

Nonprofit Studies Program

Working Paper 08-02
March 2008

**Why Do So Many Gay Men Work
for Nonprofit Organizations?**

Gregory B. Lewis



ANDREW YOUNG SCHOOL
OF POLICY STUDIES



ANDREW YOUNG SCHOOL
OF POLICY STUDIES

**Why Do So Many Gay Men
Work for Nonprofit
Organizations?**

Working Paper 08-02

Gregory B. Lewis

March 2008

Nonprofit Studies Program
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies
Georgia State University
Internet: aysps.gsu.edu/nonprofit

Why Do So Many Gay Men Work for Nonprofit Organizations?

Gregory B. Lewis

Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies
Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, GSU

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action, November 15, 2007, Atlanta, Georgia. This research was partially funded by the Williams Institute of the UCLA School of Law. I am grateful to Lakshmi Pandey for substantial help in working with the Census data and to Chester Galloway for excellent research assistance.

Abstract:

Using a 5 percent sample of the 2000 Census, I first establish that gay men and, to a lesser extent, lesbians are disproportionately likely to work in the nonprofit sector. I then test several possible explanations. First, lesbians and gay men may have educational levels, urban residences, and other characteristics that make nonprofit employment especially attractive. Second, partnered gay men may be better able to afford working for the nonprofit sector, because they are less likely to be supporting children and are more likely to have another male salary in the household. Third, they may choose occupations that are more prevalent in the nonprofit sector. Fourth, nonprofit organizations may discriminate less on the basis of sexual orientation than private firms do. Fifth, LGBs may have a stronger commitment to public service. I find some evidence to support all five hypotheses.

Although diversity, representation, and pay equality are increasingly issues in the nonprofit workforce, no one has yet studied the role of lesbians and gay men in the sector nationally. In a case study of Georgia, I (author 2006) discovered that men living with male partners were twice as likely as married men to work in the nonprofit sector, and speculated on possible explanations. Using a 5 percent sample of the 2000 Census, this paper first establishes that gay men and, to a lesser extent, lesbians are disproportionately likely to work for nonprofit organizations (NPOs). It then tests several possible explanations. First, lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (LGBs) may have educational levels, urban residences, and other characteristics that make nonprofit employment especially attractive. Second, partnered gay men may be better able to afford working for the nonprofit sector, because they are less likely to be supporting children and are more likely to have another male salary in the household. Third, they may choose occupations that are more prevalent in the nonprofit sector. Fourth, nonprofit organizations may discriminate less on the basis of sexual orientation than private firms do. Fifth, LGBs may have a stronger commitment to public service.

Research Context

First, LGBs' concentration in the nonprofit sector may be nearly accidental, the product of characteristics they share with nonprofit workers generally. Nonprofit workers are much better educated, on average, than those in the for-profit sector (Mirvis & Hackett 1983; Mirvis 1990; Preston 1989, 1990), and some survey evidence (much of it biased) indicates that LGBs have more education than heterosexuals. LGBs are much more concentrated in urban areas and in particular states than are heterosexuals (Black et al. 2000, Black et al. 2002, Gates & Ost 2004); nonprofit jobs are more urban than for-profit jobs, and their concentration varies by state. The nonprofit workforce is predominantly female (Mirvis & Hackett 1983; Mirvis 1990; Preston 1989, 1990; Onyx & Maclean 1996; Benz 2005); this makes it easier for gay male representation to exceed that of other men than for lesbian representation to exceed that of other women.

Second, gay men may be able to afford working for the nonprofit sector more easily than married men, especially those with children and stay-at-home wives. Though

seemingly in contrast to a popular perception of high-income, childless gay men devoting their time and money to leisure activities and living in expensive, “high-amenity” cities (Black et al., 2002), both hypotheses suggest that gay men can better afford what most people want. Nonprofit employees generally find their work more meaningful and personally rewarding than do workers in the for-profit or government sectors (Mirvis & Hackett 1983, Mirvis 1990, Light 2002). Indeed, Benz (2005) finds strong evidence that workers in the nonprofit sector have higher job satisfaction than similar individuals with comparable pay and benefits in the for-profit sector. As helping others or benefitting society appears to increase job satisfaction even for those who do not prioritize helping others in choosing a job (Lewis & Frank 2002), this opportunity may compensate for the lower pay typically expected in the nonprofit sector (Preston 1989, 1990).¹ Childless men with partners earning male salaries can better afford intrinsically rewarding, but poorly paid work than those who must support families. As lesbians are more likely than gay men to have children, and less likely than wives to have a male income in the household; this suggests that lesbians should be less likely than gay men and married women to work for NPOs.

Third, gay men may choose occupations that are concentrated in the nonprofit sector. Preston (1990) attributes much of women’s higher propensity to work in the sector to the concentration of “traditionally female” occupations in NPOs. Leete (2000, 440) notes that the average man in the nonprofit sector works in an occupation that is 79% female, while the average man in the for-profit sector works in an occupation that is only 41% female. Thus, the nonprofit sector may naturally attract gay men, who, like lesbians, are more likely than heterosexuals to choose occupations that violate gender norms (Badgett, 2001; Blandford, 2003). Gay men’s occupational choices may encourage nonprofit employment, while lesbians’ may discourage it.

Fourth, NPOs may discriminate against LGBs less than for-profit firms do. Preston (1990) attributes much of women’s concentration in the nonprofit sector to smaller gender pay disparities – the cost to working in the sector is lower for women than men. Arguing that pay equity is even more important in organizations that rely on

¹ More recent research, however, suggests that the pay disadvantage to working for the nonprofit sector is disappearing (Leete 2001, Ruhm & Borkowski 2003).

intrinsically motivated workers, Leete (2000) finds much lower variation in pay in NPOs than in for-profit firms, especially at managerial and professional levels, and much lower pay disadvantages for women and minority men. No one has examined whether pay disparities between gay and straight people is smaller in the nonprofit sector, but several studies of earnings disparities in the general economy find that gay men earn 15% to 30% less than comparably educated and experienced male heterosexuals, though lesbians may earn more than comparable straight women (Badgett, 1995; Klawitter & Flatt, 1998; Allegretto & Arthur, 2001; Clain & Leppel, 2001; Berg & Lien, 2002; Barrett, Pollack & Tilden, 2002; Black et al., 2003; Blandford, 2003; Carpenter, 2004, 2005; Comolli 2004a, 2004b). Experimental research indicates that employers are less likely to offer job interviews to lesbian and gay job applicants (Crow, Fok, & Hartman 1998; Hebl et al. 2002; Weichselbaumer 2003), supporting an attribution of gay men's lower pay to discrimination, though reasons for lesbians' possible pay advantage are not clear.

Fifth, lesbians and gay men might have a special preference for working in the nonprofit sector. Most NPOs have a service orientation, and the opportunity to serve others is a major attraction of work in the sector. Many NPOs rely heavily on volunteer labor, and many nonprofit employees, especially managers and professionals, may donate part of their labor by accepting lower pay than they could command in the for-profit sector (Weisbrod 1983, Preston 1989, but see Goddeeris 1988). Nonprofit employees tend to be more altruistic than those in the for-profit sector (Young 198x, Mirvis & Hackett 1983, Mirvis 1990, Jeavons 1992). A commitment to social change, frequently political or religious, is a major reason people choose to work for NPOs (Onyx & Maclean 1996).

Lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (LGBs), having experienced societal disdain, probably identify with out-groups generally more than do heterosexuals. LGBs are very disproportionately liberal (Lewis, Rogers & Sherrill 2003; Egan 2007). If liberalism and out-group identification predict a public service orientation (Perry & Wise 1990), then LGBs may prefer nonprofit employment. LGBs are strikingly less religious than heterosexuals, however (Lewis, Rogers & Sherrill 2003; Egan 2007), which would make over-representation in the sector less likely, especially as many NPOs are religious in nature and some explicitly discriminate against LGBs. As gay men seem unlikely to be

more political or altruistic than lesbians, however, this argument cannot explain why lesbians would not be more likely than married women to work for NPOs.

Data and Method

The 5 percent Public Use Microsample (PUMS) of the 2000 Census provides detailed information on individuals in a random 5 percent sample of U.S. households. In every household, the person who owns or rents the house or apartment is designated the householder, and all others are identified by their relationships to the householder. The Census lists a wide array of possible relationships (e.g., husband/wife, child, sibling, parent, housemate, boarder), including “unmarried partner.” I divide men and women separately into four categories: living with their spouse, with their different-sex partner, or with their same-sex partner, or never married not living with a partner. To simplify presentation, I drop those who are widowed, divorced, separated, or married but not living with their spouse. To make the data more manageable, I use a random 1.25% sample of married people (that is, a 25% sample of PUMS) in all regression and logit models.

Although the Census provides the best available data on lesbian and gay couples, 3 in 4 gay men and 6 in 10 lesbians do not have partners, and the Census cannot distinguish them from single heterosexuals (Gates and Ost 2004, 13; Black et al. 2000). In addition, one-quarter of same-sex couples may not have classified themselves as unmarried partners on the Census, partly due to concerns about confidentiality or about whether “unmarried partners” appropriately described their relationships (Badgett and Rogers 2003; Gates and Ost 2004, 13). As wealthier and better-educated lesbians and gay men are more likely to be in couples (Carpenter 2003) and are probably more likely to classify themselves as unmarried partners if they are (Badgett and Rogers 2003), members of same-sex couples in the Census are probably unrepresentatively wealthy and well educated, relative to lesbians and gay men generally. Thus, conclusions cannot easily be generalized to all lesbians and gay men.

I restrict the sample to full-time, full-year workers (those who worked at least 40 hours a week for at least 48 weeks during 1999) who were between the ages of 18 and 65. For most analyses, I drop self-employed individuals and government employees to restrict the sample to employees of private for-profit firms or nonprofit organizations.

The Census questionnaire asked individuals where they worked; responses included “a PRIVATE-FOR-PROFIT company or business” and “a PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT, tax-exempt, or charitable organization,” as well as working for the government, for oneself, or for one’s family (without pay). The Census checked responses for consistency based on employer name, location, industry, and occupation (Leete 2001, 145).

I first examine whether members of lesbian and gay couples were more or less likely to work for nonprofit organizations than were married, heterosexually partnered, or never married workers of their same sex. I simply calculate the percentage of each gender-couple type who work in each sector. This analysis relies on the full PUMS 5% sample for full-time workers between 18 and 65 who are in one the four relationship categories. Because the nonprofit workforce is very disproportionately college-educated, I repeat the analysis for college graduates.

To determine whether these differences persist after controlling for a variety of personal characteristics, I run logit analyses with a dummy variable coded 1 for nonprofit employees as the dependent variable.² The independent variables are education measured in years; four dummy variables for bachelor’s, master’s, professional, and doctoral degrees; age and age-squared; five dummy variables for race/ethnicity; one dummy variable for disability; three dummy variables for limited English ability and non-citizen status; 50 dummy variables for state of residence; and 19 dummy variables for the urbanicity of the location. Because many of these variables are expected to have different effects for men and women, I run separate models by gender.

To determine whether those who can “afford” to work for NPOs are more likely to do so, I include two dummy variables for having children under 18 and under 6 in the household, expecting both coefficients to be negative if having children to support makes nonprofit employment less affordable. The model also includes the natural logarithm of the partner’s earnings (coded 0 for those who do not have a partner who is employed) and dummy variables for whether one’s partner works part-time or full-time. These

² I restrict the sample to private for-profit and nonprofit employees and use only 25% of the married people in PUMS.

coefficients should be positive, as a second income, especially a higher one, should make working in the nonprofit sector more affordable.

Examining the impact of occupational distributions on choice of sector proceeds in three steps. First, I confirm that lesbians' and gay men's occupations are more likely than heterosexuals' to violate gender norms. To do this, I calculate an index of dissimilarity (Duncan & Duncan 1955) between men and women of each partner status. The index shows, for instance, what percentage of men with male partners would need to change occupations to have the same occupational distribution as married men. I hypothesize that people with same-sex partners should have occupational distributions more similar to people of the opposite sex than do people of their same sex in any other relationship status.

Second, I estimate to what extent different occupational distributions across gender-couple types can explain differences in the percentages working for NPOs. To calculate percentage of workers from each group who are expected to work for NPOs, I multiply the proportion of the workers in each of 475 detailed occupations who work in each sector times the number of workers of each gender-couple type in each occupation. This yields the number of workers of each type in each occupation who are expected to work in each sector. I sum across occupations for each gender-couple type in each sector, and then calculate the expected percentage of workers of each gender-couple type who should work in the nonprofit sector. To the extent the actual percentages are more similar to these expected percentages than to the percentage of *all* workers who work in the nonprofit sector, occupational distributions are the explanation.

Third, I estimate how much occupational distributions explain nonprofit employment, holding personal characteristics constant. I add 24 dummy variables representing broad occupational categories to the logit analyses for employment in the nonprofit sector. The coefficients on the couple types should shrink as the distribution for each type becomes more similar to that for married people.

To test whether lower levels of anti-gay discrimination explain the over-representation of LGBs in NPOs, I examine whether gay-straight pay differences are smaller in the nonprofit sector. The dependent variable is the natural logarithm of 1999 earnings. I include all the independent variables in the logit models (including the

dummy variables for broad occupational categories), plus the number of weeks worked in 1999 and the natural logarithm of the number of hours worked in a typical week.

Because many variables are expected to have different effects for men and women, I run separate models by gender. Regression coefficients roughly represent proportional changes or differences in earnings. Because these rough approximations overstate negative differences and understate positive ones, I exponentiate all coefficients, subtract 1, and multiply time 100 to generate expected percentage differences in earnings.

One complication of using people with same-sex partners as proxies for lesbians and gay men is deciding the appropriate comparison group. An extensive empirical literature shows that husbands make substantially more than unmarried men, even men who are living with female partners. Economists have proposed two major explanations that could justify that pattern even in the absence of discrimination. First, marriage may make men more productive. Becker (1991) theorizes that economically rational wives tend to specialize in home production (e.g., cooking, cleaning, raising children), allowing their husbands to specialize in market labor, which increases their productivity relative to single men, who must devote more effort to home production. More generally, marriage and children may force men to settle down and take their careers more seriously, and wives may contribute more directly to their husbands' careers. Men in unmarried heterosexual couples might not get the same productivity advantages that husbands do, as the absence of a long-term commitment may make their partners less willing to specialize in home production. This problem could be more severe for men in same-sex couples, as neither partner will have the sex role socialization to make him willing to specialize in home production. To test this argument, I run separate regression on a sample restricted to men whose wives or partners have full-time jobs, which would seem to rule out home specialization by the partner.

Second, more productive men may be more likely to marry. In choosing mates, women may consider characteristics that economists would ideally include in their earnings models; omission of these unmeasured advantages could lead to the "unexplained" pay differences. Married men's pay advantage is still legitimate; they are more productive than unmarried men, but they would have been more productive even if they had remained single. Selection effects might explain why men in unmarried

heterosexual couples earn less than apparently comparable husbands: a willingness to make formal long-term commitments might be one of the unmeasured characteristics that both wives and employers value. These selection effects seem less likely to explain why coupled gay men earn less, however, unless gay men almost universally lack those unmeasured productivity characteristics. Though different factors might attract wives than male partners, the marriage rate for male heterosexuals is much higher than is the coupling rate for gay men, suggesting that marriage is a less selective status than gay male coupling and that men in same-sex couples should be especially high on these unmeasured productivity characteristics.

A robust research literature offers conflicting evidence (e.g., Korenmann & Neumark 1991, Loh 1996, Cornwell & Rupert 1997, Gray 1997, Ginther & Zavodny 2001, Stratton 2002, Antonovics & Town 2004, Krashnisky 2004), leaving open the possibility that employers discriminate in favor of husbands, feeling that they deserve more pay due to their needs or their fulfillment of societal expectations.

Findings

The nonprofit sector employed about 5.9% of the full-time workforce in 1999. In line with previous research, the sector is disproportionately female, employing 9.4% of the women in the full-time workforce and only 3.7% of the men (Table 1). Employees of nonprofit organizations tend to be well-educated: the sector employs 10.6% of the college-educated workforce, including 15.4% of the women and 7.7% of the men.

The nonprofit sector also employs a disproportionately gay and lesbian workforce. Men with male partners were nearly twice as likely to work for nonprofit organizations as other men both overall (7.2% *versus* 3.8%), and among college graduates (12.0% *versus* 7.7%). Patterns are much weaker for women, but among female college graduates 17.0% of those with female partners worked for NPOs, compared to only 15.3% of other women.

To what extent can these differences be explained by individual characteristics? Table 2 reports the logit coefficient on the dummy variable *Has Same-Sex Partner*. All models include the other dummy variables for relationship status (*Has Different-Sex Partner*, *Never Married*, *Never Married (in 30s)*, *Never Married (in 40s)*, *Never Married (50+)*), with the currently married as the reference group. Because of the

Table 1. Distribution of Full-Time Workers, by Sector & Couple Type

	Same-Sex Partner	Married People	Different Sex Partner	Never Married	Total
Men					
Nonprofit organization	7.18	3.94	2.52	3.61	3.82
Private firm	69.36	67.89	78.53	79.89	70.71
Local government	5.00	6.01	4.57	4.39	5.62
State government	4.12	3.90	2.75	2.89	3.65
Federal government	3.66	4.78	2.69	3.08	4.34
Self-employed (uninc.)	6.41	7.79	6.03	4.24	7.03
Self-employed (inc.)	4.27	5.68	2.91	1.91	4.82
Sample size	16,487	1,689,554	133,941	407,466	2,247,448
Women					
Nonprofit organization	9.72	9.77	7.17	9.29	9.47
Private firm	63.92	65.27	76.80	72.29	67.65
Local government	7.29	7.67	4.90	6.27	7.15
State government	6.27	6.11	4.13	5.34	5.80
Federal government	3.86	3.74	2.87	3.68	3.67
Self-employed (uninc.)	5.59	4.89	2.95	2.32	4.20
Self-employed (inc.)	3.34	2.54	1.18	0.81	2.08
Sample size	16,291	889,499	98,309	276,374	1,280,473
College Graduates					
Men					
Nonprofit organization	12.00	7.81	5.88	7.52	7.74
Private firm	58.66	58.72	66.60	68.49	60.54
Local government	6.02	6.35	6.19	5.93	6.27
State government	6.52	6.41	5.56	5.84	6.29
Federal government	4.27	5.77	4.12	4.72	5.53
Self-employed (uninc.)	6.93	7.19	6.49	4.60	6.75
Self-employed (inc.)	5.60	7.76	5.16	2.90	6.88
Sample size	6,016	509,572	22,406	101,121	639,115
Women					
Nonprofit organization	16.98	15.57	13.24	15.02	15.33
Private firm	47.47	49.92	62.22	59.16	52.89
Local government	10.50	12.96	8.33	9.22	11.72
State government	10.66	10.45	7.70	8.62	9.84
Federal government	3.89	4.01	3.38	4.32	4.05
Self-employed (uninc.)	6.37	4.19	3.28	2.50	3.75
Self-employed (inc.)	4.13	2.91	1.84	1.15	2.43
Sample size	6,012	247,436	20,361	92,056	365,865

Table 2. Logit Models for Employment in the Nonprofit Sector

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9
All Men									
Same Sex	0.660** (20.81)	0.591** (17.98)	0.547** (16.48)	0.549** (16.43)	0.536** (16.02)	0.495** (14.51)	0.318** (8.40)	0.356** (9.26)	0.323** (8.56)
Different Sex	-0.373** (18.81)	-0.155** (7.62)	-0.174** (8.52)	-0.191** (9.30)	-0.226** (10.97)	-0.257** (12.15)	-0.163** (7.08)	-0.139** (5.93)	-0.153** (6.60)
Never Married	0.055* (2.22)	0.049* (1.99)	0.035 (1.41)	0.023 (0.92)	0.004 (0.16)	0.206** (6.54)	0.206** (5.89)	0.259** (7.14)	0.229** (6.46)
Never Married (in 30s)	0.071** (2.77)	0.048 (1.89)	0.038 (1.49)	0.042 (1.64)	0.038 (1.47)	0.036 (1.39)	0.039 (1.38)	-0.004 (0.14)	0.020 (0.71)
Never Married (in 40s)	0.079* (2.43)	0.208** (6.31)	0.193** (5.86)	0.197** (5.97)	0.185** (5.59)	0.180** (5.37)	0.110** (2.96)	0.050 (1.29)	0.085* (2.24)
Never Married (50+)	0.376** (10.14)	0.443** (11.67)	0.425** (11.18)	0.423** (11.11)	0.415** (10.87)	0.403** (10.34)	0.209** (4.65)	0.078 (1.53)	0.153** (3.26)
Male College Graduates									
Same Sex	0.509** (11.97)	0.522** (11.98)	0.538** (12.13)	0.547** (12.25)	0.521** (11.63)	0.486** (10.53)	0.403** (7.62)	0.398** (7.47)	0.406** (7.67)
Different Sex	-0.262** (8.25)	-0.201** (6.23)	-0.196** (6.05)	-0.196** (6.00)	-0.227** (6.91)	-0.273** (8.00)	-0.161** (4.13)	-0.161** (4.14)	-0.161** (4.12)
Never Married	-0.145** (4.13)	-0.074* (2.09)	-0.055 (1.54)	-0.056 (1.57)	-0.069 (1.94)	0.249** (5.48)	0.343** (6.46)	0.323** (5.17)	0.372** (6.75)
Never Married (in 30s)	0.110** (3.12)	0.042 (1.18)	0.039 (1.09)	0.043 (1.21)	0.040 (1.13)	0.041 (1.14)	0.040 (0.96)	0.044 (1.04)	0.034 (0.82)
Never Married (in 40s)	0.347** (7.48)	0.358** (7.60)	0.339** (7.16)	0.339** (7.15)	0.327** (6.87)	0.322** (6.63)	0.159** (2.79)	0.168** (2.84)	0.147* (2.55)
Never Married (50+)	0.684** (13.35)	0.678** (12.93)	0.649** (12.31)	0.641** (12.11)	0.636** (12.00)	0.613** (11.27)	0.354** (5.30)	0.371** (5.12)	0.330** (4.86)

Why Do So Many Gay Men Work for Nonprofit Organizations?

All Women

Same Sex	0.073** (2.60)	-0.073* (2.51)	-0.072* (2.48)	-0.071* (2.41)	-0.100** (3.41)	-0.099** (3.37)	0.057 (1.76)	0.114** (3.10)	0.070* (2.14)
Different Sex	-0.290** (19.33)	-0.212** (13.82)	-0.210** (13.64)	-0.230** (14.85)	-0.254** (16.35)	-0.247** (15.70)	-0.175** (10.46)	-0.177** (10.58)	-0.176** (10.52)
Never Married	0.071** (3.77)	-0.029 (1.53)	-0.013 (0.71)	-0.018 (0.95)	-0.043* (2.26)	-0.014 (0.48)	0.020 (0.64)	0.013 (0.41)	0.018 (0.58)
Never Married (in 30s)	0.010 (0.51)	-0.023 (1.15)	-0.029 (1.43)	-0.021 (1.04)	-0.032 (1.55)	-0.017 (0.83)	0.037 (1.68)	0.055* (2.45)	0.046* (2.07)
Never Married (in 40s)	0.065** (2.60)	0.065** (2.59)	0.055* (2.20)	0.055* (2.18)	0.042 (1.66)	0.064* (2.52)	0.092** (3.37)	0.107** (3.86)	0.099** (3.61)
Never Married (50+)	0.259** (8.78)	0.175** (5.78)	0.168** (5.53)	0.157** (5.14)	0.153** (5.00)	0.167** (5.37)	0.140** (4.18)	0.165** (4.81)	0.152** (4.50)
College Graduates									
Same Sex	0.167** (4.31)	0.098* (2.48)	0.097* (2.45)	0.097* (2.43)	0.054 (1.34)	0.066 (1.63)	0.145** (3.22)	0.157** (3.33)	0.150** (3.31)
Different Sex	-0.215** (8.49)	-0.212** (8.31)	-0.195** (7.58)	-0.197** (7.57)	-0.229** (8.77)	-0.219** (8.16)	-0.154** (5.23)	-0.162** (5.25)	-0.159** (5.30)
Never Married	-0.093** (3.39)	-0.091** (3.31)	-0.049 (1.74)	-0.048 (1.70)	-0.063* (2.22)	0.036 (0.73)	0.088 (1.61)	0.075 (1.32)	0.080 (1.46)
Never Married (in 30s)	0.031 (1.07)	-0.004 (0.12)	-0.012 (0.43)	-0.007 (0.24)	-0.016 (0.54)	0.016 (0.53)	0.073* (2.24)	0.078* (2.35)	0.076* (2.32)
Never Married (in 40s)	0.155** (4.18)	0.139** (3.71)	0.114** (3.04)	0.103** (2.73)	0.088* (2.31)	0.132** (3.44)	0.149** (3.50)	0.154** (3.59)	0.152** (3.56)
Never Married (50+)	0.331** (7.36)	0.254** (5.57)	0.234** (5.08)	0.205** (4.41)	0.196** (4.22)	0.229** (4.83)	0.254** (4.81)	0.263** (4.88)	0.259** (4.88)
Age	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Education	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Urbanicity	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Race/citizenship	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Affordability	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Occupation	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pay differences	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

distinct dummy variables for having never married at different ages, all models also include age and age-squared. I then add the control variables in sets to see how the *Has Same-Sex Partner* coefficient changes.

In Model 1 for All Men, the *Has Same-Sex Partner* coefficient of .660 implies that if a married man had a 5.5% probability of working for an NPO (the actual percentage for the data set), a man of the same age with a male partner would have a probability 4.6 percentage points higher (10.1%). Gay men's higher educational levels explain about one-seventh of their higher probability of working for NPOs: adding education (Model 2) drops the coefficient to .591, implying a difference of 4.0 rather than 4.6 percentage points. Gay men's stronger tendency to live in urban areas explains another 0.4 percentage point: adding the urbanicity of the area in which one lives (Model 3) drops the coefficient to .547. Gay men are not especially likely to live in states with high concentrations of nonprofit jobs; adding the state dummy variables (Model 4) trivially increases the coefficient. Model 5 indicates that black, Latino, and mixed race men are more likely than comparable white men to work for NPOs, while Asian men are less likely to do so. As men with male partners are more likely than married men to be black, Latino, and mixed race, and less likely to be Asian, controlling for these variables shrinks the coefficient slightly (from .549 to .536).

Model 6 provides weak evidence that people who can "afford" to work for NPOs are more likely to do so. Having a partner who is employed increases the odds one will work for an NPO, whether he or she work part or full time. Neither the partner's earnings nor having children has a significant impact on sector of employment, however. As gay men are 10 percentage points more likely than married men to have a partner who works, controlling these variables shrinks the coefficient by a small amount (from .536 to .495).

Patterns are reasonably similar for male college graduates (Panel 2). About 13% of married men with college degrees work for NPOs. With that as the base, the coefficient of .509 in Model 1 indicates that men of the same age with male partners are about 6.9 percentage points more likely to work for NPOs. Controlling for education, urbanicity, and state of residence actually increases the coefficient a bit, so differences on these variables do not help us understand why gay men are more likely to work for

NPOs. Race/ethnicity difference and especially gay men's higher probability of having an employed partner do help explain the difference, but the coefficient is only trivially smaller with all these variables controlled than with only age controlled (.486 in Model 6 *versus* .509 in Model 1). If a married man with a college degree has a 13% probability of working for an NPO, the probability for a man with a male partner is still 6.5 percentage points higher, even if they are the same race/ethnicity and level of education, live in the same city, and both have working spouses.

Among women generally (Panel 3), those in same-sex couples are slightly more likely than married women of the same age to work for NPOs (Model 1), but they are slightly less likely to do so if they are also equally educated (Model 2). That is, lesbians' higher educational levels more than explain their higher propensity to work for NPOs. Neither difference is particularly meaningful, however. About 13% of married women work for NPOs; using that as the base, the difference is only 0.8 percentage points in either direction. Locational and "affordability" differences do not shift the coefficient at all. Controlling race/ethnicity differences as well, lesbians appear about 1 percentage point *less* likely than married women to work for NPOs.

Among college graduates (Panel 4), the gross difference is a bit larger. About 25.5% of married women with college degrees work for NPOs; a woman of the same age with a female partner is predicted to have a probability that is 3.3 percentage points higher. Educational differences explain nearly half that difference, however, and the remaining controls (especially race/ethnicity) shrink the coefficient to insignificance (Models 5 and 6).

Occupations

Lesbians' and gay men's occupational choices are more likely than heterosexuals' to violate gender norms (Table 3). The first column shows the index of dissimilarity between the occupational distribution of men with male partners and those of all other groups. For instance, 27.0% of men with male partners would need to change occupations to match the distribution of married men, and 36.4% would need to change to have the same occupational distribution as married women. The three categories of predominantly heterosexual women (those who are married, have male partners, or have never married) have very similar occupational distributions: indices of dissimilarity range

only between 10.0 and 15.1. The pattern is similar, though a little weaker, for heterosexual men: their indices range between 15.2 and 22.9. Occupational segregation is stronger between heterosexual men and women: the indices range from 45.3 to 55.8.

Table 3. Occupational Segregation by Sex and Couple Type

	Male Partner	Men with Wife	Female Partner	Never Married	Female Partner	Women with Husband	Male Partner
Men with							
Wife	27.0						
Female Partner	33.6	19.0					
Never Married	27.4	22.9	15.2				
Women with							
Female Partner	17.2	32.2	37.1	31.8			
Husband	36.1	53.3	55.8	49.8	27.7		
Male Partner	34.1	51.6	51.7	45.3	28.1	15.1	
Never Married	34.6	52.7	54.2	46.5	26.5	14.0	10.0
College Graduates Only							
Men with							
Wife	21.6						
Female Partner	20.5	15.7					
Never Married	21.1	16.2	9.2				
Women with							
Female Partner	20.9	31.6	30.0	28.7			
Husband	29.4	40.8	40.7	36.9	23.4		
Male Partner	24.0	37.5	34.0	31.6	20.3	16.2	
Never Married	27.4	40.4	38.4	34.9	20.6	10.2	9.6

As hypothesized, men with male partners have occupational patterns that differ from other male groups (indices between 27.0 and 33.6) more than those groups differ among themselves (15.2 to 22.9). Their indices with heterosexual women (34.1 to 36.1) are 10 to 20 points lower than are those for other male groups. Indeed, men with male partners have an occupational distribution that is most similar to that of women with female partners (17.0). The occupational distribution for women with female partners is most similar to that of gay men, differs more from other women than they differ among themselves, and differs less from heterosexual men than other women's do.

As Preston (1990) and Leete (2000) have shown, the nonprofit sector employs more people in traditionally female occupations. In Table 4, the first column shows the actual percentage of each group who work for NPOs, and the second shows the

“expected” percentage, based on that group’s occupation is chosen. Based simply on where occupations are located, we would expect about 8% of the women and 4% of the men to work for NPOs.

Table 4. Observed and Expected Nonprofit Employment, by Sex and Couple Type

	Actual	Expected	Difference	<u>College Graduates Only</u>		
				Actual	Expected	Difference
Men with						
Male Partner	7.2	6.0	1.2	12.0	10.0	2.0
Wife	3.9	4.3	-0.4	7.8	8.7	-0.9
Female Partner	2.5	3.0	-0.5	5.9	6.8	-0.9
Never Married	3.6	3.8	-0.2	7.5	7.8	-0.3
Women with						
Female Partner	9.7	7.9	1.8	17.0	13.6	3.4
Husband	9.8	9.0	0.8	15.6	14.2	1.4
Male Partner	7.2	7.3	-0.1	13.2	12.1	1.1
Never Married	9.3	8.4	0.9	15.0	12.9	2.1

Occupational choice helps explain why gay men are more likely than other men to work for NPOs and why lesbians are not more likely than other women to do so. Based on their occupational distributions, we would expect 6.0% of men with male partners and only 4.3% of married men to work for NPOs, a predicted difference of 1.7 percentage points. Women with female partners, on the other hand, have an occupational distribution that predicts they will be 1.1 percentage points less likely than married women to work for NPOs (7.9% *versus* 9.0%).

Overall, women are more likely to work for NPOs than their occupations would predict, and men are less likely to do so. Relative to those expected percentages, people in same-sex couples are more likely to work for NPOs than heterosexuals of their same sex. Women with female partners are 1.8 percentage points more likely to work for NPOs than their occupations would predict, and men with male partners are 1.2 percentage points more likely than expected to do so. The pattern is even stronger among college graduates. Female college graduates with female partners are 3.4 percentage

points, and male college graduates with male partners are 2.0 percentage points, more likely than predicted by their occupations to work in the nonprofit sector.

Occupational choice helps explain why gay men are more likely than other men to work for NPOs and why lesbians are not more likely than other women to do so. Based on their occupational distributions, we would expect 6.0% of men with male partners and only 4.3% of married men to work for NPOs, a predicted difference of 1.7 percentage points. Women with female partners, on the other hand, have an occupational distribution that predicts they will be 1.1 percentage points less likely than married women to work for NPOs (7.9% *versus* 9.0%).

Overall, women are more likely to work for NPOs than their occupations would predict, and men are less likely to do so. Relative to those expected percentages, people in same-sex couples are more likely to work for NPOs than heterosexuals of their same sex. Women with female partners are 1.8 percentage points more likely to work for NPOs than their occupations would predict, and men with male partners are 1.2 percentage points more likely than expected to do so. The pattern is even stronger among college graduates. Female college graduates with female partners are 3.4 percentage points, and male college graduates with male partners are 2.0 percentage points, more likely than predicted by their occupations to work in the nonprofit sector.

Model 7 in Table 2 confirms that occupational choice helps explain why gay men are more likely than comparable married men to work for NPOs. Adding 18 broad occupational categories to the logit models for nonprofit employment, lowers the *Has Same-Sex Partner* coefficient from .495 to .318 for all men and from .486 to .403 for male college graduates. Gay men's occupational choices lower the unexplained sectoral difference from married men from 3.2 to 1.9 percentage points for men overall and from 6.5 to 5.3 percentage points for male college graduates. The occupational choices of women with female partners, on the other hand, predict that they will be less likely than other women to work for NPOs; controlling for occupations flips the sign of the *Has Same-Sex Partner* coefficient for women generally (from a significant -.099 to an insignificant +.057) and doubles the coefficient for college graduates (from an insignificant .066 to a clearly significant .145).

Pay Differences

The nonprofit sector appears to discriminate against gay men less than the for-profit sector does. Men with same-sex partners earn about 10.7% less in the nonprofit sector (and 13.6% less in the for-profit sector) than married men of the same race, age, and level of education, living in comparably urban areas of the same state and working in the same broad occupational category. Men with male and female partners earn about the same amounts within each sector. Never-married men in their 20s earn about 19% less than comparable married men in the nonprofit sector, with the gap growing by about 7% with each decade of age. In the for-profit sector, the pay penalty for not marrying is larger in the 20s (about 23%), but grows more slowly with age.

Among male college graduates in the nonprofit sector, the pay disadvantage to having a male or female partner rather than a wife is about the same as for men generally, but the penalties for not marrying are greater and appear to grow faster with age. Again, men with male partners do even worse relative to comparable married men in the for-profit sector, though men with female partners do not. The penalty to still not being married in one's 20s is even higher in for-profit firms, but does not grow quite as quickly with age as in NPOs.

The hypothesis that married men earn more because marriage allows them to specialize in market production while their wives specialize in home production (Becker 1991) does not explain the pay differences between men with male partners and married men. When I restrict the sample to men whose wives or partners work full time (not shown), married men still earn 10% more than comparable partnered gay men.

Pay varies much less with couple status for women. Among college graduates in the nonprofit sector, for instance, no group's expected pay differs significantly from that of comparable married women. In the for-profit sector, however, women with female partners earn significantly more than comparable wives, by 10.7% overall and by 5.1% among college graduates. Never-married women also pay a penalty relative to wives, but it is much smaller than for men and tends to shrink rather than grow with age.

Given that men with male partners lag only 2 to 3 percentage points further behind married men in for-profit firms than in NPOs and that women with female partners get a larger pay advantage from for-profit employment, incorporating expected

pay differences between the sectors does not provide much help in explaining why gay men and lesbians are more likely to work for NPOs. Models 8 and 9 in Table 2 incorporate expected pay differences calculated in two different ways. Model 8 uses differences in the expected pay predicted for each individual by the regression models in Table 5. Model 9 calculates expected differences based on four regression models, one each for gay and straight workers in the for-profit and nonprofit sectors. The *Has Same-Sex Partner* coefficients do not change meaningfully for men and rise slightly for women.

Because lesbians and gay men are more likely to work for NPOs than comparable heterosexuals, even after controlling for personal characteristics, occupations, and pay expectations, a preference for the sector seems likely. Their much stronger liberalism, their perhaps stronger identification with the downtrodden and gay men's affinity for the arts (Lewis & Seaman 2004) may be contributing. Among nonprofit sector employees, both gay men and lesbian than married people of the same sex to work for civic, social, and advocacy organizations (Table 6). Gay men are markedly more likely than married men to work for hospitals, nursing care facilities, individual and family services, and residential care. Partnered gay men are also three times as likely as married men to work for museums and art galleries. Because lesbians and gay men are markedly less religious than heterosexuals, it is not surprising that gay men are only one-third as likely as husbands to work for religious organizations and that lesbians are only two-thirds as likely as wives to do so.

Table 5. Regressions for Natural Logarithm of Salary, by Sex and Sector

	Men		Women	
	Nonprofit	For-Profit	Nonprofit	For-Profit
Same Sex	0.893** (7.29)	0.864** (30.82)	1.015 (1.43)	1.107** (22.01)
Different Sex	0.888** (11.60)	0.868** (73.16)	0.973** (4.64)	0.969** (14.66)
Never Married	0.810** (14.08)	0.772** (88.06)	0.959** (3.89)	0.951** (12.37)
Never Married, in 30s	0.929** (5.55)	0.967** (12.38)	1.001 (0.12)	1.020** (6.19)
Never Married, in 40s	0.872** -8.7	0.925** -21.94	1.021* -2.21	1.050** -12.47
Never Married, 50+	0.804** (12.04)	0.906** (20.03)	1.024* (2.14)	1.059** (10.83)
Observations	36,083	729,265	55,929	431,387
R-squared	0.44	0.45	0.45	0.43
College Graduates Only				
Same Sex	0.890** (5.47)	0.868** (13.96)	0.999 (0.04)	1.051** (5.12)
Different Sex	0.894** (6.66)	0.893** (19.80)	0.983 (1.77)	0.949** (9.47)
Never Married	0.786** (10.53)	0.713** (42.28)	0.967 (1.90)	0.917** (8.04)
Never Married, in 30s	0.931** (3.40)	0.941** (8.21)	0.994 (0.51)	1.001 (0.09)
Never Married, in 40s	0.828** (7.86)	0.857** (16.64)	0.985 (1.10)	1.003 (0.37)
Never Married, 50+	0.741** (11.63)	0.808** (17.49)	0.998 (0.11)	1.038** (2.97)
Observations	19,735	162,190	27,113	100,788
R-squared	0.41	0.33	0.37	0.33

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Coefficients have been exponentiated. Models also include 8 dummy variables for race/ethnicity, limited English, and citizenship status; education in years plus 4 dummy variables for degrees; 18 dummy variables for broad occupational category. dummy variables for children and working partners; the natural logarithm of partner's earnings; 90 dummy variables for length of potential previous experience; 50 dummy variables for state; and 20 dummy variables for urban/MSA location.

Table 6. Organizations that Employ Nonprofit Workers

	Men with				Women with			
	Male Partner	Wife	Female Partner	Never Married	Female Partner	Husband	Male Partner	Never Married
Hospitals	20.68	17.33	17.31	15.63	24.68	28.48	25.70	26.19
Colleges and universities	10.65	10.00	8.78	9.27	8.57	5.88	4.81	5.48
Civic, social, and advocacy organizations	9.58	5.64	9.26	7.86	10.01	6.54	10.03	8.96
Religious organizations	6.69	21.32	3.64	11.45	4.49	7.06	1.66	5.85
Elementary and secondary schools	5.10	8.79	6.09	6.85	7.36	13.65	5.97	8.20
Business and professional organizations	3.80	2.35	2.63	2.52	2.13	2.15	2.62	2.37
Nursing care facilities	2.81	1.34	2.42	1.75	3.74	4.27	6.25	4.96
Individual and family services	2.66	1.75	3.62	2.78	5.29	2.98	4.31	4.21
Insurance carriers	2.59	1.33	1.20	1.13	1.44	1.69	1.89	1.59
Museums and art galleries	2.43	0.70	1.28	1.14	0.75	0.67	1.05	0.87
Residential care	2.05	1.33	2.66	2.09	2.53	1.77	2.93	2.69

Discussion

Men with same-sex partners are much more likely than other men to work in the nonprofit sector, while women with same-sex partners are slightly more likely than other women to do so. These patterns are particularly strong among college-educated workers. Gay men's higher educational levels, greater concentration in occupations that are disproportionately represented in the nonprofit sector, and larger probability of having an employed partner (making nonprofit employment more "affordable") explain about half the difference. Still, even with comparable characteristics and working in the same occupations, men with same-sex partners are one-third more likely than married men to work for NPOs. Only lesbians' higher educational levels explain much of their higher propensity to work for NPOs. Because lesbians are more likely than other women to work in more traditionally male occupations, which are more concentrated in the for-profit sector, women with same-sex partners are more likely than other women to work in the nonprofit sector *despite* their occupational choices rather than because of them.

Although the Supreme Court has freed at least some nonprofit organizations from obeying state laws prohibiting anti-gay discrimination and although the Bush Administration has argued that faith-based NPOs are clearly free to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation even if they receive federal funds, NPOs would be wise to consider the costs of such discrimination in attracting a qualified workforce.

References

- Allegretto, Sylvia A., and Michelle M. Arthur. 2001. "An Empirical Analysis of Homosexual/Heterosexual Male Earnings Differentials: Unmarried and Unequal?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 54(3): 631-46.
- Antonovics, Kate, and Robert Town. 2004. "Are All the Good Men Married? Uncovering the Sources of the Marital Wage Premium." *American Economic Review* 94(2): 317-21.
- Badgett, M.V. Lee. 1995. "The Wage Effects of Sexual Orientation Discrimination." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48:726-39.
- Badgett, M.V. Lee. 2001. *Money, Myths, and Change : The Economic Lives of Lesbians and Gay Men*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- Badgett, M.V. Lee, and Marc A. Rogers. 2003. *Left Out of the Count: Missing Same-sex Couples in Census 2000*. Amherst, Mass.: Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies.
- Barrett, Donald C., Lance M. Pollack, and Mary L. Tilden. 2002. "Teenage Sexual Orientation, Adult Openness, and Status Attainment in Gay Males." *Sociological Perspectives* 45(2):163-82.
- Becker, Gary S. 1991. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Benz, Matthias. 2005. "Not for the Profit, but for the Satisfaction? – Evidence on Worker Well-Being in Non-Profit Firms," *Kyklos* 58:155-76.
- Berg, Nathan, and Donald Lien. 2002. "Measuring the Effect of Sexual Orientation on Income: Evidence of Discrimination?" *Contemporary Economic Policy* 20: 394-414.
- Black, Dan A., Gary Gates, Lowell J. Taylor, and Seth G. Sanders. 2000. "Demographics of the Gay and Lesbian Population in the United States: Evidence from Available Systematic Data Sources," *Demography*, 37:139-54.
- Black, Dan A., Gary Gates, Lowell J. Taylor, and Seth G. Sanders. 2002. "Why Do Gay Men Live in San Francisco?" *Journal of Urban Economics*. 51:54-76.

- Black, Dan A., Hoda R. Makar, Lowell J. Taylor, and Seth G. Sanders. 2003. "The Effects of Sexual Orientation on Earnings," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 56: 449-69.
- Blandford, John M. 2003. "The Nexus of Sexual Orientation and Gender in the Determination of Earnings," *Industrial & Labor Relations Review* 56: 622-42.
- Borjas, George J., H.E. Frech III, and Paul B. Ginsburg. 1983. "Property Rights and Wages: The Case of Nursing Homes," *Journal of Human Resources* 18:231-46.
- Carpenter, Christopher. 2003. "Sexual Orientation and Body Weight: Evidence from Multiple Surveys." *Gender Issues* 21(3): 60-74.
- Carpenter, Christopher. 2004. "New Evidence on Gay and Lesbian Household Incomes." *Contemporary Economic Policy* 22(1): 78-94.
- Carpenter, Christopher. 2005. "Self-Reported Sexual Orientation and Earnings: Evidence from California." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 58(2): 258-73.
- Clain, Suzanne Heller, and Karen Leppel. 2001. "An Investigation into Sexual Orientation Discrimination as an Explanation for Wage Differences." *Applied Economics* 33(1): 37-47.
- Comolli, Renzo. 2004a. "Earnings Differentials with Endogenous Disclosure of Sexual Orientation." Unpublished manuscript.
- Comolli, Renzo. 2004b. "Gays, Lesbians and Bisexuals' Wage Differentials in the U.S." Unpublished manuscript.
- Cornwell, Christopher, and Peter Rupert. 1997. "Unobservable Individual Effects, Marriage and the Earnings of Young Men." *Economic Inquiry* 21(2): 285-94.
- Crow, Stephen M., Lillian Y. Fok, and Sandra J. Hartman. 1998. "Who Is at Greatest Risk of Work-Related Discrimination – Women, Blacks, or Homosexuals?" *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 11(1): 15-26.
- Dudley, Otis Dudley, and Beverly Duncan. 1955. "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indexes." *American Sociological Review* 20(2): 210-217.
- Egan, Patrick J. 2008. "Explaining the Distinctiveness of Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals in American Politics." Southern Political Science Association, New Orleans, January 12.

- Gates, Gary J., and Jason Ost. 2004. *The Gay and Lesbian Atlas*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Ginther, Donna K., and Madeline Zavodny. 2001. "Is the Marriage Premium Due to Selection? The Effects of Shotgun Weddings on the Return to Marriage." *Journal of Population Economics* 14(2): 313-328.
- Goddeeris, John H. 1988. "Compensating Differentials and Self-Selection: An Application to Lawyers," *The Journal of Political Economy* 96(2):411-28.
- Gray, Jeffrey. 1997. "The Fall in Men's Return to Marriage: Declining Productivity Effects or Changing Selection?" *Journal of Human Resources* 32(3): 481-504.
- Hebl, Michelle R., Jessica Bigazzi Foster, Laura M. Mannix, and John F. Dovidio. 2002. "Formal and Interpersonal Discrimination: A Field Study of Bias toward Homosexual Applicants," *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28:815-25.
- Jeavons, Thomas H. (1992) "When the Management is the Message: Relating Values to Management Practice in Nonprofit Organizations," *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 2(4): 403-417.
- Klawitter, Marieka M. and Victor Flatt. 1998. "The Effects of State and Local Antidiscrimination Policies for Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17:658-86.
- Korenmann, Sanders, and David Neumark. 1991. "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?" *Journal of Human Resources* 26(2): 282-307.
- Krashnisky, Harry A. 2004. "Do Marital Status and Computer Usage Really Change the Wage Structure?" *Journal of Human Resources* 39(3):774-91.
- Leete, Laura. 2001. "Whither the Nonprofit Wage Differential? Estimates from the 1990 Census." *Journal of Labor Economics* 19(1):136-70.
- Leete, Laura. 2000. "Wage Equity and Employee Motivation in Nonprofit and For-Profit Organizations." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 43: 423-46.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Bruce A. Seaman. 2004. "Sexual Orientation and Demand for the Arts," *Social Science Quarterly*, 85 (3): 523-38.
- Lewis, Gregory B., and Sue A. Frank. 2002. "Who Wants to Work for the Government?" *Public Administration Review*, 62(4): 395-404.

- Lewis, Gregory B., Marc A. Rogers, and Kenneth Sherrill. 2003. "Sexual Identity, Sexual Behavior, and Group Socialization: Does Gay Sex Turn People into Liberal Democrats?," American Association for Public Opinion Research, Nashville, May.
- Loh, Eng Seng. 1996. "Productivity Differences and the Marriage Wage Premium for White Males." *Journal of Human Resources* 31(3): 568-89.
- Light, Paul C. 2002. *Pathways to Nonprofit Excellence*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Mirvis, Philip H., and Edward J. Hackett. 1983. "Work and Work Force Characteristics in the Nonprofit Sector." *Monthly Labor Review* 106:3-12.
- Mirvis, Philip H. 1992. "The Quality of Employment in the Nonprofit Sector: An Update on Employee Attitudes in Nonprofits versus Business and Government." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 3(1): 23-41.
- Onyx, Jenny, and Madi Maclean. 1996. "Careers in the Third Sector." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 6(4): 331-45.
- Perry, James L. and Lois R. Wise. 1990. The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review* 50(3):367-373.
- Preston, Anne E. 1989. "The Nonprofit Worker in a For-Profit World." *Journal of Labor Economics* 7(4):438-63.
- Preston, Anne E. 1990. "Women in the White-Collar Nonprofit Sector: The Best Option or The Only Option?" *Review of Economics and Statistics* 72: 560-68.
- Ruhm, Christopher J., and Carey Borkowski. 2003. "Compensation in the Nonprofit Sector." *The Journal of Human Resources* 38(4):992-1021.
- Stratton, Leslie. 2002. "Examining the Wage Differential for Married and Cohabiting Men." *Economic Inquiry* 49(2): 199-212.
- Weichselbaumer, Doris. 2003. "Sexual Orientation Discrimination in Hiring." *Labour Economics* 10: 629-42.
- Weisbrod, Burton A. 1983. "Nonprofit and Proprietary Sector Behavior: Wage Differentials among Lawyers," *Journal of Labor Economics* a(3): 246-63.