

**COMMISSION ON LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDERED
ISSUES IN ANTHROPOLOGY**

FINAL REPORT, NOVEMBER 1999

William L. Leap and Ellen Lewin, Co-Chairs

I. Introduction

II. Recommendations

III. The COLGIA Report on the Testimonies

IV. The COLGIA Report on the Survey of Department Chairs

V. The COLGIA Report on the Members' Survey

VI. Appendices.

+++++

INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose and background

The Commission was created by AAA in 1994, after a Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists (SOLGA) committee headed by Evelyn Blackwood and Mildred Dickemann submitted a document to AAA leadership that identified some key concerns facing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (L/B/G/T) anthropologists. AAA President Annette Weiner met with other SOLGA members in an effort to clarify the questions that the Association should investigate, and subsequently spearheaded establishment of the Commission (henceforth COLGIA, an acronym of its original name, the Commission on Lesbian and Gay Issues in Anthropology), for a three-year term. Members were appointed by the AAA Executive Board.

At its inception, COLGIA's members were William Leap and Esther Newton (co-chairs), and Ralph Bolton, Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Elizabeth Kennedy, Ellen Lewin, Susan Phillips, John van Willigen, and then AAA President James Peacock. After its first meeting, members recommended that membership be expanded to include two graduate students, and Deborah Amory and Martin Manalansan were invited to join. At the end of the three-year term, COLGIA requested and was granted additional time to complete its mandate. Ellen Lewin replaced Esther Newton as co-chair; Ralph Bolton, Sue-Ellen Jacobs, Elizabeth Kennedy, Susan Phillips, John van Willigen, and James Peacock rotated off the commission, and Evelyn Blackwood, Jason Cromwell, and Don Donham rotated on. Deborah Amory, Martin Manalansan, Esther Newton, and William Leap continued to serve.

B. Accomplishments to date

On November 21, 1994, COLGIA issued the following mission statement, which was endorsed by the AAA Executive Committee in January 1995:

1. Consistent with the charge given to the Commission by the Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association, it shall be the mission of the AAA Commission on Lesbian and Gay Issues in Anthropology:

1.1. to establish and enhance the visibility of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered anthropologists within the profession, within academe, and within the research and “applied” communities;

and

1.2. to secure, within those contexts, the legitimacy of research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered themes.

2. To this end, the Commission shall:

2.1. gather data to document experiences of discrimination directed at lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students, faculty and staff, or at students, faculty and staff perceived by others to be lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered;

2.2. initiate dialogue with public and private agencies to enhance opportunities and funding for research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered themes;

2.3 develop materials to assist in classroom instruction on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered themes;

2.4. establish ties with comparable commissions in other disciplines;

and pursue other activities that promote the visibility and legitimacy of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered anthropologists-and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered anthropology-within the profession.

To meet the objectives set forth in the Mission Statement, COLGIA undertook the following activities:

1. Establishing the presence of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered anthropologists.

a. Commission members met with the AAA staff, President, and Executive Committee.

b. The Commission’s name was changed to reflect its commitment to include issues affecting bisexual and transgendered anthropologists, as well as lesbian and gay, in its mandate.

c. The Commission maintained an active presence at each Annual Meeting following its formation including organizing or sponsoring scientific sessions, holding special events such as panel discussions and open forums, participating in presidential and other plenary sessions, and holding open business meetings.

d. The Commission undertook outreach to AFA, and to other commissions, sections, and groupings within the AAA whose missions are related to that of COLGIA, i.e., units concerned with improving the status of underserved or marginalized populations of anthropologists.

e. The Commission supported efforts by SOLGA to secure section status in the AAA.

f. The Commission successfully lobbied the AAA to strengthen their commitment to equal rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered anthropologists by boycotting states with sodomy or other anti-gay laws as sites for annual meetings. The current policy used by AAA in selecting suitable sites for meetings is the direct result of COLGIA's lobbying: meetings may only occur in sodomy states if the particular municipal jurisdictions under consideration have enacted explicit policies that oppose discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered citizens.

2. Securing the legitimacy of anthropological research on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered themes and initiating dialogue with public and private funding agencies.

a. The Commission sponsored scientific sessions at the AAA Annual Meetings.

b. The Commission sponsored noontime sessions on mentoring for L/B/G/T students.

c. The Commission sponsored discussions with representatives of major funding agencies at the AAA Annual Meetings. These sessions were intended to facilitate information gathering by anthropologists interested in seeking support for specific research ventures.

d. The Commission submitted lists of names of anthropologists with expertise appropriate to evaluate articles on lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered themes that are submitted to scholarly journals.

3. Documenting the experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered students, faculty and staff, and of those perceived to be lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered.

a. The Commission carried out a "members" survey at the 1994 Annual Meeting in Atlanta. Five hundred twenty five responses were received.

b. The Commission carried out a survey of department chairs in 1995. One hundred ninety eight departments responded.

c. Commission members gathered 30 personal narratives from a variety of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered anthropologists attending annual meetings in 1994 and 1995. In addition, a small number of individuals submitted written statements detailing their personal experiences.

d. Supporting data from comparable surveys undertaken in other professions (e.g., political science and sociology) were analyzed, along with material published in such edited volumes as *Tilting the Tower*, *Poisoned Ivy*, *Out in the Field*, *Inside the Academy and Out*.

4. Improving access to teaching materials and models for inclusion of L/B/G/T materials in anthropology classrooms.

a. The Commission began a process of collecting exemplary syllabi for circulation to anthropologists interested in including L/B/G/T materials in their classes.

b. The Commission sponsored noontime discussions at annual meetings on mentoring issues for L/B/G/T students; these events provided an open forum for sharing concerns and remedies.

c. The Commission began to develop a mentoring resource list, on the model of a similar project undertaken by AFA.

5. Building connections with L/B/G/T caucuses and commissions in other academic disciplines.

a. The Commission established ties with contact persons for L/B/G/T affairs in sibling organizations based in Washington, DC, and gathered examples of data-gathering tools used in related projects.

b. The Commission worked closely with a comparable unit in the American Political Science Association (APSA), adapting its questionnaire for use in our “members” survey.

c. Representatives of the Commission attended the “Creating Change” conference of academic caucuses in 1997.

d. Commission members collaborated with L/B/G/T academics from other fields, principally history, economic, and sociology, to prepare an article, *Lesbian and Gay scholarship in the Social Sciences*, for the back page of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The article eventually appeared in the newsletter of the Committee on Gay and Lesbian History, and is included as an appendix to this Report.

The COLGIA Report: Conclusions and Recommendations

[11/02/99]

Life-story narratives and responses to the Members' and Chairs' surveys provide glimpses into the experiences of lgbt anthropologists within academic and other professional settings. The discussion of these experiences, and the issues they raise, suggest several lines of action which require the immediate attention of the American Anthropological Association.

1. Anti-lgbt discrimination in anthropology.

Survey responses and life-story narratives speak directly to the presence of anti-lgbt bias and discrimination in anthropological classrooms, in rank and tenure committee meetings, in faculty-student advising and mentoring sessions, in conversations between faculty colleagues, and in other locations. These expressions of discrimination are not always overt or dramatic, and the camouflage makes such events less painful and, at times, easy to disregard. The cumulative effects of such discrimination cannot be ignored.

While AAA cannot "outlaw" the practice of anti-lgbt discrimination in anthropology departments and other professional domains, AAA can take several steps to show its opposition to *all forms of anti-lgbt discrimination* as they occur *within the profession*.

COLGIA recommends:

1.a. that AAA Executive Committee issue a policy statement condemning *discrimination in hiring, retention, promotion, or tenure which is based on actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, or sexual practices*:

1.b. that AAA Executive Committee propose an amendment to the mandate of the AAA Ethics Committee, to enable the Ethics Committee to respond aggressively to documented reports of such discrimination each time the Committee receives such documented reports;

1.c. that AAA Ethics Committee specify, in its annual report to the Executive Committee, the extent of its investigations into reported cases of anti-lgbt discrimination;

1.d. that AAA increase applicant awareness of de facto employment obstacles, e.g. unequal benefits policies and absence of protection against discrimination, by requiring that employers using AAA employment services address these issues in position announcements. All announcements of positions advertised through AAA Placement Services and/or the Anthropology News(letter) shall state whether or not the employer offers employment benefits to domestic partners of academic appointees, and whether or not the employer prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation/preference or gender identity/expression.¹

2. The practice of downplaying

¹Our thanks to Frank Proshan, who first proposed this idea to COLGIA and to the AAA Executive Board.

The camouflage which surrounds anti-lgbt sentiment in anthropology helps explain the persistent "downplaying" of instances of anti-lgbt discrimination which were reported in the surveys and the life-story narratives. "I'd like to think of myself as a victim, but I'm not sure of whom" remarked one senior anthropologist, reflecting on being "in the closet" throughout his anthropological career. Indeed, "not sure" was a recurring theme each time survey questions and life-story testimonies explored particular intersections of lgbt identities and anthropological careers.

Initially, COLGIA members were surprised at the frequency of these "not sure" responses from our lgbt colleagues. Then we became frightened, as we began to identify instances of discrimination which we had previously glossed over in our own anthropological careers, and to recognize the similarities underlying what we previously dismissed as individualized, personal experiences. It is COLGIA's belief that a *broad dissemination of this report* will encourage other lgbt colleagues to move beyond downplaying practices, to develop more accurate assessments of the details of their own intersections of sexuality and anthropological career, and to support additional lgbt colleagues to do the same.

COLGIA Recommends:

- 2.1. that one copy of the COLGIA report be provided, free of charge, to all teaching units, museums, and other entities regularly included within the AAA Guide;
- 2.2. that the Report be made available to the rank-and-file AAA membership through the AAA website;
- 2.3. that AAA Member Services work with program committee for AAA 2000 (and beyond) to ensure that the program of the annual meetings provides for an open discussion of anti-lgbt discrimination in anthropology.

3. Classroom instruction/curriculum

Survey results suggest that, while anthropologists may not be interested in conducting lgbt-centered research or in addressing such issues within other professional venues, anthropologists are willing to teach about lgbt topics in the classroom--and many report they are already doing so. Necessary are efforts which will *support anthropologists in academic settings who are already addressing lgbt-related issues and concerns within the classroom*, and efforts which will *encourage even more anthropologists to do the same*.

COLGIA recommends:

- 3.1. that AAA Academic Relations coordinate the collection of syllabi, helpful teaching strategies, and other curriculum materials from anthropologists already involved in the teaching of lgbt-related anthropology; and develop a plan to make copies of those materials available to interested users. The AAA-sponsored Gender and Anthropology: Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching (Morgan, ed., 1989) provides a worthwhile model for this project. Particular

efforts are required here, to address lgbt issues for courses in archaeology and physical anthropology, since survey respondents from those subfields expressed uncertainty about developing lgbt-centered curriculum and instructional plans which would be relevant for their courses;

3.2. that the annual budgets of the AAA for the next five years include funds to assist in the copying and dissemination of these curriculum materials;

3.3. that AAA Academic Relations and SOLGA jointly sponsor one session at the annual meetings of the AAA where anthropologists can discuss and examine the practical dimensions of lgbt-centered teaching.

4. Mentoring

While anthropologists, as a group, may be doing an effective job teaching about l/g/b/t issues, Survey results suggest that anthropologists have been less successful in offering career-related and personal support to lgbt students and younger colleagues. More distressing are the reported instances where anthropologists have allowed mentoring to become a site for sexual harassment and personal intimidation. Happily, a number of effective mentoring practices, by heterosexual as well as l/g/b/t anthropologists, already provide blueprints and guidelines for improving mentoring practices within academic departments and non-academic work settings.

COLGIA recommends:

4.1. Building on COLGIA's successful experiences with this effort, that AAA Academic Relations and SOLGA jointly sponsor an open session on mentoring at the annual meetings of the AAA.

5. Lgbt-centered research

Survey results reveal some interest in researching lgbt issues on the part of lgbt and "straight" anthropologists, but also some questioning about the relevance of such research to established anthropological interests, as well as some reluctance on the part of some anthropologists to become deeply involved in such tasks. In order for lgbt research to claim its own legitimacy within the profession, *anthropologists involved in such research need to do more, as anthropologists, to disseminate research findings--e.g. more articles in the profession's flagship journals, more sessions (and sessions of quality) at the national and regional meetings, more applications to funding agencies to seek support for such tasks, more researcher visibility (again, as lgbt people and as anthropologists) within the news media, as well as more efforts to draw sharper, substantial linkages between anthropological research and the pressing lgbt issues of our day.*

COLGIA recommends:

5.1. that AAA Executive Committee reaffirm the legitimacy of lgbt-related research, and ask individual Anthropology departments to do the same;

5.2. that AAA Government Relations work with SOLGA to develop a plan to educate federal and private granting agencies regarding research needs in lgbt anthropology, and the importance of making funds available so that researchers can address those needs.

6. Maintaining and enhancing the data-base

Left unanswered in these recommendations--and in this Report-- are a range of additional questions about lgbt experience in the profession, e.g. connections between sexuality and race/ethnicity or sexuality and rural academic experience, career experiences for lgbt anthropologists outside of academe or in academic and other settings outside of the US and Canada. Moreover, the Survey data on which this Report is based were collected in 1994; lgbt anthropologists have claimed much greater visibility in the profession since that time, and a reassessment of many of the issues explored here will shortly be in order.

Even so, we are aware that anti-lgbt discrimination continues to flourish within anthropology, that such discrimination can have many different forms, and that lgbt anthropologists tend to "downplay" their vulnerability to such treatment.

COLGIA recommends:

6.1. that the AAA, in association with SOLGA, develop and implement efforts-including a follow-up survey of the AAA membership -B which will continue to document the hostile treatment faced by lgbt anthropologists, and show how race, gender and other characteristics of anthropologists further mediate the experience of discrimination;

6.2. That the AAA make an ongoing commitment to publicizing documented cases of mistreatment, thereby undercutting the isolation which prevents many lgbt anthropologists from identifying such treatment as part of a persistent pattern of anti-lgbt discrimination.

The COLGIA Report on the LGBT Testimony

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE, METHOD, TERMS

A.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to document the experiences and effects of discrimination against lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender (l/b/g/t) scholars within anthropology. It was undertaken by COLGIA as part of its mission to promote awareness among anthropologists regarding l/b/g/t concerns within the discipline and thereby to enhance the visibility and highlight the importance of l/b/g/t issues within the American Anthropological Association.

The following report constitutes the first collection of evidence documenting these experiences of discrimination within anthropology. We hope to lay bare the mundane and debilitating effects of power as it is exercised against lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender anthropologists. Typically, these events are registered only within the realm of professional gossip or reports of injury shared among trusted colleagues. By moving the discussion of these experiences into a more public arena, we hope to demonstrate the need for the discipline as a whole to acknowledge and address the systematic attempts to exclude (particularly visible) l/b/g/t scholars from the discipline and the continuing denial of the importance of studying l/b/g/t issues within anthropology.

A.2. METHOD

This report is compiled from over 30 personal narratives collected from lesbian, bisexual, gay, and transgender anthropologists; 11 men and 14 women (including two transgendered people) provided oral testimonies, and additional written materials were collected, mostly through electronic mail. The narrators included undergraduate and graduate students, and scholars at all stages of their careers (from junior to retired faculty, and those employed outside of the academy). The majority of the narratives were heard by Commission members during the 1994 and 1995 AAA annual meetings, where we met with anthropologists who responded to general requests for people to come forward to describe their experiences within the discipline. Typically, two Commission members conducted an open-ended interview, lasting up to 1 1/2 hours, with each narrator. Interviews were conducted in a suite at the meeting hotel. The Commission members then shared their notes about the interview with other members of the Commission. All narrators were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality; within the report, all details that might identify an individual have been removed or disguised.

Commission members agreed that hearing the narratives over the course of several hours at a time proved to be an emotionally draining and, indeed, painful experience. The affective force of the narratives was ironically highlighted by the fact that narrators consistently downplayed their own experiences of discrimination or harassment; oftentimes, after describing an upsetting situation, they would state, “but it wasn’t that bad” (see section on downplaying below). All too

aware of our own experiences within the discipline, we were moved by the courage and tenacity that the narrators demonstrated, both in their stories and in relating them to us.

Additional testimonies were also collected in written form, from anthropologists unable to attend the meetings or who contacted Commission members individually. Supporting materials in the form of published accounts of l/b/g/t scholars' experiences in anthropology were also consulted when compiling this report (Lewin & Leap 1996; Kulick & Willson 1995; Weston 1997) as have relevant analyses of the political economy of the discipline and the academy (Sharff & Lessinger 1994; Messer-Davidow 1993; Roseberry 1996).

This report has been a collective effort carried out by several members of the Commission. As such, it has benefited from an ongoing discussion that developed over time, as testimonies were being gathered, about the experiences and issues faced by l/b/g/t anthropologists. Unfortunately, its greatest strength is also a weakness: by the time this report was written, the words and experiences of those narrators who provided oral testimony have been interpreted several times over. Commission members recorded the oral interviews typically in note format, which were then given to colleagues writing early drafts of the report, and finally edited by another member. Throughout this process, we have been concerned with maintaining both the veracity and the texture of the narratives that we listened to, but we also acknowledge our responsibility for any errors that may have occurred.

The report itself is arranged into subsections based on the major themes that recurred throughout the testimony: 1) The Complexities of Discrimination, 2) Downplaying, 3) Harassment/Discrimination, 4) Mentoring, 5) The Closet Versus Visibility, 6) L/B/G/T Research Issues, 7) L/B/G/T Teaching Issues, 8) Employment Discrimination, 9) Collegial Relations. All of the narrators addressed one or more of these topics, although emphasis varied according to age and time in the profession. Arguably, the three most important themes were 1) Discrimination, 2) Mentoring, and 3) Research Issues.

Finally, we have tried carefully in the report to distinguish between two related but separate issues: discrimination/harassment encountered because the individual is (or assumed to be) lesbian, bisexual, gay, or transgendered, and discrimination that is aimed at research on l/b/g/t issues. Oftentimes, if one conducts l/b/g/t research, one is assumed to *be* lesbian, bisexual, gay, or transgendered, which is not always the case. Moreover, there are certain pressures to conduct l/b/g/t research if one is “out” as such. The two issues are linked by a denial of the central importance of conducting anthropological research on l/b/g/t issues, broader contexts of homophobia and social inequalities, and perhaps the assumption that only a queer would be crazy enough to conduct queer research.

A.3. TERMS

lesbigaytrans: lesbian, bisexual, gay, and/or transgendered people

l/b/g/t: adjective, lesbian, bisexual, gay and/or transgendered

downplaying: the term we used for narrators' tendency to try to diminish the importance or impact of their accounts

the closet and being "out": terms used by l/b/g/t people to describe the contrasting conditions of keeping their sexual identity secret (the closet) or being visible or open to some degree as an l/b/g/t individual (being "out" [of the closet]).

B. ANALYSIS

B.1. DISCIPLINING ANTHROPOLOGY, DISCIPLINING ANTHROPOLOGISTS: A WHOLE WAY OF LIFE

An anthropological gaze has rarely been turned on the discipline itself, much less from the point of view of a l/b/g/t anthropologist (see, however, Newton 1987; Weston 1997). This report effectively does so, providing a unique and unsettling portrait of our discipline and profession. While the report documents the experiences of l/b/g/t anthropologists, we will also argue that it offers a glimpse into the culture of professional anthropology, that "whole way of life" that provides the context for making an anthropological living. A crucial part of this not-so-seamless whole is what we have come to describe as a "vicious circle," one that remains unbroken. This circular movement that structures our discipline depends upon the recurrent denial of the importance of studying sexuality from a l/b/g/t perspective; it highlights "renditions of gender" (Weston 1996:125-147) where gender "is not all," but part and parcel of multiply constructed and lived identities, forged within social relations of class, color, and nation. Moreover, this circle is particularly and newly circumscribed today as a result of recent shifts in the political economy of the academy and world system.

This vicious circle may rather bluntly be described in the following terms: l/b/g/t research is not considered "legitimate" or "real" anthropology, historically and currently, no jobs exist in the field of l/b/g/t anthropology; students are advised not to conduct l/b/g/t research, for there are no jobs and only a handful of mentors in formal academic positions; l/b/g/t scholars who conduct such research cannot find jobs, for their research is not valid; research remains limited by material concerns (no jobs, no grant money); l/b/g/t anthropology remains marginalized. This circular system is fueled not just by disciplinary concerns and trends, but by societal forces—homophobia, racism, sexism, and the like. Thus the circle remains unbroken, notwithstanding the current "trendy" status of Queer Theory in a number of disciplines.

Yet, like gender, this vicious circle can conceal progress than has been made. The good news is that, notwithstanding systematic discrimination, lesbian, bisexual, gay and transgender anthropologists have made many key contributions to the discipline (Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict leap to mind) and the study of l/b/g/t issues has already shaped or transformed many subfields. This fact highlights the urgency of the present report. From culture and personality studies earlier in this century (Mead, Benedict) to the feminist theorizing of gender performativity (Newton, Weston) and the theorizing of gender in Native American studies (especially studies of "berdache," such as Blackwood 1984; Whitehead 1981; Roscoe 1991, Jacobs & Cromwell 1992); from the study of gender and kinship (Weston, 1991; Lewin 1993) to the study of ritual, gender, and sexuality (Herdt 1981; Elliston 1995); from the anthropology of

AIDS (Bolton) to linguistic anthropology (Leap 1995) and community studies (Kennedy & Davis 1994), queer anthropologists and studies of (homo)sexuality have succeeded in shaping and defining much of anthropology in this century.

B.2. WHY?

This report provides evidence that the marginalization and exclusion of l/b/g/t scholars and research within anthropology is linked to historical attempts to carefully circumscribe who gets counted as a “real” anthropologist, and what constitutes “valid” research. The narratives described in this report join a growing literature on the disciplinary workings of professional anthropology, revealing an historical process whereby anthropology marginalizes some of its own and validates others. Thus the volume Women Writing Culture (Behar and Gordon 1995) provides a compelling critique not only of the so-called self-reflexive (male) movement in ethnographic writing that marked the late 1980s, but a historical pattern of exclusion and marginalization for white women, Jewish women, and women of color within anthropology -- as well as the incredible contributions these women nonetheless made to the discipline, pioneering the art of self-reflexive and innovative ethnography decades before the 1980s. African American anthropologists (Harrison 1991; Skinner 1983; Drake 1980) and Chicana/o anthropologists have also offered critiques of the ways in which the profession disciplines both its “own” and its “others.” Queer anthropologists have also recently added their perspectives in discussions of fieldwork (Lewin & Leap 1996; Blackwood 1995). Through these accounts, we may begin to answer the question, “why?”. In the name of authorizing and legitimizing the “scientific” status of anthropology, an emphasis on “objectivity” remains the theoretical (and material) grounds for disciplining and excluding women, people of color, queers, and people with disabilities, as well as circumscribing the study of “our” own ways of life.

Another answer to the Why Question would have to engage the great irony that Kulick (1995) highlights when he argues that sex provides the “very basis of the anthropological sideshow,” but only when it is the “appropriate” (i.e., someone else’s) sex/sexuality. Thus, the study of incest, female genital mutilation, kinship, etc. all constitute “classic” topics within anthropology that specifically involve questions of sexuality, but these topics are carefully circumscribed in order to prevent certain questions from being asked. Another case in point would be the literature on woman-woman marriage in Africa, a literature which is conspicuously lacking in any analysis of sexuality, as Stephen Murray has pointed out (1998). Kulick argues that “talking about it”- talking, thinking, and writing about sexuality-can bring into focus precisely those issues of exploitation, racism, hierarchies and boundaries that make anthropology and anthropological fieldwork so challenging. Kulick goes on to assert that the study of lesbian and gay issues in anthropology can be critical for the discipline-and for harassment and discrimination-precisely because it threatens and endangers professional power hierarchies. Extending Newton’s (1987) critique of homophobia within the discipline, Kulick argues that the longstanding anthropological silence with regard to the erotic subjectivity of the anthropologist, and indeed to the study of homosexuality itself, serves to conceal the racist and colonialist underpinnings of the discipline (1995).

B.3. iii. AND HOW?

How has the study of homosexuality and the work and careers of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender anthropologists been so insistently (and yet unsuccessfully) silenced and marginalized within the discipline? The narratives described in this report provide chilling details about the ways in which this silencing is carried out: research on (gay) kinship is described as “unanthropological,” “too narrow”; male professors tell lesbian students that they can “fix” their “problem”; safer sex posters are torn off the walls of graduate student offices; research on homosexuality is described as “this shit” by a member of a tenure review committee; insistent homophobic gossip echoes in departmental corridors; a lack of mentors hinders the aspirations of students interested in the study of l/g/b/t issues. Yet this silencing is not all: l/g/b/t students and colleagues survive this discrimination by building informal networks that provide support and refuge from the ignorance of other anthropologists; straight feminist professors offer protection and encouragement to students who seek advice and help. The discrimination detailed in this report is certainly systematic, and debilitating in many instances, but it is also not all. Nonetheless, a clearer understanding of the mechanics of exclusion and marginalization will help to challenge its perpetuation.

The “vicious circle” described earlier works in complex ways, but depends fundamentally on two facts: one is the denial of the importance of l/b/g/t research, and the other is the oblique and multifaceted texture of discrimination. Research on l/b/g/t topics is repeatedly and all too easily dismissed as “too narrow,” “unimportant,” “Not Real Anthropology” (see below). Lesbian, bisexual, gay and transgendered scholars, on the other hand, tend *not* to encounter such direct homophobic attacks as individuals (although these attacks still do take place). Rather, the personal dismissals are typically more oblique and indirect, often articulated in a statement like, “but you wouldn’t feel *comfortable* here” (implied: in this department, in this job, actually earning money and teaching students). In this report, we label this type of dismissal the “comfort question,” and argue that its very vagueness marks the ways in which gender and sexuality can only be represented in relation to other aspects of identity, such as race, class, or nation. Weston (1996) argues that rather than describing as “intersections” the coming together of specific race, class, and color attributes in multiply constructed identities, “renditions” of gender better approximate the complex ways in which gender, class, color or religion take on particular salience—and are particularly interpreted and marked—in historically specific and contextually dependent interactions. That is, the discrimination that l/b/g/t anthropologists encounter can never be separated from attacks aimed (directly or obliquely) at other aspects of our identity. Herein lies the power of the discrimination; a lesbian of color or a Jewish gay man might represent “discomfort” for a department on any number of fronts. The narratives that follow repeatedly raise this issue, and indeed this “comfort question” may be said to serve as one of the main reasons for the downplaying of people’s experiences: it is often not exactly clear whether and for what reason one has encountered hostility. Clearly, discrimination against those of us multiply marked by difference is about the exercise of power within the discipline. Placed within the broader context of the political economy of the academy and professional anthropology, this exercise of power works to maintain an increasingly obvious hierarchy of elite schools, programs, and jobs.

B.4. THE BIGGER PICTURE

This Commission report detailing our research on the status of lesbian, bisexual, gay and transgender anthropologists within anthropology, and the status of l/b/g/t issues within the discipline, comes at a very specific point in the history of the profession. As Roseberry (1996) argues, the current fiscal trend towards academic “downsizing” and the severity of budget cuts (particularly in public institutions), marks a new period in the history of the discipline. Following the expansion of anthropology departments in the 1970s, topics and research expanded as well, and a certain leveling of status hierarchies followed. However, since the 1980s anthropology has seen a period of retrenchment, a restriction of opportunities, and the reestablishment of older hierarchies focused around “elite” universities. Marked as well by the concentration of women in adjunct and part-time positions, the discipline is in a period of retrenchment and consolidation. Historically, it is precisely at times like these that those of us dwelling on the anthropological fringes become increasingly expendable. If nothing else, we hope that this report will highlight the urgent need for departments and programs to reconsider their composition and goals. The narratives presented below testify eloquently to the personal costs of systematic discrimination, and given an acknowledgement of the importance of research on l/b/g/t issues in anthropology, provide evidence of the urgent necessity to break the vicious cycle of exclusion and discrimination for l/b/g/t scholars and research.

II. MAJOR FINDINGS

1. LGBT respondents downplay experiences of discrimination

The testimony contains many instances where respondents describe being targets of some form of anti-LGBT discrimination, but then attempt to minimize the significance of the experience or to rationalize the experiences or the circumstances surrounding it.

Similarly, one-fourth of the LGBT respondents to the Members’ Survey report that they have experienced some form of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. And more than one third of LGBT survey respondents are either *not sure* (15.8%) or *agree* (20.3%) that their job/academic progress would be endangered if their chair/supervisor knew of their sexual orientation.

At the same time, one-fourth of LGBT survey respondents reported that they were *not sure* if they had been targets of such discrimination.

2. Department chairs give more upbeat evaluations of the LGBT presence in anthropology than do lgbt faculty and students.

For example, department chairs report a that anthropology departments have an accepting atmosphere for LGBT faculty and students; LGBT faculty and students describe anthropology departments as much less likely to be lgbt-affirming.

3. Heterosexual respondents are less likely to identify instances of anti-LGBT discrimination than are LGBT faculty and students.

4. All respondents agree, whatever their sexual orientation, that collegial relations are the most likely area of professional activity to be harmed by LGBT discrimination.

5. As a group, more anthropologists support teaching about LGBT topics in anthropology classes than actually include such topics in instruction in their own classrooms.

6. Survey responses suggest that many respondents are providing mentoring services to LGBT students and colleagues. The testimony consistently reports that LGBT anthropologists are unable to find mentors and are not able to obtain suitable guidance when pursuing scholarship or other career building tasks. And more than one-fourth of LGBT survey respondents report being discouraged from pursuing research on LGBT-related research themes.

III. ANALYSIS OF NARRATIVE DATA

The narratives the Commission collected both through personal interviews and from written sources document that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender anthropologists at all levels experience a range of pressures that undermine their careers and sometimes compromise their professional advancement. In some cases, these amount to outright discrimination, but more often, as we shall show, narrators describe patterns that are vague, subtle, and difficult to identify; it is mainly through hearing repeatedly of the same sorts of incidents that we can name these experiences discrimination.

Our research identifies two major patterns of discrimination which, while we will distinguish them here, often overlap in practice. On one level, anthropologists who are identified as l/b/g/t report being treated unequally as students or colleagues. On a different level, anthropologists (regardless of their own identity) who wish to focus on some aspect of homosexual or l/b/g/t experience in research, writing, or teaching may encounter a range of obstacles not presented to scholars with interests in more conventional anthropological topics. These two patterns frequently converge or are indistinguishable from one another because scholars who wish to study these topics are usually assumed to have one of these identities themselves and because l/b/g/t individuals are sometimes stereotyped as necessarily having these particular academic interests.

B.1. LESBIANS IN ANTHROPOLOGY

One lesbian anthropologist put her attraction to anthropology in simple terms, explaining that “it allowed one to think systematically about social life without having to believe in it.” The narratives we reviewed indicated that lesbians and gay men gravitate to the field for many of the same sorts of reasons that draw others who perceive themselves to be on the fringes of society. Notwithstanding the historic appeal of anthropology to members of minority groups, normalizing forces within the discipline operate to silence and marginalize dissenting voices and to define the shape of “appropriate,” “respectable,” or “important” research topics. The process of exclusion and marginalization that these narratives document is strikingly similar to the experiences described by women anthropologists in the recent volume, *Women Writing Culture*, particularly as that volume describes the obscuring of women’s ethnographic writing and the systematic exclusion of women from 1980’s critiques of representation (Behar and Gordon 1996). The testimonies of thirteen women collected by COLGIA paint a complicated picture of the professional lives of lesbian anthropologists, most clearly as they highlight the oftentimes

implicit, multivalent nature of discrimination. In several accounts, the “downplaying” of the discrimination or harassment by the “victim” reflects its ineffable, ambivalent, and oblique nature, as well as narrators’ desire to deny that it happens at all. That is, narrators’ accounts indicate that they rarely meet with explicitly homophobic or racist or sexist comments; rather, they struggle to interpret innuendo and elusive suggestions that could be attributed to a variety of factors. One consequence of the difficulty narrators describe in trying to make sense of their experience is a tendency to downplay the likelihood that they are victims of discrimination. We return to this theme in our conclusion.

As one senior scholar wrote in an article about her experiences in the academy, Homophobia in the academic world is not the violent shove in the back. It occurs in a privileged context where hostility is rarely so “crudely” expressed. But it does break spirits, damage careers, ruin lives. It strikes in closed-door meetings of tenure-review and promotion committees and in secret letters of recommendation. Rejection and denial are almost always attributed to the victim’s alleged personal and intellectual shortcomings. In twenty-eight years in higher education, the fact that I am a lesbian was never given as the reason for attacking me. (Newton 19)

A classic instance of this pattern of indirect discrimination is revealed by those interviewees who reported being told something along the lines of, “you might not be comfortable in our department.” This statement could mean a variety of things depending upon the nature of the “we” who is speaking. Is “our department” mainly white or male? The oblique nature of discriminatory comments make them hard to identify as such, and particularly hard to single out as *only* homophobic, or anti-Semitic, or racist. Rather, a constellation of differences marks one as unacceptable for either admission to a program, a job, or promotion; in this way, homophobia gets intertwined with racism, sexism, anti-Semitism, or any combination of possible differences. And people who experience this type of discrimination are well aware of its multivalent qualities even as they minimize the fact of its existence. The multivalent qualities of discrimination and harassment may be the strongest compulsion to remain closeted in the discipline, and the strongest compulsion to restrict research to “safe,” traditional, all too often unoriginal categories. The testimonies single out unlikely antagonists: the “allegedly feminist” straight woman who, thinking she is giving helpful advice, only discourages the lesbian anthropologist-to-be, or perhaps unwittingly flirts with her; the older (sometimes closeted) gay mentor who tries to seduce his graduate student, at great emotional cost to that student. Relatively few easily identifiable perpetrators of outrageous homophobia appear in the narratives, along with many well-intentioned but misinformed mentors, and a few traumatic experiences with persons narrators had regarded as gay or lesbian role models.

The heroes of these stories are also sometimes unlikely: the initially uncomprehending and resistant (straight) chair of the committee who gradually comes to understand and value the work of a young anthropologist on a gay or lesbian topic; the feminist who challenges other older colleagues on behalf of a student trying to launch research on homosexuality. Not surprisingly, several accounts detail how an out lesbian or gay professor saved a student from dropping out of college or inspired them to enter the field of anthropology.

It is also important to locate current accounts of discrimination and the attendant struggle to gain validation for gay and lesbian issues in anthropology within the political economy of discipline and the current wave of “downsizing” and political conservatism in university administration. As Roseberry (1996) argues, a lack of tolerance for a variety of theoretical issues correlates with scarcity of jobs in the academic market. The recent gay and lesbian studies “publishing boom” is

also now rumored to be winding down; what future then for l/b/g/t studies, especially as ethnic studies and women's studies programs also come under attack?

B.2 HARASSMENT/DISCRIMINATION

Many people testified to the devastating effects of sexual and other kinds of outright harassment of them as lesbians or gay men. Two older lesbian narrators had been cowed by highly publicized incidents of entrapment of gay male faculty by undercover police in the 1950s and '60s. Wrote one: "It was not lost on me that these cases of 'moral turpitude' had been 'resolved' with great dispatch, while in contrast we had had in the [department] for many years an obvious alcoholic, incapable of any contribution to the field or the department, who came to class drunk."

Other common forms of harassment, in the experience of both older and younger narrators, were gossip and homophobic jokes. A senior scholar reflected that back in the 1960s department had treated her gay American dissertation topic as "an inappropriate dirty joke." Another had been harassed as an undergraduate in the 1950s when she dared to wear jeans off-campus.

Even this little liberation drew criticism from suspicious male peers. One political science major asked sarcastically if I was trying to be like 'those girls during the Weimar Republic.' I knew what he meant, but shrugged and evaded.

As in other testimonies, gossip served as an informal and indirect form of harassment; as one narrator put it, "many professors were vocal about their personal disgust, though they never said such things in the classroom (you heard them in the hall)."

Although the conditions under which gossip occurs have changed (for one thing, neither of these scholars was able to be open about her lesbianism for years), l/b/g/t persons who are out are still the target of gossip and jokes. One of the transsexual respondents said that she felt compelled to be out while in graduate school because of persistent gossip about her gendered status; this gossip focuses on intimate details about her genitals, and was perpetrated particularly by staff and a few of the junior faculty (i.e., those in the weakest structural positions). She reasoned that she "can't be in the closet because of gossip, so I may as well be out". Another graduate student said that despite one male professor's statements that he was supportive of her work, she had overheard him sharing "queer jokes" with his buddies. When this first-year student met with the department's executive committee to discuss her program, she talked about her interest in "queer theory." Two of the faculty members whom she had heard sharing queer jokes asked suggestively if she "had any desires to fulfill."

The most common sexual harasser was a straight man, but incidents were also reported of harassment by straight women and gay men. One older male narrator was traumatized for years by an incident that occurred when he was a graduate student: a famous closeted gay male anthropologist to whom he had gone for mentoring attempted to seduce him. Lesbians in particular reported such comments from straight men, including in some cases faculty members, that "I can fix your problem" or "what you need is a real man." As other studies have shown, sexual harassment is a serious problem for all women in the academy; for lesbian and bisexual

women, gender combines with sexuality in sometimes surprising ways to produce multiple possibilities for sexual coercion or harassment.

As one heterosexual member of COLGIA wrote after reading one account,

I think it is common for graduate students to want to get to know faculty members well and to make efforts in this direction. For women graduate students with male faculty, not just lesbians, this may be read as a sexual or romantic invitation, whether or not it is intended that way. For women graduate students who are bisexual or lesbian, with male or female faculty, faculty may find closeness to the student more interesting or even titillating, because of the woman's sexual orientation. The sexual orientation may be perceived as a kind of rule breaking that invites other kinds of what can be perceived as rule breaking. I have had two lesbian students whose graduate careers were thought to be by them and/or others (including me) significantly disrupted or ended by sexual advances from or sexual relations with faculty in the graduate school context.

For gays and lesbians, the narratives indicate, harassment seems to be a kind of background noise they try to tune out, in the words of one undergraduate, "vague and hard to pin down." One respondent wrote of her graduate school experience of receiving unwelcome advances from a visiting male professor.

While I was aware that his behavior was obviously inappropriate, I simply tried to forget the incident. Sometime later, the topic happened to come up with another graduate student. That student was astonished, offended, and asked if I had done anything about it. In fact, his response astonished me, because I had effectively erased the importance of the incident from my memory.

Instead, victims appear to be shamed, silenced and confused. A lesbian graduate student reported that one committee member, on learning of her proposed research on lesbians, told her to "not only write it up but also do it." When she asked what he meant by this, he explained that she should sleep with her informants. She described this incident as an example of a "certain response that confuses and bothers me," and then wondered whether this committee member wanted her to come out to him about her lesbianism, or whether this comment reflected a prurient interest as he engaged in a little "peeping at the sexual arrangements in my life."

Another woman recounted how a male faculty member published her own graduate work on sexuality under his name, even as he pressured her for a sexual relationship. The effect of this experience of harassment was to make her delay actively working on sexuality, notwithstanding a long-term interest in sexuality, gender, and queer theory. Another woman described how a "straight" woman professor at her Ivy League college told the student that it was "really bad to be gay," but at the same time tried to seduce her. The professor kept her after class, gave her extra work, and harangued her about gay activism on campus, of which she was a part. During these encounters, the professor sat so close to her that she felt "uncomfortable"; nonetheless, she reasoned, she was being given extra "help" and so couldn't complain. In fact, she reported not being able to talk about the incident for a year and a half after it happened, even with her friends.

In another narrative, an out lesbian graduate student “encountered outright hostility from a [straight female] professor from the first day.” When the student went to the professor’s office to try to discuss the problem, the professor

put her feet up on the desk, one on its surface and one on the drawer pulled out in front of me, providing me with an unimpeded view of her panties (she was wearing a short skirt); then she inquired, what did I want to talk about. When I reported that I experienced her behavior in the classroom towards me as unnecessarily aggressive and volatile (trying not to gaze up her skirt), she apologized profusely and expressed concern that I had misinterpreted her actions. We left the matter as a simple matter of misunderstanding, and the aggressive behavior soon stopped, only to be replaced by a caring sort of solicitude that also made me feel uncomfortable.

The narrator interpreted both the aggressive behavior in class and the subtle sexual harassment as an unconscious response to the presence of an out lesbian in her classroom.

When they do try to fight back within the system, victims of sexual harassment are punished again. One narrator reported being expelled from law school in the 1980s after she publicly clashed with a professor who refused to study the rape law she wanted to learn about. He also made openly homophobic jokes in class, and joked about murdering gay people as “homo-cide.” After this bad experience she decided to thoroughly research attitudes toward gays before considering another graduate school experience.

B.3. MENTORING

Many narrators testified to the overwhelming importance of mentoring to their anthropological careers. Good mentoring can make the difference between one individual launching an outstanding career and another dropping out embittered. As early as the 1950s, the narratives make clear that clandestine mentoring of l/b/g/t students was going on. A senior scholar reports that she felt insecure about going to graduate school in the 1950s, even though she had an A average. She would not have gone except for the insistence of three older anthropologists; she later discovered that two of them were closeted gays and the third a bisexual man. In another case during the 1960s, a graduate student’s gay dissertation topic received support from “several powerful straight white male faculty members [without whom] my project would have been squashed.” In a theme that was frequently heard, a lesbian graduate student planning a gay dissertation topic during the early 1980s reported being supported by [straight] feminist anthropologists. Such support can take various forms - agreeing to serve on committees, defending their work to colleagues, or simply allowing them to work unimpeded. Not surprisingly, one undergraduate described getting support from her advisor, the sole out lesbian faculty. She commented, “were it not for her, I surely would have dropped out of school.”

L/B/G/T anthropologists are often so isolated that sometimes the briefest positive contact can change the course of their careers. One woman reported that attending a talk by a prominent lesbian anthropologist on a gay topic when she was an undergraduate as a turning point in her

decision to become an anthropologist and to study an l/b/g/t topic. She wrote to the Commission, addressing one of the members of COLGIA, “You were the first out-lesbian-anthropologist-working-on-a-queer-topic person I had ever met. Up to that point, I had been convinced that my interests in identity politics and queer cultural expressions would (have to) remain a side interest.” At that lecture, the student approached the speaker for advice on how to pursue queer research in anthropology. As a result of their talk, the student attended the AAA meetings that year, joined SOLGA, and subsequently enrolled in a MA program in anthropology where she is pursuing research on “the exploration of queer identity among youth.” Several interviewees reported finding support through their involvement in SOLGA. One graduate student, for example, said that the faculty at her university did not mentor her because

[they] were too busy being Important Anthropologists to worry about my own individual case, and in some senses because they felt I was too ambivalent about the discipline, and my own place within it, as I grappled with the question of whether to do gay or lesbian focused research, for example, which did not interest them, and the very thought of which indicated a lack of commitment to Real Anthropology.

Instead, this graduate student found mentors within SOLGA “who were willing to take my work and ideas seriously, and actively advocated on my behalf in professional circles.”

Bad mentoring, or no mentoring at all, has effects that range from depressing to devastating. It is impossible to overstate this; after all, the ill effects of bad mentoring were probably underrepresented, in that the worst hurt had dropped out completely so that we could not contact them.

Like most graduate students, narrators worried about finding supportive mentors. Most students with l/b/g/t dissertation topics found no one knowledgeable enough to guide them; even if their topic did not concern homosexuality or related issues, if they did not attract a mentor, they worried that it had to do with their being L/B/G/T. One recent Ph.D. characterized what she considered a generally favorable graduate school experience this way: “No one knew how to guide me, so they let me train myself.” She was unsure whether to blame her own “personality” or her gay American topic for the fact that other students had closer relationships with faculty.

In another account, a lesbian described a long and complicated graduate school history. Gender discrimination caused her to leave one graduate school for another, where sexual harassment from a committee member endangered the completion of her degree. She reported both positive experiences with mentors, including some very prominent senior faculty, and negative ones, specifically when she encountered sexual pressures from a later chair and the (unacknowledged) use of her work by this professor in his publications. At the time, she self-identified as bisexual, and was criticized for her “lack of femininity.” She didn’t come out as a lesbian until the end of her graduate career, in 1986-1987, when she was “beyond their control” (referring to the power that senior male professors had over her). In this case, explicit sexual harassment by a mentor played a clear and damaging role in this woman’s attempt to complete a Ph.D.

Many narrators attributed their problems finding faculty who could guide their intellectual interests to the absence or lack of out lesbian and gay faculty in their departments. One undergraduate anthropology major, for instance, had to work with a straight advisor. Though grateful for the help this professor offered, the narrator felt she spent valuable time “teaching” her advisor. In a similar, though more questionable incident, a graduate student

was dismayed at the way that the chair of my committee...when we were ostensibly meeting in preparation for my qualifying exams, treated me as an informant on lesbian issues-when she was writing a paper on the topic-rather than addressing the issues I was concerned about in preparation for my exams. I thought the path of least resistance required my participation in her charade, rather than actual preparation for my exams.

Ambivalent support from straight advisors and chairs was often noted. One gay man described informing his advisor of the decision to pursue a dissertation topic dealing with gay men and AIDS: “He was initially shocked. He nevertheless ‘allowed’ me to pursue my interest.” Indeed, the student noted that “my advisor was accepting of my gay identity despite his lack of knowledge about gay and lesbian issues.” Due to this lack of expertise on gay and lesbian topics, the student went elsewhere for intellectual support, noting “I found my own support group of ‘auxiliary advisors’ among the members of SOLGA.”

One woman currently pursuing an M.A. in anthropology and working on an l/b/g/t topic reported disbelief on the part of her professors that her work had anything to do with “real” anthropology. She also felt that their intense interest in the sexual histories of her research subjects represented something more than intellectual curiosity.

My professors here don’t understand what my work has to do with real anthropology. Well, they say they do, but they’d much rather know the sexual history of the kids I’m working with, than [the youths’] perspectives on the politicizing/globalization of queer identity.

Interestingly, several of the male narrators identified feminist faculty or straight women who work within women’s studies as important sources of support and advice, often notwithstanding the fact that these women do not possess expertise in the field of lesbian and gay studies. From the experiences detailed in the narratives, it became clear that gay and lesbian students are experiencing some of the same types of discrimination that an earlier generation of feminist scholars encountered when anthropological work on gender was introduced to the discipline in the 1970s. That is, dismissals of gay and lesbian topics for being “too narrow,” “unanthropological,” or “uninteresting” mirror the earlier dismissal of gender as a topic for research. Feminist scholars’ understanding of sexual harassment as well seems to play a role in their sympathy for gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered students who also encounter (sometimes different) forms of harassment.

B.4. THE CLOSET VS. VISIBILITY (BEING OUT)

The meanings of the cognate concepts of “coming out” and “the closet” have changed over the last fifty years. Prior to the Stonewall riots of 1969 that ushered in the Gay Liberation movement,

“being in the closet” versus “being out” had two general meanings; first, it could mean that you had not realized that you were gay; in effect you were “in the closet” or had not “come out to” yourself. Once you accepted that you were gay, you might hide this fact even from other gay people, so the second meaning of coming out was to enter the gay community, rather like a debut. Beyond this, you might still be reluctant to have family members, employers, neighbors, or other straight people know that you are gay; thus the third meaning of being in the closet and coming out. The expectation that l/b/g/t people would publicly reveal their identities, so common today, was rarely articulated before 1969. Very few gay people were then out to the whole world if they wanted to survive; even professional drag queens might be in the closet to their parents, or when not working.

For the two oldest narrators, simply meeting other gay people within academic settings was difficult, and all three female narrators fifty years old or older took being in the closet professionally for granted until well into the 1970s, in one case, and well into the 1980s in the other two. The results were lives of isolation, fear, and professional frustration, countered by strong support from a few gay friends. The profound power of the closet dominated the account of the oldest of these narrators, who averred that her story was “characteristic of the experiences of anthropologists of my generation”:

It is probably not clear to outsiders that the “closet” is often a product of a tacit collaboration between oppressor and oppressed. Generally, except in the most unsophisticated regions, individuals who are the least bit cross-gendered in manner, dress, attitudes or interests, or fail to follow the expected life course of heterosexual association, dating, marriage and child-rearing, are soon identified, labeled and discussed by heterosexual peers. However, this categorization is never openly addressed with the individual in question, who learns to walk a fine line in public presentation, never declaring, never violating too obviously the canons of heterosexual public behavior. The closet is a conspiracy of silence. One learns, often, never to discuss one’s orientation even with one’s gay brothers and sisters.

Sometime in the 1970s, this scholar was approached by straight colleagues who wanted her to help get a non-discrimination policy at her school. “I was evasive and unhelpful. Out of the best of motives they had blown my cover.” When she did eventually come out professionally, she experienced the other side of the conspiracy of silence, by losing access to “closeted higher academe....it’s a cliché that there’s no rejection like that of a closeted peer...then too, leaving the silence of the closet exposes one to stereotypical condescensions of one’s ‘liberal’ colleagues.”

Those who more recently have remained in the closet (undoubtedly the majority of l/b/g/t people in the profession) report similar experiences, even today. A graduate student at a large Midwestern university during the late 1980s reported that the tradition of public secrecy was maintained by means of “the language of never saying it.” The student cooperated with this silencing with difficulty. She said she felt like she spent all of her life matching straight people’s conversational and behavioral style. And when the student had a personal crisis with her lover the day before her dissertation defense, she felt isolated and alone.

The game of just never talking about it can break down at critical moments. During an interview for an administrative position, a senior anthropologist was asked by a straight faculty member,

“So are you ‘out’ at your present job?”. The irony she noted was that she assumed that because of her feminine appearance, she easily passed as straight. After this experience, she decided that “being discreet and being feminine doesn’t get you anything. In fact people who pass make people more uncomfortable because they start wondering who else could be gay.”

In general the testimony of the younger people focuses on the problems of being out, which can range from being pressured against being so out, to being stigmatized as more sexual or more political than other people.

The woman who as a graduate student faced “the language of just never saying it,” wound up teaching anthropology in a medical setting. Although her dean claims to be supportive of her being an “out” lesbian, he objects strongly to her efforts to come out on the job, viewing them as “a political stance” which he deems inappropriate in a professional context.

A rather complex relationship between feminism, lesbianism, and the closet turns up in several testimonies. One narrator who was out from the beginning of her graduate work in the 1970s at a large Midwestern university said that she avoided people she thought didn’t like her. She had a reputation as “Ms. Lesbian Liberation” after having been “Ms. Women’s Liberation” as an undergraduate, so she felt that she had constantly to deal with people’s stereotypes of her.

Another, much younger narrator worked as the director of a center for women’s studies after her undergraduate years. In her application for that job, as well as her application for graduate school, she was warned not to be “out”; one appointed director she was warned not to associate the center too closely with lesbian issues lest its status be compromised. Her account reflects the well-documented feminist fear of lesbian contamination. This push towards the closet was reflected elsewhere in her narrative. She notes several times that her lesbianism was “assumed” rather than known by her professors (or announced by her). This young woman had picked [Eastern public university] because of its strong women’s studies department, but said that the graduate students were too intimidated to organize an l/b/g/t group or even to bring their lovers to departmental functions.

They say people may tolerate you, but they wouldn’t tolerate your lover, that’s what gay students think. I usually get referred to as “the feminist.” I think it’s because I identify as lesbian and don’t hide from that. It comes from faculty and students. Even my advisor introduces me that way, “the feminist.” But there are many other feminists.

Yet several other narrators spoke enthusiastically about what they regarded as the rewards of being out. Because she was so out, for example, one recent Ph.D. had been able to meet other l/b/g/t graduate students easily when she arrived at her department, and then became active in SOLGA, the Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists.

In many ways I credit SOLGA with the fact that I actually completed the program, received a Ph.D. (although my dissertation did not focus on gay or lesbian issues), and even found a job within a year of graduation. SOLGA offered me a sense of accomplishment and inclusion in a

world of serious anthropologists in a way that my graduate program, caught in the throes of reorganization (and the denial of tenure to a gay anthropologist) could not.

One out gay male graduate student noted that fellow graduate students were much less supportive than faculty members in his department. He described the experience of having gay-positive materials posted on the walls of his office defaced or removed; no one would admit to this vandalism. He also described being told by other students, when he raised gay or lesbian issues in the classroom, “oh, you’re going to say ‘that gay thing’ again,” and other students being obviously disinterested in his class presentations on gay topics. Interestingly, he identified male archaeology graduate students as being particularly negative, and also noted that during a degree program in Public Health, his work had been supported and validated by the other students.

Finally, one out prospective graduate student reaped the rewards of consciously planning her career as a lesbian anthropologist. Knowing she wanted to work on an l/b/g/t dissertation topic, she simply avoided programs that she thought “would be difficult for someone who is so out.” Then she visited various campuses in which she was interested and interviewed the departments on their attitudes toward queers and queer research. As a result she rejected several programs and wound up at an urban graduate school where she is working successfully with [a prominent straight feminist anthropologist] and where, she says, there is “support for all kinds of authorial voices” and she feels completely comfortable bringing her lover to departmental functions. She expressed disbelief that some anthropologists would still put up with being in the closet.

This woman I talked to just now [another interviewee at the meetings], she looked gay to me, but she said she hid it during interviews, she avoided doing that kind of work, that’s unimaginable to me. People can torture you when you’re divided against yourself.

B.5 LGBT RESEARCH ISSUES

The dismissals of l/b/g/t research as “too narrow,” inappropriate for extended and serious research, are classic ones, heard both from faculty advising graduate students and from search committees for jobs advertised for specialists in the field of gender and sexuality. This pattern displays itself as a sort of vicious circle, in which the student’s “own protection” is invoked as a reason for picking a different research field because “everyone” knows that no departments are hiring specifically in the field of gay and lesbian studies. By refusing to valorize gay and lesbian research topics, faculty assure not only that no one will ever be hired who specializes in such work, but that no mentors will be available for graduate students interested in pursuing these topics, and that graduate students will be discouraged from studying l/b/g/t issues even at the most elite universities. Until this circle is broken, gay/lesbian/bisexual and transgender research issues will remain marginalized within anthropology, as will the anthropologists who hold those issues to be personally and professionally important. Several narrators also demonstrated a keen awareness of how the political economy of the academic world at different periods had helped or hindered (mostly the latter) their careers as queer anthropologists.

A related issue, and one that also disproportionately affects American ethnic minority anthropologists, comes from the long-standing devaluation of North American fieldwork. Drawn to U.S. or home-based research by political conviction or by its social policy potential, and

perhaps fearful as well of attempting overseas field work with or without a partner, l/b/g/t anthropologists, particularly those who are also members of ethnic minorities, are frequently frustrated in their intellectual interests.

B.5.a. Research topics

Interest in researching l/b/g/t topics was expressed by nearly all narrators. In some cases, they had simply been too fearful to pursue these interests, or had been shamed or pressured away from them. The oldest narrator was so closeted that she dared not integrate her most vital intellectual interests with her life with until she was in her late forties, when she began doing feminist work. In her late forties, she became politically active in the gay community—"the feeling of welcome, acceptance and solidarity were entirely new, a homecoming. This affected not only my academic politics but my scholarship as well." She went to an international gay academic conference [1987]. After this she became active in SOLGA, and then, but only after retirement, did she take up l/b/g/t research.

Examination of the careers of other senior lesbian scholars shows that there was much to be feared if one dared to take up an l/b/g/t topic. One who had researched a gay North American topic in the 1960s while remaining nominally in the closet declared, "I dared not mention in my dissertation that my being a lesbian had anything to do with my choice of topic, my perspective, or the relative ease with which I had gained my informants' confidence." Getting her Ph.D. from an elite graduate program at the end of the 1960s, the narrator was able to get a job, but after being denied tenure at her first position (she was told that she was "not committed to anthropology"), and getting it only after an intense political struggle at her second job, she began to come out both at her job and in her writing, though she paid a price for having done so. A paper that she wrote in the early 1970s about being a lesbian in graduate school, for example, was at first accepted enthusiastically by the feminist editor of a collection on academic women, only to be cut from the collection later in the process.

The publisher saw it differently, and the professor was persuaded to drop my piece. It "assumed a feminist audience," she wrote in a subsequent letter, and was too focused on the academic world. Also, she said, her collection was now more about the relation of work to "mothering," not "personal relations"; so the topic of lesbianism was inappropriate. She advised me that in revising the piece for publication elsewhere I should be more upbeat, lest people think that lesbians are bitter (Newton 19).

Such difficulties in getting work published naturally made it more difficult for her to be promoted, and ironically, like the most senior closeted scholar, the out senior scholar never advanced past her position at a public undergraduate college and so has never been able to train graduate students. She also had difficulty getting promoted to full professor:

The majority [of the promotion committee] wrote that I hadn't published enough to merit promotion, and that eight lengthy favorable outside letters (many from full professors at major universities, some of whom called my first book a "classic" in urban anthropology) were outweighed by two cursory negative ones. One male member of the review committee reportedly dropped some of my work

on the table with disdain, saying, “Have you read this?” In that atmosphere several more neutral colleagues, including a full professor who is a heterosexual feminist, found it more comfortable to vote against my promotion. Later, the feminist professor admitted disliking the irrational hostility of certain committee members toward me, but, she explained, she agreed with them about my lack of publications. “But I’ve written two books,” I objected, “you were just promoted for editing one!” The insufficient publication note was also publicly sounded by a male administrator involved in my case. A colleague later reported my boss’s off-the-record remark: “Can you imagine promoting someone who writes this shit?”

But the next youngest narrators, both of whom began graduate school in the late 1960s or early 1970s have not been able to get tenure track jobs at all. One of them, who emerged from graduate school in the mid-1970s when the academic job market was depressed, has moved from one temporary appointment to another. During job searches she has been told that her work on lesbians “wasn’t anthropology,” was “too specific,” “too specialized,” that there weren’t enough “explicit citations” in her talk.

The other senior scholar, now in her late forties, wanted to work on gender from the time she entered graduate school in the 1970s. But people often asked when she was going to do “real anthropology,” reflecting the classic assumption that one could only do gay anthropology by studying New Guinea or berdache. The attitude she reported encountering was that since picking a gay American topic would amount to career suicide, “protectiveness” prompted them to discourage her from pursuing such research. As a result, she never attempted to get a grant for the fieldwork she eventually carried out, assuming that it wouldn’t be possible, though she did receive some funding in the form of departmental block grants. Her research choice, on gay sexual practice, scandalized other anthropologists. The narrator commented the irony of finding anthropologists who were sanguine about headhunting but who were “freaked out” by her descriptions of fist-fucking in a U.S. urban setting.

Unfortunately, younger would-be lesbian anthropologists also tell similar stories. What seems to distinguish this generation from older lesbian anthropologists, however, are their hopes of doing l/b/g/t work, which in some cases are higher. One graduate student, for example, was actively encouraged to abandon a major paper on lesbian issues in favor of “something more interesting.” She is thinking about doing a lesbian project, but usually the feedback from friends and people in the department is that she should “focus more broadly.” Lesbian studies should only be a sub-topic of gender studies, they say, and since as an out lesbian she will be marginalized already, she shouldn’t make it worse by focusing on a lesbian topic. Or, if she insists on a lesbian topic, it should be phrased as the “production of difference,” and it should just be one of other kinds of differences.

Another graduate student recounted how one committee member (an “allegedly hardcore feminist anthropologist”) tried to talk her out of her [lesbian oriented] research plan (“not serious enough”) just before her qualifying orals, suggesting that she work on “international sex tourism instead.” At the time there were no out gay faculty members in the department, the L/B/G/T studies program at her university had not yet been founded, and queer studies was not yet

“trendy.” As a result, the student explained, this statement [about her research topic] “angered me tremendously but also terrified me.”

An Asian lesbian graduate student describes strong resistance to her work on a lesbian topic by anthropologists in her fieldwork country, which is also her country of origin. “I frequently heard their denouncing my work as ‘un-objective’, ‘necessarily lack of depth,’ and thus ‘un-anthropological’ for the very reason that I am a [nationality] lesbian working on [the same nationality] lesbianism. I was also warned several times not to refer to myself before I was about to give a presentation on my work at a colloquium at [the school I got my master degree from].” She has also wondered whether people like her work simply because it can be contrasted with a western gay/lesbian model. “Very few people, [an out lesbian faculty member] is actually one, seem to show true interest in and desire to know my work...without immediately reducing it to something else,” she told us.

The testimony of another Asian lesbian-identified graduate student centered on the difficulties that she had in identifying and pursuing a research issue. Because she is a non-U.S. citizen, there is conflict over whether to return to her country of origin to pursue research, where her family might be scandalized and funding would be difficult because of her “native” status. She initially wanted to study lesbians in her country of origin, but changed that topic to a disabled group to make it more mainstream and fundable; while she is also drawn to transgender issues because of their theoretical importance and complexity, she hesitates due to funding and employment concerns.

Both of the previous testimonies also highlights how race and nationality are complicating issues for l/b/g/t scholars because of the assumed dichotomy between objectivity/subjectivity; for people who inhabit multiple categories of difference, Here versus There, “us” versus “them” does not fall neatly into place (see also Lewin 1995). These are issues that have implications for scholars who are not l/b/g/t, to be sure, particularly as more young anthropologists focus their research interests on sites close to “home.” But they become further complicated for scholars also trying to negotiate their sexual identities as they move through graduate school and the early stages of their careers.

We end this section with some testimony from young lesbians. The first was a senior at [Ivy League undergraduate college] in the 1990s, a twenty-one year old anthropology major who had only been out for two or three years. She identifies as a “femme dyke” and wanted to work on a Master’s Degree doing a study of butch/femme identities comparing the U.S. with a Northern European country where she had spent the previous summer working with a senior gay scholar. Her advisor, an out lesbian, had been very supportive, and so the student applied for a grant.

As she described the application process, the college holds interviews to decide which of their students they will recommend for the grant. The interview committee she dealt with was composed of nine straight people including a couple of deans, and one closeted gay person who did not say a word throughout. The student felt that they were uncomfortable with her proposal; she was told she was “too aggressive in her word choice” and that she was “too smart.” There were questions coming from both directions. The student is very feminine looking-she felt the committee was shocked that she was an out lesbian.

Later, members of the committee came up to her individually on campus and tried to talk to her about “political agendas.” They admitted that the interview had got out of hand (“you were battered) and that she was not given constructive feedback. She was told to say that she was doing “women’s sexuality studies” to disguise her real objectives and to put quotation marks around “lesbian” and “dyke” because they were “firecracker words.” They insisted that their main concern was about how the funding agency would look at this topic-the atmosphere at the interview, they explained, didn’t represent their own views.

The student rewrote her proposal according to instructions, but she was pessimistic now about how the funding agency would respond. She wanted eventually to do gay and lesbian studies in anthropology, but feared that the climate in the U.S. is too hostile for that and she needed financial support to do graduate work. She loves anthropology, she said, and would consider doing gay/lesbian studies, but is discouraged now.

The second young student had researched graduate schools before picking a mentor and a program which explicitly offered to be supportive of her queer identity and her work. She is interested in an L/B/G/T topic that focuses on the “politics of love” and same-sex relationships across cultural boundaries. When we asked if her faculty had said the topic was too narrow she looked perplexed: “Who would say that’s too narrow? I wouldn’t change anything because of fear; I’ve already been expelled [from a previous program], I have nothing to lose, I’m not afraid. What can they take? Just your life.”

B.5.b. Fieldwork

Lesbian narrators did not talk much about the problems specific to fieldwork. (But see several of the essays in Lewin and Leap 1996 and Kulick and Willson 1995. However, one of the written testimonies received by the Commission gives a harrowing description of “the vulnerable and precarious condition of being a woman, a lesbian, and trying to maintain a significant relationship in the process of conducting fieldwork and completing a Ph.D. program.”

My girlfriend accompanied me during one round of fieldwork in [foreign field site]. This experience was traumatic on a number of different levels. Most explicitly, we encountered extreme forms of discrimination, from verbal threats to stones thrown in passing, as we tried to negotiate daily life in the field. In part, we were targets of harassment due to the fact that we were single, young women living and trying to work in a context where male escorts were the only means to safety and, to a certain extent, social acceptance. The level of harassment we experienced as young women, alone in the field, led us to fear for our lives, quite literally; [and in addition we feared] the possibility of being “discovered” as “lesbians.”

After two additional visits to this particular field, I have learned to always bring a “husband” with me (preferably a screaming queen), both to verify my “authenticity” as a “woman,” and to provide protection against unwanted sexual advances. While I am still glad that my girlfriend shared the experience of living and working at my field site, I would never again wish upon her or our relationship the dangers that fear and intimidation produce. The devaluation of studies conducted in one’s own community, and the pressure put on graduate students to conduct

research in foreign and exotic places, places a burden that falls heavily on all anthropologists but even more so on gay and lesbian ones.

B.6. COLLEGIAL RELATIONS

Virtually all the lesbian narrators report some degree of alienation from the profession which seemed related in complicated ways to their histories of discrimination and harassment. Of the five lesbians with Ph.D.s two did not have tenure track jobs; a third teaches anthropology in a medical setting; a fourth had taken early retirement; and the fifth is a tenured anthropologist in an academic setting but does not teach graduate students. Given this marginalization, and the lack of recognition for l/b/g/t studies within the discipline alluded to earlier, the support of peers, usually feminist and/or l/b/g/t, assumes paramount importance.

For example, when one senior scholar came up for tenure at a second institution, having been denied it at her first, she depended on a network of feminist supporters to mount a fight on her behalf. This scholar credits a “community of lesbian and gay scholars, primarily historians,” with giving her the intellectual and emotional support to come back to academic research after a long period of alienation. Another commented that lesbian relationships sustained her to go up the career ladder, financially and emotionally. One narrator cited the support of fellow graduate students, both straight and gay. Later she got “tremendous support” for her work from a group of independent gay scholar-historians in San Francisco and from gay anthropologists she had met on her own. She made friends with a lot of her informants and they were supportive as well.

Given the importance of such support, marginalization within the l/b/g/t world itself can be especially painful. We could cite here accounts by a transsexual lesbian of hostility she feared from other lesbians, and by a woman who had identified as bisexual for a number of years and was mistrusted by lesbians who saw her as “not committed.” Three narrators whose gender presentation was femme mentioned other lesbians being ambivalent toward them. In one of these cases the narrator speculated that provincial or ethnocentric American gays and lesbians “didn’t know that lesbians exist where I come from [Asia].” In another case, a graduate student lamented the lack of a femme support system; she does have a lesbian support system-as long as she doesn’t talk too much about being femme. These experiences have disillusioned her with the academy.

Interestingly, one of the senior scholars commented that as a masculine woman, she felt she was granted more authority and credibility in bureaucratic settings than more feminine women. While still closeted but known as gay to close associates, she had been elected Chair of the Academic Senate by colleagues at her university. Later on she was re-elected as an openly gay anthropologist. Unfortunately, such marks of professional respect were rarely reported by this group of narrators.

B.7. L/B/G/T TEACHING ISSUES

Narrators did not give us much data on their teaching experiences; in large part this is because the majority of them were students with little or no teaching experience. One senior scholar began teaching explicitly l/b/g/t material in the mid-1970s, only after getting tenure. During this

same time period, another senior scholar reports that she was recognized by students as gay, but was too afraid to acknowledge them in return. Learning of the forced shock therapy imposed on one lesbian student “confirmed in me the necessity for secrecy.” She came to self-acceptance as a lesbian through teaching a course on the anthropology of women. Finally she had the courage to offer a course on the anthropology of homosexuality, perhaps the first in the nation. “It was a high point of my teaching career,” but the photocopy shop left the title off the cover of the text and the department secretary had problems typing her syllabus. When she began teaching this course, she described her anxiety as so intense that she feared she was having a heart attack. A recent Ph.D. recounted her experience co-teaching “the first gay and lesbian studies class offered by the anthropology department” at her institution. Unlike other courses taught by graduate students,

we had to have the full syllabus approved by the department chair during a special meeting devoted to that purpose. During that meeting, the chair also took it upon himself to warn us (and particularly my hothead co-teacher) about the dangers of sexual harassment lawsuits by students. In particular, he referred to a Safe Sex poster that my co-teacher had posted in his office some years earlier as a graduate student, a poster that included an erect penis in full color. After receiving our lecture on the dangers of the abuse of power within the student-teacher relationship, I reminded the chair that no one knew better than graduate students about abuses of power within the institutional structures of academe.

B.8. EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

Worries about future employability loomed large among the lesbian graduate students we interviewed. Material considerations about money and career underlie all these issues of discrimination. One student was told by everyone but her advisor that if she insisted on working on l/b/g/t topics “fellowships simply would not be available.” These financial difficulties mirror the withdrawal of monetary support by her family once they learned she was gay, and represent an additional form of harassment that endangers many l/b/g/t graduate students’ careers. Even the experience of more senior scholars, who got into the field when jobs were more plentiful, indicates that the material and career fears of these students are justified. The two most senior lesbian scholars wound up at undergraduate state colleges. In both cases, this was partly because as lesbians they felt they needed to be near gay communities in large metropolitan areas. One of them had taught in the Midwest, where as a closeted academic, she met no other gay people. “Successful in teaching, beginning to undertake research, politically active, I was emotionally shriveling.”

Another senior scholar commented that the people she knows who have done gay research have had problematic careers, so for many years she didn’t really try to finish her degree. Now, looking for a job in her forties, she dreads giving job talks because she’ll have to talk about her research, which is on a stigmatized l/b/g/t topic, and she also worried about what to wear, since she is butch and won’t wear a dress. She dresses up by wearing a sport jacket and a tie, but knows that won’t work in most anthropology departments. Because of this and because anthropology jobs are still advertised by area or traditional topics, she has found few anthropology jobs to apply for and thus has mainly applied for women’s studies or American studies positions. Because few anthropology departments have taken stands on the issue of

domestic partner benefits, she also feels that she and her partner will face difficulties at almost any job she might eventually obtain.

For one senior scholar, the issue of employment was paramount, as she had been looking for a tenure track job unsuccessfully for fifteen years. As a graduate student she had disregarded warnings that U.S. fieldwork would “screw up” her career by deciding to pursue an American research topic (not a lesbian topic but a feminist one, almost as dangerous). In the end, though, she said:

I didn't realize there were going to be repercussions; this was the '70s, people were waltzing into jobs, I had a full fellowship, no debt. So it never occurred to me that I was not going to have a normal career.

She was also aware of how her own personal and professional trajectory intersected with the collapse of the job market in anthropology between the 1970s and the 1980s: “part of what happened to me was generational, not about being gay, and part of it was exacerbated by being gay. Everyone in my cohort had problems.”

She spent the early years of her career as a “grant hustler” sneaking gay and lesbian research topics into other proposals. After the grant money disappeared, in the mid-1980s she held her only tenure-track job, but left after two years because she felt uncomfortable in a provincial Southern town as a lesbian and a city person. She spent four years teaching women's studies near her home as an adjunct, at a major university where she encountered “real homophobia”; she was by this time pursuing research on lesbians. She described encountering personal hostility from other members of the department, and “the program chair couldn't even talk about what it was that I did without rushing out of the room.” In the end, the job was eliminated. Students “busted up the faculty meeting, but when that happens you know they're really not going to keep you.”

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, she was a finalist in several searches. She listed four major research universities where she felt homophobia had played a role in the decision, and informal reports from colleagues at these institutions confirmed these suspicions. At one interview, for a “supposedly feminist” research institute, she felt that both anti-Semitism and homophobia played a role. The interviewer repeatedly asked her about how she would (or could) talk to the wealthy benefactors of the research program, a group of older WASP women. “I finally said, ‘well you know I don't pick my nose.’ I couldn't tell if it was because I'm a lesbian, not upper class enough, too much of a kike, whatever. I felt like saying, ‘I'm wearing better clothes than you are.’” This narrator also described this interview as one in which she was directly asked whether she was “out” at her current job.

B. 9 DOWNPLAYING

Members of the Commission involved in interviewing agreed that one of the most painful features of the interviews and several written accounts was the consistent downplaying of the experience of homophobia within academia. By this we do not mean that we had to dig for evidence of discrimination and harassment, but rather that narrators kept excusing this treatment or expressing confusion about it. Reviewing the reports as a whole, we were struck by the low

expectations engendered by the routinized nature of both homophobia (active discrimination and harassment) and heterosexism (the assumption that only heterosexuality exists).

“My story is not dramatic,” begins one written statement, which goes on to narrate a lengthy academic career dominated and deformed by fear of exposure of her homosexuality. Another senior scholar with many publications, who has been unable to get a tenure-track job, ended with the reflection, “It feels funny to complain on this basis because it seems unfair. There are a lot of people who don’t have jobs.” In the same vein, a scholar in her forties who has no job at first hesitated to give testimony, saying she wasn’t sure if she’d been discriminated against. The Commission member who spoke with her asked if her joblessness might be related to the fact that her work was on a gay American theme, and several days later the scholar offered to give testimony, saying that on reflection she realized the Commission member was right.

Unfortunately, the same downplaying also characterizes younger narrators. One young lesbian reported a series of events during her undergraduate years that she described as nothing “tragic,” “nothing special, nothing horrific. Just non-encouragement and selective ignorance.” However, her account—which includes dismissal of her academic interest in homosexuality (criticized as “random and strange”), a reluctance by the college to financially and institutionally support a lesbian and gay activist group she organized, and criticism of her intelligence and other academic work after professors learned or assumed that she was lesbian—believes the fact that she suffered severe criticism that collectively constitutes a mundane but exhausting form of harassment. As in other testimonies, gossip served as an informal and indirect form of harassment; “many professors were vocal about their personal disgust, though they never said such things in the classroom (you heard them in the hall).”

One gay man with a secure job in a department with several other gay anthropologists described the discrimination he has encountered as “insidious” and “hard to put your finger on.” While his own work is not on gay or lesbian issues, he described himself as being out since graduate school and in his current job, and that his experience has been generally positive; an indication of this fact is that he regularly brings his gay partner to department functions. Nonetheless, he recounted for the commission an experience he had several years ago when a heterosexual colleague complained to a personnel committee that he was having difficulties with the other anthropologists; the heterosexual man had reported, “I’m not like them, and they don’t like me because I’m not like them,” referring to the two gay members of the department. While the problem was eventually resolved, the narrator was bothered by the fact that other faculty members never confronted the homophobic remark as something offensive. In this case, the heterosexual man blamed two gay colleagues for excluding him in some way and therefore suggested that they had impeded his progress as a professional. While the narrator emphasized that the social environments in both graduate school and his current job were generally supportive, he noted that there was a big difference between being “tolerated” and being “accepted.” He remarked that it would be nice if people would say, “bring your boyfriend” instead of “bring someone” when inviting him to a social function; he said that he swallows a lot of these subtle things, and feels that they must have an effect on his self-esteem.

“I suppose I have not suffered explicit homophobic repression against my being an out lesbian and my research,” wrote one narrator in graduate school. [Major research university] intellectuals are way too sophisticated to expound explicit homophobic accounts anyway.”

Another undergraduate explained that as a result of her bad experiences as an out lesbian in college, she wanted to go to a “queer friendly” anthropology graduate school. When the interviewer asked what she meant by that she clarified that she wasn’t asking for “total support,” but just that she not be hindered in her work on a lesbian topic. This characterization of what might constitute a “queer-friendly” environment provides a telling example of the low expectations that are inculcated in students both through explicit and emotionally devastating harassment, and more generalized disregard or denial of the importance of gay and lesbian topics.

B. 10 CONCLUSION

The comment of one narrator eloquently summarizes the testimonial evidence collected by Commission members.

How have these experiences affected my career? On the face of it, I have been held back, paid less, disrespected by many of the people I work with. More profoundly, homophobia has forced me to frame my life by its imperatives. Without it, I would not identify so strongly with other gay people. My work might have been on Paleolithic arrowheads instead of on people who are marginal and different. I have found my intellectual voice in the silence society tried to impose on me.

REFERENCES CITED

Behar, Ruth and Deborah A. Gordon, eds.

1995 *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blackwood, Evelyn

1984 Sexuality and Gender in Certain Native American Tribes: The Case of the Cross-Gender Females. *Signs* 10:27-42.

1995 Falling in Love with An-Other Lesbian: Reflections on Identity in Fieldwork. *In* Don Kulick and Margaret Willson, eds. *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. Pp. 51-75. New York: Routledge.

Bolton, Ralph

1996 Coming Home: The Journey of a Gay Ethnographer in the Years of the Plague. *In* Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists. Ellen Lewin and William L. Leap, eds. Pp. 147-168. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

1995 Tricks, Friends, and Lovers: Erotic Encounters in the Field. *In* Don Kulick and Margaret Willson, eds. *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. Pp. 140-167. New York: Routledge.

Drake, St. Clair

1980 Anthropology and the Black Experience. *Black Scholar* 11(7):2-31.

Elliston, Deborah

1995 Erotic Anthropology: "Ritualized Homosexuality" in Melanesia and Beyond, *American Ethnologist* 22:848-867.

Harrison, Faye V. ed.

1991 *Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Toward an Anthropology for Liberation*. Washington: Association of Black Anthropologists/American Anthropological Association.

Herd, Gilbert

1981 *Guardians of the Flutes*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kulick, Don

1995 Introduction, *The Sexual Life of Anthropologists: Erotic Subjectivity and Ethnographic Work*. In Don Kulick and Margaret Willson, eds. *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. Pp. 1-28. New York: Routledge.

Kulick, Don and Margaret Willson, eds.

1995 *Taboo: Sex, Identity and Erotic Subjectivity in Anthropological Fieldwork*. New York: Routledge.

Leap, William, ed.

1995 *Beyond the Lavendar Lexicon*. Amsterdam: Gordon & Breach.

Lewin, Ellen and William L. Leap, eds.

1996 *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Messer-Davidow, Ellen

1993 Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education. *Social Text* 36:40-80.

Murray, Stephen O. and Will Roscoe, eds.

1998 *Boy-Wives and Female-Husbands: Studies of African Homosexualities*. New York: St. Martins Press.

Newton, Esther

1987 *Academe's Homophobia: It Damages Careers and Ruins Lives*. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 11, p. 104.

1993 *My Best Informant's Dress: The Erotic Equation in Fieldwork*. *Cultural Anthropology* 8:3-23.

Roscoe, Will

1991 *The Zuni Man-Woman*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

1997 *Writing Queer Cultures: An Impossible Possibility?* In *Out in the Field*:

Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists. Ellen Lewin and William L. Leap, eds. Pp. 200-211. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Roseberry, William

1996 The Unbearable Lightness of Anthropology. *Radical History Review* 65:5-25.

Sharff, Jagna Wojcicka and Johanna Lessinger

1994 The Academic Sweatshop. *Anthropology Today* 10(5):12-15.

Skinner, Elliott P.

1983 Afro-Americans in Search of Africa: The Scholars' Dilemma. *In Transformation and Resiliency in Africa*. Pearl T. Robinson and Elliott P. Skinner, eds. Pp. 3-26. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press.

Weston, Kath

1991 *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.

1992 Lesbian/Gay Studies in the House of Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22:157-85.

1996 Requiem for a Street Fighter. *In Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists*. Ellen Lewin and William L. Leap, eds. Pp. 274-285. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Whitehead, Harriet

1981 The Bow and the Burdenstrap. *In Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*. Sherry B. Ortner and Harriet Whitehead, eds. Pp. 80-115. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The COLGIA Survey on Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgendered Issues in Anthropology: A Report on Findings

November 1, 1999

Bill Leap (American U) and Ellen Lewin (U Iowa)

Topical Outline

- I. Introduction
- II. The experience of anti-LGBT discrimination in Anthropology
- III. “Downplaying” experiences of discrimination
- IV. “Coming out” in the classroom and the workplace
- V. Teaching LGBT topics in the anthropology classroom
- VI. Attitudes toward LGBT-related research
- VII. Mentoring
- VIII. The importance of SOLGA

I. INTRODUCTION

I.A. Purpose and Background.

COLGIA's mission statement (November 21, 1994) directed the commission to “gather data to document the experiences of discrimination directed at lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered students, faculty and staff, or at students, faculty and staff perceived by others to be lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered.” One part of that effort was a survey of AAA membership, which probed knowledge of or experiences with lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered (hereafter lgbt) discrimination, assessments of the importance of lgbt-related scholarship, and issues pertaining to lgbt issues in curriculum and classroom instruction. That survey was distributed during the 1994 annual meetings (Atlanta) and to other anthropologists immediately thereafter.

This report reviews findings from the commission’s analysis of responses to the members’ survey. Much of this report focuses on the particulars of lgbt discrimination within anthropology, since these conditions were of primary concern to the commission members. In addition to discrimination, this Report also examines survey respondents’ attitudes regarding:

- teaching lgbt issues in the anthropology classroom
- the appropriateness of lgbt research within anthropology
- faculty and student support for mentoring lgbt students and/or students with interests in lgbt research, as well as:
- characteristics of membership in the Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists (SOLGA).

The Executive Summary outlines comparisons between findings from the members’ survey, the fall, 1995 COLGIA survey of department chairs, the oral and written testimony, and other materials on lgbt-related discrimination in anthropology. Bill Leap also worked with Les Wright, Lee Badgett and Nicole Raeburn to develop preliminary comparisons between COLGIA findings

and assessments of LGBT experiences in Economics, History and Sociology; the text of that report was printed in the newsletter of the Committee on Gay and Lesbian History (vol. 12, no. 3, 1988) and is reproduced below.

I.B. Respondent Profiles

AAA staff distributed one copy of the members' survey to each person who registered for the annual meetings in Atlanta (November, 1994). Instructions invited respondents to turn in a completed form in boxes provided throughout the registration area, or, to fill out the instrument and mail it from their home. We also invited SOLGA members to make copies of the instrument and to distribute it to colleagues and students in their departments and workplaces.

Of the approximately 4,000 surveys distributed to AAA members through these means, 525 surveys were returned to the AAA national office by the end of January, 1995. Of that number, 345 surveys were returned at the Atlanta meetings, and 180 were mailed to the national office.

Survey respondents included (by respondent self-identification): 370 heterosexuals (238 females, 130 males, 2 others), 51 lesbians, 34 gay men, 50 bisexuals, 2 transgendered persons, and 18 "others" (a category which includes a variety of gendered and political stances, including persons who refused to describe themselves in terms of such "totalizing labels.") 63.4% of all respondents identified as women (total: 333); 34.5% identified as men (total: 181); and 2.1% identified in additional ways. The average age of the respondents (again, by self-report) was 41. Most respondents (81.1%) described themselves as Euro-American in background, though some respondents self-identified as Black (4.0%), Hispanic (2.5%), or Asian (2.1%). Some respondents also objected to being asked to identify their "race/ethnic background" and most of who objected also left the question blank.

Survey respondents included undergraduates and graduate students, tenured faculty, faculty without tenure (including part-time faculty, those holding non-tenure track appoints, and those on tenure-track but not yet tenured), and anthropologists working for the government, in the private sector, or self-employed. Graduate students (32.6%) and university faculty without tenure (29.7%) were the categories with the largest percentages of respondents. Table I displays a complete set of percentages.²

The largest concentration of respondents came from cultural anthropology (72.4% of all respondents), followed by (in descending order) applied anthropology (13.5%), archaeology (11.2%) linguistics (8.2%), physical anthropology (4.8), and respondents claiming no subfield specialty (1.9%).

I.C. Data preparation, analysis and write-up

The Commission modeled the Members' and Chairs' surveys after the survey instruments developed by the Committee on the Status of Lesbians and Gays in the Political Science Profession. To enable comparisons between LGBT experiences in these two different academic

²The Tables are included at the end of this Report.

professions, Commission members tried, where possible, to keep the language of the COLGIA survey instrument consistent with that in the APSA survey. Ken Sherrill and Mark Blasius, APSA Committee members, were particularly generous with their encouragement during the planning and initial analysis phases of this project.

The analysis of the data collected through the Members' Survey has moved through a long maze of twists, turns, and frustrations and details of which are now best left behind us. Suffice it to say that, thanks to the timely intervention of AAA President (1997-99) Jane Hill, the support of the AAA Executive Committee, and the hands-on assistance of AAA Membership Services director Rob Smariga, the analysis and write-up phases of this project have now moved to completion. We acknowledge the support which Jack Cornman gave to all of COLGIA's projects while he was executive director of the AAA, and to thanks AAA past presidents Annette Weiner, Jim Peacock and Yolanda Moses for their many kindnesses.³

The tabulation and coding of the members' surveys data was a complex task, but was dutifully undertaken by Jamie Willis, Angie Manzano, Frank McKeown, Michael Kronthal, and other graduate students in the Department of Anthropology at American University (Washington DC). Angie Manzano, Frank McKeown and Michael Kronthal provided the much-needed computer-based analysis of the coded data. Bill Leap and Ellen Lewin assumed responsibility for the write up of findings from the survey analysis. Esther Newton, Evie Blackwood, Deb Amory and other commission members made helpful comments on issues of textual presentation and clarity.

I.D. Survey Highlights

1. Heterosexual support for l/g related issues (Q14):

When asked (Q14) whether support for l/g related issues had any effect on your professional career, 81.6% of straight respondents indicated that the question was not applicable (N=316). *Overall*, responses to this question suggest, *only a very small proportion of straight respondents have supported l/g related issues.*

2. Personal experience with l/g-related discrimination? (Q16B):

It appears that a sizable minority (26.3%) of LGB's affirm that they have experienced discrimination as an anthropologist, while nearly the same proportion (23.3%) were "not sure" (N=133).

This is an important documentation of the LGB's perception of discrimination in the profession given that only 42.9% answered "No"-they had not experienced such discrimination. **[II.A.1, II.A.3, III]**

3. Perceptions of department/workplace atmosphere (Q11Q-11T):

Differences between straights and LGB's are negligible here, with the exception of perception of atmosphere for transsexuals, where LGB's perceive more hostility compared to straights.

³COLGIA was created under Annette Weiner's administration, and AAA approval for this project came about in large part because of the unqualified support she gave to this initiative. We dedicate this report, with respect, to her memory.

Interestingly, reported levels of "accepting" atmosphere is lower for bisexuals compared to acceptance of lesbians and gay men.

A clear plurality of all respondents answered N/A to Q11T, suggesting that transsexuals are less visible compared to LGB's in department/workplace environments. [II.A.2.a]

4. Reported knowledge of discrimination (Q11A-11O):

Most questions show that LGB respondents are more likely than straights to have personal knowledge of a situation where a person's perceived homosexuality hurt him/her. For many questions, between 20-25% of LGB respondents answered in the affirmative.

In terms of dissertation sponsorship and job recommendations, nearly one-quarter (24.6%, N=126; and 23.6%, N=123, respectively) of LGB respondents had knowledge where someone's perceived homosexuality hurt him/her.

LGB respondents are more than twice as likely to know of someone's homosexuality hurting him/her in hiring/job search when compared to straights. Further, a substantial minority of LGB's have knowledge of perceived homosexuality hurting in hiring/job searches (38.6%, N=126); however, LGB respondents are roughly divided on this question (38.6% Yes vs. 40.2% No).

LGB respondents are twice as likely than straights to report knowledge of someone's perceived homosexuality hurting their "reappointment, promotion & tenure." A clear majority of LGB respondents are either "Not sure" or answered affirmatively to such knowledge (28.7% + 22.5% = 51.2%)

A clear plurality of LGB's (43.8%, N=128) report knowledge of someone's perceived homosexuality hurting "collegial relations." Responses to this question also shows the highest proportion of straights who acknowledge such knowledge (24.9%, N=333). [II.A.2, II.A.3.b.(1)]

5. Sexual orientation endangered job/academic progress? (Q16A):

Depending on how you look at it, a sizable minority of LGB respondents are either not sure or agree that their job/academic progress would be endangered if their chair/supervisor knew of their sexual orientation (15.8%+20.3%= 36.1%, N=133) [III]

6. "Coming out"/being "out" to colleagues and supervisors (Q15A-15D):

The LGB sample, while "out" to straight peers at a high level (83.8%, N=130), is apparently more circumspect when it comes to being "out" to straight SUPERVISORS (57.9%, N=121). [IV]

7. Support for teaching l/g-related topics in anthropology courses (Q8A-8G)

Basically, straight respondents and LGB respondents view research and teaching about l/g-related topics as appropriate/very appropriate at overwhelmingly high levels.

There are generally negligible differences between straights and LGB's in terms of "Not Appropriate" responses regarding l/g-related research and teaching.

In general, differences between straights and LGB respondents have more to do with **degree** of support for l/g-related research and teaching, with LGB's more likely to see such inclusion as "very appropriate" compared to straights.

Q8E "Integration into undergrad introductory courses" elicited the highest level of "not appropriate" responses (14.1%, N=362) from straight respondents. [V]

8. Actually teaching about l/g-related topics (Q9):

Roughly equal proportions of both straights (16.4%, N=298) and LGB's (16.2%, N=99) "never" include LGB topics in their teaching. 57.7% of the straight respondents report doing so at least "sometimes." [V]

9. Support for l/g-related research: (Q8A, 10, 10A, 10b):

A sizable minority of LGB respondents do not have research interests in LGB topics (42.0%, N=131) vs. 58.0% who report that they do. 69.9% (N=362) of straight respondents do not have research interests in LGB topics vs. 30.1% who report that they do not.

While only 8.9% (N=370) of straights have been encouraged to conduct research on LGB topics, a sizable minority (39.1%, N=133) of LGB respondents have been encouraged to do so.

Over one-quarter of LGB respondents (27.5% N=131) report being discouraged from conducting research on LGB topics. 4.4% of the straight respondents have been discouraged from conducting l/g-related research. [VI]

10. Mentoring (Q10G, Q16D):

Survey respondents report that the mentoring of LGB students is occurring at roughly equivalent levels when comparing straight and LGB respondents. Moreover, 63.8% (N=130) LGB respondents report receiving support/encouragement during their career development. [VII]

II. THE EXPERIENCE OF ANTI-LGBT DISCRIMINATION IN ANTHROPOLOGY

The narratives which commission members collected for this project demonstrate the serious consequences which experiences of anti-lgbt discrimination have had on anthropological careers and on individual lives. The narratives show how lgbt persons become targets of discrimination whether they are *open about their sexuality* or still *in the closet*. And the narratives remind us that such discrimination is often indirect in focus and rarely particular or precise, but always silences dissenting voices.

II.A. Evidence for anti-lgbt discrimination

Member's survey data are consistent with these observations and show how they are situated within the larger range of lgbt-centered experiences within the profession.

II.A.1. Direct experiences with discrimination:

Question 18-C on the members' survey asked lgbt respondents if they had ever experienced discrimination as an anthropologist because of their sexual orientation. 26.3% of these respondents answered "yes" to this question, 42.9% answered "no", 23.39% answered "not sure", and 7.5% said that the issue raised by the question was "not applicable" to them.

Significantly more lesbians (39.3%) than gay men (20.6%) or bisexuals (30.6%) indicated that they were "not sure" about experiences of discrimination or that such experiences were "not applicable" to them.

That almost 43% of the lgbt respondents answered "no" to this question is perplexing, given the comments about anti-lgbt discrimination which are so frequently attested elsewhere in the survey data. We suspect that these responses derive from a more general "downplaying" of anti-lgbt experiences within the profession, which we discuss in greater detail in section &&, below. The same is true, we suggest, for the 30.8% respondents who answered "don't know" or "not applicable" to this question.

II.A.2. Reported knowledge of discrimination:

II.A.2.a. Atmosphere within the department/workplace

Question 13 on the members' survey asked respondents to describe the atmosphere of their department/workplace toward lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transsexuals. Roughly 39% 46.7% of the lgbt respondents who answered the question described their workplace environment as either neutral or hostile to lesbians and gays, 39.6% reported a workplace environment neutral or hostile to bisexuals, and 33.1% reported a workplace environment neutral or hostile toward transgendered persons.⁴

Table 2 shows how perceptions of departmental atmosphere are distributed across particular types of academic institution.

More than 50% of respondents from PhD-granting, 4-year, 2-year, and private/other academic institutions indicated that their department is "accepting" of lesbians. More than 50% of the respondents from PhD-granting, MA-granting and 2-year, and private/other academic institutions indicated that their department is "accepting" of gay men. Survey data do not make clear why the types of institutions providing "acceptance" to lesbian vs. gay men should differ.

Respondents reported a much less favorable departmental atmosphere for bisexuals and, especially so, for transgendered persons. Overall, according to survey responses, the most accepting atmosphere for lgbt anthropologists is reported for 2-year colleges. The least accepting atmosphere for lesbians and bisexuals is reported for private/religious schools; for gay men, 4-year colleagues, and for transgendered persons, PhD-granting institutions.

⁴ Importantly, 22.8% of the lgbt respondents answered Anot applicable≡ to the portion of this question seeking evaluation of workplace atmosphere for bisexuals; and 49.2% responded Anot applicable≡ when evaluating workplace environment for transgendered persons. In contrast, 7.2% of these respondents answered Anot applicable≡ when asked to evaluate workplace environment for lesbians, and 7.0% answered Anot applicable, when asked to evaluate workplace environment for gay men.

That the atmosphere of acceptance is not the same for lesbians and gay men is worth noting. The differences are statistically significant for 4-year colleagues, 53.6% respondents report an accepting atmosphere for lesbians vs. 21% for gay men; and for private/religious institutions, where 28.6% respondents report an accepting atmosphere for lesbians vs. 42.9% for gay men.

The statistics suggest that the fact of sexual marginality, by itself, is not the only consideration determining departmental atmosphere for lgbt anthropologists. Accordingly, question 12 on the members' survey asked respondents to identify particular conditions and events which, in their experience, created a less-than-favorable atmosphere for lgbt persons at their workplace.

The next several sections examine what respondents had to say about particular conditions and events which affect workplace atmosphere to that end.

II.A.2.b Situations and contexts of lgbt discrimination

Table 3 lists the ten situations which lgbt respondents cited most frequently when responding to this question, and ranks these situations according to the relative frequency of these citations.

Collegial relations is the most common setting for such discrimination, according to the lgbt respondents, with 43.75% indicating personal knowledge of incidents of discrimination in such settings. Hiring (38.6%), and appointment, promotion and tenure (28.7%) were the next most frequently cited settings in that regard, according to the lgbt respondents, and other sites of lgbt-centered discrimination had implications for employment and job retention, as well, e.g. teaching evaluations (22.9%), job recommendations (23.2%), classroom teaching (20%), and teaching assignments (19.1%).

Heterosexual respondents responding to question 12 also cited collegial relations as the more frequent site for anti- lgbt discrimination (24.9%), followed by hiring/job search (16.5%), reappointment, promotion, and tenure (14.3), teaching evaluations (11.8%), and classroom teaching (10.1%). (See Table 4, below.)

Lgbt and heterosexual responses to these questions about sites/occasions of discrimination differed in several ways. Lgbt respondents reported greater awareness of discrimination related to dissertation sponsorship, job recommendations and awarding of research funding than did heterosexual respondents. Heterosexual respondents reported greater awareness of discrimination related to classroom teaching than did lgbt respondents. More importantly, a greater percentage of lgbt respondents reported being aware of incidents of discrimination in all of these settings than was the case for the heterosexual respondents who (judging by the survey data) are much less likely than lgbt respondents to notice incidents of discrimination related to sexual marginality. This suggests (and findings from other parts of the members' survey confirm the point) that heterosexual respondents give more positive assessments of conditions in the workplace for lgbt anthropologists than do lgbt respondents themselves. This suggests, among other points, that heterosexual respondents are less aware of the difficult conditions which lgbt people are often facing, as lgbt persons, within academic and other work-related settings.

2.c. Discrimination based on self-disclosure in the classroom

The coming out experiences --particularly within workplace settings-- is a significant component of the gender career for lgbt persons. Whether the workplace is supportive of such disclosure usually sets the parameters for other components of lgbt experience within the workplace.

Question 6 on the departmental survey asked chairs to evaluate departmental and institutional reactions to lgbt presence within academe.⁵ More than 90% of the 198 chairs responding to the survey indicated that researching lesbian/gay themes, publishing and reading papers on research findings, being invited to a lesbian/gay colleague's home, bringing lesbian/gay partner to departmental functions, and commenting on lesbian/gay issues in the media would be "accepted" in their departments, rather than merely "tolerated" (with some degree of discomfort), or considered "inappropriate." These observations present a more positive image of departmental "atmosphere" for lgbt persons than that conveyed in the responses to question 12 (and to some components of question 13) in the members' survey.⁶

The chairs' responses to question 6 did identify one activity which would **not** be so positively received: only 66% of the chairs indicated that a colleague identifying as lesbian or gay in the classroom would be "accepted" in their department, and even fewer (57% and 50%, respectively) indicated that identifying as bisexual or transgendered in the classroom would be "accepted."

Importantly, according to the respondents on the members' survey, anthropology students have a much more accepting attitude toward lgbt faculty self-disclosure in the classroom than is reported for them by respondents on the departmental survey. For example, question 18-L on the members' survey asked respondents who teach to describe their students' reactions to the faculty member's sexual orientation. 35.5% of these respondents indicated that their students' reactions were either positive or neutral, while only 1.7% indicated that student reactions were negative.

Complicating appearances here is the fact that 62.8% of the respondents to this question indicated that "student reactions to their disclosure of sexual orientation" did not apply to them. While these respondents may simply be unaware of students' reactions to their sexuality, comments in the testimony and elsewhere in the members' survey make it more likely that these respondents may not have formally disclosed their sexual orientation to their students. Whatever the reason(s) for this response, more than half of the lgbt respondents to the members' survey answered question 18-L in these terms.

II.A.3. How uniform is the experience of anti-lgbt discrimination?

⁵ We assume here that the chair was the person who actually filled out the departmental survey. COLGIA members know of some instances where chairs delegated this task to lesbian/gay colleagues, but the distinctions between the chairs' and members' responses to questions about discrimination and other issues convinces us that this did not happen frequently.

⁶This is, however, an image which is consistent with the impressions about departmental atmosphere suggested by Table 2. At issue here may be the fact that anthropology department chairs are more likely to be heterosexual than lesbian or gay, and therefore (in the sense attested in the responses to question 11, above) less likely to notice instances of lgbt discrimination or to be aware of how frequently they occur

II.A.3.a. Discrimination across categories of sexual orientation:

26.3% of lgbt respondents reported (question 18-C) having directly experienced some form(s) of lgbt-related discrimination during their anthropological career. However, experiences of discrimination are not reported evenly across particular categories of sexual orientation. 29.4% of the lesbian respondents, 48.3% of the gay men respondents, and 8.2% of the bisexual respondents answered "yes" to this question. Apparently, sexual orientation not only frames respondents's experience of discrimination, it also shapes perceptions of discrimination as well as (perhaps) the willingness to report such experiences on this survey.

II.A.3.b. Discrimination across the subfields

II.A.3.b.(1) Knowledge of discrimination across the subfields

Respondents from all subfields (archaeology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, physical anthropology, and applied anthropology) reported firsthand knowledge of lgbt-related discrimination, involving a person's real of perceived homosexuality, and they also reported that collegial relations, hiring/job search, reappointment/tenure, and evaluation of teaching are the four areas where lgbt-related discrimination is mostly likely to occur.

Table 5 provides a full listing of the frequencies of "yes" responses for all of the settings listed on the members' survey. A comparison of frequencies across subfields shows consistency in sites where respondents have identified occurrences of anti-lgbt discrimination. But respondents from different subfields report these occurrences at different levels of frequency: Twice as many cultural anthropologists and physical anthropologists identify collegial relations in this regard, as did archaeologists, and three times as many cultural anthropologists and physical anthropologists as archaeologists identified hiring/job search in that regard.

Importantly, a somewhat different pattern appears in the responses to this questions given by anthropologists who did not claim affiliation with any particular subfield. The number of persons in this category is quite small - 8 respondents, but using raw percentages to draw comparisons across subfield categories shows that a larger percentage of "no-subfield" anthropologists than anthropologists within any single subfield identified collegial relations, hiring/job search, reappointment and tenure, and teaching evaluations as sites where anti-lgbt discrimination had occurred. We suspect that this response pattern reflect the particular place within the profession which anthropologists not affiliated with a single subfield are likely to occupy: these are persons who are hired as part-time, non-tenure track classroom teachers, are not given formal affiliation with their host institution, and remain highly vulnerable to unpredictable fluctuations in academic budgeting and planning.

Identifying lesbian/gay activism as a potential target for anti-lgbt discrimination -- something reported on the members' survey only by respondents holding part-time teaching positions' speaks to similar conditions of professional vulnerability.

II.A.3.b.(2) Experience of discrimination across the subfields

Table 6 shows how reported experiences of discrimination patterns across the several subfields. As before, cultural anthropology had the largest percentage of reported instances of

anti-lgbt discrimination, linguistics and applied anthropology have the second largest percentage, and archaeology has the lowest.

Worth noting is that at least one-fourth of lgbt respondents in each of the subfields except physical anthropology reported first-hand experience with anti-lgbt discrimination, and the same is true for respondents without a subfield affiliation. Respondents from applied anthropology gave the highest frequency of “yes” answers to this question, but a comparable number of applied respondents also answered this question with “not sure” or “not applicable.” More respondents from cultural anthropology and archaeology answered “no” to this question than answered “yes” or “not sure”. More respondents in linguistics answered “not sure” than any other option.

The emphatic “no” given by more than 80% of the respondents from physical anthropology is also worth noting. Whether this reflects an atmosphere of tolerance particular to bio-medical and related inquiry in anthropology, or is another instance of “downplaying”, remains to be determined.

II.A.3.c Discrimination across racial/ethnic backgrounds:

More than 90% of the lgbt respondents to the Members' survey self-identified as White, and less than 10% self-identified as Black, Hispanic or Asian. Under these circumstances, survey data cannot be used to draw reliable conclusions about the relationships between anti-lgbt discrimination and racial/ethnic background. The patterning in Table 7 is worth noting, however. These data suggest that experiences of such discrimination were reported rather differently by respondents from different racial/ethnic backgrounds. And they make it in point for future research to examine how race/ethnicity reframes awareness of anti-lgbt discrimination or the willingness to report it under these circumstances.

III. *Downplaying*: WHY FEW LGBT RESPONDENTS ACKNOWLEDGE INSTANCES OF LGBT-RELATED DISCRIMINATION

One of the striking features of the testimony collected during this project is the way in which respondents excuse, rationalize or otherwise dismiss the discriminatory treatment which they receive from others. Such downplaying of discrimination occurs even while respondents are narrating experiences of discrimination in considerable detail. Frequently, women respondents downplayed the significance of discrimination by finding ways to excuse, rationalize or dismiss discriminatory treatment. Men respondents suggest that they have learned not expect "too much" from others in academic settings, and that they are more likely to be appreciative for what little support they actually receive, regardless of the accompanying negative consequences. Survey data provide additional evidence of lgbt respondents downplaying the presence of anti-lgbt discrimination and its effects in their professional and personal lives.

15.6% of the lgbt respondents (question 18-B) indicated that their academic progress/job would be endangered if their chair or supervisor knew about their sexual orientation, while 56.3% of the lgbt respondents reported that their academic progress/job would not be endangered if their chair or supervisor knew. The second statistic - over half of the lgbt respondents answering “no” to this question - is certainly surprising, given the evidence of anti-lgbt discrimination reported in

the oral and written testimony and in response to other questions on the members' survey. And it is all the more surprising, given the knowledge of anti-lgbt discrimination which heterosexual respondents reported throughout the members' survey; see, for example, sections A.2.a and A.2.b.

Because question 18-B was directed at the effects of supervisor knowledge on job as well as academic progress, it is possible that more favorable conditions outside of academe may be prompting the high percentage of "no" given to this question. However, analyzing responses to question 18-B strictly in terms of lgbt respondents who teach at PHD-granting and MA-granting universities, or at 4-year and 2-year colleges yields a similar division of responses: 13.2% of the academic sub-sample report that progress would be affected if their supervisor were aware of their sexual orientation. 59.6% of them report that their progress would not be affected under that circumstance. And 21% of these respondents said they did not know what the outcome would be under these circumstances.

Consistent with responses to other questions on the survey, lgbt respondents from MA-granting institutions voiced concern on this issue more frequently than did respondents from other academic settings; 30.8% of these respondents answered "yes" to question 18-B, compared to 14.6% of respondents from PhD-granting institutions, 14.3% of respondents from 4-year colleges, and no respondents from 2-year colleges.

Another indication of downplaying is suggested by the fact that more than one-fourth of all lgbt respondents (28.1%) said that they "don't know" (20.3%) whether their academic/ professional progress would be adversely affected if their supervisor knew about their sexual orientation, and the number who said the issue was "not applicable" (7.8%) to them. Similarly, 36.5% of the lgbt respondents reported that they "don't know" whether their sexual orientation affected their relationship with their graduate school mentor while in graduate school, and 42.6% reported that the question was not applicable to them. 46.1% of the lgbt respondents reported that they "didn't know" whether their sexual orientation affected their relationships with their academic advisor, and 37.5% reported that the question was "not applicable" to them. And, continuing this trend, 31.5% of the lgbt respondents indicated either that they "were not sure" (24.0%) whether they had had firsthand experiences with anti-lgbt discrimination, or that the question was "not applicable" (7.5%) to them.

Pervasiveness of reported discrimination aside, more than one-fourth of the lgbt respondents to the members' survey'-and in some instances, more than one-third of these respondents -- did not (or could not) answer "yes" or "no" to questions about firsthand knowledge of, or direct experience with, anti-lgbt discrimination during their professional career.

Admittedly, it is possible that these respondents have been spared such encounters in their professional life, and the patterning in these percentages accurately reflect these circumstances. But the downplaying of discrimination revealed in the narratives makes it just as likely that these respondents are disregarding the presence of anti-lgbt discrimination and minimizing the effects which it has had on their professional development and experience. The issue here is not just one of accurate biography. The active denial of lgbt-discrimination creates barriers to opportunity and obstacles to equitable treatment for lgbt persons within our profession; much educational

work needs to be done-- within SOLGA, within anthropology departments, and throughout the profession -- before we can overcome these barriers and eliminate these obstacles.

IV. "COMING OUT" IN THE CLASSROOM AND THE WORKPLACE

As noted in section 2.c., the coming out experiences is a significant component of the gender career for lgbt persons, and the workplace's reaction to such disclosure sets the parameters for other components of lgbt experience within the workplace.

Responses to the members' survey have much to say regarding the various factors which structure disclosures of sexual identities within the workplace or the academy, the particular work-related settings which favor or discourage such disclosures, and connections between "coming out" and prior experiences with discrimination.

Responses to question 18-a show that 88.5% of the lgbt respondents to the members' survey reported being "out" to lgbt peers and 83.8% reported being "out" to their straight peers. In contrast, 61.3% of the lgbt respondents reported being "out" to their lgbt supervisors, and 57.9% reported being "out" to straight supervisors.

"Coming out" to peers and supervisors also varies according to the respondent's sexual orientation. As Table 8 suggests, lesbians are more likely to be "out" to peers and supervisors than are gay men or bisexuals, and bisexuals are the least likely to be "out" to persons in any of these category.⁷

The likelihood of being "out" to peers or supervisors also varies according to the respondents' type of employment and, if employed in academe, status within the academy; likelihood of being "out" also varies according to the speaker's relationship with the person (peer vs. supervisor) to whom sexual orientation is declared, and according to the sexual orientation of the person being addressed.

For example, as Table 9 suggests, survey respondents report being least likely to be "out" to lgbt colleagues if they are government employees (to whom 40% of the sample respondents in that category are "out"); and most likely to be out to lgbt colleagues if they are graduate students (94.5%) or non-tenure track faculty (90.5%). Respondents are least likely to be "out" to straight supervisors if they are government employees (40.9%), or employed in the private sector (40%).

Overall, and as might be expected, the percentage of respondents who report being "out" to supervisors is lower, for all categories, than the percentage reporting being "out" to peers. The likelihood of being "out" to peers or supervisors also varies according to the type of academic institution with which the respondent is associated. (See Table 10) Note that the percentage of respondents at "private/other" institutions who are out to their peers is smaller than that for respondents at PhD-granting, 4-year and 2-year colleges, even though respondents to the

⁷ It is impossible to comment on the "coming out" issues faced by transsexual respondents, since only 2 survey respondents self-identified in these terms.

members' survey report that the atmosphere at "private/other" institutions is relatively more accepting of lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, than at PhD granting institutions or four-year colleges. Respondents at schools with MA programs are also less likely to report being "out" to peers than are respondents from PhD-granting, 4-year or 2-year institutions. These findings are completely consistent with the respondents description so the "atmosphere" for lgbt anthropologists at these institutions.

Once again, the percentage of respondents who are "'out' to [their] supervisors" is consistently lower than the percentage of respondents "'out' to peers." Apparently, issues of status hierarchy influence "coming out" decisions regardless of the institutional detail.

Finally, as Table 11 suggests, the percentage of respondents with prior experiences with discrimination who are "out to peers" corresponds closely with the percentages of respondents who are "out to supervisors." Relative status (in this case, "peer" vs. "supervisor") of the person being addressed does not influence the coming out decision, neither does the sexual orientation of the person being addressed.

The percentages differ more noticeably, however, for respondents who do not report prior experiences with discrimination. For them, the percentage who are "out to peers" is almost twice as large as the percentage who are "out to supervisors. This pattern is evidenced throughout Tables 8-11, and this is the pattern disrupted by prior experiences with discrimination. Apparently, such experiences teach lgbt respondents that peers are not always the best allies against discrimination, that supervisors can be allies in that regard, and that sexual orientation, by itself, is not a reliable predictor of lgbt solidarity in the workplace.

V. TEACHING LESBIAN/GAY-RELATED TOPICS IN THE ANTHROPOLOGY CLASSROOM

65.7% of all survey respondents, regardless of sexual orientation, report that they include lesbian/gay-related (hereafter, l/g) topics in their teaching "often" or "sometimes."⁸ Moreover, considered as a group, regardless of sexual orientation, more anthropologists teach about homosexuality than research it, and more teach about it than work with lgbt students in these areas.⁹

Importantly, while the specifics differ somewhat at different academic levels, survey respondents generally reported being willing to include discussions of l/g-related themes in their classroom lectures, and many report that they already do. Almost three-fourths of the survey respondents

⁸ The survey instrument asked respondents about the teaching of Lesbian/gay≡ topics, not lgbt topics. We use the notation l/g in this and the following sections to maintain consistency with the survey wording. Future inquiry needs to determine whether anthropologists are including discussions of bisexuality and/or transgendered issues, as well as lesbian and gay issues, in their classroom instruction and research activities, and to assess anthropologists attitudes toward such tasks.

⁹ See, for example, the percentage of respondents saying "often" and "sometimes" in Table 12 and the percentage of respondents saying Ayes≡ in Table 13.

(whatever their sexual orientation or subfield) claim that they include l/g-related topics in their teaching. 83.8% of the lgbt respondents said they do so "often" or "some of the time; 83.5% of the heterosexual respondents said they did so "often" or "some of the time."

Respondents from archaeology were the least likely to report including l/g-related topics in their classroom teaching: 57.5% of respondents from archaeology reported doing so, compared to 79.5% in linguistics. 88.2% in physical anthropology, 88.6% in applied anthropology, and 88.7% in cultural anthropology.

Table 14 compares frequency of including l/g-related topics in teaching with type of institution where instruction occurs. While the particular percentages vary, the combination of "often" and "sometimes" is greater than 75% in every instance, suggesting that type of academic institution does not, in itself, necessarily influence over decisions to include l/g-related topics in classroom instruction. Interestingly, while MA-granting universities were reported to offer the least accepting workplace environments for lgbt anthropologists (see Table 2). MA granting universities are also sites where the largest percentage of respondents reported "never" including l/g-related topics in classroom teaching. On the other hand, PhD granting institutions, where workplace conditions are reported to be more favorable for lgbt anthropologists, were the second-highest site reporting that l/g-related topics were "never" included in classroom instruction.

Survey respondents evaluated the appropriateness of teaching l/g-related themes somewhat differently, depending on the *level of the course* in question and their own reported sexual orientation; see Tables 15-19. Heterosexual respondents considered l/g-related topics to be more appropriate for inclusion in specialized, graduate level seminars than in undergraduate courses, and judged them least appropriate in undergraduate introductory classes. As Table 20's comparisons of "not appropriate" percentages from Tables 15-19 point out, the percentage of heterosexual respondents who consider l/g-related topics "not appropriate" in introductory undergraduate anthropology classes (14.1%) is almost three times greater than the percentage of heterosexual respondents (4.9%) who find those topics "not appropriate" for discussion in specialized graduate seminars. In contrast, much smaller percentage of lgbt respondents reported that such discussions were "not appropriate" generally, and the percentage of those doing so shows much less variation across course levels.

Two general observations can be made regarding these data. First, according to the survey respondents' report, *much teaching about l/g-related topics is already taking place within anthropology classrooms*, and while there is some variation in relation to particular course types and levels of student audience, survey responses also indicate that respondents see l/g-related topics as appropriate for discussion in all of the anthropological subfields and at all levels of academic instruction.

Secondly, according to these data, *many more anthropologists report teaching about lesbian/gay topics than exploring these topics in their own research*. And while this finding is hardly surprising, it does give further support to the important role which classroom settings can play in building familiarity with lgbt issues within the profession. If anthropologists are already willing

to teaching about l/g-topics, encouraging them to do so, and assisting them with various instructional tasks provide powerful opportunities to enhance understandings of lgbt concerns.

VI. ATTITUDES TOWARD LESBIAN/GAY-RELATED RESEARCH

The member's survey included questions about lgbt-related research, in order to gauge respondent reaction (and, where possible, evaluation) of this relatively new direction of anthropological inquiry.

Comments in the testimony suggest that, as a group, anthropologists do not hold l/g-related research in high esteem, but consider such research to be "too narrow" in focus, to be inappropriate for serious research, to violate the privacy of informants, or to be inconsistent with rules for protecting human subjects in research situations. Moreover, according to respondents' commentary, some anthropologists object to the fact that l/g-related research is often US-based; others object simply because they find the subject matter unsavory.

Responses to the members' survey suggest, in contrast, that anthropologists hold a much more accepting stance toward lesbian/gay research.

88.9% of all respondents reported (Question 2.a.) that lesbian/gay-related topics are "appropriate" for research within their subfield. This endorsement did not vary significantly across sexual orientation: 93.2% of the lgbt respondents and 88.9% of the heterosexual respondents considered l/g-related topics to be "appropriate" research for their subfield.¹⁰

But the level of support for lgbt research changes dramatically, when survey questions begin to probe respondent-specific involvements with these themes. And here, differences in sexual orientation also moved into the foreground of the discussion.

For example, respondents were asked (question 4) if they included l/g-related topics within their own research. 58.0% of the lgbt respondents and 30.0% of the heterosexual respondents answered "yes" to this question. That is, only half of the lgbt respondents who consider lgbt research to be appropriate for their subfield are actually engaged in such research themselves. For heterosexual respondents, the connection between "research appropriateness" and "personal research involvement" was even smaller: only one-third of the heterosexual respondents who consider lgbt research appropriate to their subfield also report that they are actually doing such research.

Levels of personal involvement in l/g-related research also differed across anthropological subfields. 26.1% of all respondents in physical anthropology, 39.9% of all respondents in cultural anthropology, 41.9% of all respondents in linguistics, and 23.2% of all respondents in archaeology, and 47.4% of all respondents in applied anthropology reported being engaged in l/g-related research.

¹⁰ Responses to the chairs' survey suggest a similar image of acceptance. More than 90% of the 198 chairs responding to that survey reported that research on lgbt themes, as well as publishing and/or reading papers on lgbt-related research findings would be "accepted" activities in their departments, rather than merely "tolerated" (with some degree of discomfort), or considered "inappropriate."

Anticipating that a large number of respondents to the Members' survey would not be involved in l/g-related research, respondents on the member's survey were asked to indicate whether they had avoided pursuing lgbt research because of "concern that it would not be considered 'serious anthropology'" or because of "fear that others would label you lesbian/gay."

Slightly more than one-fourth of the lgbt respondents answered "yes" one or both parts of this question: 26.5% said they avoided l/g-related research because others would think the work is "not serious"; and 27.4% said they did so because of fears of being labeled lesbian or gay.

Very few lgbt respondents provided additional reasons for avoiding l/g-related research, even though space to enter such comments was included on the survey form.

Table 21 shows that roughly the same percentage of lesbians and gay men reported avoiding l/g-related research because the work might not be taken seriously, or because of fear of being labeled lesbian or gay. A somewhat lower percentage of bisexual respondents answered "yes" to each part of this question, and so do it much lower percentage of heterosexual respondents.

Worth noting here are the parallels between responses to questions about l/g-related research and responses to questions about teaching l/g-related topics. Just as survey respondents report that they are willing to support teaching about lesbian/gay themes, but are less willing to support lgbt anthropologists teaching as openly lgbt anthropologists, so survey respondents appear to be *willing to be supportive of lesbian/gay research in principle, but are much less willing to become personally involved or engaged with such research themselves.*

This ambivalent stance helps explain why 60.9% of the lgbt respondents and 91.1% of the heterosexual respondents reported that they have never been encouraged by others to conduct research on l/g-related themes, and why 72.5% of the lgbt respondents and 95.6% of the heterosexual respondents reported that they have never been discouraged from conducting research on these topics, either.

And this ambivalence helps explain why individual anthropologists might respond negatively when confronted with a colleague's interests in l/g-related research (in the sense reported in the testimonies), even though survey respondents on the whole offered generic endorsements for such inquiry.

Under such circumstances, anthropologists who decide to pursue lesbian/gay-related research are likely to do so without the support of their peers or colleagues. That 58.0% of the lgbt respondents claimed some degree of involvement with lesbian/gay-related research is especially commendable, under such circumstances. Absence of collegial support may explain why over 30% of the heterosexual respondents report being involved in such studies; of course, other considerations may also be contributing to such avoidance.

VII. MENTORING

Comments in the testimony describe difficulties and frustrations which lgbt students experience, when trying to locate supportive mentors for graduate school training, dissertation writing, and other components of career development.

However, responses to the members' survey report a rather different set of conditions within the profession.

80.7% of the lgbt respondents report that they "have encouraged [another person] to conduct research on these topics," and 50.5% of the heterosexual respondents report giving such encouragement. 10.7% of the lgbt respondents report that they have discouraged others from conducting such research; 0.8% of the heterosexual respondents report discouraging others in this regard.

Read in isolation, these statistics suggest that a large number of anthropologists are actively supporting colleagues who pursue lgbt research interests. Indeed, the percentage of respondents who report that they give such support is somewhat higher than is the percentage of respondents claiming involvement in such research tasks themselves -- 80.7% vs. 58.0% for lgbt respondents, and 50.5% vs. 80.7% for heterosexual respondents, respectively.

However, if (as noted in the preceding section) 60.9% of the lgbt respondents report that they never have been encouraged to pursue lesbian/gay-related research, then who are the persons who receive this encouragement?

Unfortunately, survey responses show that the beneficiaries are not students in anthropology. As Table 22 suggests, only 15.2% of the lgbt respondents indicated that they were mentors for lgbt undergraduates, 7.6% report mentoring lgbt graduate students, and 17.5% report mentoring with lgbt undergraduates and graduate students. That is, only 40.3% of all lgbt respondents indicated some level of involvement in student mentoring, a percentage far lower than the 93.2% of lgbt respondents who claim to be supportive of lgbt-centered anthropological research, and far lower than the percentages (see Tables 15-19, above) of lgbt respondents who consider lgbt themes to be appropriate for discussion in anthropology classrooms.

Similarly, 18.8% of the heterosexual respondents indicated that they were mentors for lgbt undergraduates, 11.8% reported mentoring lgbt graduate students, and 10.6% report mentoring lgbt undergraduates and graduate students. That is, 41.2% of the heterosexual respondents indicated some level of involvement in student mentoring again, a percentage far lower than the 88.9% of heterosexual respondents claiming to be supportive of lgbt research, and far lower than the percentage (see Tables 15-19, above) of heterosexual respondents who consider lgbt themes to be appropriate for discussion in the anthropology classroom.

Table 22 makes strikingly clear that any involvement in lgbt student mentoring is not uniform across sexual orientation. Lesbians were more likely to report providing such services to lgbt undergraduates. Bisexuals, as a group, were more likely than other lgbt respondents to report providing mentoring services to lgbt graduate students, though heterosexual respondents reporting doing so with greatest frequency. Gay men, in contrast, were the least likely to report

doing so. Bisexual respondents also indicated that the question was "not applicable" more than twice as frequently than did lesbians or gay men.

Overall, 41% of all survey respondents, regardless of sexual orientation, indicated they were providing mentoring services to lgbt undergraduate and/or graduate students. 27.5% of this group of mentors are lgbt, and 72.5% are heterosexuals.

Graduate students, as well as graduated professionals, are represented within this grouping. In fact, 24.8% of the graduate students responding to the survey indicated that they provide mentoring to lgbt undergraduates and/or graduate students. None of the undergraduates in the survey sample reported providing mentoring services to their peers. Additionally, 34.6% of the self-employed persons in the sample, 25.6% of the private sector employees, and 33.3% of the government employees indicated that they provide mentoring services to lgbt undergraduate and/or graduate students. So responsibilities for mentoring lgbt students are in non sense provided exclusively by university faculty or through sites within the academe.

The university faculty who report that they are providing mentoring services to lgbt students are a complex group, including , e.g.:

40.1% of the respondents who are part-time faculty;
42.7% of the respondents who are faculty but not on tenure track;
42.2% of the respondents who are faculty, on tenure track, but not yet tenured; and 59.4% of the respondents in other categories, including are tenured faculty.

That 40% or more of the non-tenured faculty responding to the members' survey report that they provide mentoring services to lgbt students is especially important, given the vulnerable position which these anthropologists occupy within academe. That more anthropologists who do enjoy more stable locations in the academe are not involved in mentoring helps explain why problems with mentoring-- and with particular anthropologists acting as mentors -- are so frequently discussed in the oral and written testimony.

Adding to these problems, university faculty providing mentoring services are less likely to be located in departments with PhD or MA degree programs. 51.3% of the respondents who teach at four-year institutions indicated that they provide mentoring services to lgbt students, whereas only 41.76% of respondents from PhD-granting institutions and 40.1% from MA-granting programs report providing these services to lgbt students.

Mentors are more likely to have the PhD than any other degree, and mentors are more likely to have been awarded the PhD during the years between 1970-1979 (25 respondents) or 1980-89 (26 respondents), than before 1970 (6 respondents). The number of mentors receiving the PhD between 1990 and 1994 (the time of the survey) is sufficiently large --19 respondents--to suggest that recency of degree also has a close relationship with mentoring.

45.2% of the respondents from cultural anthropology represented in the sample indicated that they provided mentoring services to lgbt students. So did 42.3% of respondents from archaeology, 43.2% from linguistics, 36.0% from applied, and 32.0% from physical

anthropology. The percentages are surprising, given the difficulties which, according to the testimonies, often surround lgbt anthropologists efforts to locate a suitable mentor. The discrepancy may be due to the overstatements of self-reporting (that is, respondents believe they are serving as mentors, while students and colleagues report otherwise), other differences in student vs. faculty perspectives regarding the availability of mentoring services within the profession, and/or the reluctance of initially cooperative faculty to provide such services to particular lgbt students when asked to do so.

16.2% of the lgbt respondents who provide mentoring services to lgbt students reported (question 18c) that they have experienced some form of anti-lgbt discrimination in their anthropological career, whereas 12.3% of these respondents reported not having experience with such discrimination.

Finally, only 1.1% of the heterosexual respondents providing mentoring services to lgbt students reported (question 17) that their support of lgbt issues had negative effects on their anthropological careers. That statistic suggests that mentoring lgbt students is not necessarily associated, in and of itself, with instances of lgbt-related discrimination within the profession.

VIII. THE IMPORTANCE OF SOLGA

Many of the narratives discussed in powerful language the important effects which have come out of their association with SOLGA (the Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists). Interestingly, 28.6% of the lgbt respondents to the members' survey (question 14) reported that they were members of SOLGA, while 71.4% of these respondents reported that they were not members of that organization.

Survey responses say nothing directly about reasons why lgbt anthropologists join, or do not join, this organization. However, a closer look at survey responses reveal the following characteristics of the SOLGA membership, compared to lgbt respondents who are not members of SOLGA:

- members of SOLGA are less likely than non-members to be "out" to g/l/b/t peers than are persons who are not members of SOLGA (27.8% vs. 60.3%)
- members of SOLGA are less likely than non-members to be "out" to their "straight" peers, than are non-members (28.1% vs. 55.5%)
- members of SOLGA are less likely than non-members to be "out" to Lgbt supervisors or to heterosexual supervisors, than are non-members (21.7% vs. 39.1%; 23.3% vs. 34.2%)

At the same time,

- members of SOLGA are less likely as non-members to feel that their job/academic progress would be endangered if their chair/supervisor knew about their sexual orientation (3.8 vs. 11.5%).
- members of SOLGA are just as likely as non-members to have experienced discrimination as an anthropologist because of their sexual orientation (13.7 vs. 12.2%).

According to these data, survey respondents see that SOLGA speaks to the interests of some - but certainly not all - lgbt anthropologists. Recent discussions on the SOLGA list-serve show

that SOLGA members themselves have differing perspectives regarding SOLGA's mission: Some argue in favor of SOLGA's promoting research/scholarship. Others insist that SOLGA should be a support resource for lgbt colleagues. Still others want SOLGA to pursue a more aggressive, activist stance, where lgbt human rights and related issues are concerned.

It seems doubtful that SOLGA (or any one organization) can address such a wide range of functions, and/or speak in meaningful ways to the interests of all lgbt anthropologists. At the same time, SOLGA has been the focal point for recent efforts to increase visibility and broaden opportunity for lesbians, gay men, bisexuals and transgendered people within anthropology. Indeed, a report from a SOLGA task force which prompted the AAA's Executive Committee to create COLGIA, and SOLGA efforts led to the AAA's commitment not to hold professional meetings in jurisdictions which maintain anti-sodomy laws. SOLGA has been an important force in the struggle to claim greater lgbt opportunity in anthropology. By continuing to align its sense of mission and goals with the ever changing needs of this diverse constituency, SOLGA will continue to maintain its prominence within our profession.

Appendix I. Tables

Table 1: Members' survey respondents, by status within the profession

Undergraduates	1.9%
Graduate students	32.6%
Non-tenure track faculty	7.8%
Part-time faculty	8.6%
Untenured faculty	13.3%
Government employee	4.8%
Private sector employee	8.0%
Self-employed	5.5%
Other (including tenured faculty)	30.7%

Table 2: Department atmosphere towards lgbt persons as reported for different types of academic institutions

(data in percentages)

A. Departmental atmosphere for lesbians is:

	Accepting	Neutral	Hostile	N/A	(N=)
PhD granting	57.1	32.0	6.1	4.9	(247)
MA granting	44.0	32.0	16.0	8.0	(50)
4-year college	53.6	27.8	11.3	7.2	(97)
2-year college	61.5	23.1	7.5	7.7	(13)
priv/religious	28.6	57.1	14.3	-0-	(7)
private/other	61.1	22.2	11.1	5.6	(18)

B. Departmental atmosphere for gay men is:

	Accepting	Neutral	Hostile	N/A	(N=)
PhD granting	56.3	33.6	5.7	4.5	(247)
MA granting	50.0	28.0	14.0	8.0	(50)
4-year college	21.0	31.6	11.6	8.4	(95)
2-year college	53.8	38.5	-0-	7.7	(13)
priv/religious	42.9	42.9	14.3	-0-	(7)
private/other	61.1	27.8	11.1	-0-	(18)

C. Departmental atmosphere for bisexuals is:

	Accepting	Neutral	Hostile	N/A	(N=)
PhD granting	39.0	33.6	6.6	20.7	(241)
MA granting	28.6	28.6	12.2	30.6	(49)
4-year college	39.6	25.0	11.5	24.0	(96)

2-year college	53.8	30.8	7.7	7.7	(13)
priv/religious	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5	(8)
private/other	50.0	22.2	-0-	27.8	(18)

D. Departmental atmosphere for transsexuals is:

	Accepting	Neutral	Hostile	N/A	(N=)
PhD granting	16.5	18.2	12.7	52.5	(236)
MA granting	18.0	18.0	14.0	50.0	(50)
4-year college	19.8	19.8	15.4	45.1	(91)
2-year college	33.3	25.0	8.3	33.3	(13)
priv/religious	28.6	57.1	-0-	14.3	(7)
private/other	17.6	23.5	11.8	47.1	(17)

Table 3: Situations where Lgbt respondents report actual/perceived homosexuality hurt someone

(data in percentages, ranked by descending frequency)

	(N=138)
collegial relations	43.8%
hiring/job search	38.6%
reappointment, promotion, tenure	28.7%
dissertation sponsorship	24.6%
job recommendations	23.2%
teaching evaluations	22.0%
student advising	21.0%
research funding	20.2%
actual teaching in classrooms	20.0%
teaching assignments	19.4%

Table 4: Situations where Heterosexual respondents report actual/perceived homosexuality hurt someone

(data in percentages, ranked by descending frequency)

	(N=374)
collegial relations	24.9%
hiring/job search	16.5%
reappointment, promotion, tenure	14.3%
teaching evaluations	11.8%
actual teaching in classrooms	10.1%
fieldwork	7.6%
student advising	7.4%

teaching assignments	6.5%
dissertation sponsorship	5.5%
job recommendations	4.4%
course grade received	3.9%
research funding	2.5%
publications	2.4%

Table 5: Awareness of anti-lgbt discrimination by subfield
(Numbers in percentages)

	Arch	Cult	Phys	Ling	Appl ied	None
N=	(59)	(290)	(22)	(38)	(55)	(8)
grad school	0	3.9	0	2.6	0	0
course grade	5.3	7.4	4.5	7.7	5.0	11.1
diss. Sponsor	7.1	13.4	9.5	7.9	5.1	12.5
job rec's	7.1	11.8	5.0	10.5	10.5	12.5
hiring/job search	10.7	23.8	23.8	29.3	17.7	25.0
reappt/tenure	7.1	20.6	19.0	23.7	17.7	25.0
research funding	1.8	8.8	0	10.8	7.0	0
publications	5.4	5.1	4.8	5.3	3.5	0
teaching assignmnts	7.1	5.4	14.3	18.9	10.3	25.0
classroom teaching	1.8	15.8	4.8	21.1	7.0	37.5
teaching evaluation	5.4	15.4	14.3	26.3	13.6	25.0
collegial reltns	16.1	32.0	31.8	36.3	27.6	50.0
student advising	5.4	13.5	9.5	7.9	1.8	25.0
fieldwork	8.9	14.3	14.3	10.5	7.3	0
lesbian/gay activism	3.8	10.7	16.7	2.9	5.5	25.0

Table 6: Lgbt respondents, by subfield, reporting direct experiences with anti-lgbt discrimination
(numbers in percentages)

Subfield:	Yes	No	Not Sure	N/A	(N=)
archaeology	25.0	50.0	25.0	0	(12)
cultural	27.7	41.6	22.8	7.9	(101)
physical	0	83.5	16.7	0	(6)
linguistics	27.3	27.3	36.4	9.1	(11)
applied	38.5	15.4	23.1	23.1	(13)
no subfield	25.0	50.0	0	25.0	(4)

Table 7: Experience with anti-lgbt discrimination reported by race/ethnicity
(numbers in percentages)

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian
(N=)	(113)	(4)	(3)	(4)
Yes	24.7	25	33.3	75
No	43.3	75	0	25
Not sure	24.7	0	33.3	0
Not apply	7.0	0	33.3	0

Table 8: Percent lgbt respondents "out" to peers and supervisors
(data in percentages)

% respondents "out" to:

rspdnt's sexual orientation	lgbt peers	straight peers	lgbt supervisors	lgbt supervisors	(N=)
lesbians	98.0	96.0	83.3	78.7	(51)
gay men	92.0	93.1	76.5	69.2	(32)
bisexuals	78	66.0	33.3	31.8	(50)
all l/g/b	89.5	84.1	61.7	58.9	(133)

Table 9: How employment/academic status affects "being out" to peers and supervisors
(data in percentages)

% respondents "out" to:

Employment/Academic Status	lgbt peers	straight peers	lgbt supervisors	straight supervisors	(N=)
government employee	40.0	60.0	50.0	40.9	(5)
self-employed	85.7	87.5	60.0	50.0	(8)
private sector employee	66.7	62.5	40.0	40.0	(16)
part-time faculty	90.9	83.3	40.9	54.5	(12)
untentured faculty	84.6	85.7	50.0	53.8	(14)
non-tenure track faculty	90.0	80.0	60.0	66.7	(10)
undergraduate student	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	(2)
graduate student	94.5	89.1	60.5	58.8	(55)
tenured faculty	89.7	79.3	57.9	57.7	(29)

Table 10: How type of academic institution affects "being out" to peers and supervisors
(data in percentages)

% lgbt respondents "out" to:

	lgbt peers (N=)	straight peers (N=)	lgbt supervisors (N=)	straight supervisors (N=)
PhD granting	93.7 (79)	86.1 (79)	63.2 (57)	61.6 (73)
MA granting	75.0 (12)	61.5 (13)	50.0 (6)	41.7 (9)
4 year	85.7 (21)	86.4 (22)	50.0 (14)	57.1 (22)
2 year	100.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	100.0 (1)
priv/religious	50.0 (2)	100.0 (2)	100.0 (1)	50.0 (2)
private/other	71.5 (7)	75.0 (8)	42.9 (7)	37.5 (5)

Table 11

(source: revised sample; data in percentages)

"Out" to:

	lgbt peers (N=120)		straight peers (N=123)		lgbt supervisors (N=88)		straight supervisors (N=117)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Prior experience with lgbt discrimination								
Yes	23.8	0.0	22.7	1.6	22.8	3.3	20.8	5.0
No	37.3	7.9	34.4	9.4	17.4	20.7	18.3	24.2
Not sure	21.4	1.6	21.9	2.3	9.8	8.7	15.0	8.3
N/A	6.3	1.6	5.5	2.3	3.0	5.4	4.2	4.2

Table 12: Respondent includes L/G-related topics in teaching?

(numbers in percentages)

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(38)	(25)	(36)	(278)
Often	60.5	48.0	33.3	25.8
Sometimes	36.5	28.0	41.7	57.7
Never	2.6	24.0	25.0	16.4

Table 13: Respondent's research interests include L/G topics?

(numbers in percentages)

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(38)	(25)	(36)	(278)
Often	60.5	48.0	33.3	25.8
Sometimes	36.5	28.0	41.7	57.7
Never	2.6	24.0	25.0	16.4

(N=)	(48)	(34)	(49)	(362)
Yes	60.4	64.7	51.0	30.1
No	39.6	35.3	49.0	69.9

Table 14: How frequently respondent includes l/g topics in teaching vs. type of academic institution

(numbers in percentages)

	Often	Sometimes	Never	(N=)
PhD granting	30.6	52.7	16.7	(222)
MA granting	39.6	41.7	18.8	(48)
4 year college	32.3	57.3	10.4	(96)
2 year inst	42.9	42.9	14.3	(14)
priv/religious	25.0	75.0	0	(8)
private/other	37.5	56.3	0	(16)

Table 15: How appropriate is integration of L/G topics in specialized graduate seminars?

(data in percentages)

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(51)	(32)	(49)	(366)
Very	80.4	75.0	65.3	50.8
Appropriate	19.6	18.8	32.7	44.3
Not	0	6.3	2.0	4.9

Table 16: How appropriate...integration into existing graduate courses?

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(50)	(32)	(49)	(361)
Very	86.0	62.5	67.3	47.1
Appropriate	14.0	31.3	30.6	47.6
Not	0	6.3	2.0	5.3

Table 17: How appropriate...integration into specialized undergraduate courses?

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(50)	(31)	(49)	(366)

Very	78.0	64.5	57.1	45.6
Appropriate	20.2	29.0	38.8	45.4
Not	2.0	6.5	4.1	9.0

Table 18: How appropriate...integration into undergrad courses?

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
(N=)	(51)	(32)	(49)	(361)
Very	80.4	59.4	57.1	44.3
Appropriate	19.6	34.4	42.9	47.9
Not	0	6.3	0	7.8

Table 19: How appropriate...integration into undergrad intro courses?

	Lesbian	Gay	Bisexual	Heterosexual
Very	76.5	62.5	49.0	39.2
Appropriate	23.5	31.3	44.9	46.7
Not	0	6.3	6.1	14.1

Table 20: Not appropriate percentages from Tables 15-19

course level/type:	lesbian	gay	bisexual	heterosexual
grad specialized	0	6.3	2.0	4.9
grad regular	0	6.3	2.0	5.3
undergrad spec'lzd	2.0	6.5	4.1	9.0
undergrad regular	0	6.3	0	7.8
undergrad intro	0	6.3	6.1	14.1

Table 21: Reasons why respondents avoid l/g-related research
(data in percentages)

	research not taken seriously	fear lesbian/gay label	(N=)
lesbians	26.7	33.3	(45)
gay men	25.0	30.0	(30)
bisexual	16.7	20.4	(49)

heterosexual	3.5	2.1	(331)
--------------	-----	-----	-------

Table 22: Is respondent a mentor for lesbian/gay students?

(source: members' survey; data in percentages)

	lesbian	gay	bisexual	heterosexual
(N=)	(50)	(34)	(47)	(340)
undergrads	24.0	11.8	8.5	18.8
grads	4.0	8.8	10.6	11.8
both	24.0	26.5	4.3	10.6
no	24.0	23.5	25.5	27.9
n/a	24.0	29.4	51.1	30.9

Appendix II.

Alan S. Yang
Department of Political Science
Columbia University

The following analyses are based on the AAA Commission on Lesbian and Gay issues in Anthropology membership survey. Analyses are based on the following material provided by COLGIA: SPSS data file, code sheet, and notes. Some data/coding transformation was required prior to analysis of the data, particularly survey questions that invited multiple responses (e.g., Questions 1,2,5,7); these questions were entered in the original data file as a series of separate dichotomous variables, each corresponding to a particular response category of a given question. For these questions, a new variable was computed, with each respondent now assigned a single value (consequently, the number of categories, given the possible number of combinations if multiple categories were checked, were often very high).

The total valid sample for the membership survey was 525. The self-administered questionnaires were returned at both the annual meeting and by mail or fax to COLGIA c/o AAA. Response rate was ___%.

Of the total 525 respondents in the sample, 375 identified as heterosexual (Q. 13), while 135 identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual (15 of the 525 were coded as “missing”). The LGB sample is comprised of 50 bisexuals, 34 gay men, and 51 lesbians. Examining differences between heterosexuals and LGB’s (collapsed) allows us to make more reliable (statistically significant) inferences; thus, separate marginals for lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals are not included. Marginals for questions that query perceptions of discrimination and climate, and the appropriateness of LGB topics in various academic settings are reported separately for heterosexuals and LGB’s, a convention followed in analyses of racial attitudes (where marginals for white respondents are reported separately from those of black respondents). While there are obviously issues of self-selection (and thus representativeness) in the survey’s administration, the combined total of 135 LGB generally allows us to make inferences about the distribution of opinion among LGB’s on a given question (e.g., Q.’s 15, 16) as well as differences between LGB’s and heterosexuals.

The following analyses include:

- 1) a profile of all respondents on a variety of SES and sociodemographic categories(pp. 2-3)
- 2) questions asked only of LGB respondents (whether they are “out” in certain contexts and perceptions of the implications of being “out”, perceptions of discrimination based on sexual orientation, questions of mentoring and effects of being “out” in these contexts; pp. 3-5)
- 3) differences between heterosexual and LGB respondents on questions ranging from the appropriateness of including LGB topics in curricula, teaching, and research, as well as recollections of encouragement or discouragement in the conduct of such research (pp. 5-9).
- 4) differences between heterosexual and LGB respondents on questions of whether perceived homosexuality hurt someone in a variety of (academic) contexts (pp. 9-12)
- 5) differences between heterosexual and LGB respondents on questions of climate toward LGBT’s (p. 13).

PROFILE OF MEMBERSHIP:

The total membership sample shows an overrepresentation of men relative to the general adult population (though whether relative to general AAA membership is not clear), and an LGB sample (26.5%) that suggests self-selection bias. Cultural anthropology constitutes the overwhelming primary subfield response(63.2%).

Sex: Male: 64.4%
Women: 35.0%
Other: 0.6%
Valid N: (518)

Sexual Identity:

Heterosexual: 73.5%
LGB Total: 26.5%
Subtotal LGB: 9.8% Bisexual, 6.7% Gay, 10.0% Lesbian
Valid N: (510)

Degree Granting Institution:

PhD Granting in Anthro: 61.7%
MA Granting in Anthro: 11.0%
4 year college: 21.1%
2 year college: 2.5%
Multiple Categories: 3.8%
Valid N: (446)

Age:

Mean Age: 41.2 years
Median Age: 41 years
Range: 20-76 years
Valid N: (516)

Race:

White: 88.9%
Black: 4.4%
Hispanic: 2.7%
Asian: 2.3%
Other: 1.7%
Valid N: (479)

Highest Degree Received:

Phd: 62.4%
Other Doctor: 1.0%
MA or equivalent: 27.4%
BA or equivalent: 8.5%

Less than BA: .9%
Valid N: (508)

Year awarded Highest degree:

Mean year: 1984
Median Year: 1988
Range: 1949-1996
Valid N: (506)

Subfield Specialty:

Cultural: 63.2%
Archaeology: 9.2%
Linguistics: 5.0%
Physical: 3.1%
Applied: 6.6%
Multiple Fields: 11.3%
No Specialty: 1.5%
Valid N: (519)

Question asked of Heterosexual R's only:

We can infer that only a very small proportion of straight respondents has supported l/g related issues (81.6% at N/A).

Q. 14: "Has your support of l/g-related issues had any affect on your professional career?"

Positive affects: 16.1%
Negative affects: 2.2%
Not Applicable: 81.6%
Valid N: (316)

Questions asked of LGB R's only:

While a large proportion of LGB respondents are "out" to their straight peers (83.8%), the proportion who report being "out" to their straight SUPERVISORS drops (57.9%).

Q. 15A: "Are you "out" to anyone on campus or in your workplace?...g/l/b peers?"

Yes: 88.3%
No: 11.7%
Valid N: (128)

Q. 15B: "Are you "out" to...straight peers"

Yes: 83.8%
No: 16.2%
Valid N: (130)

Q. 15C: “Are you “out” to...g/l/b supervisors”

Yes: 61.3%

No: 38.7%

Valid N: (93)

Q. 15D: “Are you “out” to...straight supervisors”

Yes: 57.9%

No: 42.1%

Valid N: (121)

A sizable minority of LGB respondents are either not sure or agree that their job/academic progress would be endangered if their chair/supervisor knew of their sexual orientation (15.8%+20.3%= 36.1%)

Q. 16A: “Do you feel your job/academic progress would be endangered if your chair or supervisor knew about your sexual orientation?”

Yes: 15.8%

No: 56.4%

DK: 20.3%

N/A: 7.5%

Valid N: (133)

A sizable minority (26.3%) of LGB’s affirm that they have experienced discrimination as an anthropologist, while nearly the same proportion (23.3%) were “not sure.” Note that this combined total of respondents either not sure or affirming discrimination exceeds that of those responding “no” (42.9%).

Q. 16B: “Have you ever experienced discrimination as an anthropologist because of your sexual orientation”

Yes: 26.3%

No: 42.9%

Not sure: 23.3%

N/A: 7.5%

Valid N: (133)

Q. 16C: “If you have a same sex partner, how much is she or he integrated into your academic or professional social life?”

Not at all: 10.9%

Only w/some colleagues: 25.8%

At most depart’l/office events: 12.5%

At most institutional events: 10.9%

N/A: 39.8%

Valid N: (128)

Evidence of mentoring by another LGB anthropologist is quite strong here: 63.8% report receiving support/encouragement in their career development.

Q. 16D: "Has a l/g/b anthropologist ever given you support or encouragement in your career development?"

Yes: 63.8%

No: 36.2%

Valid N: (130)

<<Mentoring questions added>>

Q. 16E: "Did you have a mentor in graduate school?"

Yes: 69.7%

No: 30.3%

Valid N: (132)

Q. 16F: "If so, did he or she know about your sexual orientation?"

Yes: 44.5%

No: 21.8%

DK: 10.1%

N/A: 23.5%

Valid N: (119)

Q. 16G: "Was your relationship with your mentor affected because of your sexual orientation?"

Positively: 13.7%

Negatively: 5.1%

DK: 36.8%

N/A: 44.4%

Valid N: (117)

Q. 16H: "Did your formal adviser know about your sexual orientation?"

Yes: 53.0%

No: 47.0%

Valid N: (117)

Q. 16I: "Was your relationship with your adviser affected because of your sexual orientation?"

Positively: 10.8%

Negatively: 3.3%

DK: 47.5%

N/A: 38.3%

Valid N: (120)

Q. 16J: "In your current work, are you asked to speak or advise on issues related to sexual orientation?"

Frequently: 12.0%

Occasionally: 30.1%

No: 51.9%

N/A: 6.0%

Valid N: (133)

Q. 16K: “If you teach and your students are aware of your sexual orientation, has their reaction been primarily...”

Positive: 16.5%
 Negative: 1.7%
 Neutral: 19.0%
 N/A: 62.8%
 Valid N: (121)

STRAIGHT VS. LGB DIFFERENCES:

In general, differences between straights and LGB respondents have more to do with **degree** of support for the inclusion of LGB topics, with LGB’s more likely to see such inclusion as “very appropriate” compared to straights. Still, there are generally negligible differences between straights and LGB’s in terms of “Not Appropriate” responses. Basically, even straights clearly view the inclusion of lgb topics as appropriate/very appropriate at very high levels.

Q’s 8A-8G: “What is your assessment of how appropriate it is to consider l/g-related topics (e.g., homosexuality, sexual orientation, gay and lesbian cultures and identities, bisexuality, transgenderism) in the following environment...”

Q. 8A: “...Research in your subfield”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	51.9%	73.7%	57.7%
Appropriate	37.0%	19.5%	32.4%
Not Appropriate	11.1%	6.8%	9.9%
Valid N	(370)	(133)	(503)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 8B: “...Specialized Graduate Seminars”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	50.8%	73.5%	56.8%
Appropriate	44.3%	24.2%	39.0%
Not Appropriate	4.9%	2.3%	4.2%
Valid N	(366)	(132)	(498)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 8C: “...Specialized undergraduate Courses”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	45.6%	66.9%	51.2%
Appropriate	45.4%	29.2%	41.1%

Not Appropriate	9.0%	3.8%	7.7%
Valid N	(366)	(130)	(496)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 8D: "...Integration into existing undergraduate courses"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	44.3%	66.7%	50.3%
Appropriate	47.9%	31.8%	43.6%
Not Appropriate	7.8%	1.5%	6.1%
Valid N	(361)	(132)	(493)

Chi-square < .001

This question (8E) elicits the highest level of "not appropriate" responses from straight respondents.

Q. 8E: "Integration into undergraduate introductory courses"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	39.2%	62.9%	45.5%
Appropriate	46.7%	33.3%	43.1%
Not Appropriate	14.1%	3.8%	11.3%
Valid N	(362)	(132)	(494)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 8F: "Integration into existing Graduate Courses"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	47.1%	73.3%	54.1%
Appropriate	47.6%	24.4%	41.5%
Not Appropriate	5.3%	2.3%	4.5%
Valid N	(361)	(131)	(492)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 8G: "Present papers and organize sessions at annual meetings"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Very Appropriate	59.2%	81.1%	65.0%
Appropriate	37.8%	16.7%	32.2%
Not Appropriate	3.0%	2.3%	2.8%
Valid N	(365)	(132)	(497)

Chi-square < .001

While roughly equal proportions of both straights and LGB's "never" include LGB topics in their teaching, a clear majority of straight respondents at least "sometimes" report doing so.

Q. 9 "Do you include such topics (lesbian and gay) in your teaching?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Often	25.8%	47.5%	31.2%
Sometimes	57.7%	36.4%	52.4%
Never	16.4%	16.2%	16.4%
Valid N	(298)	(99)	(397)

Chi-square < .001

A sizable minority of LGB respondents do not have research interests in LGB topics (42.0%); an interesting 30.1% of straights report having research interests in LGB topics

Q. 10 "Do your research interests include such topics (lesbian and gay)?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	30.1%	58.0%	37.5%
No	69.9%	42.0%	62.5%
Valid N	(362)	(131)	(493)

Chi-square < .001

While only 8.9% of straights have been encouraged to conduct research on LGB topics, a sizable minority (39.1%) of LGB respondents have been encouraged to do so.

Q. 10A "Have you ever been encouraged to conduct research on lesbian/gay-related topics?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	8.9%	39.1%	16.9%
No	91.1%	60.9%	83.1%
Valid N	(370)	(133)	(503)

Chi-square < .001

Over one-quarter of LGB respondents (27.5%) report being discouraged from conducting research on LGB topics. Further, around one-quarter of LGB respondents also report they have avoided pursuing such research for different reasons (10C & 10D).

Q. 10B "Have you ever been discouraged from conducting research on such topics?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
--	----------	-------	-------

Yes	4.4%	27.5%	10.4%
No	95.6%	72.5%	89.6%
Valid N	(367)	(131)	(498)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 10C “Have you ever avoided pursuing research on these topics because of the effect on your career: out of a concern that it would not be considered “serious anthropology”?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	3.5%	22.3%	8.5%
No	96.5%	77.7%	91.5%
Valid N	(340)	(121)	(461)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 10D “(same intro as in 10C)...for fear that others would label you lesbian/gay?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	2.1%	27.4%	9.0%
No	97.9%	72.6%	91.0%
Valid N	(331)	(124)	(455)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 10E “Have you ever encouraged anyone, for whatever reason, to conduct research on these topics?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	50.5%	80.8%	58.4%
No	49.5%	19.2%	41.6%
Valid N	(368)	(130)	(498)

Chi-square < .001

Q. 10F “Have you ever discouraged anyone, for whatever reason, from conducting research on these topics?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	.8%	10.7%	3.4%
No	99.2%	89.3%	96.6%
Valid N	(372)	(131)	(503)

Chi-square < .001

It appears that the mentoring of LGB students is occurring at roughly equivalent levels when comparing straight and LGB respondents.

Q. 10G “Are you a mentor for any lesbian, gay, and/or bisexual students?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes, undergrad	18.8%	15.3%	17.8%
Yes, with grads	11.8%	7.6%	10.6%
Yes, with both	10.6%	17.6%	12.5%
No	27.9%	24.4%	27.0%
Does not apply	30.9%	35.1%	32.1%
Valid N	(340)	(131)	(471)

*No statistically significant difference

PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER PERCEIVED HOMOSEXUALITY HURT SOMEONE

Most questions show that LGB respondents are more likely than straights to have personal knowledge of a situation where a person’s perceived homosexuality hurt him/her. In many of the questions, between 20-25% of LGB respondents answered in the affirmative.

“Do you have personal knowledge of a situation in which a person’s perceived or actual homosexuality hurt him/her, in the following circumstances...”

11A: “...graduate school admission?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	1.5%	5.6%	2.6%
No	79.3%	66.4%	75.7%
Not Sure	9.5%	18.4%	11.9%
N/A	9.8%	9.6%	9.7%
Valid N	(328)	(125)	(453)

Chi square < .01

11B: “...course grade received?”

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	3.9%	15.3%	7.0%
No	77.9%	64.5%	74.3%
Not Sure	10.9%	12.1%	11.2%
N/A	7.3%	8.1%	7.5%
Valid N	(331)	(124)	(455)

Chi square < .001

In terms of dissertation sponsorship and job recommendations, nearly one-quarter (24.6% and 23.6% respectively) of LGB respondents had knowledge where someone’s perceived homosexuality hurt him/her.

11C: "...dissertation sponsorship?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	5.5%	24.6%	10.8%
No	73.3%	53.2%	67.7%
Not Sure	10.4%	14.3%	11.5%
N/A	10.7%	7.9%	10.0%
Valid N	(326)	(126)	(452)

Chi square < .001

11D: "...job recommendations?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	4.5%	23.6%	9.8%
No	72.0%	49.6%	65.7%
Not Sure	12.4%	17.1%	13.7%
N/A	11.1%	9.8%	10.8%
Valid N	(314)	(123)	(437)

Chi square < .001

LGB respondents are more than twice as likely to know of someone's homosexuality hurting him/her in hiring/job search when compared to straights. Further, a substantial minority of LGB's have knowledge of perceived homosexuality hurting in hiring/job searches (38.6%); in fact, LGB respondents are roughly divided on this question (38.6% Yes vs. 40.2% No).

11E: "...hiring/job search?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	16.5%	38.6%	22.6%
No	63.8%	40.2%	57.3%
Not Sure	12.0%	15.0%	12.8%
N/A	7.8%	6.3%	7.4%
Valid N	(334)	(127)	(461)

Chi square < .001

Again, LGB's are twice as likely to have knowledge of someone's perceived homosexuality hurting their "reappointment, promotion & tenure" when compared to straights. A clear majority of LGB respondents are either "Not sure" or answered affirmatively to such knowledge (28.7% + 22.5% = 51.2%).

11F: "...reappointment, promotion & tenure?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
--	----------	-------	-------

Yes	14.3%	28.7%	18.3%
No	66.3%	39.5%	58.7%
Not Sure	9.4%	22.5%	13.1%
N/A	10.0%	9.3%	9.8%
Valid N	(329)	(129)	(458)

Chi square < .001

11G: "...research funding?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	2.5%	20.2%	7.4%
No	75.1%	52.4%	68.8%
Not Sure	11.5%	18.5%	13.5%
N/A	10.9%	8.9%	10.3%
Valid N	(321)	(124)	(445)

Chi square < .001

11H: "...publication?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	2.5%	10.5%	4.7%
No	78.3%	63.7%	74.2%
Not Sure	8.4%	18.5%	11.2%
N/A	10.9%	7.3%	9.9%
Valid N	(322)	(124)	(446)

Chi square < .001

11I: "...teaching assignments?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	6.5%	19.4%	10.0%
No	74.7%	59.7%	70.5%
Not Sure	9.0%	13.7%	10.3%
N/A	9.9%	7.3%	9.2%
Valid N	(324)	(124)	(448)

Chi square < .001

11J: "...actual teaching in classroom?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	10.2%	20.8%	13.1%
No	71.0%	56.8%	67.0%

Not Sure	10.5%	17.6%	12.5%
N/A	8.3%	4.8%	7.3%
Valid N	(324)	(125)	(449)

Chi square < .01

11K: "...teaching evaluations"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	11.8%	21.8%	14.6%
No	66.1%	54.8%	63.0%
Not Sure	14.0%	17.7%	15.0%
N/A	8.1%	5.6%	7.4%
Valid N	(322)	(124)	(446)

Chi square < .05

A clear plurality of LGB's (43.8%) report knowledge of someone's perceived homosexuality hurting "collegial relations." Interestingly, this question shows the highest proportion of straights that agree to this (24.9%).

11L: "...collegial relations?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	24.9%	43.8%	30.2%
No	57.1%	37.5%	51.6%
Not Sure	11.1%	14.1%	11.9%
N/A	6.9%	4.7%	6.3%
Valid N	(333)	(128)	(461)

Chi square < .001

11M: "...student advising?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	7.4%	21.0%	11.1%
No	71.4%	54.8%	66.8%
Not Sure	13.2%	16.1%	14.0%
N/A	8.0%	8.1%	8.0%
Valid N	(325)	(124)	(449)

Chi square < .001

11N: "...fieldwork?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	7.6%	24.8%	12.4%
No	70.8%	57.9%	67.2%

Not Sure	13.0%	11.6%	12.6%
N/A	8.6%	5.8%	7.8%
Valid N	(315)	(121)	(436)

Chi square < .001

11O: "...lesbian/gay activism?"

	Straight	L/G/B	Total
Yes	5.6%	17.1%	8.8%
No	70.6%	59.5%	67.5%
Not Sure	13.6%	11.7%	13.1%
N/A	10.1%	11.7%	10.6%
Valid N	(286)	(111)	(397)

Chi square < .01

PERCEPTION OF ATMOSPHERE TOWARD LGBT'S

Differences between straights and LGB's are negligible here, with the exception of perception of atmosphere for transsexuals, where LGB's perceive more hostility compared to straights

Question 11Q-11T: "How would you describe the atmosphere in your department/workplace toward..."

11Q: "...lesbians."

	Straights	LGB's	Total
Accepting	54.2%	53.4%	54.0%
Neutral	30.7%	33.1%	31.3%
Hostile	7.2%	8.5%	7.6%
N/A	7.8%	5.1%	7.1%
Valid N	(332)	(118)	(450)

*No statistically significant difference

11R: "...gays."

	Straights	LGB's	Total
Accepting	54.9%	50.4%	53.7%
Neutral	31.7%	32.8%	32.0%
Hostile	6.4%	10.1%	7.4%
N/A	7.0%	6.7%	6.9%
Valid N	(328)	(119)	(447)

*No statistically significant difference

Interestingly, reported levels of “accepting” is lower for bisexuals compared to acceptance of lesbians and gay men.

11S: “...bisexuals.”

	Straights	LGB’s	Total
Accepting	37.9%	35.6%	37.3%
Neutral	30.4%	34.7%	31.6%
Hostile	7.8%	10.2%	8.4%
N/A	23.9%	19.5%	22.7%
Valid N	(322)	(118)	(440)

*No statistically significant difference

A clear plurality of all respondents answered N/A to this question, suggesting that transsexuals are less visible compared to LGB’s in these environments

11T: “...transsexuals?”

	Straights	LGB’s	Total
Accepting	20.4%	11.3%	17.9%
Neutral	22.3%	12.2%	19.6%
Hostile	10.2%	20.9%	13.1%
N/A	47.1%	55.7%	49.4%
Valid N	(314)	(115)	(429)

Chi-square < .001