G. DeLama, Gay FBI Agent Wants His Job Back, Chicago Tribune report, *The Times Picayune*, New Orleans, Louisiana, p. A-20, December 1993.
46. C. Skorneck, Reno Orders End to Gay Bias in FBI, Associated Press report, *The Times Picayune*, p. A-6, December 4, 1993.
47. L. S. Stepp, Vatican Encourages Discrimination of Gays, Washington Post report, *The Times Picayune*, New Orleans, Louisiana, pp. A-1, A-10, July 17, 1992.
48. T. Sowell, Gay Bashing, *Forbes*, p. 78, March 15, 1993.
49. Gay Rights or Human Rights, *Economist*, pp. 19-20, February 6, 1993.
50. H. A. Simon and E. Daly, Sexual Orientation and Workplace Rights: A Potential Land Mine for Employers? *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 18:1, pp. 29-60, 1992.
51. P. Lowe, Gays Win in Colorado, Associated Press report, *The Times Picayune*, New Orleans, Louisiana, pp. A-1, A-6, December 15, 1993.

Direct reprint requests to:

Dr. Steven M. Crow
University of New Orleans
Department of Management
Lakefront
New Orleans, LA 70148