J Police Crim Psych (2016) 31:173–181
DOI 10.1007/s11896-015-9169-2

LGBTQ-Affirming Policing: Tactics Generated by Law Enforcement Personnel

Tania Israel[1] · **Audrey Harkness**[1] · **Todd R. Avellar**[1] · **Kevin Delucio**[1] · **Jay N. Bettergarcia**[1] · **Joshua A. Goodman**[1]

Published online: 9 August 2015

Abstract Law enforcement personnel (LEP) use a variety of tactics to perform their job duties. Although LEP often receive specialized training to work with ethnocultural minorities and are sometimes trained to work with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) citizens, a clear articulation of LGBTQ-affirming police tactics has not yet been established. Using qualitative content analysis and a multiple case study approach, this project identified a variety of tactics generated by LEP in written surveys and group discussion of scenarios involving LGBTQ citizens. Results showed that across all scenarios, LEP were able to generate LGBTQ-affirming tactics, including both typical police procedures, as well as approaches specific to LGBTQ citizens. Non LGBTQ-affirming tactics typically reflected reluctance to adapt general procedures to meet the needs of LGBTQ citizens. The results of this study support the use of group-based scenario training to help LEP identify and adopt LGBTQ-affirming approaches. This study is significant because it represents a first step toward identifying best practices for LGBTQ-affirming police tactics.

Keywords LGBTQ · Police tactics · LEP training

There has been a troubled history between law enforcement personnel (LEP) and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ)[1] communities. Police frequently raided LGBT gatherings until the 1969 Stonewall Riots in New York City (Amnesty International, 2005). Although these police raids may not occur as frequently or overtly today as they did prior to Stonewall, there are examples of recent raids in which numerous officers and excessive force were used; and the history of anti-LGBT sexual, physical, and verbal harassment and abuse by law enforcement continues to have a negative impact on LGBT communities today (Amnesty International, 2005; Mallory, Hasenbush, & Sears, 2015).

LGBTQ individuals experience a variety of barriers to reporting crimes, including fears of secondary victimization, hostility, or abuse from LEP (Bernstein & Kostelac, 2002; Herek & Berrill, 1992), mistrust of LEP (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 2011), and concerns about LEP either not taking the reported crime seriously or failing to note anti-LGBTQ aspects of crimes (Wolff & Cokely, 2007). Lesbians and gay men were found to be significantly less likely to report a violent crime if it did not feel practical to contact the police, the victim was scared or did not feel safe, the incident occurred at work, or the victim felt partly to blame (Peel, 1999). Kuehnle and Sullivan (2003) suggest that victims of anti-LGBT bias crimes and racially motivated bias crimes may hesitate to report these crimes for similar reasons, including a history of insensitivity and discrimination on the part of law enforcement. Transgender people may have distinct fears, including being profiled as a sex worker, arbitrarily arrested due to violating gender norms, inaccurately accused that legal identification is fraudulent, and fearful of "moral regulations" such as lewd conduct or public lewdness (Amnesty International, 2005). Such barriers result in an underreporting of

A poster based on this study was presented at the 2013 American Psychological Association Annual Meeting

✉ Tania Israel
tisrael@education.ucsb.edu

[1] Department of Counseling, Clinical & School Psychology, Gevirtz Graduate School of Education, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9490, USA

[1] The authors primarily use "LGBTQ" to refer to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer communities and individuals, however, "LGBT" and "LGB" may be used to reflect the content of the cited source.

crimes (Herek & Berrill, 1992) such that more than half of domestic incidents and more than a third of bias incidents experienced by lesbians and gay men are not reported (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003). These rates of underreporting are concerning given the prevalence of victimization among the LGB community; approximately 20% of sexual minority individuals in the United States have experienced an anti-LGB crime since the age of 18 (Herek, 2009).

Specialized efforts may be required for LEP to work effectively with communities that have experienced historical discrimination and harassment by LEP. For this reason, law enforcement has adopted specialized strategies for dealing with minorities and minority issues. In many jurisdictions, police officers are prohibited from using unnecessary force, abusing their authority, speaking discourteously, or using offensive language when interacting with citizens (Seron et al., 2004). However, these strategies may not be sufficient to create positive experiences for marginalized communities who have historically experienced discrimination and harassment from LEP. Himelfarb (1991) explains that in order for LEP to work effectively with ethnocultural minority groups, LEP must maintain respect for and sensitivity to the unique needs of particular communities, which he states can be best achieved through "specialized training," (p. 53), or tactical training that goes beyond broad-based prohibited police behaviors. Improvements in those strategies have occurred in the last decade, however, further improvements are needed and are described by some as easily attainable (Coderoni, 2002).

LEP are predominately white, heterosexual, men, thus much of what we understand to be true of "police culture" is based on the perspective of this demographic group [Brown, 2007; as cited in Loftus, 2008; Myers, Forest, & Miller, 2004). According to Myers and colleagues (2004), LEP are expected to express a dominant version of masculinity that prizes "authority, aggressiveness, technical competence, and heterosexual desire for and domination over women" (p. 18). Furthermore, although lesbian and gay LEP are increasingly represented in law enforcement agencies, anti-LG bias is a common experience for LGBTQ LEP, who often report feeling socially isolated, feeling like an outsider, and being exposed to homophobic comments by colleagues, especially in situations where the LGBTQ officer is not "out" (Colvin, 2008). Consequently, although there is variation among and within law enforcement organizations (Loftus, 2008; Loftus, 2009), one challenge for some organizations in training LEP on LGBTQ issues may be dominating heteronormative values steeped within the organization.

LEP are increasingly trained and engaging in "community policing" (Himelfarb, 1991). This model of police work acknowledges that the majority of police work involves communicating with community members, and thus, LEP may need specialized intercultural communication training in order to collaborate effectively with marginalized communities (Birzer, 1999). In communities where LEP are trained extensively in community-oriented policing, people are more likely to report crimes (Schnebly, 2008). Given the historical tensions between LGBTQ communities and LEP as well as subsequent underreporting of crimes perpetrated against LGBTQ individuals, increased crime reporting would be a very positive outcome of such trainings. In order for LGBTQ communities to experience the optimal benefit from LEP being trained in community policing, it will be important for LGBTQ-affirming tactics to be identified and incorporated into LEP training.

There are several specific reasons why LEP may interact with LGBTQ people around their sexual orientation and gender identity. For example, the United States' Federal Hate Crimes Statistics Act requires law enforcement to protect LGBTQ people who have been victimized by anti-LGBTQ crimes (Congress, 1990). Sexual minority individuals experience higher than average rates of bullying in schools and verbal harassment and violence in public spaces (Herek, 2009), which are under the protection of LEP. LGB people may seek out the support of LEP when victimized by crimes such as theft, vandalism (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003), assault, sexual assault (Rothman, Exner, & Baughman, 2011), and intimate partner violence (Kuehnle & Sullivan, 2003). In addition, minority stress experienced by LGB people can heighten risk for issues such as drug and alcohol abuse, which could increase contact between LGB people and LEP (Green & Feinstein, 2012). Further, due to a variety of factors, including rejection by family of origin, homelessness, employment discrimination, and limited health insurance coverage, transgender people and LGBTQ youth may practice sex work for economic survival and for gaining access to hormonal or surgical treatments related to gender identity (Hwahng & Nuttbrock, 2007; Marshall, Shannon, Kerr, Zhang, & Wood, 2009) and therefore have greater interaction with police (Grant et al., 2011).

Because of increased visibility of the LGBTQ population, LEP may also encounter more situations in which they will interact with LGBTQ individuals. For instance, recent same sex marriage debates have become commonplace in mainstream politics, which have placed LGBTQ families at the forefront of media attention and have left them susceptible to scrutiny (Onishenko & Caragata, 2010). The AIDS epidemic of the 1980s and 1990s also led to increased media representations of gay men and lesbians (Walters, 2003). However, these representations are often negative and inaccurate, leading to increased negative stereotypes about lesbians and gay men in the general public (Walters, 2003). More recently, mainstream media representations of LGBT people has increased (Avila-Saavedra, 2009), covering topics such as anti-LGBT bullying (Padva, 2008) and same-sex parenting (Riggs, 2012). Because increased LGBTQ visibility may in some cases lead to scrutiny and hostility, there may be increased

situations in which LEP must respond to LGBTQ individuals. A search on the article database "LGBT Life" revealed significant media coverage of LGBTQ Pride events (e. g., Gullickson, 2011; "The World's Got Pride…," 2013) and several articles about vigils for LGBT suicide victims and youth targeted by anti-LGBT bullying (e.g. "Candlelight Vigil," 2010; Gorton, 2010). Additionally, given widespread media attention to anti-LGBTQ bullying, there appear to be increased measures to protect victims, which may include school collaborations with LEP ("Students Encouraged to Report Bullying," 2010). This media coverage represents the reality that LGBTQ issues and communities are increasingly visible. This increased public presence of LGBTQ community events may also increase the number of interactions between LGBTQ people and LEP.

LEP interact with LGBTQ people in many different contexts, therefore it is important for LEP to be able to respond effectively in a variety of circumstances. For example, LEP may be called to the scene of a same-sex domestic violence dispute (Younglove, Kerr, & Vitello, 2002), anti-LGBT verbal harassment, intimidation, physical assault, or property crime (Wolff & Cokely, 2007). In a review of 260 incidents where police were called to the scene to assist an LGBT community member with reported verbal harassment, intimidation, physical assault, and property crime, Wolff and Cokely (2007) found that "positive" strategies used by police included being professional, taking the situation seriously, maintaining respect for the victim, and attempting to help the victim. In contrast, they found that "negative" experiences for LGBT victims involved police being rude, disrespectful, inappropriate, harassing victims, denying services to victims, and being the original perpetrator of the anti-LGBT verbal harassment, intimidation, or physical assault (Wolff & Cokely, 2007). Characteristics of positive and negative experiences with LEP were also identified in a survey of LGBTQ individuals (see Table 1 for a summary of the findings; Israel, Goodman, Avellar, Delucio, Ledbetter, & Harkness, 2014).

Tactics are behaviors or approaches law enforcement can use in order to perform their work effectively (Bruce, 2008). We consider tactics to be intentional behaviors in which LEP engage. LGBT people report positive and negative experiences with LEP; some of which seem to be related to LEP's intentional tactics, such as the extent to which LEP follow up on a crime; whereas others may be related to unintentional behavior of LEP, such as seeming disinterested (Wolff & Cokely, 2007). Although LEP are typically trained within a framework of tactics, there are not clear guidelines in terms of what those tactics should be when working with LGBTQ citizens in a variety of settings. This research seeks to identify tactics that LEP can use to demonstrate an LGBTQ-affirming approach to their work by bringing together two different sources of data: (1) tactics generated individually by LEP on written surveys and (2) tactics generated by LEP in group discussions of training scenarios.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were approximately 120 LEP who participated in a 5-hour training workshop on LGBTQ issues, the evaluation of which is reported elsewhere (Israel, Harkness, Delucio, Ledbetter, & Avellar, 2013). The descriptive information that follows was gathered from 81 of these participants who completed a demographic questionnaire. Almost all of the participants (90.1%) were sworn officers, for whom the training was mandatory (the remaining participants did not report their current position or indicated "other"). Participants had worked in law enforcement for an average of 14.13 years (range = 1 – 32). Participants ranged in age from 26 to 60 years old (M = 41.05; SD = 8.57). The majority of participants were men (74.1%), fewer were women (16%), and the remaining participants did not report their gender (9.9%). Eight participants did not report their sexual orientation, and the rest identified as heterosexual (90.1%). In terms of ethnicity, participants identified as European American/White (63%), Latino(a) or Hispanic (16%), African American/Black (2.5%), Asian (2.5%), Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (2.5%), and Other (4.9%); 13.6% of participants did not report their ethnicity.

All participants engaged in role plays and group discussion regarding working effectively with LGBTQ individuals. We refer to these role plays as the "group prompts." As part of an evaluation of the training, 56 of the participants responded individually to a written prompt involving working with an LGBTQ individual, which we refer to as the "individual prompt."

Measures

The individual and group prompts were developed by the researchers in collaboration with the local police department, an LGBTQ community organization, and diversity training professionals. The scenarios were based on LGBTQ community members' self-reported positive and negative experiences with LEP (see Israel, et al., 2014). The format for these prompts was based on LEP vignettes described by De Fruyt, Bockstaele, Taris, and Van Hiel (2006) and also followed theoretical guidelines for scenario-based training with LEP described by Lynch (2005).

Individual Prompt All participants in the training evaluation were given the following written prompt: "An LGBTQ citizen has been the victim of anti-LGBTQ verbal harassment and

Table 1 Positive and negative experiences with LEP (from Israel, et al., 2014)

Characteristics of positive experiences	Characteristics of negative experiences
• LEP were pleasant to deal with (warm, cooperative, compassionate, professional, caring helpful, non-threatening, lenient)	• LEP abused their power (excessive force, threats, harassment, overstepping bounds, inflicting extreme punishment, lacking integrity or transparency)
• LEP did their job (effective/efficient, resolving situations, following-up)	• LEP were difficult or unpleasant to deal with (rude, demeaning, judgmental, uncaring, uncomfortable)
• LEP were sensitive or responsive to sexual orientation or gender identity (sensitive, educated, aware, took anti-gay aspect of crime seriously, protected safety of LGBTQ people, appropriate treatment of transgender people, present at LGBTQ events, LGBTQ-identified LEP, no differential treatment)	• LEP exhibited homonegative or transnegative attitudes/behavior (differential treatment, anti-LGBTQ remarks, insensitive, homophobic, lack of LGBTQ education, minimizing anti-LGBTQ aspect of crime, blaming victim)
	• LEP did not do their job (lack of thorough investigation or follow-up, did not take context or complexity of situation into account)
	• LEP exhibited negative attitudes/behavior toward other marginalized communities (poor or differential treatment of homeless people, Latino/as, youth)
	• Participant felt distressed with LEP (targeted, uncomfortable, embarrassed)

threats of violence on [name of a central street in the local downtown area], and you have been called to the scene. The victim is very emotionally upset by the event." After reading this prompt, they were asked to "list as many tactics as possible that would help to put the target of the crime at ease in this situation." Participants in the training evaluation had the opportunity to respond anonymously in writing to this individual prompt before and after the training.

Group Prompts Participants in the training responded, through role plays and discussion, to six written scenarios in which LEP might interact with LGBTQ citizens. Participants discussed the scenarios in small groups (5–6 people), and then presented the scenario in the large group. A scribe was present at each training session to capture participants' responses to the training and to fully and accurately describe the training. The scribes were graduate students in counseling psychology and members of the research team. Scribes were instructed to capture participants' comments and questions in the role plays and discussions of the scenarios, using the participants' own words to the extent possible; the context of these comments; and trainer responses. Scribes were instructed not to document any identifying information about the participants. Material was scribed from the segments of the training in which all participants were together (such as a the presentations of the scenarios), but not from small group discussions. Prior to the training, the scribe informed participants about their role as the scribe, including the purpose of the scribing and that no identifying information about the participants would be documented. As audio or video recording would have presented a privacy risk for and possibly deterred full participation of LEP in the training, the scribe approach was used to enhance anonymity and increase acceptability of data collection during the training.

Procedure

The study was carried out by a research team consisting of a faculty member and five doctoral students in counseling psychology. Participants' responses to the individual prompts were analyzed using qualitative content analysis (Morgan, 1993). The coding structure from a previous study of LGBTQ individuals' experiences with and perceptions of LEP (Israel et al., 2014) was modified for the current study. Two research team members reviewed the original coding structure and drafted modifications necessary to capture the perspectives of LEP, which were reviewed by the research team. The research team then collaborated with a local police officer to confirm that the listed tactics and coding structure were consistent with LEP's language and procedures. The consultation led to further clarification of the coding structure and the addition of several additional tactics codes. Using the modified coding structure, two research team members coded the data, noting any tactics not included in the coding structure. These coders then brought their notes of "other" codes not included in the established coding structure, and as a team, the researchers added additional codes. The two coders then used this finalized coding structure to code the individual data. With this final coding completed, the independent coders reached 80.75% interrater reliability (percentage agreement;

Birkimer & Brown, 1979). Two research team members, one who was involved in the coding process, and one who was not, argued to consensus for the remaining codes.

Participants' scribed responses to the group prompts were coded by using QSR NVivo 10, a qualitative data analysis program. Research team members individually identified tactics that participants generated during the training, and these codes were audited by another research team member. Many tactics generated by participants were specific to the scenario, and qualitative content analysis was not able to capture the context across scenarios, therefore, a multiple case study approach was used, and themes were identified for each scenario. Pairs of research team members described tactics that LEP generated during the training in response to each group based scenario. These themes were reviewed and edited by the research team as a whole.

Results

Individual Prompt

Fifty-six participants responded in writing to the individual prompt before and/or after their training. Participants had the opportunity to write in tactics to the individual prompt both before (n = 48) and after (n = 34) the training, and some elected to provide tactics at both opportunities (n = 25), whereas others only responded at one time point (n = 31) or neither time points (n = 25). Participants generated a variety of tactics in response to this scenario about responding to a victim of anti-LGBTQ verbal harassment. Participant responses are summarized in Table 2. Due to the dearth of matched pre-test and post-test data, meaningful comparisons of pre-test and post-test tactics were not feasible, and all responses are reported together.

Table 2 Frequency of tactics generated for individual prompt.

Tactic	Frequency *
Followed through on investigation (e.g. investigated thoroughly)	39
Was emotionally supportive	32
Referred to non LGBTQ-specific resources	25
Was calming	21
Listened	20
Shared information about the legal process	16
Showed concern for safety/protection	14
Suggested other social support	10
Explained that police are there to help	9
Removed victim from the situation	8
Treated LGBTQ victim like any other victim	8
Conveyed to the victim that the crime is serious and/or unacceptable	7
Was objective and fair	7
Was respectful to the victim	6
Built trust and rapport	6
Conveyed understanding of the situation to the victim	5
Validated or acknowledged the victim's experience	5
Communicated that the victim was not to blame	5
Included or empowered the victim to make decisions	4
Advocated for or empowered the victim	4
Referred to LGBTQ-specific resources	4
Acknowledged to the victim the anti-LGBTQ aspect of the crime	2
Was sensitive to LGBTQ people's experiences and perspectives	2
Shared general information about this type of situation or crime	1
Let the victim know that LEP has received training on LGBTQ issues	1
Other tactic	7

*56 participants provided 82 total responses

Group Prompts

This section consists of themes identified in LEP's role plays and group discussion of six group prompts. Each prompt is summarized, and the collective responses of the participants are described below.

1. In this scenario, LEP stopped a driver for speeding; the identification listed the driver as male, and the driver appeared to the officer to be a woman. LEP described the importance of politeness, professionalism, treating LGBTQ individuals with dignity, maintaining calmness in oneself and in the citizens involved, and being transparent about LEP's intentions. Participants suggested asking the driver which pronouns were preferred and acknowledging one's own error if LEP misgendered the driver. Another tactic was to focus on the situation at hand rather than overemphasizing gender. LEP suggested speaking to the driver separately rather than disclosing the driver's gender in front of passengers, noting the "obvious" disparity between the person's driver's license and gender presentation, collecting identifying information and verifying the authenticity of the license, as well as determining why the person's presentation and license are discrepant. Some LEP stated that they would assume the person's identification was not authentic.
2. This scenario involved LEP responding to a fight in which one man hit another outside a bar. The assailant had identified the victim as gay prior to the assault and referred to the victim using a derogatory term for gay men. LEP suggested taking the crime seriously and thoroughly investigating it, as well as being aware of the possibility of

anti-LGBTQ motivations on the part of the assailant. In contrast, some LEP thought it was important not to assume that the fight was related to sexual orientation. LEP suggested explaining the potential consequences of pursuing the incident as a hate crime, such as sensitive information about the victim becoming public, and providing the option to report anonymously. LEP also suggested encouraging the victim to make a report in order to help others in future situations. Additional tactics generated by LEP included being reassuring, showing sympathy, explaining that LEP are there to help, talking privately with the victim, building trust with those involved, including or empowering the victim to make decisions, and offering general resources to the victim.

3. In this scenario LEP overheard a coworker who had previously expressed discomfort with the local LGBTQ Pride festival telling an LGBTQ citizen that s/he could avoid harassment by dressing in a way that did not reveal their sexual orientation. LEP suggested sanctioning the coworker's behavior publicly, privately, or by reporting the behavior to a supervisor. LEP differed in whether they would communicate their private sanctioning of their coworker's behavior to the victim or not. In addition, LEP suggested assisting the victim in filing a complaint against the coworker, either by presenting this as an option, documenting the incident, or writing a report. Additional strategies involved connecting with the victim by demonstrating caring and compassion or by appropriately responding to any harassment complaint.
4. In this scenario, LEP witnessed someone yell a derogatory term for gay man at another man. LEP generated a variety of tactics, including verbally connecting with the victim, assessing the victim's safety, and explaining legal options to the victim, and alternatively, prevent the situation from escalating, ignoring the situation or choosing not to take action. Some LEP also suggested confronting the perpetrator or using legal interventions to address the perpetrator's behavior, such as assessing for intoxication and legal violations. It was also noted that it could be hard to deal with a victim who is highly emotional or too "flamboyant, " and that this situation would be a low priority for use of police resources.
5. In this scenario, LEP found two truant female high school students hugging in the park. While driving them home, the students asked LEP not to tell their family what they were doing. Participants identified strategies including building rapport with the students, showing that LEP cares, providing resources to the students, and not treating these students any differently than a mixed sex couple. They also noted the importance of avoiding making assumptions about the students' behavior and asking more questions about the situation. While some LEP suggested avoiding parental disclosure of the students' sexual orientation (e.g. if not relevant, parents did not ask directly, or risk of violence), others maintained that they had a legal and/or moral obligation to either provide parental disclosure or have the students disclose their behavior to the parents. They also suggested facilitating parent–child communication by helping the students talk to their parents about sexual orientation, helping to build a relationship between parents and their children, offering counseling for parents and children, and providing the parents with resources. LEP noted the importance of risk assessment, including asking about history of violence in the home and assessing for suicide risk. LEP suggested taking the minor to a crisis shelter if they did not want to go home. Finally, they suggested being transparent about their intentions in contacting the parents.
6. In this scenario, LEP came to the home of two men who reported vandalism. The men seemed nervous and were not forthcoming about the nature of their relationship. Several tactics involved accommodating the unique needs of the victims, including asking the men how they wanted LEP to proceed, responding to requests to move the police car to a less visible location (e.g. moving police car so neighbors would not see their presence), taking extra steps to show respect, and creatively solving the problem. A variety of tactics involved connecting emotionally with the victims, including demonstrating care and empathy, validating the victims' experience, explaining that LEP are there to help, and leaving the victims with positive feelings about LEP. LEP noted the importance of investigating the crime by asking questions about the situation without interrogating the victims, handling the situation efficiently, demonstrating that LEP are doing something about the situation, and accepting only information that was perceived by LEP to be relevant to the situation. Participants also suggested conveying to the victims that the crime was unacceptable and considering the possibility that the vandalism was a hate crime, if appropriate. Finally, they suggested that it would be important to treat the victims like any other victims rather than overemphasizing that they were two men. LEP also suggested having an LGBTQ liaison, online or hotline reporting for graffiti, and a beat coordinator whom citizens feel comfortable contacting.

Discussion

Implications for Practice

The results of this study demonstrate that, both individually and in the context of group training, LEP generate a range of strategies for dealing with LGBTQ citizens, many of which

are LGBTQ-affirming, and some of which are not. This discussion will focus on the nature of LGBTQ-affirming LEP tactics, the context in which various types of tactics are generated by LEP, and implications for training and practice. In order to determine the extent to which tactics are LGBTQ-affirming, we will compare the tactics generated by LEP with the positive and negative characteristics of LGBTQ citizens' interactions with LEP reported by Israel et al. (2014).

As was demonstrated in this study, given accurate LGBTQ-related information relevant to their work, LEP can generate LGBTQ-affirming tactics. Most of the tactics LEP identified were consistent with LGBTQ participants' positive experiences with LEP from the Israel et al. (2014) survey. For example, the most frequent tactics suggested by LEP included being emotionally supportive, calming the victim, and following through on the investigation. LGBTQ survey participants had reported similar characteristics of positive experiences with LEP, such as feeling that LEP were warm in demeanor in their interactions and that LEP were effective or efficient in resolving a situation or following up on a crime.

Interestingly, the tactics LEP most frequently reported that they would use in the individual scenario are consistent with general police procedures that LEP could use with any citizen, rather than those that are specific to working with LGBTQ citizens. For example, LEP more frequently suggested referring the victim to general resources than to LGBTQ-specific resources. Both of these tactics may be associated with LGBTQ citizens' positive experiences with LEP. Thus, if LEP consistently apply general police tactics when working with LGBTQ citizens, this will help LGBTQ citizens to have more positive and affirming experiences with LEP. Further, given LEP have likely long been trained in these general tactics, these may be the easiest for LEP to adopt in their work with LGBTQ citizens.

LEP expressed a variety of views regarding whether LGBTQ citizens should be treated like everyone else or be treated differently from non-LGBTQ people. Although many general LEP tactics are helpful when also used with LGBTQ citizens, it is important to note that some general tactics may need to be adapted when working with LGBTQ citizens in order to be affirming. For example, it might be typical police procedure to assume that a driver's license is inauthentic if a person's physical presentation and license information are discrepant. Although this may be an understandable and appropriate response on the part of LEP, it may feel non-affirming to a transgender driver. In contrast, slightly modifying general police procedure by collaborating with the driver to determine why the person's physical presentation and driver's license were discrepant and modifying one's own language to reflect the driver's preferred pronouns could be perceived as affirming. Similarly, confronting someone who is engaging in verbal harassment could demonstrate LEP's concern about the safety of LGBTQ citizens, even if LEP may not typically intervene in verbal interactions that don't violate the law. Equal treatment, in which all citizens are treated identically, may be less effective than the "equal outcome" approach, which focuses on citizens' perceptions of LEP fairness (Bowling, 2007). In these cases, appropriate treatment of a transgender person's gender identity and intervention in verbal harassment could increase LGBTQ citizen's positive perceptions of LEP (Israel et al., 2014). In a profession, such as law enforcement, where LGBTQ individuals have historically been mistreated or marginalized, professionals may need to take extra steps to demonstrate their affirmation of LGBTQ people in order to work effectively with this population.

Comparison of the tactics written individually on surveys and those within the context of group discussion of scenarios reveals some patterns. Tactics generated on surveys were all affirming and more likely to be general, whereas group discussion yielded more LGBTQ-specific tactics, as well as some tactics that would likely be considered non-affirming by LGBTQ citizens. This again suggests that LEP may more easily integrate general positive tactics into their LGBTQ-affirming police work. Further, this may reflect the reality that LEP's responses to the group scenario were often generated by only one participant in the training workshop. Although others may have agreed with some of these tactics, it is possible that when working independently, other participants may not have thought to use it. However, exposure to affirming tactics generated by their colleagues may have increased LEP's capacity to generate both general and LGBTQ-specific tactics while on the job.

Implications for Training

Additionally, according to Lynch (2005), LEP should be provided with training programs "developed to give officers the skills to successfully complete a task" (p. 3). The authors suggest that scenario-based training is one way to ensure that officers can implement strategies in which they have been trained. The current findings support the use of such scenario-based trainings, which may enhance officers' abilities to *use* such skills on the job, as well as trainers' and colleagues' ability to provide LEP with feedback on their use of different tactics in various situations involving LGBTQ citizens.

This study also suggests that group-based training on LGBTQ issues is helpful. It appears that group training exposed LEP to a wider range of tactics than they would have generated on their own. Furthermore, the group discussion of scenarios offered LEP an opportunity to use their collective expertise in generating LGBTQ-affirming responses. This approach acknowledged the expertise of the participants and generated solutions that would be acceptable to LEP and consistent with law enforcement protocols. Keeping in mind that LGBTQ people should not be expected to possess and share

specialized knowledge regarding their identity group, LGBTQ LEP may feel uniquely prepared to work with marginalized citizens (Miller et al., 2003), and the group training format may offer them an opportunity to draw on their expertise.

An additional benefit of providing training for LEP on LGBTQ issues is to shift police culture toward greater diversity. Police culture is often defined by traditional masculinity (Miller et al., 2003), which creates an environment where LGBTQ LEP may be fearful of portraying themselves as LGBTQ-affirming due to perceptions that they are less "masculine" or not tough enough and, therefore, less competent in performing their job duties (Myers et al., 2004; Rumens & Broomfield, 2012). Furthermore, lesbian and gay LEP report overt and subtle anti-gay behavior and discrimination within law enforcement organizations, which can result in feeling unsafe in an already stressful occupation (Belkin & McNichol, 2002; Miller et al., 2003). By training all LEP to engage in LGBTQ-affirming tactics, the behavioral norms within hegemonically masculine law enforcement organizations may widen so that all LEP can feel comfortable performing a range of policing tactics and embracing a variety of sexual orientation and gender identities, without risking the perception of competence and effectiveness.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

There were several limitations to the current study. Because of the design of the training, it was not possible to capture each individual participant's tactical response to each group prompt. Instead, we analyzed collective responses that emerged from each scenario. Thus, it is unclear how well the results represent each participant in the training workshop. It is likely that the results over-represent LGBTQ-affirming tactics that each participant might have been able to generate individually. Future research might attempt to gather data on the percentage of LEP who agree with and/or would intend to use a particular participant's tactical approach to working with an LGBTQ citizen in order to gain clearer insight into LEP's attitudes and insights toward particular tactics. This would help to further clarify the acceptability of different tactics to a broader range of LEP. Behavioral ratings of LEP in simulations or role plays may also offer insight into the extent to which LEP may implement various tactics.

Another limitation is the potential discrepancy between intentions to engage in a behavior compared to actual engagement in a behavior. Given that it is socially desirable for LEP to be unbiased and fair, it is likely that participants provided their most affirming tactics, and potentially overestimated the degree to which they would actually apply these behaviors in practice. A separate evaluation of the training from which these data were collected demonstrated that LEP reported increased self-efficacy in their ability to use LGBTQ-affirming tactics on the job from before the training to after the training (Israel, Harkness, Delucio, Ledbetter, & Avellar, 2013). Although it was beyond the scope of this study to evaluate participants' behavioral changes in the period of time following the training, Israel et al.'s (2013) findings support the implicitation that LEP felt confident in their ability to use the tactics generated from the training. Additional evidence that the generated tactics may have translated to practice, at least for some LEP, is evident in LEP's response to an anti-LGBTQ hate crime that occurred approximately two months after the training was completed. According to one report, LEP who received the training found it to be useful in responding more effectively to the crime (Patterson, 2012). Future research that investigates the relationship between generation, self-efficacy, and use of LGBTQ-affirming tactics would help to determine the support necessary to help LEP implement such tactics.

Conclusion

This study is the first to begin empirically identifying LGBTQ-affirming police tactics. Such tactics include typical police procedures, as well as approaches specific to LGBTQ citizens. LEP could generate a wide range of LGBTQ-affirming tactics in the context of group-based scenario training, and tactics identified in such settings may be most likely to be adopted in practice. We hope that the findings of this study will contribute to further training, research, and articulation of best practices to enhance LEP's effectiveness in working with LGBTQ individuals and communities.

Acknowledgments The authors express appreciation to their collaborator, Ethan Ragsdale of the Santa Barbara Police Department.

References

Avila-Saavedra G (2009) Nothing queer about queer television: televized construction of gay masculinities. Media, Culture, and Society 31(1):5

Belkin A, McNichol J (2002) Pink and Blue: Outcomes Associated With the Integration of Open Gay and Lesbian Personnel in the San Diego Police Department. Police Quarterly 5(1):63–95. doi:10.1177/109861102129198020

Bernstein M, Kostelac C (2002) Lavender and Blue Attitudes About Homosexuality and Behavior Toward Lesbians and Gay Men Among Police Officers. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice 18(3):302–328. doi:10.1177/1043986202018003006

Birkimer JC, Brown JH (1979) Back to Basics: Percentage Agreement Measures Are Adequate, but There Are Easier Ways. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis 12(4):535–543. doi:10.1901/jaba.1979.12-535

Birzer ML (1999) Police training in the 21st century. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 68(7):16–19

Bowling B (2007) Fair and Effective Policing Methods: Towards "Good Enough" Policing. Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention 8(sup1):17–32. doi:10.1080/14043850701695023

Bruce, C.W. (2008). Police strategies and tactics: What every analyst should know. International Association of Crime Anaysts. Accessed from http://www.iaca.net/resources.asp October 2, 2014.

Candlelight Vigil for Tyler Clementi and other GLBT suicide victims at EUP on October 11. (2010). *Erie Gay News*, 4–5.

Coderoni GR (2002) The relationship between multicultural training for police and effective law enforcement. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 71(11):16–18

Colvin R (2008) Shared Perceptions Among Lesbian and Gay Police Officers: Barriers and Opportunities in the Law Enforcement Work Environment. Police Quarterly. doi:10.1177/1098611108327308

Congress, U. S. (1990). *Hate Crimes Statistics Act*. PL. Retrieved from http://149.101.146.50/jmd/ls/legislative_histories/pl104-155/hear-j-102-79-1992.pdf

De Fruyt F, Bockstaele M, Taris R, Van Hiel A (2006) Police interview competencies: assessment and associated traits. European Journal of Personality 20(7):567–584. doi:10.1002/per.594

Gorton D (2010) State House vigil remembers LGBT suicide victims. Bay Windows 28(43):2–2

Grant JM, Mottet LA, Tanis J, Harrison J, Herman JL, Keisling M (2011) Injustice at every turn: A report of the national transgender discrimination survey. National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, Washington

Green KE, Feinstein BA (2012) Substance use in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: An update on empirical research and implications for treatment. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors 26(2):265

Gullickson G (2011) Marching Toward Pride. Echo Magazine 22(14):26–28

Herek GM (2009) Hate Crimes and Stigma-Related Experiences Among Sexual Minority Adults in the United States Prevalence Estimates From a National Probability Sample. Journal of Interpersonal Violence 24(1):54–74

Herek, G. M., & Berrill, K. T. (1992). *Hate crimes: confronting violence against lesbians and gay men*. Sage Publications.

Himelfarb F (1991) A training strategy for policing in a multicultural society. Police Chief 58(11):53–55

Hwahng SJ, Nuttbrock L (2007) Sex workers, fem queens, and cross-dressers: Differential marginalizations and HIV vulnerabilities among three ethnocultural male-to-female transgender communities in New York City. Sexuality Research & Social Policy 4(4):36–59

Israel, T., Goodman, J.A., Avellar, T. R., Delucio, K., Harkness, A., & Bettergarcia, J. N. (2014). *LGBTQ people's positive and negative experiences with law enforcement*. Manuscript in preparation.

Israel, T., Harkness, A., Delucio, K., Ledbetter, J. N., & Avellar, T. R. (2013). Evaluation of Police Training on LGBTQ Issues: Knowledge, Interpersonal Apprehension, and Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 1–11. doi:10.1007/s11896-013-9132-z

Kuehnle K, Sullivan A (2003) Gay And Lesbian Victimization Reporting Factors in Domestic Violence and Bias Incidents. Criminal Justice and Behavior 30(1):85–96. doi:10.1177/0093854802239164

Loftus B (2008) Dominant Culture Interrupted Recognition, Resentment and the Politics of Change in an English Police Force. British Journal of Criminology 48(6):756–777. doi:10.1093/bjc/azn065

Loftus B (2009) Police occupational culture: classic themes, altered times. Policing and Society 20(1):1–20. doi:10.1080/10439460903281547

Lynch M (2005) Developing a scenario-based training program: Giving officers a tactical advantage. FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin 74(10):1–8

Mallory, C., Hasenbush, A., & Sears, B. (2015). *Discrimination and harassment by law enforcement officers in the LGBT community*. The Williams Institute. Retrieved from http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/LGBT-Discrimination-and-Harassment-in-Law-Enforcement-March-2015.pdf

Marshall, B. D. L., Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Zhang, R., & Wood, E. (2009). Survival Sex Work and Increased HIV Risk Among Sexual Minority Street-Involved Youth: *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 1. doi:10.1097/QAI.0b013e3181c300d7

Miller SL, Forest KB, Jurik NC (2003) Diversity in Blue Lesbian and Gay Police Officers in a Masculine Occupation. Men and Masculinities 5(4):355–385. doi:10.1177/0095399702250841

Morgan DL (1993) Qualitative content analysis: a guide to paths not taken. Qualitative Health Research 3(1):112–121

Myers KA, Forest KB, Miller SL (2004) Officer Friendly and the Tough Cop. Journal of Homosexuality 47(1):17–37. doi:10.1300/J082v47n01_02

Onishenko D, Caragata L (2010) A Theoretically Critical Gaze on the Canadian Equal Marriage Debate: Breaking the Binaries. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services 22(1–2):91–111. doi:10.1080/10538720903332404

Padva G (2008) Media and Popular Culture Representations of LGBT Bullying. Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services 19(3–4):105–118. doi:10.1080/10538720802161615

Patterson, P. (2012). Gay Girl Responds to Gay Bashing. Retrieved September 19, 2014, from http://www.independent.com/news/2012/jan/06/gay-girl-responds-gay-bashing/

Peel E (1999) Violence against lesbians and gay men: Decision-making in reporting and not reporting crime. Feminism & Psychology 9(2):161–167. doi:10.1177/0959353599009002008

Riggs DW (2012) "Paradoxes of Visibility": Lesbian and Gay Parents in the Australian Print Media. Jindal Global L Rev 4:201–272

Rothman EF, Exner D, Baughman AL (2011) The Prevalence of Sexual Assault Against People Who Identify as Gay, Lesbian, or Bisexual in the United States: A Systematic Review. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse 12(2):55–66. doi:10.1177/1524838010390707

Rumens N, Broomfield J (2012) Gay men in the police: identity disclosure and management issues. Human Resource Management Journal 22(3):283–298. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2011.00179.x

Schnebly SM (2008) The Influence of Community-Oriented Policing on Crime-Reporting Behavior*. JQ: Justice Quarterly 25(2):223–251. doi:10.1080/07418820802025009

Seron C, Pereira J, Kovath J (2004) Judging Police Misconduct: "Street-Level" versus Professional Policing. Law & Society Review 38(4):665–710. doi:10.1111/j.0023-9216.2004.00063.x

The World's Got Pride… (2013). *Gay Times*, (421), 56–58.

Walters, S. D. (2003). *All the Rage: The Story of Gay Visibility in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Wolff K, Cokely C (2007) "To protect and to serve?": An exploration of police conduct in relation to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community. Sexuality & Culture 11(2):1–23. doi:10.1007/s12119-007-9000-z

Younglove JA, Kerr MG, Vitello CJ (2002) Law Enforcement Officers' Perceptions of Same Sex Domestic Violence Reason for Cautious Optimism. Journal of Interpersonal Violence 17(7):760–772. doi:10.1177/0886260502017007004