



Handwritten:
#228

PERSEREC 

**PRESERVICE ADJUSTMENT OF HOMOSEXUAL
AND HETEROSEXUAL MILITARY ACCESSIONS:
IMPLICATIONS FOR
SECURITY CLEARANCE SUITABILITY**

Michael A. McDaniel

January 1989

DRAFT

**DEFENSE
PERSONNEL SECURITY
RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER
99 Pacific Street, Building 455-E**

January 1989

**Preservice Adjustment of Homosexual
and Heterosexual Military Accessions:
Implications for Security Clearance Suitability**

Prepared by
Michael A. McDaniel

Reviewed by
Carson Eoyang
Director

Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center
Monterey, California 93940-2481



Preface

The differences between homosexuals and others in society have long been subjects of great debate. More often than not, the controversy has suffered from a paucity of scientific research that could illuminate and inform the issues. This study is a limited effort to address the question: How do homosexuals differ from non-homosexuals in preservice adjustment characteristics? By exploring these differences, which may have direct security implications, this research helps increase our knowledge base pertaining to the suitability of homosexuals for positions of trust. This technical report is a revision of an earlier draft report entitled "The Suitability of Homosexuals for Positions of Trust" (November, 1987).

Carson K. Eoyang
Director



**Preservice Adjustment of Homosexual
and Heterosexual Military Accessions:
Implications for Security Clearance Suitability**

Prepared by
Michael A. McDaniel

Summary

Problem

Homosexuality is a topic of considerable debate and litigation in the national security community. The debate centers around the suitability of homosexuals for positions that require national security clearances.

Objective

The objective of the present study was to determine whether homosexuality is an indicator that a person possesses characteristics, separate from sexual orientation, that make one unsuitable for positions of trust. Specifically, this paper attempts to answer the question: How do homosexuals differ from heterosexuals in background characteristics relevant to security suitability?

Approach

To answer this question, background data were drawn from the Educational and Biographical Information Survey (EBIS) (Means & Perelman, 1984). This self-report inventory contains questions regarding educational experiences, drug and alcohol use, criminal activities, and driving record. Military accessions who were discharged from the service for homosexuality were compared with other military accessions on preservice background characteristics relevant to security suitability.



Results

The data indicate that the suitability of homosexuals relative to heterosexuals depends upon the background area examined and the sex of the comparison group:

- o In general, homosexuals showed better preservice adjustment than heterosexuals in areas relating to school behavior.
- o Homosexuals also displayed greater levels of cognitive ability than heterosexuals.
- o Homosexuals, however, showed less preservice adjustment than heterosexuals in the area of drug and alcohol use.
- o With the exception of drug and alcohol use, homosexuals resemble those who successfully adjust to military life more so than those who are discharged for unsuitability.
- o Although male homosexuals tend to be better than or as equally adjusted as male heterosexuals with respect to the indices examined, female homosexuals tend to score lower on preservice adjustment indices than female heterosexuals. However, females as a whole tended to show better preservice adjustment than males, and female homosexuals tended to have better preservice adjustment than most heterosexual male accessions.

Conclusion

The discussion section of this report lists several limitations of this study. Although these limitations should be carefully considered, the preponderance of the evidence presented in this study indicates that homosexuals show preservice suitability-related adjustment that is as good or better than the average heterosexual.



Table of Contents

Preface	i
Summary	ii
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Approach	3
Results	7
Results for the Major School Problems Scale	7
Results for the Drug and Alcohol Scale	9
Results for the Employment Experience Scale	11
Results for the Felonies Scale	11
Results for the Minor School Problems Scale	14
Results for the Drunk and Disorderly Scale	16
Results for the AFQT Percentile	16
Discussion	19
Limitations of the Present Study	19
Conclusion	21
References	23



List of Tables

1.	Major School Problems Background Scale	8
2.	Drugs and Alcohol Background Scale	10
3.	Employment Experience Background Scale	12
4.	Felonies Background Scale	13
5.	Minor School Problems Background Scale	15
6.	Drunk and Disorderly Background Scale	17
7.	AFQT Percentile.	18.



Introduction

Homosexuality is a topic of considerable debate and litigation in the national security community (National Security Institute, 1987). Questions in the national security/homosexuality debate include:

1. Does the homosexuality of a security clearance holder present an exploitable vulnerability for hostile intelligence agencies?
2. Does the presence of a homosexual in a military or nonmilitary work group cause the group work performance or security climate to decay?
3. Is homosexuality an indicator that a potential security clearance holder possesses characteristics, separate from sexual orientation, that make one unsuitable for positions of trust?

This paper primarily addresses the third question. Specifically, this paper attempts to answer the question: How do homosexuals differ from heterosexuals in background characteristics relevant to security suitability? Thus, this paper has a narrow focus and does not address all questions concerning the suitability of homosexuals for employment in positions that require national security clearances.

A major problem in resolving the issue of the suitability of homosexuals for positions of trust is the paucity of research available on this topic. Recently, Ellis and Ames (1987) reviewed the literature on the origins of sexual orientation. After reviewing the literature on experiential, social-environmental, genetic, and physiological explanations of the causal determinants of sexual orientation, they concluded that the evidence best supports the position that sexual orientation is largely determined by genetic, neurological, hormonal, and environmental factors prior to birth. However, regardless of the origin of sexual orientation, there is little research addressing the suitability of homosexuals for positions of trust. This report is an attempt to address this research gap.



Approach

This study focuses on the question, "With reference to the types of background data normally collected in security-related background investigations, how do homosexuals and heterosexuals differ?" To answer this question, background data were drawn from the Educational and Biographical Information Survey (EBIS) (Means & Perelman, 1984). This self-report inventory contains questions regarding educational experiences, drug and alcohol use, criminal activities, and driving record. The EBIS data differ from most background investigation data, such as that collected by the Defense Investigative Service, in that the information was collected in a structured format (i.e., multiple choice questions), does not contain interview data or data from official sources such as police departments or credit agencies (i.e., all information was self reported), and contains more school adjustment questions than is obtained in most background investigations. However, the data set does tap the most common data domains in background investigations, and thus appears well suited for the present inquiry.

During the spring of 1983, the EBIS was administered to approximately 34,000 military applicants and 40,000 new recruits from all four services. The applicants who did not enter the military were categorized by gender. The military personnel were classified by gender, education, military career changes, and level of security clearance. Military discharge data on the EBIS respondents were obtained from the Defense Manpower Data Center. For this analysis, all military personnel who were discharged for homosexuality were separated from all other military accessions. The definition for all analysis groups in this study are:

Homosexuals:

Military personnel who were discharged for homosexuality. This group was further divided by gender.

Applicants Not Entering Service:

Military applicants who did not enter the military service. These persons took the EBIS as military applicants and either declined service entry or were refused admission. This group was divided by gender.

All Other Accessions:

All military accessions, except those discharged as homosexuals. Separate analyses were conducted by gender, education (high school diploma or not), military career changes, and level of security clearance. The categories of military career change were:



- 1) those discharged for unsuitability for reasons other than homosexuality,
- 2) those released from service,
- 3) those who sought immediate reenlistment in the military service,
- 4) those enlisted personnel who were granted entry into officer training programs,
- 5) those who received medical discharges, and
- 6) those who were still in the military, but who did not fit any of the above categories (these were labelled "not separated").

For the clearance level categorization, the military personnel were divided into those without a Secret or higher clearance (these were labelled "no clearance"), those with a Secret clearance, those with a Top Secret clearance but no SCI access, and those with a Top Secret clearance with SCI access or eligibility for SCI access.

Statistical methods were used to cluster the EBIS background data into meaningful clusters. The EBIS data formed seven clusters of background data that provided a useful summary of the recruits' preservice behavior. Six clusters are described below. The seventh background area, Grades and Socio-Economic Status, was not examined in this paper since it is not an area that is normally examined in security-related background investigations. For the remaining six categories, the items in each cluster were summed to yield six scale scores.

The scale contents were:

1. Major School Problems:
Suspension from school, fighting in school, trouble in schools for being disorderly, using bad language, and smoking.
2. Drugs and Alcohol:
Use of marijuana, stimulants, depressants, cocaine, heroin, other narcotics, other drugs, alcohol, cigarettes.
3. Job Experience:
Reasons for leaving past jobs. Length of past full-time and part-time work.
4. Criminal Felonies:
Adult and juvenile arrests and convictions.
5. Minor School Problems:
Missing school, missing class, thoughts about quitting school.



6. Drunk & Disorderly:

Problems with alcohol, disorderly conduct, drunk driving, drug-related arrest, assault, misdemeanors.

The six background scales were standardized and expressed as percentiles. The higher the percentile for a group of persons the more favorable is the group's past life experience. The scales were standardized so that the average male military accessions are at the 50th percentile. Those groups with a percentile of greater than 50 had fewer preservice difficulties than the average male military accession. Those groups with a percentile of less than 50, on the average, had more preservice adjustment problems than the average male military accession. In each military group examined, there is considerable variability around each group's mean percentile. Thus, for example, if homosexuals are at the 45th percentile in a background domain, it means that on the average the homosexuals had more preservice adjustment problems than the male accessions. However, there will be substantial overlap in the distribution of the two groups such that some homosexuals will be more suitable than most of the male recruits.

In addition to the six background scales, the analysis groups were compared on Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) percentiles. The AFQT is a measure of cognitive ability. The AFQT percentile reflects the scaling of the AFQT determined by DoD and was not normed so that all male accessions were at the 50th percentile.

In these analyses, the percentile standing of homosexuals on a given background scale is compared with the percentile standings of various other groups. In these comparisons, a difference of five percentile points was considered a meaningful difference. While this is a somewhat arbitrary decision rule, it appears to be a reasonable one. Those who wish to adopt a different decision rule may easily do so by examining the percentiles presented in the tables.



Results

The six background scales appear to be relatively independent. The Major and Minor School Problems scales are the most similar item clusters. The Major School Problems scale appears to tap more serious problems in school, while the Minor School Problems scale is composed of less serious indicators of school adjustment.

The Drugs and Alcohol scale is distinguished from the Drunk and Disorderly scale in that the Drugs and Alcohol scale measures frequency of drug use, while the Drunk and Disorderly scale taps the amount of trouble one gets into as a result of drug and alcohol use. Both the Drunk and Disorderly scale and the Drugs and Alcohol scale have moderate correlations with all other scales. Since the six background scales were relatively distinct, it is most meaningful to compare the homosexuals and other groups on each of the six scales.

Results for the Major School Problems Scale

Table 1 displays the results for the background scale "Major School Problems." This scale reflects serious school problems including suspension from school, fighting in school, trouble in school for being disorderly, using bad language, and smoking. Those with SCI clearances showed better adjustment than the Top Secret clearance holders without SCI access, who in turn showed better adjustment than the Secret clearance holders, who in turn showed better adjustment than those with no clearance. This monotonic relationship between level of adjustment and clearance level supports the hypothesis that the Major School Problems scale is a relevant background scale for accessing preservice adjustment.

In accordance with the 5-percentile definition of a meaningful difference, only differences of that magnitude or larger are noted. Given that male and female homosexuals showed meaningfully different levels of preservice adjustment in this area, they are discussed separately.

On the whole, the homosexuals showed better preservice adjustment on the Major School Problems scale than most other comparison groups. On the average, male homosexuals showed better preservice adjustment (59th percentile) on the Major School Problems scale than did the group of male military accessions (50th percentile). Male homosexuals on the average displayed substantially greater preservice adjustment on this dimension than the average heterosexual person discharged for unsuitability (40th percentile), and those without high school diplomas (32nd percentile). The male homosexuals had fewer major school problems than heterosexuals who were discharged for unsuitability, released from service, and who received medical discharges. Male homosexuals (59th percentile) also had better levels of preservice



TABLE 1

Major School Problems Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.

<u>Comparison Groups</u> ¹	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	166	61
Males	113	59
Females	53	66
Applicants Not Entering Service ²	16,357	56
Males	12,525	52
Females	3,720	71
All Other Accessions	48,302	53
Males	42,095	50
Females	6,207	73
High School Graduate	43,233	56
GED and Nongraduates	5,069	32
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	40
Release From Service	6,855	53
Immediate Reenlistment	4,023	57
Officer	277	75
Medical	1,838	49
Not Separated	24,970	57
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	50
Secret	18,181	56
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	64
SCI	1,622	68

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality. Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



adjustment than those without clearances (50th percentile), and showed no meaningful difference in preservice adjustment from those holding Secret clearances. Male homosexuals, however, showed meaningfully less preservice adjustment on the Major School Problems dimension than enlisted personnel who entered officer training, and Top Secret and SCI clearance holders.

Regardless of sexual orientation, females showed better levels of preservice adjustment on Major School Problems scale than males. Female accessions were at the 73rd percentile, while female applicants not entering the service were at the 71st percentile. However, in contrast to the male homosexuals who had fewer preservice adjustment problems in this area than the average male accession, female homosexuals had more preservice adjustment problems than the average female accession (66th percentile vs. 73rd percentile). Although female homosexuals showed poorer preservice adjustment on the Major School Problems scale than heterosexual females, the homosexual females showed better adjustment than most other comparison groups including those with Top Secret and SCI clearances.

Results for the Drug and Alcohol Scale

Table 2 displays the results for the background scale "Drugs and Alcohol." This scale primarily measures admissions concerning the quantity of drugs and alcohol consumed by the respondent. The higher the clearance level the greater the preservice adjustment on the drug and alcohol scale. This monotonic relationship between level of adjustment and clearance level supports the belief that the Drug and Alcohol scale is a relevant background scale for accessing preservice adjustment.

In contrast to the Major School Problems scale, homosexuals showed worse preservice adjustment on the Drugs and Alcohol scale than most other comparison groups. The difference between male and female homosexuals on the Drugs and Alcohol scale was small (43rd vs. 45th percentile). The homosexuals appear to use about as much drugs and alcohol as the non-high school graduates (41st percentile) and the unsuitability discharges (43rd percentile).

Homosexuals showed meaningfully less preservice adjustment on the Drugs and Alcohol dimension than all male accessions, all female accessions, high school graduates, those released from the service, those who sought immediate reenlistment, those who entered officer training, medical discharges, and those who did not separate. All levels of clearance holders showed better levels of preservice adjustment on the Drugs and Alcohol scale than did the homosexuals.



TABLE 2

**Drugs and Alcohol Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.**

<u>Comparison Groups¹</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	166	44
Males	113	43
Females	53	45
Applicants Not Entering Service ²	16,357	58
Males	12,525	55
Females	3,720	64
All Other Accessions	48,302	51
Males	42,095	50
Females	6,207	58
High School Graduate	43,233	52
GED and Nongraduates	5,069	41
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	43
Release From Service	6,855	51
Immediate Reenlistment	4,023	57
Officer	277	58
Medical	1,838	51
Not Separated	24,970	53
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	50
Secret	18,181	52
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	53
SCI	1,622	57

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality.
Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



Results for the Employment Experience Scale

Table 3 displays the results for the background scale "Employment Experience." This scale primarily measures the amount of one's job experience and the conditions under which one terminated employment. The level of preservice adjustment on this scale does not monotonically covary across clearance levels. This suggests that this scale may have less relevance for security suitability than other scales.

Whereas male homosexuals showed a meaningfully lower level of preservice adjustment on the Employment Experience scale than female homosexuals, the two homosexuals groups are discussed separately.

The male homosexuals showed less preservice adjustment on this scale (48th percentile) than those who sought immediate reenlistment and those who did not separate. Male homosexuals were not, however, meaningfully different from any of the groups holding security clearances. In general, there was little differentiation in employment experience adjustment among any of the comparison groups. This was probably due to the limited amount of job experience for those who enter the military.

Female homosexuals (58th percentile) showed the same level of preservice adjustment on the employment experience scale as heterosexual females. Females, regardless of their sexual orientation, showed better levels of preservice adjustment on this scale than most other comparison groups, including those with Secret clearances, Top Secret clearances and those with SCI access.

Results for the Felonies Scale

Table 4 displays the results for the background scale "Felonies." This scale measures the number of felony arrests and convictions. Those with SCI clearances showed better adjustment than the Top Secret clearance holders without SCI access, who in turn showed better adjustment than the Secret clearance holders, who in turn showed better adjustment than those with no clearance. This monotonic relationship between level of adjustment and clearance level supports the hypothesis that the Felonies scale is a relevant background scale for accessing preservice adjustment.

Since male homosexuals showed meaningfully lower levels of preservice adjustment than female homosexuals on the Felonies scale, the comparison is discussed separately.



TABLE 3

Employment Experience Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.

<u>Comparison Groups¹</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals		
Males	166	51
Females	113	48
	53	58
Applicants Not Entering Service ²		
Males	16,357	59
Females	12,525	56
	3,720	66
All Other Accessions		
Males	48,302	51
Females	42,095	50
High School Graduate	6,207	58
GED and Nongraduates	43,233	52
	5,069	46
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	46
Release From Service	6,855	52
Immediate Reenlistment	4,023	53
Officer	277	50
Medical	1,838	44
Not Separated	24,970	53
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	51
Secret	18,181	51
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	49
SCI	1,622	52

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality. Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



TABLE 4

Felonies Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.

<u>Comparison Groups</u> ¹	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	166	51
Males	113	47
Females	53	59
Applicants Not Entering Service ²	16,357	48
Males	12,525	46
Females	3,720	58
All Other Accessions	48,302	51
Males	42,095	50
Females	6,207	59
High School Graduate	43,233	52
GED and Nongraduates	5,069	44
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	46
Release From Service	6,855	51
Immediate Reenlistment	4,023	52
Officer	277	56
Medical	1,838	50
Not Separated	24,970	52
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	49
Secret	18,181	53
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	57
SCI	1,622	58

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality. Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



Male homosexuals (47th percentile) showed worse preservice adjustment than high school graduates, those who obtained immediate reenlistment, those who entered officer training, and those who did not separate. Male homosexuals also showed lower levels of preservice adjustment than those who held clearances.

In contrast to the male homosexuals, female homosexuals had better levels of adjustment on the Felonies dimension than most comparison groups. Female homosexuals showed better adjustment on the Felonies scale than high school graduates, non-high school graduates, unsuitability discharges, those released from service, those who received immediate reenlistment, medical discharges, those not separated, and those with Secret clearances. There was no meaningful difference in preservice adjustment on the Felonies dimension between female homosexuals and Top Secret and SCI clearance holders.

Results for the Minor School Problems Scale

Table 5 displays the results for the Minor School Problems background scale. This scale measures minor school problems such as missing class and thoughts about quitting school. The higher the clearance level the greater the preservice adjustment on the Minor School Problems scale. This monotonic relationship between level of adjustment and clearance level supports the contention that the Minor School Problems scale is a relevant background scale for accessing preservice adjustment.

Because male homosexuals showed lower preservice adjustment on this dimension than female homosexuals, the comparisons are discussed separately.

Male homosexuals (52nd percentile) showed little difference from most comparison groups including those with Secret clearances. Homosexuals had lower levels of preservice adjustment than high school graduates, those who entered officer training, and Top Secret (nonSCI) and SCI clearance holders. Male homosexuals had higher levels of preservice adjustment on the Minor School Problems dimension than non-high school graduates, heterosexual unsuitability discharges, and medical discharges.

Females, regardless of sexual orientation, showed higher levels of preservice adjustment on the Minor School Problems scale than most other comparison groups, with female homosexuals (58th percentile) showing less preservice adjustment than female accessions (63rd percentile). Female homosexuals had fewer preservice adjustment problems in this area than non-high school graduates, unsuitability discharges, those released from service, medical discharges, and those without clearances.



TABLE 5

Minor School Problems Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.

<u>Comparison Groups</u> ¹	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	166	54
Males	113	52
Females	53	58
Applicants Not Entering Service ²	16,357	50
Males	12,525	47
Females	3,720	61
All Other Accessions	48,302	52
Males	42,095	50
Females	6,207	63
High School Graduate	43,233	59
GED and Nongraduates	5,069	9
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	37
Release From Service	6,855	51
Immediate Reenlistment	4,023	55
Officer	277	89
Medical	1,838	47
Not Separated	24,970	56
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	48
Secret	18,181	55
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	64
SCI	1,622	68

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality. Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



Results for the Drunk and Disorderly Scale

Table 6 displays the results for the Drunk and Disorderly scale. This scale includes items regarding drunk driving arrests, drug-related arrests, and misdemeanors. Those with SCI clearances showed better adjustment than the Top Secret clearance holders without SCI access, who in turn showed better adjustment than the Secret clearance holders, who in turn showed better adjustment than those with no clearance. This relationship between level of adjustment and clearance level supports the contention that the Drunk and Disorderly scale is a relevant background scale for accessing preservice adjustment.

Male and female homosexuals showed approximately equal levels of preservice adjustment on this scale. When homosexuals showed meaningful differences with other comparison groups, the differences typically indicated that the homosexuals had higher levels of preservice adjustment.

Results for the AFQT Percentile

Table 7 presents the results for the AFQT analyses. The AFQT can be viewed as a measure of general cognitive ability. The AFQT has a DoD-dictated norming standard which was used in this analysis. Consequently, the male accession percentile is not 50. The higher the clearance level, the greater the average AFQT percentile. Although cognitive ability is not a topic explored in the typical background investigation, this monotonic relationship between AFQT and clearance level supports the contention that the AFQT Percentile is a relevant background characteristic for accessing preservice adjustment.

Male and female homosexuals showed similar levels of AFQT scores which tend to be higher than those for other comparison groups. Female homosexuals showed greater cognitive ability than unsuitability discharges, those released from service, those who received immediate reenlistment, and medical discharges. Male homosexuals showed greater cognitive ability than all these groups and also showed greater cognitive ability than male and female accessions, accessions regardless of educational status, and Secret clearance holders. Those enlisted personnel who entered officer training and SCI clearance holders, however, showed greater levels of cognitive ability than homosexuals.



TABLE 6

**Drunk and Disorderly Background Scale.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Better Adjustment.**

<u>Comparison Groups</u> ¹	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	166	56
Males	113	56
Females	53	55
Applicants Not Entering Service ²		
Males	16,357	51
Females	12,525	48
	3,720	63
All Other Accessions	48,302	52
Males	42,095	50
Females	6,207	62
High School Graduate	43,233	53
GED and Nongraduates	5,069	45
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,468	46
Release From Service	6,855	50
Immediate Reenlistment	4,000	55
Officer	277	59
Medical	1,838	52
Not Separated	24,970	53
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,347	49
Secret	18,181	55
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,152	58
SCI	1,622	61

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality. Applicants not entering service were those military applicants who completed the EBIS but did not join the service.

²The gender of 112 military applicants who did not enter service is unknown.

³A total of 1,871 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



TABLE 7

AFQT Percentile.
Comparison of Homosexuals with Other Groups.
Higher Scores Indicate Higher Ability.

<u>Comparison Groups</u> ¹	<u>N</u>	<u>Percentile</u>
Homosexuals	164	63
Males	111	64
Females	53	62
Applicants Not Entering Service ²	---	---
Males	---	---
Females	---	---
All Other Accessions	48,055	58
Males	41,863	58
Females	6,192	60
High School Graduate	43,028	58
GED and Nongraduates	5,027	58
Military Career Changes ³		
Unsuitability Discharges	8,441	55
Release From Service	6,708	53
Immediate Reenlistment	4,022	54
Officer	273	85
Medical	1,833	56
Not Separated	24,917	61
Clearance Category		
No Clearance	27,173	56
Secret	18,122	59
Top Secret (no SCI)	1,144	66
SCI	1,616	72

¹Homosexuals were defined as those released from military service for homosexuality.

²AFQT data for applicants not entering service were not available.

³A total of 1,861 persons had military career changes which are not one of those in the table.



Discussion

This study indicates that the suitability of homosexuals relative to heterosexuals depends upon the preservice background area examined and the sex of the comparison group. In general, homosexuals showed better preservice adjustment than heterosexuals in areas relating to school behavior. Homosexuals also showed greater levels of cognitive ability than heterosexuals. Homosexuals, however, showed less adjustment than heterosexuals in the area of drug and alcohol use. Male homosexuals also showed less adjustment than several comparison groups on the Felonies scale. Except for preservice drug and alcohol use (and homosexual males adjustment on the Felonies scale), homosexuals more closely resemble those who successfully adjust to military life than those who are discharged for unsuitability. While male homosexuals appeared to have better or equal preservice adjustment patterns than male heterosexuals, female homosexuals tended to have somewhat poorer preservice adjustment patterns than female heterosexuals. However, females as a whole tended to show higher levels of preservice adjustment than males, and female homosexuals tended to have higher levels of preservice adjustment than most heterosexual male accessions.

One may question the appropriateness of the background scales used in this analysis. It could be argued that one or more of these background areas are irrelevant to suitability for positions of trust. For example, the Defense Investigative Service no longer devotes extensive investigative resources to collecting school-related background information. Two lines of evidence, however, support the relevance of these background areas for employment suitability. First, with the possible exception of the school adjustment clusters, the background areas have similar content to those used by DoD background investigators. Second, the results for these background scales showed a meaningful pattern of relationships across comparison groups. Those enlisted personnel who entered officer training had higher levels of preservice adjustment than other successful accessions who had higher levels of preservice adjustment than heterosexuals discharged for unsuitability. Except for the Employment Experience scale, those with SCI access had higher levels of preservice adjustment than those with non-SCI Top Secret clearances, who had fewer preservice adjustment problems than Secret clearance holders, who had higher levels of preservice adjustment than those who did not have a Secret or higher clearance.

Limitations of the Present Study

While this report makes a significant contribution to understanding homosexual suitability for positions of trust, the study suffers from several limitations. Five caveats are offered:



- o First, the paper has a limited focus. It does not address the issue of homosexuality as a vulnerability that may be exploitable by hostile intelligence agencies. Nor does it address the consequences of mixing homosexual and heterosexual persons in the same work group.
- o Second, the definitions used in this study for homosexual and heterosexual are not perfect. Some of those who received discharges for homosexuality may be heterosexuals who falsely professed to homosexuality to gain a prompt release from military service. Also, it is very likely that some members of the heterosexual group examined in this analysis were homosexuals. Only those homosexuals who were discharged from the military service for homosexuality were counted as homosexuals for this analysis. In addition, the homosexuality/heterosexuality dichotomy used in this study is an arbitrary one. Many people are neither exclusively homosexual nor exclusively heterosexual.
- o Third, homosexuals who choose to join the military may be very different from the population of young adult homosexuals who are potential military accessions and may be very different from civilian homosexuals who seek national security clearances.
- o Fourth, the calculation of the percentiles presented in the tables implicitly assumes that the background scales scores are normally distributed. All of the background scales showed at least some departures from a normal distribution.
- o Fifth, relative to all other comparison groups in this analysis (viz., 42,095 male military accessions), the number of homosexuals was small (113 males and 53 females). Less confidence should be placed in conclusions drawn from smaller samples. Data collected on another group of homosexuals and heterosexuals will likely be somewhat different from the results in this study solely due to random sampling error.



Conclusion

In summary, this report has provided limited but cogent evidence regarding the preservice suitability of homosexuals who may apply for positions of trust. Although this study has several limitations, the preponderance of the evidence presented indicates that homosexuals show preservice suitability-related adjustment that is as good or better than the average heterosexual. Thus, these results appear to be in conflict with conceptions of homosexuals as unstable, maladjusted persons. Given the critical importance of appropriate policy in the national security area, additional research attention to this area is warranted.



References

Ellis, L., & Ames, M. A. (1987). Neurohormonal functioning and sexual orientation: A theory of homosexuality-heterosexuality. Psychological Bulletin, 101, 233-258.

Means, B., & Perelman, L. S. (1984). The development of the Educational and Background Information Survey. FR-PRD-84-3. Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

National Security Institute (1987). Court rules for gays. NSI Advisory, 3, 4.