J. INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS, Vol. 4(4) 319-336, 1995-96

MOVING FROM BIAS TO DISCRIMINATION: A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS OF HOMOSEXUALS IN THE WORKPLACE

STEPHEN M. CROW

LILLIAN Y. FOK

SANDRA J. HARTMAN

University of New Orleans, Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This research sought to determine whether biases exist against homosexuals with respect to perceptions of hypothetical situations involving sexual harassment. We reasoned a hypothetically drawn sexual harassment scenario may kindle visceral biases against gays and lesbians. This study found no adverse homosexual effects in perceptions related to decision making in arbitration cases resulting from the hypothetical harassment scenarios. While we did find differences in perceptions, these differences were related to rater gender and age rather than to differing perceptions of homosexuals. These findings conflict with the widely held view that biased perceptions of gays and lesbians may lead to adverse judgments in work-related situations.

The current gay and lesbian movement bears all the markings of earlier social revolutions: considerable debate over civil rights for homosexuals, mass demonstrations, and angry backlashes. The forces for and against federal civil-rights legislation for gays and lesbians are gaining momentum. In 1994, Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Henry Waxman pieced together a federal gay civil rights bill modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act [1]. On June 24, 1994 the bill was introduced by Sens. Kennedy and John Chaffee and twenty-eight co-sponsors [2]. This bill would extend existing federal protection against job discrimination on the basis of race, religion, gender, national origin, age, and

doi: 10.2190/D510-A9WP-6G06-V2FK
http://baywood.com

disability to include sexual orientation [3]. The rationale for a civil-rights law is, of course, that widespread discrimination exists against homosexuals. According to Senator Kennedy, the Employment Nondiscrimination Act is all about "righting senseless wrongs" in the workplace against gays and lesbians [3].

For many concerned individuals, a random review of media events confirms the existence of homophobia and serious problems arising from discrimination in the workplace. The furor raised by President Clinton's 1993 initiative to end discrimination against gays in the military is just one example. Another is the Vatican's support of discrimination against homosexuals in public housing, family health benefits, and hiring [4]. There is also the debate about whether homosexuality is chosen or genetically determined (e.g., [5, 6]) which, at least in part, includes the idea that homosexual behavior, if freely chosen, is far more "evil" than if genetically determined. Homosexuality is so controversial and homophobia may be so widespread that some sort of legal action to provide protection for gays and lesbians may be in order. But is the discrimination significant enough to justify a comprehensive civil-rights law for homosexuals?

In the workplace, for example, protection may be warranted if there is evidence that homosexuals and/or their actions receive treatment different from heterosexuals. Note that we are contending at least two elements are necessary for a problem to exist in the workplace. The first is evidence of negative attitudes toward homosexuals. Even apart from the sensationalized reports presented by the media, there is objective evidence of negative stereotyping of homosexuals. For example, persons who are aware of a person's homosexuality are more negative toward the homosexual than are persons who are unaware, regardless of their attitudes toward homosexuality [7-9].

The second element that must be considered is the presence of differential negative treatment of homosexuals in the workplace. Evidence of this requires a logical leap from negative biases involving individuals and their sexual orientations to bias against them in the workplace. Our area of investigation centers on this second issue. Do negative attitudes translate into a willingness to treat gays and lesbians differently in the workplace?

This research represents an effort to clarify one of the possible issues involved. Specifically, we consider perceptions about homosexually oriented sexual harassment and whether this form of sexual harassment is perceived differently in a simulated arbitration situation than other forms of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Several concerns led us to believe a need exists for dispassionate, objectively-based research in this area. Specifically, we see little evidence of academic attention to whether bias against homosexuals adversely affects their treatment in the workplace. Many problems are associated with the related research [10]. For example, opinion research predominates, and much reported as research is based on perceptions of homosexual respondents; little research has been conducted in the organizational setting using heterosexual subjects. Additionally,

in the area of how people judge and react to sexual harassment, even the issues of gender differences, age differences, and perhaps racial differences remain unresolved or not considered. A review of the literature seems to support these conclusions.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

An extensive body of research and commentary supports the supposition of job-related discrimination against homosexuals (e.g., [11-21]). However, much of the research has been conducted by gay and lesbian activist groups [22], a practice suggesting a possible conflict of interest. Virtually all of the available studies involve opinion research based on self-reported discrimination by gays and lesbians [23]. The validity problems associated with self-reported opinion research are well-documented (e.g., [24]), and there is probably no reason to expect higher accuracy for self-reports by homosexuals than for any other subgroups.

In fact, further complicating the issue of self-reported discrimination is evidence that gays and lesbians may be overly sensitized to discrimination and other forms of workplace harassment. Presumably, overly sensitized individuals could be somewhat *more* likely to report incidents as discriminatory in situations where others would not perceive discrimination. In one study [25], a gay sample perceived discrimination against six minority groups (included was a gay group) to be significantly greater than did a general community sample. Schneider [26] found lesbian workers are more likely than heterosexual female workers to label a variety of specific social-sexual behaviors directed toward them as sexual harassment and lesbians reported more social-sexual behaviors directed toward them than did heterosexual women. In summary, Levine [19] suggested that in studies of bias against them, homosexuals may overstate the extent and degree of discrimination.

Empirical research in organizations or of organizational decision makers is practically nonexistent (e.g., [19, 22, 27-28]). John P. DeCecco, editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality* [23], was not aware of *any* empirical research in organizational frameworks. He doubted if any such research exists.

Why the paucity of empirical research? Levine suggested that due to the sanctions against homosexuals, exact measurements of job discrimination are beyond the grasp of social science [19]. More specifically, many gays and lesbians fear discrimination if they reveal their sexual orientation. As a result, when studying homosexuality, it is not always possible to accurately identify the subjects of the research, much less obtain accurate responses from them. To some extent, their fears "about coming out" are justified in terms of antihomosexual stereotyping (see, for example [7-9]). However, we must repeat our caution that negative attitudes toward homosexuals, even if present, does not necessarily imply the presence of job-related discrimination against them.

What's more, few managers are willing to open their organizations to research—fewer still to homosexual-related research. Quite naturally, many managers would be fearful of involvement in research related to gay and lesbian issues. A classic double-bind prevails, as there is the potential for controversy whether research indicates tolerance *or* intolerance of homosexuals. Consider, for example, the recent debates associated with gays in the military (e.g., [29-30]) and the decision by Cracker Barrel Old Country Store executives to fire homosexual employees (e.g., [31]).

Additionally, to insulate themselves from criticism, many scholars may be reluctant to get involved in research in such an emotionally charged field of study. All things considered, it is relatively easy to see why there is so little empirical research in organizational settings.

Sexual Harassment as a Research Focus

In this research study, we focus on one area where it seems reasonable to suspect bias by heterosexuals against homosexuals—sexual harassment. Perhaps, for example, heterosexuals feel more outrage or offense when a homosexual makes a sexual advance toward them than when a heterosexual makes the advance. Or perhaps heterosexuals are more offended by homosexual sexual harassment in the workplace than by heterosexual harassment, even when they are not personally involved. Certainly, some of the objection raised against President Clinton's initiatives toward bringing homosexuals into the military was couched in terms of sexual harassment. It became clear that there was considerable sentiment that sexual advances by homosexuals would work to the detriment of the military's ability to function effectively (e.g., [29-30]).

However, any discussion of sexual harassment must include a definition of the term itself, and it quickly becomes clear that we may be farther than we suspect from fully understanding what is meant by the term sexual harassment. Some evidence suggests that perceptions about what constitutes sexual harassment are influenced by social-sexual behavior expectations. Many studies assert that social-sexual behavior is inherently "gendered," and that men and women have different experiences because there are defined roles for men and women in social-sexual behavior [32-33]. Men and women are expected to behave in a manner consistent with established gender roles and those expectations are likely to carry over into their work role, a phenomenon Gutek and her colleagues [34-35] call sex-role spillover. In sexual behavior, men are expected to initiate and women are expected to respond [33, 36].

Overall, research findings involving sex roles suggest that expectations involving gender have a significant impact on judgments about sex-role behaviors (e.g., [37-38]) and social-sexual behaviors (e.g., [39-43]). Men and women are considered to have systematically different orientations toward sexually-related behaviors at work (e.g., [44]) and different reactions to sexual harassment (e.g.,

[33, 45]). Differences observed in the workplace are believed to be grounded in sex roles learned at an early age (e.g., [46]).

Generally speaking, men have been found to have a more positive image of sexually-oriented work behaviors than women (e.g., [40]) and to be more tolerant of sexual harassment than women (e.g., [47]). Men tend to rate hypothetical scenarios [48] and specific social behaviors [33] as less harassing than women. Men, more so than women, are likely to believe that sexual harassment in the workplace is exaggerated [49]. One conclusion that can be drawn from this research is that men view the workplace as one of the playing fields for sexual games, while women resent sexual overtures at work [50] and react to sexual harassment scenarios more negatively than men.

In fact, a number of findings indicate there are differences in expectations of men and women and these differences are shared by all subjects, regardless of gender (e.g., [51-56]). The available evidence seems to suggest the lay person's understanding of sexual harassment is that it usually involves male behavior (e.g., [57]). Out-of-role behavior, such as the sexual advances of a woman to a man are seen as less likely and perhaps also seen as less harassing than the same advances by a man to a woman. Hypothetical scenarios involving a woman as an initiator of social-sexual behavior are seen as relatively nonharassing [48]. Thus, this research suggests that *all* subjects, regardless of gender, may have different expectations of men and women in terms of sexual behavior.

However, there are also reports of mixed findings involving the gender of a research subject. For example, Kenig and Ryan [58] found significant differences by gender in the definition of what constituted sexual harassment among non-tenured faculty (women were more comprehensive in terms of what they perceived as sexual harassment) but in the other four groups (tenured faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and staff employees), there were no significant differences. Taken as a whole, our sense of this research is that differences in expectations about the behavior of men and women may affect judgments about how seriously a harassment action may be judged, but that differences between men and women as judges of sexual harassment are minimal.

In our discussion to this point, we have focused on differences in expectations of men and women by all subjects who might be asked to rate a given instance of harassment, regardless of whether the rater is a male or a female. However, we have not considered whether differences between male and female raters in terms of tolerance toward homosexuality could affect the judgment process or whether heterosexuals, regardless of gender, react more negatively toward gays than toward lesbians.

Regarding the first question, there has been some study of male/female differences in tolerance. In attitudes related to homosexuals, females have generally been found to be more tolerant than males [59-60]. In a recent Gallup poll, 56 percent of women and 35 percent of men agree with extending civil-rights protection to gays [61]. Another indication of differences in tolerance by gender is that

males who report being the target of sexual harassment are more likely to report the incident if it involved homosexual harassment [62]. However, one study found no significant differences between males and females in tolerance of homosexuals [63].

There has also been some consideration of the second question, attitude differences toward gays versus lesbians. D'Augelli [22] suggested that gay men are more often victimized (harassment, discrimination, and violence) than lesbian women. Gay men are more likely to experience the consequences of negative attitudes toward homosexuality than are lesbians [64-67]. There is also evidence that female homosexual behavior is labeled erotic while male homosexual behavior is seen as repugnant [66]. Taken as a whole, this body of research suggests that there are at least some gender-related differences in tolerance toward homosexuality, with women being more tolerant, but that gays are judged more negatively than lesbians, regardless of the gender of the individual responding to the survey.

Several ideas grow out of our review of the literature to this point. When sexual harassment is considered in isolation, we find that sexual harassment research has focused on social-sexual behavior directed at individuals (e.g., [68-69]) and on the impact of sexual harassment on work environments [33, 50, 70]. While there has been a prodigious amount of research, there is no research about the relationship between sexual preference and perceptions about what constitutes sexual harassment. When we consider sexual harassment sensitivity, we note the bulk of the sexual harassment sensitivity research relates to the traditional relationships in sexual harassment—male aggressor and female victim.

When we turn our attention to discrimination in the workplace involving homosexuals, we find evidence of negative attitudes toward homosexuals—perhaps more negative toward gays than toward lesbians. We also see opinion research which posits that discrimination exists, but we can find little direct evidence to show specifically what may be occurring.

One potential area for evidence of bias against homosexuals in the workplace may lie in perceptions about sexual harassment. This area seemed an important one to investigate, both in terms of the considerable attention it has received in recent years, and also because it is a likely area for bias to appear. Sexual orientation is where homosexuals and heterosexuals differ, and any negative attitudes that exist toward homosexuals should therefore center around sexual activities.

In considering judgments about an incident, we use the full range of gender and sexual preference combinations—1) male aggressor, female victim; 2) female aggressor, male victim; 3) male aggressor, male victim; 4) female aggressor, female victim—to facilitate the detection of both heterosexual and homosexual effects and to tease out relationships. We also consider differences between male and female subjects. We do this because the literature suggests that individuals involved in a sexual harassment incident will be judged on a number of factors,

such as gender of the perceiver, gender of the harasser, and gender of the harassee (e.g., note our discussion suggesting women are more tolerant). In considering gender of harasser and harassee, as noted previously, there is evidence that males and females may perceive sexual harassment situations differently. Note that it would have been of interest to include sexual orientation as a control variable as well (i.e., reactions of lesbians versus heterosexual women to the scenarios, etc.), but we believed it unlikely the subjects would be truthful about their orientations, so we did not request this data.

We might also expect respondents to react along lines of sex role expectations. For example, raters may consider it the role of men to make sexual overtures to women and that female-initiated sexual overtures and homosexual sexual overtures are outside gender role expectations. Theoretically then, perceptions of sexual harassment should be influenced by gender of the initiator and by sex-role expectations. We also consider specific reactions to harassment by homosexuals. Does it matter whether the harasser is a gay or a lesbian? When we look at the full range of possible harasser-harassee relationships—man/woman, woman/man, man/man, woman/woman—we are also afforded the possibility of identifying any differences in judgments of homosexuals that may be occurring.

Hypotheses

As we have noted, there has been almost no research directed specifically to the issues under investigation in this study. As a result, we consider our research exploratory and state our purpose as a research question with three associated hypotheses:

Research Question:

What homosexual and heterosexual effects are detected when male and female subjects are presented with a full range of hypothetical situations of sexual harassment?

> *Hypothesis 1*: The gender of the subjects will affect their perceptions of sexual harassment—females, more so than men, will perceive higher levels of sexual harassment in the research situations.
> *Hypothesis 2*: The gender of the victim in the case will affect the subjects' perceptions of sexual harassment—subjects will perceive lower levels of sexual harassment in the research situations when the victim is a man.
> *Hypothesis 3:* The type of case, homosexual versus heterosexual, will affect the subjects' perceptions of sexual harassment—subjects will perceive higher levels of sexual harassment when the case involves homosexually initiated harassment.

Note that the research we have cited leads us to feel far more confident in our first two hypotheses than in our third, simply because of the paucity of

empirical study in the area. Furthermore, while our three hypotheses specified main effects, our research also involved an examination of any interactions that may be occurring.

METHOD

Sample

We collected responses from 244 full-time workers in the health-care field (156 males and 88 females). The sample was employed in managerial, professional, and technical categories.

Measures

To examine perceptions of sexual harassment, we developed a questionnaire (Appendix A) based on York's [56] study of sexual harassment in the workplace.[1] York identified eight categories for classifying sexual-harassment behaviors. We used the responses to the eight scenarios as dependent variables. One category involved the *status* of the sexual harassment aggressor, the supervisor. The other categories were *history* (how long the victim and the aggressor had worked together), *place* (where the harassment occurred), *form* (the nature of the harassment), *reaction* (how the victim reacted to the harassment), *coercion* (if the aggressor put pressure on the victim to comply), *job consequences* (whether the victim suffered any job-related consequences by refusing to comply), and *prior evidence* (whether the aggressor had a history of sexual harassment). Subjects indicated degree of sensitivity to each scenario on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 being not important and 7 being very important.

To examine the full range of sexual preference combinations, four versions of the questionnaire were developed by combining the nature of the case (homosexual versus heterosexual) and the gender of the victim: 1) male aggressor, female victim; 2) female aggressor, male victim; 3) male aggressor, male victim; and 4) female aggressor, female victim. Versions 1 and 2 are heterosexual cases where the aggressor and the victim are of the opposite sex and versions 3 and 4 are homosexual cases where the aggressor and the victim are of the same sex. Since the gender of the subjects can be different, we had a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ research design.

In the analysis of effects, we included *age* as a control variable. Age effects are inconsistent in research studies related to sexual harassment and homosexuals. One study indicated a greater acceptance of sexual harassment by younger students [47], however, Lee and Heppner [53] found no significant age differences in responses to sexual harassment sensitivity. West [71] reported that older,

[1] Note that this is not a replication of York's study. York classified categories of sexual harassment in a way we believed would be logical in analyzing the full range of sexual harassment sensitivity.

less-educated people are more intolerant of homosexual behavior. Other research suggests that age has consistently demonstrated little or no effect in attitudes toward homosexuals [66, 72].

Data Analysis

MANOVA was used to test the effect of the three treatment variables—gender of subjects, type of cases (homosexual versus heterosexual), and gender of victim—on the eight dependent variables (the perception of the eight harassment situations). We used age as a control variable (covariate).

RESULTS

The MANOVA results for our sample are summarized in Table 1. The covariate (age of subjects) and one of the main effects (gender of the subjects) were statistically significant. There were no other significant main effects and no significant interaction effects.

Tables 2 and 3 illustrate directionality of the two effects. As illustrated in Table 2, the age of subjects was inversely related to *place* and positively related to *coercion* and *prior evidence*. In comparison to the younger subjects, the older subjects thought that where the harassment occurred (place) was less important when determining the severity of the harassment. In addition, the older subjects,

Table 1. Summary of MANOVA Results

Effect[a]	Approx. *F*	Sig. of *F*
Covariate		
Age	3.127	.002**[b]
Interactions		
Gender by case by victim	1.008	.431
Case by victim	1.467	.170
Gender by victim	1.035	.410
Gender by case	1.009	.430
Main effects		
Victim	1.008	.431
Case	0.906	.512
Gender	1.981	.050*

[a]Age = age of subjects, Gender = gender of subjects, Case = type of case (homosexual vs. heterosexual), Victim = gender of victim.
*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

Table 2. Summary of Univariate Test Results of Age of Subjects

Variable	*F*	Sig. of *F*	Beta Coef.
Status	0.002	.965	
History	0.010	.922	
Place	14.956	.000***	−.245
Form	2.583	.109	
Victim reaction	2.402	.123	
Coercion	4.979	.027*	.144
Job consequences	0.512	.475	
Prior evidence	3.213	.050*	.116

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level
***Significant at .001 level

Table 3. Summary of Univariate Test Results of Gender of Subjects

Variable	*F*	Sig. of *F*	Male	Female
Status	0.361	.549		
History	0.928	.166		
Place	2.985	.085		
Form	6.974	.009**	6.50	6.78
Victim reaction	3.620	.050*	6.13	6.39
Coercion	5.136	.024*	6.44	6.71
Job consequences	2.641	.105		
Prior evidence	1.175	.279		

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

more so than the younger subjects, assigned importance to scenarios where the aggressor put pressure on the victim to comply (coercion) and scenarios where the aggressor had a history of sexual harassment (prior evidence) when assessing the severity of the harassment.

Table 3 indicates that the gender of the subjects was significant in three of the sexual harassment situations—*form, victim reaction*, and *coercion.* In general, subjects, regardless of their gender, thought these three harassment situations were very important in terms of judging the severity of the harassment—the averages were 6.13 to 6.78 on a 7-point scale. However, averages for the female subjects were significantly higher than those of the male subjects.

DISCUSSION

Our findings in this study were unexpected: we found some support for Hypothesis 1 but *no* support for Hypotheses 2 and 3. First, we consider our findings with respect to Hypothesis 1. In line with our speculation at Hypothesis 1, our female subjects rated *form, victim reaction*, and *coercion* as significantly more important in their judgments of harassment than did our male subjects. Note that, in line with our discussion, the *pattern* evidenced by the females is not different—all subjects found these three aspects important; our female subjects simply found them more important than did the males. This finding supports our overall suggestion that all raters, whether male or female, show similar patterns, but women differ in their relative intolerance for sexual harassment. This finding is consistent with earlier reports that men are less sensitive to sexual harassment than women—possibly as a result of socialization or early experiences.

While none of our hypotheses specified an age effect—primarily because this effect was not a central interest in this study—we did control for age. The age effects we found were that older subjects put relatively more emphasis on *coercion* and *prior evidence* of sexual harassment, while younger subjects emphasized *place* where the harassment occurs. In general, these findings may suggest there has been a shift over time and younger subjects are more willing to cull some sexual encounters among coworkers depending on the place and circumstances. Perhaps this is a finding that will warrant further investigation by those interested in projecting future developments in sexual harassment.

Several comments about the *lack* of support for Hypotheses 2 and 3 may be in order. That there were no distinctions made about the severity of the sexual harassment scenarios with respect to the victim's gender was not altogether unexpected. We assumed, incorrectly as it turned out, that subjects would find more evidence of sexual harassment in situations where the victim was a female. Assuming they are replicated, we believe these findings reflect a shift in perception over recent years. Specifically, presuming that stereotypes, expectations of differences of men and women, and expectations about "correct" sex-role behavior for men and women are blurring, it may very well be that sexual harassment is no longer being seen as something men do to women!

We were surprised however, that we found no "gay and lesbian" effects and that our subjects appeared to judge harassment by a gay or lesbian no differently than heterosexual sexual harassment. Specifically, we see a conflict with the view that bias against gays and lesbians may lead to different assessments in work-related situations. In this study, however, when asked to judge the severity of the harassment in various situations where the full range of sexual orientation was explored, subjects made no distinctions.

There are at least three plausible explanations for these results. First is the intriguing possibility that in their decision making, and regardless of their own personal feelings about homosexuality, people in the workplace are relatively indifferent to sexual orientation. In responding to the scenario in the role of an arbitrator, respondents did not vary in their assignment of importance to the severity of sexual harassment based on the sexual orientation of the sexual-harassment aggressor. Intuition would suggest that, for example, heterosexual men are biased against homosexual men and it might be reasonably expected that heterosexual men would manifest their bias by assigning more weight to the severity of the act of sexual harassment by homosexuals. This was not the case in this study. While we did see differences related to the age and the gender of the subject, these differences manifested themselves as differences in severity with which harassing behavior was judged or in the specific situational aspects that were deemed harassing, rather than with differences in the way homosexual versus heterosexual harassment was judged.

A second plausible explanation is that sexual orientation does affect work-related decision making in ways not tapped by this study. For example, we are dealing with a paper-and-pencil measure rather than observed behavior on the job. It is conceivable that subjects may simply be sensitized to the importance of making socially correct responses (i.e., "I judge everyone the same.") but may, in reality, treat the groups differently in an actual job situation. While it is possible that our measure is simply not picking up events occurring on the job, we believe our general approach is sound. Moreover, we are presently involved in four additional projects related to discrimination against gays and lesbians. Our preliminary statistical analyses of the second project show similar findings—no homosexual effects. In the second study, respondents make a work-related decision where disciplinary action is taken against employees who violate rules related to sexual harassment.

A third possible explanation for our findings involves sample generalizability. Perhaps our research sample did not represent the attitudes of typical Americans toward homosexuality. There may be some merit in this concern. The research *was* conducted in a community—New Orleans—noted for its large population of gays and lesbians. New Orleans has been one of the traditional enclaves for homosexuals, and there may be more tolerance for gays and lesbians in New Orleans than in other parts of the country. However, other than speculation, we have no reason to suspect a biased sample.

Obviously, more research is needed. If it develops that our finding of no adverse impact based on sexual preferences holds across a wide range of work-related decisions and samples, such results would seriously challenge the assumption of widespread *workplace* discrimination against gays and lesbians. As a consequence, the argument for extending special protection to gays and lesbians through civil-rights legislation could be significantly weakened.

APPENDIX A
A Hostile Environment Case Study

Mark and Tom are both union workers employed in a local company. Tom complained to the Human Resources Department that Mark harassed him. The Human Resources Department investigated the charges, and as a result, Mark was fired. Mark then filed a grievance through his union chairman that his termination was not based on just cause. The grievance was denied and now the case will be heard by a labor arbitrator who will decide if the company had just cause to fire Mark. You are the arbitrator. Your task is to decide which of the following factors are most important to you in deciding a case like the above. You will make judgments by circling a number from 1 to 7 on the scales provided under each factor. Try to make your judgments as if these hypothetical incidents are real.

STATUS

Mark was Tom's supervisor and had influence over his position.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

HISTORY

Tom and Mark have worked together for a long time.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

PLACE

Mark asked Tom to come into the office and close the door.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

FORM

Mark asked Tom to come to his place after work and have sex with him.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

VICTIM'S REACTION

Tom tried to discourage Mark's behavior.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

COERCION

After the alleged incident, Mark demanded that he cooperate or he would make things hard for him.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

JOB CONSEQUENCE

After the incident, Tom was fired the next day.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

PRIOR EVIDENCE

There have been other incidents with Mark and other employees, but not with Tom and other employees.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not important						very important

* * *

Professor Hartman and Associate Professors Crow and Fok are with the Management Department at the University of New Orleans. They have a diverse research interest with a particular interest in organizational justice.

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). By *The Associated Press* in *The Times Picayune*.
3. S. Johnson, Gays Make Plea for Law to Protect Employment, *The Times Picayune*, p. A-5, 1994.
4. L. S. Stepp, Vatican Encourages Discrimination of Gays, *The Times Picayune*, pp. A-1, A-10, July 17, 1992.
5. M. Elias, "Differences Seen in Brains of Gay Men," *USA Today*, 8D, August 3, 1992, A *USAToday* report of a study by Allen and Gorski planned for the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.*
6. D. J. Jefferson, Studying the Biology of Sexual Orientation has Political Fallout, *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. A1, A5, August 12, 1993.
7. 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.

8. 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.
9. M. E. Kite and K. Deaux, Attitudes toward Homosexuality: Assessment and Behavioral Consequences, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7*:2, pp. 137-162, 1986.
10. S. M. Crow and S. J. Hartman, Assumed Remedy for a Presumed Problem: Civil Rights Legislation for Gays and Lesbians, forthcoming in the *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. A. P. Bell and M. S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity among Men and Women*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1978.
14. 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.
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*, Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force, Philadelphia, 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 one of the authors of this manuscript on 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. T. R. Bohn, Homophobic Violence: Implications for Social Work Practice, *Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 2*, pp. 91-112, 1983/1984.
28. M. P. Levine and P. Leonard, Discrimination against Lesbians in the Workplace, *Signs, 9*, pp. 700-710, 1984.
29. B. B. Auster, Shape Up or Ship Out, *U.S. News & World Report*, pp. 24-33, April 5, 1993.
30. T. Morganthau, Gays and the Military, *Newsweek*, pp. 52-55, February 1, 1993.
31. J. Oleck, Bad Politics, *Restaurant Business*, pp. 80-89, June 10, 1992.
32. E. Grauerholz and R. T. Serpe, Initiation and Response: The Dynamics of Sexual Interaction, *Sex Roles, 12*, pp. 1041-1059, 1985.
33. B. A. Gutek, A. G. Cohen, and A. M. Konrad, Predicting Social-Sexual Behavior at Work: A Contact Hypothesis, *Academy of Management Journal, 33*:3, pp. 560-577, 1990.
34. V. F. Nieva and B. A. Gutek, *Women and Work: A Psychological Perspective*, Praeger, New York, 1981.
35. B. A. Gutek and B. Morasch, Sex-Ratios, Sex-Role Spillover, and Sexual Harassment of Women at Work, *Journal of Social Issues, 38*:4, pp. 55-74, 1982.
36. A. C. Kinsey, W. Pomeroy, and L. Martin, *Sexual Response in the Human Male*, Saunders, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1948.
37. A. L. Rhodes, Effects of Religious Denomination of Sex Differences in Occupational Expectations, *Sex Roles, 9*:1, pp. 93-108, 1983.
38. J. T. Spence and R. L. Helmreich, *Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents*, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1978.
39. S. L. Bem, Probing the Promise of Androgyny, in *Beyond Sex-Role Stereotypes*, A. G. Kaplan and J. P. Bean (eds.), Little, Brown, Boston, 1976.
40. B. A. Gutek, *Sex and the Workplace*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1985.
41. M. Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values*, Free Press, New York, 1973.
42. D. E. Terpstra and D. D. Baker, *Reactions to Sexual Harassment*, presented at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, 1985.
43. D. E. Terpstra and D. D. Baker, The Identification and Classification of Reactions to Sexual Harassment, *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 10*:1, pp. 1-14, 1989.
44. A. M. Konrad and B. A. Gutek, Impact of Work Experiences on Attitudes toward Sexual Harassment, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, pp. 422-438, 1986.
45. D. D. Baker, D. E. Terpstra, and K. Larntz, The Influence of Individual Characteristics and Severity of Harassing Behavior on Reactions to Sexual Harassment, *Sex Roles, 22*:5/6, pp. 305-325, 1990.
46. M. Weintraub and L. M. Brown, The Development of Sex-Role Stereotypes in Children: Crushing Realities, in *The Stereotyping of Women*, V. Franks and E. D. Rothblum (eds.), Springer Publishing, New York, pp. 30-58, 1983.
47. M. E. Reilly, B. Lott, and S. M. Gallogly, Sexual Harassment of University Students, *Sex Roles, 15*:7/8, pp. 333-358, 1986.
48. B. A. Gutek, B. Morasch, and A. C. Cohen, Interpreting Social Behavior in Work Setting, *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22*:1, pp. 30-48, 1983.

49. E. B. C. Collins and T. B. Blodgett, Sexual Harassment: Some See It . . . Some Won't, *Harvard Business Review, 59*:2, pp. 76-95, 1981.
50. B. A. Gutek and V. Dunwoody, Understanding Sex in the Workplace, in *Women and the Work: An Annual Review*, A. H. Stomberg, L. Larwood, and B. A. Gutek (eds.), Sage Publishers, Beverly Hills, pp. 249-269, 1986.
51. D. D. Baker, D. E. Terpstra, and B. D. Cutler, Perceptions of Sexual Harassment: A Re-Examination of Gender Differences, *The Journal of Psychology, 124*:4, pp. 409-416, 1990.
52. J. J. Hartnett, D. Robinson, and B. Signh, Perceptions of Males and Females toward Sexual Harassment and Acquiescence, *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 4*:3, pp. 291-298, 1989.
53. L. A. Lee and P. P. Heppner, The Development and Evaluation of a Sexual Harassment Inventory, *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69*, pp. 512-517, 1991.
54. D. M. Pollack, *Gender Differences in Perceptions of Social-Sexual Situations as Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Ohio, 1988.
55. D. E. Terpstra and D. D. Baker, A Hierarchy of Sexual Harassment, *Journal of Psychology, 121*, pp. 599-605, 1987.
56. K. M. York, Defining Sexual Harassment in Workplaces: A Policy-Capturing Approach, *Academy of Management Journal, 32*:4, pp. 830-850, 1989.
57. J. B. Pryor, The Lay Person's Understanding of Sexual Harassment, *Sex Roles, 13*:5/6, pp. 273-286, 1985.
58. S. Kenig and J. Ryan, Sex Differences in Levels of Tolerance and Attribution of Blame for Sexual Harassment, *Sex Roles, 15*:9/10, pp. 535-549, 1986.
59. A. P. MacDonald, Jr. and R. G. Games, Some Characteristics of Those that Hold Negative Attitudes toward Homosexuals, *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*:1, pp. 9-27, 1974.
60. L. Reiter, Developmental Origins of Anti-Homosexual Prejudice in Heterosexual Men and Women, *Clinical Social Work Journal, 19*:2, pp. 163-175, 1991.
61. R. Davis, Poll: Women More Tolerant, *USA Today*, p. A10, April 26, 1993.
62. U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is It a Problem?* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1981.
63. J. Ruggiero and L. C. Weston, Comparative Analysis of Male and Female Attitudes: Toward Tolerance of Nonconformists, *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 7*, pp. 77-85, 1977.
64. A. Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1971.
65. K. L. Nyberg, *Homosexual and Homoerotic Behavior Difference in Men and Women*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Utah, Salt Lake City, 1973.
66. K. L. Nyberg and J. P. Alston, Homosexual Labeling by University Youths, *Adolescence, 7*:48, pp. 541-546, 1977.
67. W. Simon and J. H. Gagnon (eds.), *Sexual Deviance*, Harper and Row, New York, 1969.
68. A. Abbey, Sex Differences in Attributions for Friendly Behavior: Do Males Misperceive Females' Friendliness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, pp. 830-838, 1982.

69. R. E. Quinn, Coping with Cupid: The Formation, Impact and Management of Romantic Relationships in Organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*, pp. 30-45, 1977.
70. J. Hearn and W. Parkin, *Sex at Work: The Power and Paradox of Organization Sexuality*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1987.
71. W. G. West, Public Tolerance of Homosexual Behavior, *Cornell Journal of Social Relations, 12*:1, pp. 25-36, 1977.
72. E. E. Levitt and A. D. Klassen, Jr., Public Attitudes toward Homosexuality, *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*, pp. 29-43, 1974.

Direct reprint requests to:

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