

Chuck K. Stewart

Dr. Nelly Stromquist

The Efficacy of Sexual Orientation Training in Law Enforcement Agencies

This study sought to document and assess the effectiveness of sexual orientation sensibility training programs. Sexual orientation trainings were observed and empirical data gathered at seven different California police basic academies and agencies. These training sites included basic academies associated with large metropolitan police departments and California Community Colleges, including an In-Service for all employees of a small police department. Recruits primarily made up the student population with two classes designed for police employees and administrators.

The effectiveness of the training was assessed using psycholinguistic/humanistic education theory. Interviews with students, instructors, program administrators and gay and lesbian community activists used the *Overt-Institutional-Societal* model of homophobia to assess the culture in which sexual orientation training was conducted. Interviews were also used to gather data on appropriate police behaviors in situations that had gay and/or lesbian components. Instrumental testing was conducted on students to assess changes in attitudes, feeling, knowledge, identities and behaviors concerning homosexuality. A total of 438 students were observed of which 167 completed pre-/post-testing, and 6 participated in interviews. Fifty other persons were interviewed and completed instrumental testing.

Training took essentially three forms: *Panel Method*—gay and lesbian panel members sharing their life stories, *Open Dialogue Method*—students were asked to share their concerns about homosexuality, and a *Structured Method*—one that followed a prescribed curriculum. Panels that did not contain gay or lesbian officers and the less structured classes were ineffective. Having gay or lesbian officers as instructors following a prescribed curriculum was the most effective. Only the *Index of Homophobia* (feelings

toward homosexuals) showed statistical significance for a number of training sites. All instructors took an essentialist position concerning homosexuality and every program administrator believed homosexuality to be a deficit. The police culture towards gays and lesbians had a significant influence on training effectiveness. Instrumental testing revealed that if an overall agency was gay-affirming then both administrators and their recruits would score more gay-positive than in a gay-negative environment and vice versa, and this impacted training acceptance.

Word Count of Title and Body = 350.

**THE EFFICACY OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION TRAINING
IN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

by

Chuck Klenzing Stewart

A Dissertation Presented to the

FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(Education)

May 1995

Copyright 1995

Chuck Klenzing Stewart

Prologue and Acknowledgments

In 1992, I was contacted by the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force* concerning their desire to have a curriculum on sexual orientation training written for use at the Los Angeles Police Academy. This event changed my life. I had just completed my master's in education with a thesis titled *Homosexuality and Public Education* where I examined some of the legal decisions surrounding gay and lesbian teachers and the discussion of homosexuality in public school. I was interested in pursuing a Ph.D. in education and very much concerned with teaching methods that effectively reduce homophobia. But I was blocked, since a venue in which to conduct research in public education does not exist. I discovered that no school or school system has workshops or in-service trainings targeting the reduction of homophobia. A few schools have counseling and educational programs for identified gay and lesbian students, but no organized effort is made to inform teachers, administrators or parents about gay and lesbian issues and to effect positive changes in attitudes, feelings and behavior.

Writing the 175-page curriculum and teaching package opened the door to law enforcement. Because of changes in California state law, sexual orientation was mandated to be included in the 24-hour minimum cultural awareness programs taught at all police basic academies. Thus, a venue opened up in which to conduct research.

Immediately after writing the curriculum I started to receive phone calls from other cultural awareness training program administrators across the nation wanting to know what constituted effective training. Since I had not started my own research, I was unable to reply but was impressed by the overwhelming need to find some answers. During the review of the literature, I was floored by the lack of research—not only on police cultural awareness training, but even trainings in public schools. Police academies, public schools, and businesses constantly engage in trainings designed to “sensitize” employees to

particular groups of persons (sometimes referred to as *Human Relations Training*, *Cultural Awareness Training*, *Multi-Cultural Education*), yet none of these programs are ever assessed for effectiveness. Instead, these programs are held up as a badge of pride that the organization is addressing sensitive issues, but they are never formally assessed.

Many people have assisted in the development of this dissertation. My Ph.D. committee—Dr. Nelly Stromquist (Chair), Dr. Walter Williams, and Dr. William Tierney—has been invaluable in preparing the dissertation in a form that hopefully will lead to it being published. It is Dr. Walter Williams who originally encouraged me to attend USC for the master's and Ph.D. and has never failed as my champion. I am grateful that he gave the opportunity to write a chapter in his forthcoming edited book, *Overcoming Heterosexism: Strategies that Work*. At first I was hesitant to attend USC because of its reputation for being a conservative institution. I had interviewed many other educational institutions but was continually warned that my topic was too controversial and that would jeopardize my chances for a Ph.D.. For example, at one major university in Southern California, the dean of the education department closed his office door when we met and shared in a hushed voice that his son was gay. He predicted major battles in the department over my topic but that he would back me 100%. At USC, different department heads and deans encouraged me to attend. All these men were able to say the “gay” or “homosexual” words without that perceptual pause that most people stutter. Thus, I want to thank the entire USC education department for their continued support. This is important research.

I received some important financial support for the field portion of the research. Both the California Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) and the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force* helped to cover travel expenses while collecting data. From these organizations, I thank Dave Spisak, Frank Patino, Jim Tarver, Dr. Marsha Tarver, Sandra Farrington-Dominguez, John Ferry, Donna Wade, and Art

Mattox. Of course, I must thank all the participating California police academies and agencies who allowed me to conduct research at their institutions. Many of them bent over backwards to accommodate my needs, plus being pleasant to work with. They impressed me with their professionalism and their intense desire to make cultural awareness training viable and the best that it can be.

Finally, there are my family and friends who have seen me through this project. The strength of convictions role-modeled by my parents Dr. John and Margaret Stewart, my sister Dr. Bonnie Stewart and my best friend Norman Kolpas, encouraged me to never lose sight from achieving my goal. Special thanks go to Jim Dochterman, Barry Waldron, Katie and Jake Kolpas, Lilo Zuckerman-Loftin, Steven Douglas, Mark Sherwin, Dr. Virginia Uribe, Frank Carrillo, Shelly Diamond and Barbara Belmont of *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Scientist* (of which I am co-chair), Jim Owens, Dean Moffat, and Shane Martin.

I dearly hope that this research will help educators conduct more effective trainings on sexual orientation. We must overcome homophobia.

Table of Contents

Prologue and Acknowledgments	ii
List of Tables.....	vi
Appendices	vii
CHAPTER 1 — THE PROBLEM AND ITS EXPLICATION	1
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Importance of the Study	9
Research Questions.....	9
Conceptual Assumptions.....	10
Methodology.....	11
Methodological Assumptions.....	12
Delimitations	13
Limitations.....	13
Bibliography.....	14
CHAPTER 2 — REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
Issue 1 — What is Cultural Awareness Training?.....	16
Issue 2 — Why is Training Conducted on Sexual Orientation?.....	17
Issue 3 — What are the Goals for Sexual Orientation Training?.....	26
Issue 4 — How is Training “Effectiveness” Assessed?.....	30
Issue 5 — What Specific Elements Comprise Effective Sexual Orientation Training?	36
Issue 6 — How are Police Culture and Administrative Structures Related to the Effectiveness of Sexual Orientation Training?	38
Synergy on Sexual Orientation Training	42
Bibliography.....	47
CHAPTER 3 — METHODOLOGY	56
Overall Design.....	59
Quasi-Experimental Research Instrumentation.....	60
Qualitative Research	65
Bibliography.....	70
CHAPTER 4 — RESEARCH DESCRIPTION, QUALITATIVE AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FINDINGS	71
Section 1 — Qualitative and Non-Instrumental Empirical Research.....	71
Site #1	75
Site #2	89
Site #3	99
Site #4.....	101
Site #5	112
Site #6	125
Site #7	137
Site #8	150
Site #9	158
Participants’ Suggestions for Assessing the Effectiveness of Sexual Orientation Training.....	166
Program Suggestions Made by Interviewees.....	168
What Forces Contribute Most to the Acceptance of Gays and Lesbians?.....	171
“Appropriate” Police Behaviors in Gay and Lesbian Scenarios.....	172

Section 2 — Instrumental Empirical Research.....	175
Section 3 — Homophobia Level Estimate	185
CHAPTER 5 — SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	189
Summaries.....	189
Research Questions Reviewed.....	196
Conclusions.....	205
Recommendations	210
Bibliography.....	212

List of Tables

Table 4.1 Sexual Orientation Training Observation Summary — Activity, Time and Student Involvement.	73-74
Table 4.2 Pre- and Post-Test Mean PERQ Scores of Heterosexual Students Attending Sexual Orientation Training.....	179
Table 4.3 Pre- and Post-Test PERQ Scores of Homosexual Students Attending Sexual Orientation Training	180
Table 4.4 PERQ Scores of Heterosexual Police Officers and Administrators Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training.....	181
Table 4.5 PERQ Scores of Homosexual Police Officers Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training.....	182
Table 4.6 PERQ Scores of Heterosexual Community Members Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training	182
Table 4.7 PERQ Scores of Homosexual Community Members Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training	183
Table C1 — Instructional Time and Activity Schedule	230
Table C2 — Times Spent at Each Level of Student Involvement and Percent of Total Time that Represents.....	233
Table D — Compliance of Observed Instructional Methodology to Education Theory.....	236
Table E1 — Indicator of Levels of Homophobia.....	243
Table E2 — Training Site #1	244
Table E3 — Training Site #2.....	247
Table E4 — Training Site #3.....	249
Table E5 — Training Site #4.....	250
Table E6 — Training Site #5.....	252

Table E7 — Training Site #6.....	254
Table E8 — Training Site #7.....	257
Table E9 — Training Site #8.....	259
Table E10 — Training Site #9.....	260

Appendices

APPENDIX A — PERQ PART 4— Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, Emotional Identity	213
APPENDIX B — PERQ PART 6— Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality (PBSH)	215
APPENDIX C — Documentation of Sexual Orientation Training at Nine California Police Agencies and Academies.....	219
Comparison of Instructional Times for 8 Different Police Sexual Orientation Trainings.....	230
APPENDIX D — Educational Analysis of 8 Different Police Sexual Orientation Trainings	234
APPENDIX E — Qualitative and Instrumental Data / Levels of Homophobia Tables.....	241
APPENDIX F — Comprehensive Program and Instructional Model for “Training on Socially Stigmatized Communities”.....	262
Training Program	264
Recommendations to Overcome Police Homophobia.....	275
Resources.....	280
Training on sexual stigmatized communities—Checklist.....	282

CHAPTER 1 — THE PROBLEM AND ITS EXPLICATION

Virtually every law enforcement agency in the United States performs some type of cultural awareness training for new recruits. These training programs often include race, ethnicity, gender and occasionally sexual orientation issues. Although police agencies agree that cultural awareness trainings are important, very few have performed an analysis of their existing programs and none have ever published their findings. Police departments often cite cultural awareness training programs as evidence of their efforts to improve the effectiveness of their officers but without themselves becoming vested in the program goals. There are major problems with cultural awareness training programs stemming from confusion over program goals, training methodologies, “effectiveness” assessment, which groups to include in training, and core problems as to the very basic definition of what is “cultural awareness training.”

Law enforcement cultural awareness training programs are often called, “human relations training,” “diversity training,” “sensitivity training,” “multicultural education training,” besides others. Part of the confusion originates from historical influences and the differences in emphasis by law enforcement agencies. California’s Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) uses the nomenclature “cultural awareness” (CA) and “cultural awareness training” (CAT) which will be used in this research. Chapter 2 will discuss the historical and conceptual differences in these terms and propose a clearer definition of cultural awareness training.

The concern for cultural awareness training has been generated by a growing tension between police and certain minority groups. Police work is recognized to be inherently discriminatory in its operation (Bittner, 1980), conservative in nature (Barlow, 1993; Paternoster & Bynum, 1982; Barlow, Barlow, & Chiricos, 1993; Miller, 1980; Quinney, 1974; Manning, 1988; Platt, et al., 1982; Klockars, 1988) and focuses primarily

on street crime. Police most often interact with lower income groups as victims and suspects. Changes in the general racial and ethnic makeup in the US (“minorities” will comprise a majority of the population by the year 2000 (Johnston, & Packer, 1991)) have exacerbated the disproportional composition of ethnic minorities in offender populations. Certain minorities have experienced restrictions on their freedoms and an alienation from the American dream because of the lack of financial and social improvements which were partly caused by the conservative political movement of the 1980s. These actions have “contributed to efforts by [blacks], gays/lesbians, Hispanics and women to seek greater empowerment. Part of the empowerment issue is to gain equal treatment and protection from the police” (Barlow, 1992).

The need for increased cultural awareness training comes from additional sources. During the 1970s, police community relations programs including cultural awareness programs were reduced in size and redirected toward crime prevention units and DARE programs. Police agencies decided to allot more time and money to meet the changes in technology, officer survival training, computers, equipment purchases and seminars. At the same time citizen complaints against police officers and hate crime reporting increased dramatically, primarily in the area of racial, ethnic and sexual orientation discriminations (*see* the annual Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations, Hate-Crime Report (1991); National Gay & Lesbian Task Force annual, Anti-Gay Violence, Victimization & Defamation, (1989-92)). Obviously, the reduced effort by police in cultural awareness training was not meeting the challenges or demands of the community they served.

Juvenile justice practitioners have also become increasingly concerned with the issue of cultural awareness training. The Committee on Minorities and Juvenile Justice in New Jersey (American Correctional Association (ACA) and Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), 1992, p. 9) found that bias toward minority youth could be identified by

the following; (1) “the over-representation of minorities at all stages of juvenile delinquency cases,” (2) the unequal distribution of available services between minority and non-minority youth, and (3) minorities are more often channeled into correctional facilities whereas their white counterparts are directed toward private treatment facilities.

In an attempt to assess the extent to which law enforcement agencies have addressed cultural awareness training, the ACA & PERF performed the first large-scale national survey of police agencies regarding their efforts in the area of cultural awareness training. Curricula were collected and questionnaires filled out from many large police departments throughout the US. and reported in the *Preliminary Report on Training In Cultural Difference for Law Enforcement / Juvenile Justice Officials* (1992). They found that there is a belief in law enforcement agencies that:

cultural awareness must be developed if the United States is to compete successfully on the world market and maintain social order and harmony among its citizens. Recognizing this fact, the move to instill cultural awareness has become socially, economically and politically correct for many segments of our society; however, there still remains a tremendous amount of work to be done. (ACA & PERF, 1992, p. 7).

Thus, there is a strong belief that cultural awareness is essential for modern police agencies and that cultural awareness training is an important element for developing cultural awareness. But what are the characteristics of “effective” cultural awareness programs and the elements of “effective” cultural awareness training? Unfortunately, there are no published reports by any police agency or training institution on the assessment of program and/or training effectiveness. That is not to say that police researchers do not claim to know what makes for program and training effectiveness. Many authors, including the ACA & PERF (1992) report, outline elements of “effective” cultural awareness training programs (ACA & PERF, 1992, p. 24; Cizon, 1970; Siegal & Senna, 1991). Even critics of cultural awareness training programs often

make their own suggestions on how to improve training effectiveness (St. George, 1991); however, none of these claims are substantiated by clear research.

The question of “effectiveness” is a major problem for cultural awareness programs in police agencies. Four approaches are possible for assessing training “effectiveness:”

1. A community approach evaluates the reduction in the number of citizen complaints and lawsuits against police. But are either of these measures directly related to the “effectiveness” of the cultural awareness training? Not necessarily. The reporting of hate crimes is a prime example where the explosion of reported incidents may be related to citizen knowledge of the law and police efforts to make reports, instead of an increase in such crime. Previously, this kind of violence was not even reportable.
2. A police approach usually involves student evaluations of the training. Researchers have concluded, however, that 90% of what is taught in the academy has no relationship to the actual demands of the job, and that no single educational experience has any direct relationship to police performance (Shelden, 1982). Student evaluations of training may not indicate their actual behaviors on the job and subsequently the effectiveness of training.
3. An instrumental empirical assessment strategy attempts to measure shifts in attitudes, feelings and behavior, but may be inconclusive about changes resulting from short-term training.
4. An education theory assessment of training “effectiveness” can be made by analyzing how closely training matches theory. This study proposes to use the psycholinguistic/humanist educational perspective. Originally, this

theory evolved from research on how people learn languages and has primarily been used to develop “holistic” reading programs.

(See Chapter 2 for a development of these four approaches.)

Besides the general lack of research, there is much confusion as to what the goals of cultural awareness programs for police should be. Confusion exists not only regarding the appropriate goals of such programs, but also what constitutes “cultural awareness.” For example in California, the enabling legislation for police training on cultural awareness (SB 2680 and AB 401) states that the goal of cultural awareness training is to provide “adequate instruction on racial and cultural diversity in order to foster mutual respect and cooperation between law enforcement and members of all racial and cultural groups . . . [and that] “cultural diversity” include, but are not limited to, gender and sexual orientation issues.” As interpreted by The California Commission of Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), their *Guidelines for Law Enforcement’s Design of Cultural Awareness Training Programs* (February, 1992, p. ii) states, “The purpose of cultural awareness training is to focus on principles that hold promise for moving California law enforcement to a higher level of understanding, acceptance, and appreciation for our diversity.” A review of other state cultural awareness programs (ACA & PERF, 1992) reveals a similar wide-range of goals that are either ambiguous or unrealistic. Terms such as “heighten sensitivity of officers,” “increase awareness,” or “know how to treat each member of the community” are used to state the goals of the program. “Often the goals are broad, sociologically based, and unmeasurable” (St. George, 1991, p.8).

Confounding the vagueness over goals is a lack of agreement within the law enforcement community as to which groups or issues are to be addressed through cultural awareness programs. The ACA & PERF (1992) report found that approximately one-third of the responding police agencies did not train on any one specific cultural or ethnic

group, but rather “focused on more general issues of tolerance, diversity, prejudice reduction and changing demographics” (p. 22). Approximately half of the responding police agencies included African-American and Asian groups. Sexual orientation seems to be the most recent addition to cultural awareness programs. Less than ten percent of the responding police agencies included gay, lesbian, and/or gender issues in training. Most police cultural awareness programs do not address the individual differences of minorities or the special needs of gays and lesbians. Many police cultural awareness training programs “come right off a training shelf, indicating that the material covered in the program must be broad enough to relate to a number of training audiences, and thus making the programs generic and not relevant to the participants” (St. George, 1991, p. 12). In some cases, the state mandates the topics and issues to be covered during cultural awareness training. In California, the minority groups to be covered are mandated by state law, but has delegated Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) to train personnel from police agencies in methods to assess the particular agency’s cultural awareness needs. It is then up to each agency to conform to the law through implementation of their own cultural awareness program. Subsequently there is wide variation in the content and methodology of the cultural awareness training programs.

Implementation of cultural awareness training programs within law enforcement agencies is similarly inconsistent. “The amount of training ranged from short roll-call training sessions to 16-hour plus blocks provided to agency employees” (ACA & PERF, 1992, p. 23). Most police agencies do not train all employees equally—recruits being trained more often than line officers, supervisors or civilian employees. Also inconsistent is who provides the training instruction. Police academy staff performed instruction most often, although minority group representatives, government representatives, private consultants and police employees who are minority group members have also been used. When it comes to training materials and methodologies, “materials used for training for

police agencies varied greatly . . . [as well as] training approaches” (ACA & PERF, 1992, p. 24). One major content area that is unresolved deals with appropriate police behaviors in situations that include gay and/or lesbian contact. Nels Klyver, Ph.D., Training Administrator for the Los Angeles Police Department, stated in 1992 that, “We do not care what attitudes police officers have, we only care about their behavior.” Finally, the interplay of administration support and diversity program effectiveness has been suggested but not measured. For example, in a survey of 130 participants in the California POST Cultural Awareness Facilitators training (Stewart, 1993), it was found that support and commitment from the administration were the primary obstacles to development and implementation of the training program. However, a direct measure of the impact that administration support had on program effectiveness was not performed, leaving unclear the degree to which administrative organizational structures are important.

Police agencies have engaged in cultural awareness training for more than 20-years. Because of the delicate nature of the subject, programs are rarely scrutinized or criticized by trainers or supervisors. Yet officers informally criticize the trainings and those who are responsible for implementing the programs often do not take the subject seriously. Why is there such a negative backlash and resistance from the officers? “For many officers, the title of the training alone sends a message that they are viewed as insensitive. The notion that police are insensitive is repugnant to many officers who have been involved in pulling victims from car crashes, talking people out of suicide, and helping to deliver babies” (St. George, 1991, p. 8). Lee Brown (1973) identified four additional reasons why police cultural awareness programs often fail:

- (1) many were hastily established because it was “fashionable” to have one;
- (2) many were created exclusively to “prevent riots”; (3) often the programs became the dumping grounds for misfit officers; and (4) because of the historical context in which they were formed (1960s), the programs were looked upon as programs geared specifically for Blacks.” (p. 22).

A continuing problem with cultural awareness programs within police agencies is how they are perceived by the officers. Instead of trainings being seen as opportunities to become “better” officers by learning about different cultures and personal biases, they are often perceived to be forms of punishment imposed upon them through outside political pressures. Police attitudes, feelings, as well as police culture have significant impact on the acceptance of sexual orientation training.

To summarize, there is much confusion and many problems facing implementation of cultural awareness training programs within law enforcement agencies. These include:

1. A major stumbling block to developing and implementing cultural training programs is the lack of support from police administration.
2. Goals are often vague, broad and all-encompassing and presented as *the* solution to police-community conflict.
3. Which groups and what topics to be covered within cultural awareness is unclear and no process has been identified to help police make such determinations.
4. How cultural awareness training programs are implemented varies widely from police agency to police agency.
5. Measurements of training “effectiveness” are faced with many challenges.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is three-fold: (1) to identify the key elements that make sexual orientation training programs within law enforcement agencies “effective,” (2) to develop and test an assessment model based on psycholinguistic and humanistic education theory, and (3) to document some of the actual attempts at conducting sexual orientation training as future reference for other researchers, oversight organizations, and instructors.

Importance of the Study: This study should prove useful to individuals responsible for the development and implementation of cultural awareness programs within law enforcement agencies. Police administrators, curriculum developers and cultural awareness trainers should be able to use the results of this study to improve their existing cultural awareness training programs.

There are several reasons why this research will be of interest to police agencies. First, many states are in the process of implementing legislation requiring every police agency within their state to include cultural awareness training; however, cultural awareness training takes on a wide range of topics and pedagogy with little consensus regarding content and scope. Thus, state police regulatory commissions would find this research helpful in designing state-wide guidelines for the implementation of cultural awareness training programs, particularly on sexual orientation training. Second, national agencies such as the American Correctional Association (ACA) and the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) are in the process of developing curricula on cultural awareness training for implementation nation-wide. Not included in their research is an assessment component of their final product. This research should dovetail with their efforts and combine to make for more effective national guidelines. Third, it is at the local level that training actually takes place. Each police agency has to decide how to meet the national and state guide-lines and this research should help integrate all levels of police training.

In addition, public schools and private businesses in the process of developing their own cultural awareness training programs, should be able to use this study to create effective programs. And finally, schools of education will find this research to be invaluable in their efforts to develop appropriate curricula for teaching cultural awareness.

Research Questions: This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the goals of sexual orientation training as expressed by the community, police personnel and program instructors? How are these goals related to the training

actually delivered in law enforcement agencies? How are these goals related to training effectiveness?

2. Of the four possible assessment strategies—community assessment, police assessment, instrumental empirical assessment, and psycholinguistic/humanistic education theory assessment—which ones provide the best estimate of sexual orientation training effectiveness in law enforcement environments?
3. How is law enforcement agency’s culture related to the acceptance of sexual orientation training? How does the agency’s culture influence training effectiveness? What administrative organizational structures provide the most support for effective sexual orientation training development and implementation?
4. Within a sexual orientation training program, what are the parameters that make the program most successful? For example—What are the contents of the trainings? What training methodologies are to be used? Who should conduct the training? How long should trainings last? Who should attend the trainings?
5. Often police administrators claim that they do not care what attitudes and beliefs officers hold, but rather that their behavior be appropriate. A major training content question is what behaviors are law enforcement personnel expected to demonstrate in different work scenarios that involve gay and/or lesbian contact? Are these behaviors taught as part of an effective training program?

Conceptual Assumptions: The following conceptual assumption is implicit in this study:

1. That there is a general set of “best” criteria for effective sexual orientation training.
2. That by examining the criteria of other police agencies and working professionals in the field of sexual orientation training, a valid way of determining the criteria is possible.

Methodology

All California police recruits and officers are required by law to participate in cultural awareness training. Purely experimental research methodologies are therefore impossible because of the lack of a control group and randomization of the test subjects. Also, cultural awareness training is not standardized throughout the state. Wide variations in the course content, length of course, teaching pedagogy, etc., make assumptions about treatment similarities problematic.

The methodology proposed for this research is to combine quasi-experimental analysis of cultural awareness training courses, education theory analysis of training observations along with qualitative measures of police academy/agency cultures. Using the findings of these methodologies and comparing the similarities and differences between different police settings should lead to a deeper understanding about the elements needed for effective training on sexual orientation.

Sexual orientation training together with other cultural awareness trainings will be observed at a number of California police agencies and academies. Although it would be preferable to conduct research with agencies representing a broad-spectrum of law enforcement environments in California, participation is voluntary and thereby most likely under-representative of agencies who have minimally implemented the legal requirements for cultural awareness training. Assessment instruments will be given training participants before and after sexual orientation training. These instruments include attitudinal, emotional, knowledge base, identities, and behavioral measures (See Chapter 3 for details about these instruments). The quasi-experimental portion of the research is modeled after Isaac's & Michael's (1981) *Design 1—One Group Pretest—Post-test Design*. Appropriate statistical tests will be used to determine whether there are statistically significant changes between pre- and post-testing. Besides the quasi-experimental portion

of the research, qualitative research will be conducted in order to flesh out the meaning of the training experience. Each training will be observed, training participants will be asked to volunteer for interview, key informants will be interviewed from the training staff and agency administration, police ride-alongs in the locale's gay community will be scheduled, interviews will be conducted with leaders of the gay and lesbian community, and documents concerning training and the administrative implementation of cultural awareness programs will be obtained and reviewed.

Triangulation between the sources of qualitative data will provide an accurate picture on the status of gays and lesbians within the police agency. Class observations will be compared and analyzed against education theory. Comparing all these sources of data will allow conclusions to be made concerning the effectiveness in the overall cultural awareness program and the sexual orientation training in particular.

Methodological Assumptions: The following methodological assumptions are implicit in this study:

1. Many important selection criteria are adequately represented in the survey.
2. The parts of the training that are memorable and stand-out for their strengths are in fact "effective."
3. The stratified random sample is truly representative of personnel throughout the agency and the results of this survey are generalizable to at least California.
4. The participants will respond honestly and accurately and their responses reflect their actual practice on the job.
5. Maturation (psychological) of the participants is expected to be a significant contributor to the change in attitude.

Delimitations: The following delimitations are noted:

1. Only personnel within law enforcement agencies or their liaison will be sampled.

Limitations: The following limitations are noted:

1. California police agencies may not be representative of other parts of the nation, thereby limiting the generalizability of the study.
2. To the degree that the methodological assumptions set forth were not met, the internal and external validity of the study would be limited.
3. The sustained attitude change effected by the program may not be fully apparent over the short period of time this study is conducted.

Bibliography

- American Correctional Association (ACA) & Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). (1992, September). *Preliminary report on training in cultural difference for law enforcement / juvenile justice officials.*
- Barlow, D.E. (1992, March). *Cultural sensitivity training; Rediscovered.* Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Meetings, Pittsburgh.
- Barlow, D.E., Barlow, M.H., & Chiricos, T.G. (1993). Long economic cycles and the history of criminal justice in the U.S. *Crime, Law and Social Change, 19*, 143-169.
- Bittner, E. (1980). *The functions of the police in modern society.* Cambridge, MA: Olegeschlager, Gunn, and Hain.
- Brown, L. P. (1973). *The death of police community relations.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Urban Affairs and Research.
- California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST), (1992, February). *Guidelines for law enforcement's design of cultural awareness training programs.*
- Cizon, F.A., & Smith, W.H.T. (1970). *Some guidelines for successful police-community relations training programs.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Isaac, S. & Michael, W.B. (1981). *Handbook in research and evaluation.* San Diego: Edits Publishers. Also see Van Dalen, D.B. (1979). *Understanding educational research* (4th ed.). New York: MacGraw-Hill. (Adapted from Cambell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Johnston, W., & Packer, A. (1991). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st Century.* Indianapolis, Indiana: Hudson Institute.
- Klockars, C.B. (1988). The rhetoric of community policing. In Greene and Mastrofki's (Eds.) *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality.* New York: Praeger.
- Klyver, N. (1992). Personal correspondence to C. Stewart.
- Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations. (1991). *Hate-crime report 1991.*
- Manning, P. (1988). Community policing as a drama of control. In Greene and Mastrofki's (Eds.) *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality.* New York: Praeger.
- Miller, M.B. (1980). At hard labor: Rediscovering the 19th Century prison. In Platt and Takagi (Eds.) *Punishment and penal discipline: Essays on the prison and the prisoners' movement.* San Francisco: Crime and Social Justice Associates.

- National Gay & Lesbian Task Force. (1989-92). *Anti-gay violence, victimization & defamation*.
- Paternoster, R., & Bynum, T. (1982). The justice model as ideology: A critical look at the impetus for sentencing reform. *Contemporary Crisis*, 6, 7-24.
- Platt, et al., (1982). *The iron fist and the velvet glove: An analysis of the U.S. police*. 3rd. Ed.. San Francisco: Crime and Justice Associates.
- Quinny, R. (1974). *Criminal justice in America: A critical understanding*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Shelden, R. (1982). *Criminal justice in America: A sociological approach*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Siegal, L.J., & Senna, J.J. (1991). *Juvenile delinquency: Theory practice and law*. St. Paul: West.
- St. George, J. (1991, November 30). Sensitivity training needs rethinking. *Law Enforcement News*, 17, 347.
- Stewart, C.K. (1993, October 4). *POST cultural awareness survey*. Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Society, Los Angeles, CA.

CHAPTER 2 — REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Sexual orientation training in law enforcement uncovers a number of policing and educational issues that are unclear and unresolved by traditional cultural awareness training. This section will look at six broad interconnecting issues. At the end of this section, the issues will be combined into a coherent strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of sexual orientation training.

Issue 1 — What is Cultural Awareness Training?

Shane Martin (1993) conducted a thorough literature review on the issue of cultural awareness (he used the term “multicultural education,” which will be used in this section only). He found that there is a great deal of ambiguity about what is multicultural education and that much of the confusion stems from the historical evolution in education of integrating multiple cultures into schools. Originally viewed as an add-on program, attempts are currently being made to address multiculturalism with a holistic approach. This includes considering ethnicity and culture when diagnosing students’ needs or assessing their performance (Gay 1979; 1983). Grant & Sleeter (1985) proposed five models or typologies to describe current attempts at multicultural education; (1) *Ethnic Studies* (multiculturalism treated as separate subject), (2) *Human Relations* (aimed at prevention of conflict between members of different ethnic groups), (3) *Education of the Culturally Different* (attempts to increase home/school cultural compatibility but unavoidably classifies the home culture as the “other”), (4) *Education That is Multicultural* (teach students to value cultural differences and to accept others’ right to be different), and (5) *Social Reconstructionist* (teach students to analyze critically why some groups are oppressed and to take an active role in restructuring unequal relationships).

The *Human Relations* model is the most prevalent form of multiculturalism education found in schools and cultural awareness training used by law enforcement.

Issue 2 — Why is Training Conducted on Sexual Orientation?

The discussion of cultural awareness rarely distinguishes between the unique needs of different groups. Racism is usually treated the same as sexism, xenophobia, ethnocentrism, and heterosexism; however, each bigotry has its unique characteristics, emerges from specific historical developments and is locally situated. American gay and lesbian rights are following a similar political development as did the Civil Rights Movement for African-Americans. Yet, there are unique differences. Gays and lesbians are not a “visible” minority in the same sense that racial minorities are “visible.” Few gays and lesbians fit the physical stereotype that our culture uses to identify and stigmatize homosexuals. It is possible for gays and lesbians to “pass” as straight and be invisible to most Americans.

Gays and lesbians have many of the psychological scars similar to those of persecuted religious minorities. But even this analogy is not complete. Whereas the religious minority family will emotionally support their child, homosexual children discover that they are not the same as their parents or siblings and learn that their core sexual identity is something terrible and is never to be shared. Gays and lesbians have the unique experience of growing up in total emotional isolation, even from their family members.

Homosexuals also challenge many of the gender roles of American society. Many people are confused by homosexuals and believe that they want to be the opposite of their sex. They may think men who have sex with other men actually want to be women. Women who have sex with other women threaten male domination. Homosexuals blur the

distinction between men and women, question femininity and masculinity, and threaten the patriarchal social structures. Thus, gays and lesbians have some of the same experiences as those who experience racism, discrimination based on religion, and sexism, but with additional dimensions unique to their group.

Furthermore, through formal and informal structures, societies treat gays and lesbians differently than other minority groups. Almost half the states in the United States still have sodomy laws that are primarily used to harass gays and lesbians. Recent attempts to preclude legal protections for gays and lesbians have been made in the states of Oregon and Colorado, and there is continuing debate over gays in the military. Gays and lesbians have legal protection in only six states and a few municipalities, and still experience legal discrimination in most places in the United States with respect to employment, housing, child custody and visitation rights, marriage, the armed forces, and property ownership (Hunter, Michaelson & Stoddard, 1992). Besides these formal discriminations, gays and lesbians experience a daily onslaught of anti-gay sentiments and the reinforcement of heterosexual norms through informal structures such as the media, religion, school activities, library book selections, fraternal organizations, and job advancement.

“Homophobia” is the broad term often used to describe discrimination against gays and lesbians. Originally, homophobia was popularized by Weinberg (1972) and defined by him as “the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals.” Anti-gay sentiments have been labeled by various authors as *homoerotophobia* (Churchill, 1967), *heterosexism* (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978), *homosexphobia* (Levitt & Klassen, 1974), *homosexism* (Lehne, 1976), *homonegativism* (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980), *antihomosexuality* (Hacker, 1971), *homohatred* (Kirk & Madsen, 1990), and *antihomosexuality* (Klassen, Williams, & Levitt, 1989). Although these terms were previously used to describe the fear, dislike and distrust of homosexual women and men,

“homophobia” gained currency and began to be widely used by professionals and non-professionals alike. In the process, homophobia “lost much of its original precision” (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980, p. 357). The term homophobia, besides being linguistically awkward (since it literally means “fear of sameness”), contains three assumptions; (1) that antigay prejudice and feelings are primarily fear responses, (2) that it is dysfunctional and irrational when manifested in individuals, and (3) that it is situated locally in the individual rather than as a cultural norm. Yet, empirical evidence on homophobia does not corroborate these assumptions (Fyfe, 1983; Herek, 1986a; Nungesser, 1983). For our discussion, “homophobia” will simply mean any negative attitude, belief or action directed against non-heterosexual persons.

Two components that make up the phenomenon of homophobia are: (1) prejudicial attitudes about homosexuals without valid justification, and; (2) discriminatory acts based on sexual orientation. Prejudice and discrimination can be reinforced through social institutions and are said to constitute *institutionalized discrimination* (Eitzen, 1980). When the discrimination results in segregation of population, this can occur by two means: (1) *de jure*—formalized discrimination through law, and (2) *de facto*—informal segregation by social custom and business practice. Homophobia is manifest in three forms:

- A. Overt: The use of defamatory words, violence, name-calling, verbal abuse and character assassination. (See Comstock, 1991.)
- B. Institutional Homophobia: Major social institutions have policies that exclude homosexuals. Blumenfeld & Raymond (1988) identified four examples:
 1. Government—Same-sex eroticism is still illegal in nearly half the states of the United States with penalties ranging from fines to life imprisonment; there are no national laws protecting the rights of gays and lesbians; many states legally exclude sexual minorities from employment protections,

housing discrimination, immigration, rights of child custody, public accommodations, police protection, inheritance, and security clearances; and gays and lesbians cannot be legally married to each other and thus are not accorded tax, insurance, pension and medical advantages accorded heterosexual marriage partners. In addition, public libraries often refuse to carry homosexual literature. (*See Harvard Law Review, 1990; Hunter, Michaelson & Stoddard, 1992.*)

2. Military—Although the military is under attack by the courts for excluding and/or discharging homosexuals, the current policy is still exclusionary and establishes a double standard between heterosexual and homosexual personnel. (*See Dyer, 1990.*)
3. Organized Religious Institutions—“If discovered or admitting to be homosexual, priests, rabbis, ministers, and other officials are in many instances stripped of powers and licenses. Officials and parishioners alike have been excommunicated, ostracized, and denied ceremonial participation. Students and novices are often dismissed from parochial schools and orders” (Blumenfeld & Raymond, p. 257; *see Swidler, 1993*).
4. Medical and Psychiatric Professions—Until 1973, homosexuality was considered a pathology needing to be cured. Even with the changes in the professional organizations’ policies, many practitioners still attempt to “convert” homosexuals to a heterosexual orientation. Also, physicians usually assume their patients are heterosexual, thereby failing to ask questions or perform tests that are unique to homosexual needs. Hospital visits are often limited to blood relatives leaving out gay and lesbian lovers. Gays and lesbians have been forced to have lobotomies and other medical

procedures to “cure” their “disease.” (*See* Gonsiorek & Weinrich, 1991, Chapters 9 & 10.) Relatives have had the right to commit homosexuals to mental institutions solely because of their sexual orientation. (*See* for example, Greenberg, 1988, Chapter 9; Gonsiorek & Weinrich, 1991, Chapter 7.) And finally, many therapists still consider homosexuality to be unacceptable (Wisniewski & Toomey, 1987; Glenn & Russell, 1986; Casas, Brady, Ponterotto, 1983; Rudolph, 1988(a & b); Coleman & Remafedi, 1989; Iasenza, 1989).

C. Collective or Societal Homophobia: Although not written into law, social codes of behavior are used to oppress homosexuals. Blumenfeld & Raymond (1988) identified eight examples:

1. The Denial of Culture—Schools fail to include information about the homosexual orientation of the people discussed in English, history and other classes. In fact, active efforts have been made by historians to falsify historical accounts of same-sex love. For example, Michelangelo’s grandnephew changed the wording of his uncle’s sonnets to make them more acceptable (heterosexual) to the public (Boswell, 1980, p. 18.)
2. The Denial of Popular Strength—“No matter how many surveys are carried out concluding that a significant percentage of the population is lesbian, gay, or bisexual, and no matter how often these studies are confirmed, there still seems to be a general failure to acknowledge just how many gays or lesbians there really are” (Blumenfeld & Raymond, p. 259).
3. Fear of Over-Visibility—Sexual minorities are asked to keep their personal lives to themselves because it is claimed to be “not important.” If it truly is not important, why do so many people get upset when it is mentioned?

Obviously, what is really being asked is for homosexuals to keep their relationships invisible.

4. Conspiracy to Silence—The use of a “token” gay or lesbian within an organization is used as evidence that the organization “bent over backwards” to be equitable (Tinney, 1983), when in fact it is an attempt to silence complaints of non-access.
5. Creation of Defined Public Spaces—Gays and lesbians are ghettoized similar to other minorities.
6. Denial of Self-Labeling—It has taken a long time for society to accept the self-label African-American. It will probably take even longer for society to accept whatever term gays and lesbians select to describe themselves.
7. Negative Symbolism (Stereotyping)—Negative myths and stereotyping about gays and lesbians still abound in our society, such as gay men are perceived to be child molesters and lesbians are trying to act as men.
8. Tolerance, Acceptance and Homophobia—Tolerance can be a mask to hide basic underlying hatred or fear. Upon reluctantly accepting homosexuals, a patronizing attitude often develops.

Homophobia is multifaceted with emotional, attitudinal and cognitive dimensions and is sometimes better described by the word “homonegativism” (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980, p. 358). Homophobia has its roots in prejudice and discrimination and is manifest overtly, within formal social institutions, and informally, through collective social actions.

In contrast to homophobia, “*heterosexism*,” is the system by which heterosexuality is the assumed societal norm. Heterosexism is so pervasive, it is difficult to detect and is reinforced by parents, teachers, and the media. For example, schools conduct home-coming dances in which it is assumed that the elected king will be male, the queen will be female, and that all participants will couple and dance in heterosexual

groups. Heterosexism forces lesbians, gays, and bisexuals to struggle constantly against their own invisibility, which makes social integrating (while maintaining a positive sexual identity) much more difficult. Heterosexism masks the rampant homophobia and anti-gay nature in our society.

In ancient Greece *stigma* was a physical sign that was cut or burned into the skin of persons to indicate that they were slaves or criminals. Although gays and lesbians are not usually physically mutilated in the Western world, discrimination has resulted in emotional cuts and stigmatization. Allport (1954) enumerated eleven varieties of negative responses to stigmatization, including; obsessive concern, denial, social withdrawal, clowning, slyness and cunning, self-hate, blaming one's own group, discriminating against others, neuroticism, self-fulfilling prophecy, and the excessive striving for status. "Thus many of the more undesirable characteristics often attributed to minorities are not intrinsic but are rather defenses and responses to discrimination. Yet, when these responses occur, they often lead to reinforcement of negative stereotypes and beliefs" (Blumenfeld & Raymond, p. 263). Using Allport's model of victimization, responses to homophobia can be predicted. Gays, lesbians and bisexuals grow up in a world that teaches them they are morally repulsive and sick. The negative attitudes become internalized and manifest themselves with denial of one's sexual orientation, attempts to "pass" as heterosexual (e.g., Humphreys, 1972; *see* also Goffman, 1963), contempt for "obvious" lesbians and gays, distrust of other gays and prejudice toward other minority groups, entering into a heterosexual marriage so as to gain social approval, fear (Garnets, Herek, & Levy, 1990), sadness and anxiety (Dion, 1986), behavioral and somatic reactions (e.g., Bard & Sangrey, 1979; Frieze, Hymer, & Greenberg, 1984; Janoff-Bulman & Frieze, 1983), feelings of being punished for being gay (Bard & Sangrey, 1979; Lerner, 1970), feelings of depressions and helplessness (Janoff-Bulman, 1979), withdrawal from family and friends, and too often suicide (Remafedi, 1987; Jay & Young, 1979; Bell & Weinberg, 1978;

Roesler & Deisher, 1972; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1989; Kourany, 1987; Remafedi, Farrow, Deisher, 1991). However, some positive arises from stigmatization include: closer identification with one's own minority group members, support for other minorities, learning to be assertive over obstacles, and challenging the status quo. Many homosexuals convert negative stigmatization to the political identity of "gay" or "lesbian" which explains the reason homosexuals "come out" as part of claiming their rights against heterosexism.

Many of the dynamics presented about homophobia and heterosexism are similar to the dynamics experienced by other oppressed minorities; however, there are significant differences that are real, and have direct consequences for law enforcement. We now will look at the development of police subculture, the maintenance of normative boundaries, and see how these are related to homophobia and heterosexism.

The police subculture emanates from a military model (Sykes, 1989) of training and develops a tunnel-vision perspective of life—an 'us against them' philosophy, and a tendency to see things in dichotomies, as good or bad, black or white, with no gradations of difference between (Riser, 1970). Research has found the militarization of persons into police officers contributes to feelings of insularity, isolation, and in-grouping wherein police only feel understood and comfortable in the company of other officers (Niederhoffer, 1967; Wilson, 1957). Police have been characterized as being authoritative (Blach, 1972; Coleman & Gorman, 1982), prejudiced and bigoted (Bayley & Mendelsohn, 1969; Rafkey, 1973; Rafkey, 1979), needing to be in control (Gudjonsson & Adlam, 1983) and cynical in nature (Lester & Brink, 1985). These characteristics are stereotypes (Adlam, 1982; Atwater, Bernhart, & Thompson, 1980; Cochran & Butler, 1980; Butler, 1982; McNamara, 1967; Bayley & Mendelsohn, 1968; Bent, 1974) often believed by the community and ascribed to by many police personnel.

The research on homophobia indicates that persons who have the most homonegative attitudes and beliefs are authoritarian (Smith, 1971), more conservative and less lenient (Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Hudson and Ricketts, 1980), and adhere to a double sex-standard (MacDonald, 1974) (for the most comprehensive review on homophobia research, *see* Herek, 1985). Comparing the police stereotype with the research on homophobia indicates that many of the identifying characteristics of police strongly resemble people with severe homophobia. Gays and lesbians and the issues of sexual orientation have unique needs in relationship to police subculture. Training on sexual orientation issues ultimately asks police to tolerate and accept people who are the antithesis of their self-identity.

Sexual orientation, specifically homosexuality, challenges many cultural norms for gender, sexual and affection identities. Society has singled out gays and lesbians for their perceived “differences” and stigmatized them through a number of oppressive social, institutional and cultural mechanisms. Police have historically functioned to conserve the cultural and legal norms (Mohr, 1988), and characteristically displayed severe homophobia (Marotta, 1981) and overt discrimination (Davidson, 1991; Faderman, 1991) toward gays and lesbians. The changes in political power for gays and lesbians has shifted legal and cultural norms toward a less prejudicial and discriminatory position. Police are caught between conserving previous anti-gay norms, including physically bashing and wrongfully arresting gays and lesbians, with their legal responsibility to treat all people equally. Police subcultural norms are also threatened by homosexuals’ non-conformance to gender and sexual identities.

Gays and lesbians are at an historical juncture (similar to where African-American women were in the 1950s) where the issue of gay rights is at the forefront of political discussion. For police, this means that training on homosexuality constitutes an important and growing endeavor. Furthermore, the inclusion of sexual orientation training

challenges the simplified criteria previously used for selecting groups for inclusion in cultural awareness training. Analysis of gay oppression suggests that selection of inclusive groups for training is better related to how groups are stigmatized and their political status rather than attributed to any “inherent differences” of that group. Training on sexual orientation in law enforcement occurs because of gay and lesbian stigmatization and political history. From this perspective, cultural awareness training in law enforcement should shift from the *Human Relations* model to a more *Social Reconstructionist* model.

Issue 3 — What are the Goals for Sexual Orientation Training?

In Issue #1, five models were used to describe the current attempts at “multicultural education.” Implicit to each of these were specific goals. Law enforcement agencies incorporate some of each of these typologies into their cultural awareness programs. As discussed in Chapter 1, the ACA & PERF (1992) report paints a picture of cultural awareness trainings that are treated as separated modules (*Ethnic Studies* model), aimed at prevention of conflict between police and community members (*Human Relations* model), sees police subculture as the primary culture and all other cultures as “other” (*Education of the Culturally Different* model), emphasizes that all people have equal rights and police should tolerate people who are different (*Education That is Multicultural* model), and occasionally the mechanisms of oppression are analyzed (*Social Reconstructionist* model).

Historically, the goals for cultural awareness training stemmed from a desire to reduce race riots (Barlow, Barlow, & Chiricos, 1993). The Civil Rights Movement broadened police training to emphasize the equality of all people. Often though, people reject the inclusion of sexual orientation training because they claim that it is not a “legitimate culture” or that other minorities deserve training emphasis. In Issue #2, a

discussion on homophobia, heterosexism and police subculture showed the relationship between stigmatization and oppression against gays and lesbians supported by law enforcement. Training on gays and lesbians is not occurring simply because they are a minority interesting to study or that they should be tolerated, but because of the politics of stigmatization. Thus, the goals for sexual orientation training need to emphasize learning about the mechanics of oppression and how to overcome them (a *Social Reconstructionist* model).

What does it mean to learn about the mechanics of oppression and how to overcome them? Often it is argued that the goal of training should be to change student attitudes. This offends many law enforcement officials. As Nels Klyver, Ph.D., Training Administrator for the Los Angeles Police Department, stated in 1992 that, “We do not care what attitudes police officers have, we only care about their behavior.” Is the goal of sexual orientation training to change attitudes, change behaviors, or both—and then change them toward what?

The three main theories of attitudinal change developed by social psychologists include: the *Cognitive-Dissonance Theory* (Festinger, 1957), the *Self-Perception Theory* (Bem, 1972) and the *Role-Playing Theory* (Elms, 1969). The reader should not view these theories as being in competition, but rather complementary to each other.

1. *Cognitive-Dissonance Theory* (Festinger, 1957)—When a person’s stated beliefs are discrepant with his/her private beliefs or attitudes on a specific idea, a “dissonance” is said to be aroused because of the inconsistency. This dissonance is thought to motivate people towards restoring a balance between their behavior and their beliefs. It is thought that persons will either change their attitude to be consistent with their behavior, rationalize their behavior, or seek new information so as to justify the apparent discrepancy between their public actions and private beliefs.

2. *Self-Perception Theory* (Bem, 1972)—We can infer attitudes and intent from the actions of others and from observing our own behavior. People want to have a balance between their emotions, their beliefs and their actions. In order to have this balance, the two attribution principles— (1) *insufficient justification*, when people try to understand their behavior and there is insufficient justification to attribute the cause to some external force; and (2) *over justification*, when people discover that external factors are the cause of their personal actions— must also be in balance. Otherwise, the person may attribute the imbalance to their personal beliefs and seek to change them. This is similar to the *Cognitive-Dissonance Theory* but includes a person’s actions and his/her perception of these actions.
3. *Role-Playing Theory* (Elms, 1969)—This theory assumes that the technique of allowing people to play roles they would normally not perform, will yield insights into how others perceive the world and how they might act if they were in the same situation or role.

These three theories share a common concept; that through education (purposely seeking knowledge, observing one's self or playing the role of another) attitudes will change. However, beliefs and attitudes are considered to be difficult to change. Research conducted into attitude formation has found that public behavior that is freely chosen and not coerced and that which is learned, are “extremely powerful and long lasting” (DeJong, 1979). Thus, attitude change must be evaluated within context of the educational change has meaning for the person.

One other issue that needs to be addressed is the controversy over whether changes in attitude enable changes in behavior, or that changes in behavior must precede changes in attitudes. Fishbein (1966) and Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) suggested a “four-step pattern of influence, where beliefs determine attitudes, which determine intentions, resulting in specified behaviors” (Larsen, Reed, Hoffman, 1980, p. 247). In contrast,

Guskey's (1986) review of teaching effectiveness suggested the opposite—that changes in behavior (teaching practices) preceded changes in attitudes and beliefs.

So, is it attitudes that affect behaviors or behaviors that affect attitudes? Perhaps the missing element in this debate is the “meaning” of the interaction of behaviors and attitudes? Police research concludes that cynicism, prejudice and isolation increases the longer an officer is on the job, i.e., exposure to environmental elements and engaging in behaviors contrary to academy training result in modification of initial attitudes. The humanist psychological perspective likewise recognizes that attitudes and behaviors are related to the issue of “meaning” (Dembo, 1991). Children who join the *club* of persons they want to be, will engage in behaviors that both reinforce and challenge their original attitudes resulting in a modification of their attitudes. Yet this is not a one-way process. If the behaviors and attitudes of the *club* are not what the child wants to be, he/she will change *club* membership or attempt to modify the *clubs* to which he/she belongs. Thus, it is “meaning” that influences the development of behaviors and attitudes. This issue should be viewed as being a heuristic, instead of linear, phenomenon. Initial attitudes and behaviors evolve as each interacts with the environment and each other according to the meaning assigned by the individual. Teaching or workshop situations should have goals stated in both behavioral and attitudinal domains and designed to maximize the interaction of attitudes and behaviors within a meaningful exchange—an exchange modeled by someone students want to become.

Issue 4 — How is Training “Effectiveness” Assessed?

In Chapter 1, the issue training “effectiveness” suggested that four different perspectives may influence assessment strategies. The following discussion explores each of these perspectives and develops an assessment theory to be tested by this study.

Community Perspective: Sometimes it is suggested that complaints against police, hate crime reports, and discrimination lawsuits are measures of sexual orientation training effectiveness. They are not. Sexual orientation training is just one tool in the battle against homophobia. Community level responses reflect the entire police subculture and the community culture toward gays and lesbians. Ultimately, these are the kinds of problems the gay and lesbian community want to see reduced, but there are many other factors involved besides sexual orientation training that contribute to the change. Thus, community assessment techniques are likely to be unrevealing about training effectiveness.

Police Subculture Perspective: In Issue #2, it was shown that the police subculture is extremely homophobic and that the police stereotype—authoritarian personality, super-masculine, prejudicial, needing to be in control, and cynical—virtually matches the characteristics of persons who exhibit severe homophobia. One strategy for assessing sexual orientation training effectiveness would be to measure the changes in police homophobia. These could be macro-changes in the entire police agency or micro-changes in students attending sexual orientation training. Before discussing these two levels, we need to review the attempts to measure “homophobia.”

As discussed in Issue #2, “homophobia” has veered from its original definition and often includes more than simply the “fear of being near homosexuals.” This broadening of definition is reflected in the many attempts to measure “homophobic” characteristics including *homophobia*, anti-gay or negative responses to homosexuality, non-homosexual attitudes toward homosexuality, the sexual and affectional orientation of

the respondent, feelings about homosexuality, attitude change, and beliefs and behaviors of persons with homosexual experiences. Taken together, four broad categories are most often measured; (1) emotional response to being near a homosexual (*homophobia*) or thinking about homosexuals, (2) value systems (attitudes) about homosexuality and homosexuals, (3) the sexual and affectional orientation of the respondent, and (4) factual information about homosexuality and homosexuals. It should be pointed out that *attitudes* and *factual* information are often treated as being the same dimension by researchers, yet it is still possible for a person to have read a scientific article and know factually that homosexuality is not an illness, yet still believe it to be true and hold attitudes that homosexuals are sick. Hudson & Ricketts (1980), in a review of previous research believed, “it is obvious that many researchers are confusing personal beliefs with emotional response” and that the entire domain of anti-gay responses should be termed *homonegativism*. They constructed a stricter scale, *Index of Homophobia* (IHP), that adhered closer to the original definition of homophobia and made use of a 5-point Likert-type scale. This work is probably the best crafted scale and best validated for measuring emotional responses. However, Gentry (1986) argued that the IHP was unclear as to the kind of homosexual being referred in the questions, that all questions were of equal weight and that the final score did not inform as to which items contributed most to the final score. Gentry, instead, proposed an 8-item scale based on Guttman theory.

In 1973, MacDonald & Huggins (*see* MacDonald, Huggins, Young & Swanson, 1973) created and tested a 28-item Likert-type scale—*Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale* (ATHS). The study was designed to investigate two sources of non-homosexuals’ attitudes toward homosexuality: (a) attitudes determined by conservative standards of sex morality, and (b) attitudes determined by a need to preserve the gender double-standard (as assessed by use of the *Sex Role Survey* (SOS)), that is, homosexuality is condemned in order to reduce sex-role confusion. The authors found that “[negative] attitudes toward

homosexuals are more highly associated with support for a double standard for the sexes than with permissive or nonpermissive attitudes regarding premarital sexual intimacy” (p. 161). The ATHS survey has become the primary instrument used by most researchers to assess attitudes as conceptualized as a set of cognitive beliefs about homosexuality. In subsequent articles (MacDonald & Games, 1974; MacDonald, 1974), deficiencies in the ATHS were worked out and Price (1982) modified the scale (MATH) by simplifying the language to a reading level of grade 11 (± 1.5 grade as determined by the SMOG readability formula) into a form that other researchers used during the 1980s. It should be noted that critics of the scale point out that this scale is multidimensional and deviates from the original definition of homophobia by mixing attitudes with emotional response (Sears, 1992, p. 40).

Sears (1992) constructed a survey designed to test knowledge about homosexuality. This 14-item test included questions from both the behavioral and natural sciences. The *Homosexuality Knowledge Index* (HKI) reflects the most recent understanding about homosexuality and is carefully constructed in the use of language and gender—although there are references unique to South Carolina. Sears found that “the more knowledgeable the student, as measured on the Homosexual Knowledge Index, the less negative attitudes toward homosexuality and feelings toward lesbians and gay men were evidenced” (p. 52).

Shively & DeCecco (1993) measured sexual orientation with their *Assessment of Sexual Orientation* (ASO) using the bi-polar Kinsey (1953) scale as their model, but only for two dimensions—behavior and feelings. However, the concept of sexual orientation is experiencing a major shift as documented by Coleman (1987). Sexual orientation is viewed to be multi-dimensional and situated both culturally and historically. For example, there are thought to be three psychological components of sexual identity—gender identity, social sex-role, and sexual orientation (Shively & De Cecco, 1993)— and each of

these should be constructed with two independent continua instead of the simpler, bipolar continuum as proposed by Kinsey. Although the expanded perspective of sexual orientation is more inclusive and accurate, the potential confusion to respondents not educated in the evolutionary developments on sexual orientation definitions could result in less accurate measures. It is believed that as students learn more about human sexuality, they will see themselves as being less bi-polar (either exclusively heterosexual or exclusively homosexual).

Again, the question is, will assessing the level of homophobia within the police subculture reveal the effectiveness of sexual orientation training? For the macro-police subculture—no; however, the assessment instruments described above could be used for pre- and post-testing of students attending sexual orientation training. Resultant changes in student levels of homophobia would suggest that the training was effective at changing attitudes, feelings, knowledge and identities. Changes themselves are relatively meaningless unless they are tied to specific educational practices. Thus, we need to discuss education theory and how it is related to changes measured with instrumental questionnaires.

Psycholinguistic/Humanistic Education Perspective: The psycholinguistic revolution influenced by Noam Chomsky (1957; 1965), Stephen Krashen (1982) and Frank Smith (1986), claim that “meaningful” learning is always accomplished much quicker, and persists much longer than programmatic learning. “Meaningful” in the humanist perspective centers around the learner and what they want to become. This is much more than the cognitive psychological definition of the word “meaningful” and it represents more than simply being “relevant.” For example, learning how to balance a check book could be made both comprehensible plus relevant (adults know that it is the kind of knowledge all persons need to know in our contemporary society), but if the person has no immediate need for the skill and is not personally involved in becoming the

type of person who balances check-books (Frank Smith would call “joining the *club* of check-book users”), then the lesson does not have meaning for the person and will not be learned.

According to psycholinguists, effective learning occurs when the information is comprehensible, meaningful, and modeled by teachers in an authentic manner, thereby allowing students to form symbiotic relationships with teachers. “Comprehensibility” in this context means information based on what the student knows, prepared for the student (Ausubel’s [1963] *advanced organizers*), and is presented in a manner that stretches student understanding just beyond what they currently know (e.g., Vygotsky’s [1986] *zone of proximal displacement*, Krashen’s *i+1 Concept*). Tied to the student’s comprehension of their current state of knowledge, is the meaning of that knowledge. Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez (1992) referred to the meaning of this initial level of knowledge as “funds of knowledge” (historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being) and they claim that they are the more natural forms of knowledge transmission and yet have been historically ignored by classroom teachers. Particularly, they identified that “funds of knowledge”: (1) emerge from networks that are flexible, adaptive and active and may involve multiple persons including those outside the family, and (2) that the reciprocity between persons sharing their “funds of knowledge” establish serious obligations based on the assumption of mutual trust. “Funds of knowledge” are important sources of instructional meaning and our schools often violate these two essential learning sources. “Meaningful,” therefore, is that which is important (relevant) to the learner and the type of person the learner wants to become. It is important to emphasize that “the type of person the learner wants to become” is much more than simply a student-teacher relationship in formal schools and that teachers need to “model” behaviors students want to engage. Educational experiences must also be “authentic,”

i.e., the activity engaged in by teachers and students must be something that adults voluntarily engage in.

How is teaching assessed using psycholinguistic/humanistic educational theory? This is one of the biggest challenges faced by this educational perspective. In public education, particularly in the primary grades, “portfolio assessment” (Wolf, 1989; California Dept. of Education, 1989) has evolved as an attempt to assess “holistic” methodologies (California Dept. of Education, 1993) (the public schools’ adaptations of psycholinguistic/humanistic perspectives). These kinds of assessments methodologies are not well documented, stress qualitative measures, take considerable time and are difficult for teachers and supervisors to administer (Wiggins, 1989). One of the goals of this study is to develop an assessment model based on psycholinguistic/humanistic educational theory and to test the appropriateness of this model for use in evaluating sexual orientation training in law enforcement environments.

To conclude: Although the ultimate goal for sexual orientation training is better treatment of the gays and lesbians by law enforcement agencies and personnel, measures of these macro-interactions cannot be used to assess effectiveness of the training. Measuring the level of police homophobia (e.g., using the MATH, IHP, HKI and Assessment of Sexual Orientation) may indicate the environment in which training takes place, but again, such assessments are not direct indicators of training effectiveness.

Stone (1982) suggested that both empirical and subjective measurement methodologies are required to accurately assess an educational experience. By focusing on the 4-subprocesses of instruction (comprehensibility, meaningfulness, role-molding and authenticity) and overall class changes, training effectiveness can be assessed. Qualitative assessment methods are most appropriate for evaluating the subprocesses of instruction whereas instrumental empirical assessment are appropriate for evaluating the overall class change. Chapter 3 will detail the methodology used for this research which

combines qualitative assessments (including training observations and student interviews) using psycholinguistic/humanistic educational model and instrumental empirical measures of attitude, feeling, knowledge, identity and behavioral changes in a pre- and post-test arrangement.

Issue 5 — What Specific Elements Comprise Effective Sexual Orientation Training?

Now that 4 elements of teaching have been identified through application of the psycholinguistic/humanistic educational perspectives (described in Issue #4), these need to be applied to law enforcement environments in which the goal of a particular educational program is to reduce homophobia. This will help identify the specific elements to be assessed. The following three specific elements represent the logical application of psycholinguistic/humanistic educational theory to law enforcement environments.

Students/Instructors: Having an instructor who is the kind of person students want to become is an important element to effective instruction. Because sexual orientation training is given to different kinds of law enforcement personnel, the choice of instructor needs to reflect the different kinds of students. Theory would suggest, for example, police recruit classes need instructors who are masculine-acting, patrol officers, respected professionals and who are well liked. Middle managers need similar kinds of instructors but they must be of a higher rank than the students. Top management have different self-identities, more academic (many have graduate college degrees) and more managerial. Instructors for top management need to be respected police managers and respected academics.

Content: Theory suggests that course content must reflect the realities of law enforcement work and provide information that not only raises self-awareness about

homosexual behavior and political identities, but also about the process of social stigmatization and the role police play in supporting oppressive norms against gays and lesbians. Since homosexuality is not a deficit, it does not be justified or defended. Instead, the causes of oppression must be explored. The model of homophobia—overt, institutionalized, and social—provides a framework from which to conduct analysis of gay and lesbian stigmatization. These processes of stigmatization are to be presented in the environment of police work.

Methodologies: Psycholinguistic/humanistic educational perspective reflects the social nature of learning. Instruction methodologies need to emphasize individual and group activities leading to self-awareness and problem solving in authentic situations. Pedersen (1988) identified three stages of analysis needed for both the culture being taught, and the student’s level of understanding in order to determine the correct teaching method.

1. Awareness—False awareness of a culture (biases, stereotypes) must be changed and corrected to appropriate attitudes, opinions and assumptions before “multicultural development” can continue.
2. Knowledge—Serious gaps in knowledge and information about a culture need to be filled in before multicultural development can continue.
3. Skill—The ability to interact appropriately with persons from other cultures.

Pedersen believed that most multicultural training programs fail for three reasons:

1. Overemphasizing “awareness” through value clarification techniques or simplistic “good” or “bad” value judgments. “Awareness” without the knowledge or information about how to act is confusing.
2. Overemphasizing “knowledge” results in excessive accumulation of information and frustrates the recipients because they do not see the relevance of the materials (awareness) and they do not know what to do with the information.

3. Overemphasizing “skill” may give the recipient the skills needed to make change, but they are uncertain about why they are making the change and they could possibly make things worse by not having the knowledge to act appropriately.

Theory suggests that these three features comprise effective instruction within law enforcement environments.

Issue 6 — How are Police Culture and Administrative Structures Related to the Effectiveness of Sexual Orientation Training?

In Chapter 1, it was discussed how administrative support for cultural awareness training programs vary widely from agency to agency. Although there are no published reports comparing levels of homophobia between police agencies, it is reasonable to assume that some agencies are less homophobic than others (as indicated by media coverage and as discussed in Issue #2 and Issue #4). Together, the influences of administrative structures, the mechanisms of police culture reinforcement, and levels of homophobia most likely affect sexual orientation training effectiveness. This section first looks at some of the boundary maintenance mechanisms used by police to establish their subcultural norms. Understanding these mechanisms should shed light on how multicultural programs are likewise effected and suggest a model of administrative policies and actions that facilitate overcoming homophobia and the support of sexual orientation training. Qualitative and empirical research performed by this study will attempt to correlate the effectiveness of sexual orientation training with the administrative model.

Police subculture is primarily quasi-militaristic with “masculine” norms (Yarmey, 1990, p. 54) that polarize the world into “us” (police officers) vs. “them” (civilians). It was discovered that these norms are stereotypes that few police officers conform since police psychology reflects conservative beliefs within the dominant culture. However,

these stereotypic norms are maintained through cultural boundary maintenance strategies during the three phases of officer development—the initial psychological screenings of applicants (Yarmey, 1990, p.33; Pugh, 1985), the cultural socialization process in the academy (McConville & Shepherd, 1992, p. 188; Bayley & Bittner, 1989, p. 103; Manning, 1977, p. 289; Levinson, 1976, p. 23; Scarman, 1981, p. 45), and on the job (McConville, 1992; Gross, 1984).

In California, POST requirements for police emotional suitability states that “applicants shall be judged to be free from job-relevant psychopathology, including personality disorders, as diagnosed by a qualified profession. . . [and listed in the] Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DMS III)” (POST, 1984, p. 5). However, researchers have questioned the validity of psychological screening on a number of grounds, including: a lack of understanding between the psychological constructs and their job-relatedness (Bittner, 1971, p. 82; Saxe & Fabricatore, 1982), lack of basic empirical research (Bittner, 1971, p. 82), the belief that all psychological tests are dubious in value (Spielberger, 1979; Inwald, 1984), the dismissal of psychological testing by many police administrators (Reiser, 1970), and the norming of psychological tests on the dominant culture values (Burbeck & Furnham, 1985; Schonefeld, Kobos & Phinney, 1980). Since there is little consensus about appropriate screening tests for applicants, one could conclude that the primary purpose for the applicant screening process is to act as a “gate-keeper” function and reinforce police cultural norms.

Similarly, the relevance and effectiveness of the police academy is questioned by many researchers (McConville, 1992, p. 190). As stated in Chapter 1, police researchers believe that 90% of what is taught in the police academy has no direct application to the job (Shelden, 1982). It is thought that field training is where trainees learn about “real policing,” e.g., to be authoritarian-submissive (Bayley & Bittner, 1989, p.104). Finally, on the job police officers are reinforced toward being suspicious and cynical (McConville

& Shepard, 1992, p. 207-8; Reiner, 1985). The socialization process at all three phases of officer development (McConville, 1992, p. 194) place barriers to programs and trainings that ask officers to deviate from police subcultural norms—norms that are typically homophobic (as discussed in Issue #2).

The research on “multicultural programs” in police environments is very sparse. In 1970, Cizon & Smith conducted interviews and discussions with three police agencies completing Police-Community Relations Training (unfortunately they gave no details about how the research was conducted). They identified a number of administrative requirements thought to be effective. After the Rodney King riot of 1991, St. George presented a critical assessment of “sensitivity” training and also suggested administrative requirements she found to be effective for her own instruction. These authors suggested six broad administrative structures necessary to promote multicultural programs:

1. *Motivation*—The cultural awareness training programs need to provide the skills required to improve police officers’ effectiveness, and include incentives for participation and attendance by use of compensatory time and promotion.
2. *Leadership*—Leaders must not only give verbal support and empathy to such cultural awareness training efforts but must also be action-oriented in implementing programs into the educational process and culture of the agency.
3. *Culture*—Cultural awareness trainings must be part of a comprehensive program that positively supports open communication and collaboration between police personnel on cultural issues, and between police personnel and community members.
4. *Change*—“The program [cultural awareness training] must make an effort to reach as many of these men [authoritative and power-oriented] as possible” (Cizon & Smith, 1970, p. 35). Power-oriented officers are at odds with the policies of police departments and are also the most difficult to change. “Behavior

backed by department policy is more easily accepted. Peer group (fellow officers) pressure is more effective” (Cizon & Smith, 1970, p. 40-41).

5. *Conflict*— Although cultural awareness training programs attempt to change attitudes, the primary function of cultural awareness training programs is to change behaviors. Attitudes are extremely difficult to change (see Issue #3) in the short term, but behaviors can be specified and potential conflict averted through departmental policy and practice. “Attitude change must be encouraged but behavioral change is the immediate goal” (Cizon & Smith, 1970, p. 30).
6. *Decision making*— Officers need to be involved in the planning, development and implementation of cultural awareness training program. Ideas for improvement of the program need to be solicited from the community.

These six administrative structures form a model that can be used to assess the effectiveness of changing police subcultural norms toward being less homophobic. Sexual orientation training, which first occurs during recruit training and later during in-service training, both influences the development and is the result of police subcultural norms and reflects support or non-support of administrative structures. Assessment of administrative structures should correlate with assessment of sexual orientation training effectiveness.

Synergy on Sexual Orientation Training

This section brings together the six issues discussed in this chapter, summarizes them and develops a comprehensive educational model designed to overcome homophobia set within law enforcement environments. Having such a model facilitates qualitative and empirical research and provides the framework for verification of theory.

For learning to occur, the information must be comprehensible, meaningful, and modeled by teachers in an authentic manner. This applies not only in the formal classroom, but also to all social interactions, since learning takes place continually. In both teaching and administering, the effectiveness of the process is directly related to the serious social obligations precipitated between the participants. It is the meaning associated with the social obligations that allows for learning to occur. The greater the social obligations, the greater the exchange of information, skills, attitudes and behaviors. The effectiveness of the information exchange is related to the skill of the teacher or administrator to model the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors in a comprehensible, meaningful and authentic manner. People form social obligations with other people they see themselves becoming. Learning occurs between people who choose to be like each other. As Frank Smith (1989) said, “You learn from the company you keep.”

Police subculture development is often confused because of conflict between several perceptions about policing, and the realities of the job and institution. Recruits enter the police academy with one perspective on policing, the media stereotype—portrayed as super masculine, militaristic, morally righteous, prejudiced, “objective” (as Sergeant Friday of TV’s *Dragnet* says, “Just the facts ma’am.”), and authoritarian. Then, during the training process, they are subjected to a second set of perspectives—information is presented on many of the social conflicts faced on the job, the need to learn coping mechanisms with a paramilitary bureaucracy and a hostile

community, indoctrination to an authoritarian-submissive psychology, and “objectivity” of enforcing laws that are reinforced through the application of “scientific” methodology. Once on the job, the recruit’s morale is broken down to the new group codes and reinforced on a daily basis. This third set of on-the-job perspectives denigrates the academy experience, encourages the formation of criminal and behavioral stereotypes, induces cynicism and suspiciousness, and teaches the officer that isolation is an important survival technique. On the path to becoming a police officer, the student has formed various social obligations with people who represent the police role they want to become. Later on the job, not all officers find the social obligations that enable them to continue as officers (almost half of all police officers leave the profession within the first two years). Ultimately, it is the social obligations formed between recruits and officers reflecting a particular agency culture that determines the success of creating a police officer. Recruits learn from the officers they identify with, and officers learn from the administrators they identify with. Administrators establish and maintain their particular police agency’s subculture.

The problem faced by police trainers on sexual orientation is that the police subculture is typically very homophobic. The police stereotype—authoritarian personality, super-masculine, prejudicial, needing to be in control, and cynical—virtually matches the characteristics of persons who exhibit homophobia. Furthermore, homophobia within the police subculture permeates all levels and is manifested overtly, institutionally and socially. Succinctly, the solution to police homophobia is to have those administrators, officers and recruits who display (model) attitudes and behaviors that are supportive of differing sexual orientations, assist other administrators, officers and recruits through the use of social obligations in manifesting these same attitudes and behaviors. To change police homophobia, ways must be found to foster social obligations between those who display non-homophobic attitudes and behaviors with those who are homophobic. Also, it is

necessary to provide those who are non-homophobic with the information and skills needed to assist those who are homophobic to overcome their fears and bigotry. The goal for sexual orientation training is not simply to gain better understanding or greater self-awareness, but to change behaviors and attitudes to ones that are less homophobic.

Within a police context, educational and/or attitude change programs need to consider the following four elements of “effective” learning:

1. Comprehensible—Comprehensible input needs to start at the student’s understanding of gender, sex and police work and be extended toward the program’s goal of reducing homophobia. Much of the recent research and literature on sexual orientation is based on advanced feminist theory and many of the concepts are foreign to all but the educated elite. For example, trying to explain sexual orientation variance using the Shively and De Cecco (1993) *tri-continua model* based upon gender identity, social sex-role, sexual orientation to persons who find Kinsey’s bipolar model unbelievable, would not be the best starting place. Similarly, starting with a deep analysis of the biological component of sexual orientation is possible only with persons familiar with genetics and biological brain research. Instead, it is best to start with the student’s own feelings and experiences. The teacher then assists students to a greater understanding of gay and lesbian stigmatization.
2. Meaningful—When designing gay and lesbian sensitivity programs, “meaning” is the most overlooked element of the program. The programs typically grew out of political considerations and are often taught by a gay rights advocate who has a personal stake in the program. The program may have meaning for the teacher but this does not automatically imply the program will have meaning for the students. For a program of sexual orientation to have meaning for police officers, it must be relevant to police subculture, and instructors and administrators must manifest

non-homophobic attitudes and behaviors as stated in the program's goals. A serious obligation between police members that is non-homophobic must be established. However, a symbiotic relationship between recruits, instructors, officers and administrators will not be achieved by either the police joining the gay subculture or the gay subculture joining the police subculture, but rather with both police and gays joining the same law enforcement culture that is not homophobic.

3. Modeled—It is essential that the leaders of particular police cultures model attitudes and behaviors that are non-homophobic and embracing of sexual diversity. Instructors of sexual orientation training must be the kind of person students want to emulate.
4. Authentic—Treating sexual orientation as a one-time workshop reinforces the belief that it is not related to police work and that it must be endured. In addition to sexual orientation training that uses police based scenarios for students to examine and solve, sexual orientation issues must become part of the daily routine and conversation at the work place. Homosexual behaviors and relationships need to be shared around the “water cooler” on Monday mornings just as heterosexual ones are shared now. On the job, officers need to see other officers display sensitivity toward the gay and lesbian community and eliminate heterosexist assumptions.

Having identified four elements required for “effective” teaching (as proposed by psycholinguistic/humanistic education theory) including administrative support structures and set in law enforcement environments, qualitative and empirical research (as described in Chapter 3) can now be used to test the “effective” teaching model and identify the “effective” elements of sexual orientation training programs.

Bibliography

- Adlam, K. R. C. (1982). The police personality: Psychological consequences of being a police officer. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 10, 344-49.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- American Correctional Association (ACA) & Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). (1992, September). *Preliminary report on training in cultural difference for law enforcement / juvenile justice officials*.
- Atwater, E., Bernhart, B., & Thompson, S. (1980, January). The authoritarian cop: An outdated stereotype? *Police Chief*, 58-59.
- Ausubel, D.P. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning*. New York: Grune & Stratton.
—(1977). The facilitation of meaningful verbal learning in the classroom. *Educational Psychologist*, 12, 162-178.
- Bard, M., & Sangrey, D. (1979). *The crime victim's book*. New York: Basic Books.
- Barlow, D.E., Barlow, M.H., & Chiricos, T.G. (1993). Long economic cycles and the history of criminal justice in the U.S. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 19, 143-169.
- Bayley, D. H., & Bittner, E. (1989). Learning the skills of policing. From Roger G. Dunham & Geoffrey P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*. Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Bayley, D.H., & Mendelsohn, H. (1969). *Minorities and the police; Confrontation in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Bell, A., & Weinberg, M. (1978). *Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz, (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Bent, A. (1974). *The politics of law enforcement*. Toronto: Lexington.
- Bittner, E. (1971). *The functions of the police in modern society*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bittner, E. (1980). *The functions of the police in modern society*. Cambridge, MA: Olegeschlager, Gunn, and Hain.
- Blach, R. W. (1972). The police personality: Fact or fiction? *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 63, 106-19.
- Blumenfeld, W. (1992). *Homophobia: How we all pay the price*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Blumenfeld, W., & Raymond, D. (1988). *Looking at gay and lesbian life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Boswell, J. (1980). *Christianity, social tolerance, and homosexuality: Gay people in western Europe from the beginning of the Christian era to the fourteenth century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burbeck, E., & A. Furnham. (1985). Police officer selection: A critical review of the literature. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 13, 58-69.
- Butler, A. (1982). *An examination of the influence of training and work experience on the attitudes and perceptions of police officers*, mimeo, Branshill: Police Staff College.
- California Department of Education. (1989). Quality criteria for elementary schools: planning, implementing, self-study, and program quality review.
— (1993) Guide and criteria for program quality review: Elementary.
- Casas, J.M., Brady, S., & Ponterotto, J.G. (1983). Sexual preference biases in counseling: An information processing approach. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30(2), 139-145.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton
— (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Churchill, W. (1967). *Homosexual behavior among males: A cross-cultural and cross-species investigation*. New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Cizon, F.A., & Smith, W.H.T. (1970). *Some Guidelines for successful police-community relations training programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cochran, R., & Butler, A. (1980). The values of police officers, recruits and civilians in England. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8.
- Coleman, A., & Gorman, L. (1982). Conservatism, dogmatism and authoritarianism in British police officers. *Sociology*, 16(1), 1.
- Coleman, E. (1987). Assessment of sexual orientation. *The Journal of Homosexuality*, 14, 1/2, p.9
- Coleman, E., & Remafedi, G. (1989, September/October). Gay, lesbian, and bisexual adolescents: A critical challenge to counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 68, 36-40.
- Comstock, G.D. (1991). *Violence against lesbians and gay men*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Davidson, J. (1991). *The LAPD and the lesbian and gay community*. Written testimony by the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California and

submitted to the Special Independent Commission of the Los Angeles Police Department.

- Dembo, M. (1991). *Applying educational psychology in the classroom*. New York: Longman. Chapter 8, pp. 321-362.
- Dion, K.L. (1986). Responses to perceived discrimination and relative deprivation. In J.M. Olson, D.P. Herman, & M.P. Sana (Eds.), *Relative deprivation and social comparison: The Ontario Symposium* (159-179). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dyer, K. (1990). *Gays in uniform: The Pentagon's secret reports*. Boston, Mass.: Alyson Publications, Inc.
- Eitzen, D.S. (1980). *Social Problems*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Elms, A. (Ed.) (1969). *Role playing, reward, and attitude change*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Faderman, L. (1991). *Odd girls and twilight lovers; A history of lesbian life in twentieth-century America*. New York: Penguin.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. New York: Row, Peterson.
- Fishbein, M. (1966). The relationship between beliefs, attitudes, and behavior. In S. Feldman (Ed.), *Cognitive constancy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior*. Reading Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Frieze, I.H., Hymer, S., & Greenberg, M.S. (1984). Describing the victims of crimes and violence. In A. Kahn (Ed.), *Victims of crime and violence: Final report of the APA Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence* (19-78). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fyfe, B. (1983). "Homophobia" or homosexual bias reconsidered. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 549-554.
- Garnets, L., Herek, G.M., & Levy, B. (1990). Violence and victimization of lesbians and gay men: Mental health consequences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(3), 366-383.
- Gay, G. (1979). Changing conceptions of multicultural education. In Basptiste, H. & Baptiste, M. (Eds.), *Developing multicultural process in classroom instructions: Competencies for teachers* (18-30). Washington, D.C.: University press of America.
- (1983, Winter). Why multicultural education in teacher preparation programs? *Contemporary Education*, 54(2), 79-85.
- Gentry, C. (1986). Development of scales measuring social distance toward male and female homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 13(1), 75-82.

- Glenn, A.A., Russell, R.K. (1986, March). Heterosexual bias among counselor trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 222-228.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gonsiorek, J. C., & Weinrich, J. D. (1991). *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Grant, C.A., & Sleeter, C.E. (1985). The literature on multicultural education: Review and analysis. *Educational Review*, 37(2), 97-118.
- Greenberg, D.F. (1988). *The construction of homosexuality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gross, S. (1984, January). Women becoming cops: Developmental issues and solutions. *Police Chief*, 32, 33-35
- Gudjonsson, G.H., & Adlam, K.R.C. (1983). Personality patterns of British police officers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 4, 507-12.
- Guskey, T.R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher*, 15(5), 5-12.
- Hacker, H.M. (1971). Homosexuals: Deviant or minority group? In E. Sagarin (Ed.), *The other minorities* (65-92). Waltham, MA: Ginn.
- Harvard Law Review. 1990. *Sexual orientation and the law*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Herek, G. (1985). Beyond 'homophobia': A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In *Bashers, Baiters, and Bigots: Homophobia in American Society*. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Herek, G.M. (1986a). The social psychology of homophobia: Toward a practical theory. *NYU Review of Law & Social Change*, 14(4), 923-934.
- Herek, G.M. (1986b). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29(5), 563-577.
- Herek, G.M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 25(4), 451-477.
- Hudson, W., & Ricketts, W. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5(4), 357-372.
- Humphreys, L. (1972). *Out of the closets: The sociology of homosexual liberation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Hunter, N.D., Michaelson, S.E., & Stoddard, T.B. (1992). *The rights of lesbians and gay men*. American Civil Liberties Union, Southern Illinois University Press.
- Iasenza, S. (1989, September/October). Some challenges of integrating sexual orientations into counselor training and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*, 73-76.
- Inwald, R. (1984). Psychological testing: Guidelines help manager avoid liability issues. *Training Aids Digest, 9*, 1-7
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioral self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1798-1809.
- Jay, K., & Young, A. (eds.) (1979). *The gay report: Lesbians and gay men speak out about their sexual experiences and life-styles*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Kirk, M., & Madsen, H. (1990). *After the ball: How America will conquer its fear & hatred of gays in the 90's*. New York: Plume.
- Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., Martin, C.E., & Gebhard, P.H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.
- Klassen, A.D., Williams, C.J., & Levitt, E.E. (1989). *Sex and morality in the U.S.* Middletown, CT: Weleyan University Press.
- Klyver, N. (1992). Director of Training at the Los Angeles Police Academy, private communication to Chuck Stewart.
- Kourany, R. F. (1987). Suicide among homosexual adolescents. *Journal of Homosexuality, 13*, 111-117.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice of second language acquisition*. Oxford, Eng.: Pergamon.
- Larsen, K.S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980, August). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A Likert-type scale and construct validity. *Journal of Sex Research, 16*(3), 245-257.
- Lehne, G. (1976). Homophobia among men. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (66-68). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lester, D., & Brink, W.T. (1985) Police solidarity and tolerance for police misbehavior. *Psychological Reports, 57*, 326.
- Levinson, H. (1976). *Psychological man*. Cambridge, MA: The Levinson Institute.
- Levitt, E.E., & Klassen, A.D. (1974). Public attitudes toward homosexuality: Part of the 1970 National Survey by the Institute for Sex Research. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*(1), 29-43.

- MacDonald, Jr., A.P. (1974, October). The importance of sex-role to gay liberation. *Homosexual Counseling Journal*, 1(40), 169-180.
- MacDonald, Jr., A.P., & Games, R.G. (1974). Some characteristics of those who hold positive and negative attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1(1), 9-27.
- MacDonald, Jr., A.P., Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 161.
- Manning, P. (1977). *Police work*, p.289
- Marotta, T. (1981). *The politics of homosexuality; How lesbians and gay men have made themselves a political and social force in modern America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Martin, S. (1993). The problem of multicultural education: Background, definitions and future agenda. *Multicultural Education Journal*, 11(1), 9-20.
- McConville, M., Shepherd, D. (1992). *Watching police, watching communities*. London: Routledge, 188.
- McNamara, J. (1967). Uncertainties in police work. In D. Bordua (Ed.). *The Police*. New York: Wiley.
- Morh, R. (1988). *Gays/Justice; A study of ethics, society, and law*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Morin, S., & Garfinkle, E. (1978). Male homophobia. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34(1), 29-47.
- Niederhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. New York: Doubleday.
- Nungesser, L.G. (1983). *Homosexual acts, actors, and identities*. New York: Praeger.
- Peace Officers Standards and Training. (1984). *POST psychological screening manual*.
- Pedersen, P. (1988). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness*. Alexandria, Virginia: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Pharr, S. (1988). *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism*. Little Rock, AR: Chardon Press.
- Price, J. (1982). High school students' attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of School Health*, 52(8), 469-474.

- Pugh, C. (1985). Situation tests and police selection. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 13*, 30-35.
- Rafkey, D.M. (1973). Police race attitudes and labeling. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1*, 65-86.
- Rafkey, D.M. (1979). The cognitive gap between the police and the policed: An exploratory study in attitude organization. *Law and Human Behavior, 1*, 63-79.
- Reiner, R. (1985). *The blue-coated worker*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93.
- Reiser, M. (1970, September). A psychologist's view of the badge. *The Police Chief, 224-226*.
- Remafedi, G. (1987). Adolescent homosexuality: Psychosocial and medical implications. *Pediatrics, 79*, 331-337.
- Remafedi, G., Farrow, J., & Deisher, R. (1991, June). Risk factors for attempted suicide in gay and bisexual youth. *Pediatrics, 87*(6), 869-875.
- Roesler, T., & Deisher, R. W., (1972). Youthful male homosexuality. *JAMA, 219*, 1018-1023.
- Rudolph, J. (1988). *The effects of a multimodal seminar on mental health practitioners' attitudes toward homosexuality, authoritarianism, and counseling effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA. (Dissertation Abstracts International 49, 7, 2873B).
- Rudolph, J. (1988b, November). Counselors' attitudes toward homosexuality: A selective review of the literature. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67*, 165-168.
- Saxe, S. & Fabricatore, J. (1982, August). Using psychological consultants in screening police applicants. *F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin*.
- Scarman, L. (1981, April). *The Scarman Report: The Brixton Disorders*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Schonefeld, L. S., Kobos, J.L., & Phinney, I.R. (1980). Screening police applicants: A study of reliability with the MMPI. *Psychological Reports, 47*, 419-25.
- Sears, J. (1992). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? from Karen M. Harbeck (ed.) *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula*. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Shively, M.G., & De Cecco, J.P. (1993). Components of sexual identity. In Garnets, L.D., & Kimmel, D.C.(eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian & gay male experiences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Smith, F. (1986). *Insult to intelligence: The bureaucratic invasion of our classrooms*. New York: Arbor House.
- Smith, F. (1989). Speech given at California State University Chico.
- Smith, K.T. (1971). Homophobia: A tentative personality profile. *Psychological Reports*, 29, 1091-1094.
- Spielberger, C.D. (1979). *Police selection and evaluation: Issues and techniques*. New York: Praeger.
- St. George, J. (1991, November 30). Sensitivity training needs rethinking. *Law Enforcement News*, 17, 347.
- Stone, G.L. (1982). Evaluating the effectiveness of skills training programs. From Marshall, A.K., Kurts, P.D., & Assoc. (Eds.). *Interpersonal helping skills: A guide to training methods, programs and resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Chapter 15.
- Swidler, A. (1993). *Homosexuality and world religions*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Sykes, G. (1989). The functional nature of police reform: The 'myth' of controlling the police. From *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*, Roger G. Dunham & Geoffrey P. Alpert (Eds.). Illinois: Waveland Press, 292.
- Tinney, J.S. (1983). Interactions. In *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin*, 14 (3-4). New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1989). *Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide, Volume 3: Prevention and interventions in youth suicide*. Rockville, MD.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and language* (translated and revised by A. Kozulin). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Wiggins, G. (1989, May). A true test: Toward more authentic and equitable assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 703-713.
- Wilson, O.W. (1957). *Parker on police*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Wisniewski, J.J., & Toomey, B.G. (1987, September). Are social workers homophobic? *National Association of Social Workers, Inc*, 454-455.
- Wolf, D. (1989, April). Portfolio assessment: Sampling student work. *Educational Leadership*, 46, 35-39.

Yarmey, A. D. (1990). *Understanding police and police work: Psychosocial issues*.
New York: New York University Press.

CHAPTER 3 — METHODOLOGY

All California police recruits and officers are required by law to participate in cultural awareness training. Purely experimental research methodologies are therefore impossible because of the lack of control groups and randomization of the test subjects. Also, cultural awareness training is not standardized throughout the state. Wide variations in the course content, length of course, teaching pedagogy, etc., make assumptions about treatment similarities problematic.

The methodology for this research was to combine quasi-experimental analysis of cultural awareness training courses, education theory analysis of training observations along with qualitative and empirical measures of police academy/agency cultures. Using the findings of these methodologies and comparing the similarities and differences between different police settings should lead to a deeper understanding about the elements needed for effective training on sexual orientation.

Solicitation of Participants

Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) is the State of California commission responsible for the development and implementation of cultural awareness training standards in California police agencies and academies. As of this writing, POST has also trained over 130 personnel (representing over 120 different public safety agencies) in a two-year process to act as their agencies' Cultural Awareness Facilitator (CAF). This training was designed to assist each agency in conducting an assessment of their cultural awareness needs. Later, 40-week intensive trainings (Train-the-Trainer) were given by POST to select members to act as cultural awareness trainers at their respective agency.

In soliciting participants for this study, I initially used my professional relationship with POST to garner their support. POST agreed to send my letter of solicitation to the more than 130 persons who had attended either the CAF or Train-the-Trainer programs. It was reasonable to start with these persons because of their responsibility for the cultural awareness programs at their agencies and hence, the sexual orientation training in which I was most interested.

From the initial solicitation, eleven agencies and/or academies showed interest in participating in the study. A second letter was sent to these agencies that described in greater detail the desire to conduct pre-/post-testing, agency and community interviews, classroom observations and a review of related documents. It was here, that I started to experience my first tastes of the complexities of police subculture. For example, one large agency initially agreed to every aspect of my request, then week by week called back with concerns over different parts of the study. At first they approved my assessment instrument, then they wanted parts of it removed. Increasingly more higher-level meetings took place, additional restrictions were placed on my access to students and training personnel. Finally, the agency backed out of the study altogether citing that even having an observer in the classroom would “still alter the confidential and ‘safe’ atmosphere we strive to create for discussion dialogue. Cultural awareness training topics are often controversial and sensitive in nature; we encourage our personnel to express their feelings and discuss their ideas openly, without fear of retribution.” Another large agency followed a similar path— first agreeing to all aspects of the study, then slowly backing out. They claimed that having an observer in the classroom would be unacceptable because “many of the officers will be going into undercover work and we don’t want anyone to be able to identify them.” In these two cases, *Part 4* of the assessment instrument that asks questions about gender, sexual and affectional identities seemed to cause the greatest concern. As one staff psychologist explained, “We are very protective

of our recruits and officers and asking questions about their sexual orientation might be too much for them and could do them harm.” I personally was astounded at these concerns. Police have the legal right to carry guns and to kill people, yet the assertion that asking questions about their sexual orientation on an *anonymous* questionnaire may be “too much for them and could do them harm” seems unbelievable to me.

In some of the community college based police academies, other reasons were given to decline my request to conduct research. Because students often came from many different police agencies, the colleges claimed that approval from the chiefs of each agency would be required before research could be conducted on their employees. Furthermore, it was claimed that approval would be required from the State (POST) or that the college had an ethics review board whose approval would be required. Finally, the request to have students fill-out questionnaires and/or other written assignments could not be required outside of class time because of conflict with the State Fair Labor Laws concerning unpaid work — and of course, the instructors did not want any of their class time taken away with students answering research questionnaires. These four barriers were sufficient to block attempts to work with some academies. Interestingly, the community college based police academies that did participate in the research made no mention of these concerns.

Three of the agencies that declined to participate, did so because they felt that their existing program did not meet my needs. For them, training aimed specifically at sexual orientation was rarely conducted, and usually only in response to some community complaint. Their letters of declination were marked with embarrassment about the inadequacies of their programs.

In contrast, most of the agencies and academies that finally participated in this study were more than cooperative. All of them assigned an officer to assist me in getting to classes, making appointments with police personnel, contacting community members

and scheduling Ride-Along. Also, police officers were assigned to escort me to the local gay/lesbian bars and waited while I conducted interviews with bar owners and patrons.

Overall Design

The final seven participating California agencies and academies represented very different settings, participants, training approaches, administrative commitment and relationships with their local gay and lesbian community. Sexual orientation trainings were observed at:

1. Two academies that were fully supported by large metropolitan police departments and trained only their employees.
2. One community college-based academy that was uniquely designed as a regional training center where staffing came from local participating police agencies.
3. One police agency was involved in training their entire staff and did so internally without use of a police academy.
4. A husband/wife team were observed teaching their cultural awareness training (CAT) program at two separate community college-based police academies.
5. I was a participant-observer when hired to teach sexual orientation training at a community college-based police academy — and three different trainings are discussed.

Participation was voluntary and thereby most likely under-representative of California police agencies who have minimally implemented the legal requirements for cultural awareness training. Although this compromises the generalizability of the research findings, these sites probably reflect leading efforts to implement the state requirements and, as such, are most interested in cooperating with the research. Agencies and academies from the San Francisco Bay Area, San Joaquin Valley, Los Angeles and

San Diego Counties volunteered to participate and represented communities ranging in population size from 88,000 to over 3 million.

At each agency, part or all of their cultural awareness training was observed—particularly the training on sexual orientation. Using the Isaac's & Michael's (1981) *Design 1—One Group Pretest—Post-test Design* model for quasi-experimental research, assessment instruments were given training participants before and after sexual orientation training. These instruments included attitudinal, emotional, knowledge base, identities, and behavioral measures (described in the next section). Appropriate statistical tests were used to determine whether the difference attributed to the training was statistically significant.

Besides the quasi-experimental portion of the research, qualitative and empirical research was conducted in order to flesh out the meaning of the training experience. Each training was observed, training participants were asked to volunteer for interview, key informants were interviewed from the training staff and agency administration, police ride-along in the locale's gay community were scheduled, interviews were conducted with leaders of the gay and lesbian community, and documents concerning training and the administrative implementation of cultural awareness programs were obtained and reviewed.

Quasi-Experimental Research Instrumentation

1. Instrumentation: Trainings on sexual orientation were expected to change students toward a less homophobic position. Whether this occurs at the attitudinal, emotional, knowledge, or identity level is unknown and needed to be assessed. The following are empirical assessment instruments designed to measure these dimensions: (See Chapter 2, Issue #4 for review of the literature concerning these assessment instruments.)

- a. *(Modified) Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale* (MATHS) (Price, J. 1982, October, which modifies the *ATHS* as described in MacDonald, Jr., et al., 1973). This 28-item 5-point Likert type scale measures the attitudes a person holds toward homosexuality. This is the primary instrument used by researchers on anti-gay sentiments. Reliability of the instrument is reported at $r = +.95$ using the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient (Price, 1982, p. 471) and criterion validity was obtained by administering the questionnaire to heterosexuals and homosexuals in which the homosexuals, as expected, held more positive attitudes toward homosexuality.
- b. *Index of Homophobia* (IHP) (Hudson, W., & Ricketts, W., 1980). This scale evaluates emotional responses to homosexuality and being in the vicinity of homosexuals, and thus, is a closer measure of the original definition of homophobia—”the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals” (see Chapter 2, Issue #4). The instrument is a 25-item summated category partition scale with a score range from 0 to 100. Persons who have very little dread of being in close quarters with homosexual men or women tend to obtain very low scores on the IHP.

Persons who score from 0 to 25 are regarded as ‘high grade non-homophobics’ and those who score between 25 and 50 are ‘low grade non-homophobics.’ A person who scores between 50 and 75 is regarded as a ‘low grade homophobic.’ ‘High grade homophobics’ score above 75 on the IHP. (p. 362)

The authors reported reliability by computing coefficient alpha (Nunnally, 1978) to be .901 and the standard error of measurement (SEM) to be 4.75. This indicates that an individual’s IPH score will fall within a range of \pm

9.5 points of their true score about 95% of the time. For construct validity, the authors reported that the correlation between the IHP and the Sexual Attitude Scale (SAS by Hudson and Murphy, 1978) was .53 significant at $p < .0001$. The authors believed the IHP has “very high content validity” (p. 366) and factorial validity as assessed using the multiple-group method yielded item-correlation statistically significant at $p < .05$.

- c. *Homosexuality Knowledge Index* (HKI) (Sears, J., 1991). This is probably the most recent instrument used to assess the knowledge a person has about homosexuality. The 14-item test asks respondents to identify whether statements (based on common myths and stereotypes about homosexuals) were true or false. The author found negative correlation when compared to the ATH ($r = -.34$) and the IHP ($r = -.26$). That is, the greater accurate knowledge someone has about homosexuality, the lower their levels of homophobia. Reliability of $p < .05$ were reported for each item.

It is believed that as students learned more about human sexuality they will shift away from an exclusively heterosexual or exclusively homosexual self-identity and toward a more complex identity that involves both components. (See Herek’s (1986) discussion of the relationship between sex-role beliefs and levels of homophobia.) To test this theory and use it as a correlate with the established instruments, a new assessment instrument was created for this research:

- d. *Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, Emotional Identity* (Stewart, C.K., 1994). (See Appendix A for a copy of this assessment instrument). Using the Michael G. Shively and John P. De Cecco (1993) theories on gender-sexual-emotional identity, I developed an assessment instrument to evaluate students’ self-identities on gender, sex and emotions. Fieldwork

demonstrated many problems in administering this assessment instrument.

See Chapter 5 for discussion.

It is believed that one of the primary goals of police training is to modify behavior. Also, for training assessment to have meaning and relevancy, it is important to assess the potential behaviors of students. An assessment instrument was created to assess police behaviors:

- e. *Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality* (PBSH) (Stewart, 1994). (See Appendix B for a copy of this assessment instrument.) Thirteen scenarios were developed with the help of gay and lesbian police officers. Each scenario was given four alternative behaviors to police situations that had a gay and/or lesbian component and were based on the Overt-Institutional-Societal/Homophobia model with gradation toward support of gays and lesbians. A balance was maintained between the use of negative and positive statements and between the use of terms homosexual/gay/lesbian/same-sex/homosexuality. Double negatives were avoided and reading level was kept at the high school level. For internal validity check, each question was paired with other questions that were anticipated to yield similar results. Students were asked to select one of the four alternatives for each scenario as representing the behavior they expected to engage as police officers. Overall, this assessment instrument proved to be not discriminating. See Chapter 5 for discussion.

2. Data Analysis: These five assessment instruments were designed to yield detailed information about changes in attitudes and beliefs, emotions, factual understanding, and behaviors in police officers participating in sexual orientation training. The entire set of five assessment instruments and personal data were referred to as *Police Empirical Research Questionnaire* (PERQ). When students took the PERQ before

training, they were asked to hold onto all test materials. After training, they were asked to turn their answer sheets over and take the test a second time. This allows for individual tracking and the more powerful pooled-t-test statistical analysis. Confidentiality was assured all respondents. Out of 438 students, 176 completed pre-/post-testing with the PERQ.

One other group of persons asked to complete the assessment instruments were the key informants who did not participate in the training program. Although this did not represent assessment of the training program, it provided important base-lines about police and community cultures. Of the 22 instructors/panel member, 10 program administrators, and 18 community members participating in interview, approximately half completed the PERQ.

3. Reliability and Validity Issues for Instrumental Empirical Research: The instrumental empirical research portion of this study faced many obstacles that affected the accuracy of the findings. The *One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design* is one of the weakest quasi-experimental designs because of its minimum of control. The primary advantage of the design is that it provides a comparison between performances by the same group *before* and *after* exposure to some treatment (in this case, cultural awareness training). This design controls for the internal validity problems of *selection* and *mortality* but is exposed to many disadvantages. In particular, there is no assurance that the treatment is the only or even the major factor for the measured difference. Similarly, “probable error” arises from issues of *history*, *maturation*, *testing effects*, *changing effects of instrumentation*, and *statistical regression* (Isaac & Michael, p. 64). As to the validity and reliability of the five assessment instruments, three of them have been reported to be internally valid and reliable. Only the *Gender Identity*, *Sexual Identity*, *Emotional Identity* and *Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality (PBSH)* have not previously been assessed for reliability and validity.

A number of strategies were used to help balance against these empirical difficulties. First, some of the respondents were persons who did not go through the observed trainings and represent a potential control group, albeit one with histories of previous cultural awareness trainings. Second, each of the training programs observed at different police agencies were recognized to differ from each other, and not assumed to be the same “method”.

Qualitative Research

Empirical research quantifies changes within specific domains, but it is qualitative research that brings out the meaning of that change. For this research, qualitative data was obtained from four sources: (1) Training and Patrol Observations, (2) Key Informant Interviews, (3) Written Student Comments, and (4) Document Review. The descriptive data from these four sources were coded according to the theoretical framework and organized to detect meaning, intensity and frequency.

Miles & Huberman (1984) used the analogy of “bins” as a way to identify units of analysis. The “bins” for this research originated from the theories of education, homophobia, police subculture development, multiculturalism and administrative organizing. The research sample included not only people, but events settings and processes. Instrumentation for the qualitative research initially started with a “front-end . . . [fairly] structure[d]” (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 43) format, but evolved as more key informants at other agencies were interviewed.

Qualitative Research Involved:

1. Training Observations—Each cultural awareness training (and particularly, ones on sexual orientation) were observed. The nine training sites included 438

students. Initially, I requested the right to videotape trainings, but the university ethics board rejected the request besides most police agencies balked at the idea for a number of reasons including that they did not want a visual record of officers in the class because it might compromise their future work as undercover agents. Observation data included curriculum structure, content, teaching pedagogy, classroom management, student responses, physical space, and student interactions. These observations were coded according to the psycholinguistic/humanistic education model developed in Chapter 2. These codes were tabulated (See Appendix D) to assess each training site's convergence to the education model. Hence, an estimate of training on sexual orientation "effectiveness" was made for each site.

Patrol Observations—Participating in police Patrol Ride-Along programs allowed observations to be made of police officers at work in their agency's respective identified gay community. These officers were informally engaged in conversation aimed at assessing the police agencies' perception of the gay and lesbian community and hence, the police's subculture regarding homosexuals.

2. Key Informant Interviews—Two classes of informants were solicited for interviews:

- (a) Participants of the training program and those persons who were directly involved with conducting or administering the training. It was hoped that these persons would help illuminate the source of meaning to the training experience. Unfortunately, only 6 out of the 438 observed students volunteered for interview—representing less than one student interview per training site. Twenty-two trainers and panel members were interviewed in order to obtain their experiences about conducting cultural awareness trainings and to obtain their perspective on what contributes to "effective"

training for police. Finally, 10 police administrators (with responsibilities for cultural awareness programs including police chiefs) were interviewed to better gauge the administrative support for the trainings.

- (b) Informants who could help identify the level of homophobia and the social interactions responsible for the maintenance of heterosexist values in the police subculture and organization. This included the Chief of Police together with other personnel responsible for administrative leadership. Also, 18 gay and lesbian leaders of the respective communities were interviewed to obtain their perspective on police interaction with their community.

All interviewees were asked to complete the PERQ.

The interview data was used to estimate levels of homophobia within the training class and the agency (see Appendix E for details of the estimation model and subsequent findings), obtain data on “appropriate” police behavior in situations that involve gays and lesbians, and suggestions for improving the training program .

3. Written Student Comments—Written comments were solicited from students attending sexual orientation training. Many instructors had students write statements of beliefs or feelings, or questions they had regarding homosexuals or homosexuality as part of a class activity. These were collected and made available for analysis. Similarly, some training sites allowed for the distribution of a three-question survey at the end of class that asked for students’ reactions and input about the sexual orientation training. These too, were collected for analysis. Appendix E presents a model for estimating the level of homophobia found at each training site based upon these written student comments.
4. Document Review—As described in Chapter 2 Issue #6, there is a suspected strong interplay between police subculture, administrative structures, levels of

homophobia and sexual orientation training effectiveness. Police documents related to cultural awareness training are important sources of information and were collected where feasible. These documents included; (a) administrative policies and procedures concerning non-discrimination, personnel and community complaints, personnel applications, personnel promotions, etc., (b) training curriculum and support materials, (c) implementation of cultural awareness programs, (d) lawsuits based upon sexual orientation complaints, and (e) gay community articles dealing with police.

Triangulation between the sources of qualitative data provided an accurate picture on the status of gays and lesbians within the police agency. Class observations was compared and analyzed against education theory. Comparing all these sources of data allowed conclusions to be made concerning the effectiveness in the overall cultural awareness program and the sexual orientation training in particular.

Reliability and Validity Issues for Qualitative Research:

The qualitative portion of this study faced many problems experienced by the instrumental empirical research. Triangulation (Denzin, 1978, 291) within the qualitative data, and between the empirical and qualitative data provided the strongest balance against research validity problems. By recognizing the potential biases in research data, triangulation hoped to answer the question of weight value on the data, i.e., comparing data for importance to research question. As Guba (1981) reported, naturalistic studies should have credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity), dependability (reliability) and confirmability (objectivity). Williams (1986) expanded upon Guba and outlined eleven methodological precautions to help ensure credibility. Because of the structure of the police training field research, prolonged engagement was not possible.

However, credibility was based upon triangulation, finding no internal contradictions, police acceptance of the report as credible, inductive emergence of issues, and evidence of contradictory instances (Williams, 1986, p. 90-92).

Bibliography

- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act*, 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guba, E.G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29, 75-92.
- Herek, G.M. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychical consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29(5), 563-577.
- Hudson, W., & Murphy, G.J. (1978). *Liberal vs. conservative orientations toward human sexual expressions*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii School of Social Work.
- Hudson, W., & Ricketts, W. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5(4), 357-372.
- Isaac, S. & Michael, W.B. (1981). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego: Edits Publishers. Also see Van Dalen, D.B. (1979). *Understanding educational research* (4th ed.). New York: MacGraw-Hill. Adapted from Cambell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1966). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- MacDonald, A.P, Jr., Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 161.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Price, J. (1982, October). High school students' attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Journal of School Health*, p. 469.
- Sears, J. (1991). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? p. 50, from Karen M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula*. New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Shively, M. G., & De Cecco, J. P. (1993). Components of sexual identity, p. 80, from Garnets, L. D., & Kimmel, D. C. (eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian & gay male experiences*. New York: Columbia Press.
- Williams, D.D. (1986, Spring). Naturalistic evaluation: Potential conflicts between evaluation standards and criteria for conducting naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 8(1), 87-99.

CHAPTER 4 — RESEARCH DESCRIPTION, QUALITATIVE AND EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FINDINGS

Chapter 4 presents detailed descriptions and findings of the sexual orientation training observed at different police training sites. Section 1 includes qualitative observations and interviews used to assess sexual orientation training effectiveness. Section 2 looks closely at the data obtained from administering an assessment instrument (PERQ described in Chapters 2 and 3) and relates these findings with the previous data. Section 3 takes the qualitative and instrumental empirical research and estimates the level of homophobia within the police academy and/or agency. Hopefully, these comprehensive write-ups will give the reader a sense of how sexual orientation trainings were conducted and the cultures in which they are embedded. There are important concepts to be learned from each of these observations.

Section 1 — Qualitative and Non-Instrumental Empirical Research

This section documents the qualitative and non-instrumental portion of the research. To observe cultural awareness sexual orientation training as a singular event would not yield much information about its effectiveness without also evaluating how this kind of training fits into the overall police program. To that end, classroom observations, document review and interviews with participants and persons involved with the training were conducted. The primary purpose in conducting these interviews was to obtain a sense of culture of the communities of persons surrounding the sexual orientation training. These communities of persons included not only the participants in the training,

but also course instructors, program administrators, other police personnel and the community the police serve.

Training Observations

Table 4.1 presents a summary of the nine observed sexual orientation trainings. For comprehensive documentation of the training observations, see Appendix C which includes an analysis of the level of student involvement. As each site is discussed in this chapter, please refer back to Table 4.1 and Appendix C.

Table 4.1 gives information on the total time for sexual orientation training, and the kinds and numbers of students attending. Each discrete activity is shown along with the amount of time devoted to the activity. Also, an assessment of the level of student involvement is indicated for each activity. These levels are discussed in Appendix C, and correspond to:

Level 1— Lecture/video with almost no question or student involvement.

Level 2— Lecture with some questions and answers by students.

Level 3— Instructor-led class discussion or activity with moderate student involvement.

Level 4— Individual or small group activity with follow-up class discussion and much student involvement.

At the bottom of Table 4.1, a summary is made of the total time allotted and corresponding percentage at each level of student activity.

Table 4.1
Sexual Orientation Training Observation Summary
— Activity, Time and Student Involvement

Time Student # Students	Site #1 143 min. in-service 17	Site #2 & 3 132 min. recruits 43/39	Site #4 240 min. recruits 30	Site #5 202 min. recruits 45
	Video — “Growing up Gay.” 53 min. Level 1.	Instructor- led discussion . 41 min. Level 2.	Local gay history video . 23 min. Level 1.	Introduction & goals lecture . 20 min. Level 1.
	Personal stories from police personnel panel-lecture . 90 min. Level 1-2.	Open discussion — on homosexuality. 60 min. Level 2.	“Stereotype” activity . 8 min. Level 3.	Personal story by gay and lesbian police officer lecture . 15 min. Level 1.
		Religious lecture . 31 min. Level 1.	“Self-Awareness” activity . 35 min. Level 3.	Personal story by gay and lesbian police officer lecture . 15 min. Level 1.
			Personal story- lecture . 24 min. Level 1.	Knowing someone gay activity . 2 min. Level 3.
			Gay politics news video with lecture and discussion . 24 min. Level 2.	“Stereotype” activity . 25 min. Level 3.
			Video — “Gay Cops” from <i>60 Minutes</i> . 25 min. Level 1.	Personal story by gay and lesbian police officer lecture . 23 min. Level 1.
			Domestic violence and hate crime lecture . 5 min. Level 2.	“Gay Lifestyle” activity . 13 min. Level 3.
			Video of “Harvey Milk.” 90 min. Level 1.	“Question Cards” activity . 4 min. Level 4.
				“Points-of-Contact” lecture . 40 min. Level 1.
				“Questions and Answers” activity . 30 min. Level 3.
Summary of Time Allocations for Different Levels of Student Involvement				
Level 1	101 min./ 71%	30 min./ 23%	167 min./ 70%	122 min./ 60%
Level 2	42 min./ 29%	102 min./ 77%	29 min./ 12%	0
Level 3	0	0	44 min./ 18%	76 min./ 38%
Level 4	0	0	0	4 min./ 2%

Note: For each training site, the sequence of teaching activities is presented by listing the type of activity, length of instruction and the level of student involvement. Levels correspond to: **Level 1**— lecture/video with almost no question or student involvement; **Level 2**— Lecture with some questions and answers asked by students; **Level 3**— Instructor-led class discussion or activity with moderate student involvement; and **Level 4**— individual or small group activity with follow-up class discussion and much student involvement.

**Table 4.1 (cont.)
Sexual Orientation Training Observation Summary
— Activity, Time and Student Involvement**

Time Student # Students	Site #6 110 min. recruits 105	Site #7 193 min. recruits 94	Site #8 211 min. in-service 38	Site #9 223 min. recruits 65
	Personal stories from community panel-lecture . 50 min.. Level 1.	Introduction and “Stereotype” activity . 35 min. Level 3.	Introduction and “Stereotype” activity . 40 min. Level 3.	Introduction and share- lecture personal story. 10 min. Level 1.
	“Police Scenarios” activity . 40 min.. Level 3.	“Homophobia” lecture . 13 min. Level 1.	“Homophobia” lecture . 12 min. Level 1.	Video — “Gay Cops” from <i>60-Minutes</i> . 23 min. Level 1.
	“Questions and Answers” activity . 20 min.. Level 2.	“Gay Lifestyle” activity . 8 min. Level 3.	“Gay Lifestyle” activity . 2 min. Level 3.	“Police Scenarios” of police harassment activity . 30 min. Level 4.
		Scientific lecture on sexual orientation. 40 min. Level 1.	“Self-Awareness” activity . 10 min. Level 4.	“Question Card” activity . 5 min. Level 4.
		Video — “Project 10” teen suicide. 20 min. Level 1.	“Question Card” activity . 2 min. Level 4.	“Stereotype” activity . 30 min. Level 3.
		“Famous Gays and Lesbians” activity . 15 min. Level 4.	Video — “Growing Up Gay.” 31 min. Level 1.	Scientific lecture on sexual orientation. 15 min. Level 1.
		“Hate Crime” lecture . 5 min. Level 1.	Scientific lecture on sexual orientation. 32 min. Level 1.	“Famous gays and lesbians” activity . 15 min. Level 4.
		Police homophobia lecture/activity . 10 min. Level 3.	“Famous Gays and Lesbians” activity . 15 min. Level 4.	“Points-of-Contact” lecture/activity . 60 min. Level 2.
		“Points-of-Contact” lecture/activity . 15 min. Level 2.	“Hate Crimes” lecture . 5 min. Level 1.	“Personal Contact” activity . 15 min. Level 4.
		“Appropriate Police Behavior” activity . 15 min. Level 4.	“Police Scenarios” of police harassment activity . 30 min. Level 4.	“Questions and Answers” activity . 15 min. Level 3.
		Questions and Answers activity . 15 min. Level 3.	“Points-of-Contact” lecture/activity . 30 min. Level 2.	Closure . 5 min. Level 1.
Summary of Time Allocations for Different Levels of Student Involvement				
Level 1	50 min./ 46%	83 min./ 43%	85 min./ 40%	53 min./ 24%
Level 2	20 min./ 18%	15 min./ 8%	30 min./ 14%	60 min./ 27%
Level 3	40 min./ 36%	63 min./ 33%	39 min./ 18%	45 min./ 20%
Level 4	0	30 min./16%	57 min./ 28%	65 min./ 29%

Note: For each training site, the sequence of teaching activities is presented by listing the type of activity, length of instruction and the level of student involvement. Levels correspond to: **Level 1**— lecture/video with almost no question or student involvement; **Level 2**— Lecture with some questions and answers asked by students; **Level 3**— Instructor-led class discussion or activity with moderate student involvement; and **Level 4**— individual or small group activity with follow-up class discussion and much student involvement.

Site #1

Site #1 is a medium-sized city of 120,000 located in the San Francisco Bay Area. Posted on the major roads entering the community are signs that state, "Racism is not tolerated." Towards that commitment to overcome racism, Site #1 police department initiated a program in 1991 to assess the cultural awareness needs of the agency which resulted in a comprehensive Cultural Awareness Training (CAT) program for all police personnel starting in 1994. With 161 sworn officers and 124 civilian employees, the program planned for small classes of 15-19 students to attend the 40 hour CAT. Holding classes monthly, the department anticipated completing training within 24 months. Taking great pride in their program, they proposed to the City Council a similar training program to be initiated for all city employees.

Gay and Lesbian Community:

The gay and lesbian community at Site #1 is small and revolves around a few bars located in the old downtown. Bar owners and patrons report that the overall harassment of gays and lesbians has decreased significantly over the last ten years, particularly since the hiring of the new police chief. No longer do police enter gay bars to stand and stare at the patrons or randomly arrest them. Still, bar owners report continued low-level harassment from the community including "verbal harassment 3 to 5 times a week, being egged once every 6 weeks and being water pistoled by passing cars a few times a year."

Site #1's gay and lesbian community is virtually unaware of the police except for when there is an altercation. Although no official liaison group exists between police and the gay community other than the broad based Human Rights Commission, recurring problems with noise and public drunkenness at a particular heterosexual bar located near

homes of wealthy citizens and next to a lesbian bar had resulted in a coalition of these homeowners and bar owners to form to try and rid the community of this problem. The gay/lesbian bar owners are vocally anti-drug, non-supportive of illegal behavior, welcome police inspections, and have learned that police respond to requests for assistance with haste and a smile. Non-gay police noted that they “wish the straight bars were as cooperative and well behaved as the gay/lesbian bars.” Together, a mutually supportive relationship has developed. Of course, not all police officers are perfect, and bar owners report the infrequent need of going directly to the area police administrator to settle problems. Vice enforcement, historically an area of conflict between police and the gay community, is not a problem, since as a police administrator explained, “Vice does not target homosexuals or street prostitution (unless a complaint is filed).” Furthermore, the police’s non-harassment and professional support of the gay/lesbian community, aligned with the City’s adoption of anti-discrimination policies that include a domestic partnership registration, has defused most gay/lesbian political organizing.

The gay and lesbian community is very unaware of the internal happenings or policies of the police department. Although more than half of Site #1’s fifteen women police officers are open lesbians (as reported by some of the open lesbian officers interviewed for the study), the community perceives that there are only one or two on the force. Since there have been no public statements, press releases, or community forums at which the gay/lesbian community could officially recognize gay/lesbian police officers, the primary source of information about the internal workings of the police is through friendship networks with the open lesbian and closeted gay male officers. It is through these networks that the community is aware that there are no open gay male officers and as one bar owner reported, it would be “very dangerous” for a gay male officer to come out. The community also learned about previous harassment experienced by the lesbian

officers, including the current controversy regarding the heterosexual women personnel requesting greater “privacy” be built into the bathroom renovations. Although no “incidents” have occurred in the bathrooms, some heterosexual women have stated that they resent sharing the bathrooms with lesbian officers. The lack of official communication between the city, the police department and the gay/lesbian community has weakened the communities’ understanding of the legal protections based on sexual orientation afforded them in Site #1.

Police Subculture:

The police administration is strongly committed to organizational change toward being more responsive to the entire spectrum of community needs. The police chief is recognized, both in the community and in the agency, as a leader in this quest and the best administrator Site #1 has had in the past few years. Yet, some in the community see the chief as a political opportunist since it is widely known that he already has applied to take a new chief position at a much larger police agency. Also, some officers feel that the agency is blinding itself with a self-serving attitude, a belief that they are way ahead of most other police agencies and that they are the most knowledgeable about policing.

The police subculture with respect to gays and lesbians is much more complex. No citizen and/or internal police complaints or suits based on sexual orientation discrimination have been filed against the police during the administration of the current police chief. The number of open lesbian officers has increased. Police personnel make an “active” recruitment effort by not discriminating against gays and lesbians. Together, the acceptance of gays and lesbians seems good, i.e., the level of homophobia in the agency seems low. However, there seem to be unresolved issues that contribute to continued harassment of the gay and lesbian officers. First, different administrators view

sexual orientation issues diametrically opposed to one another; some claim that sexual orientation is a non-issue for police, while others claim that having no open gay male officers indicates a significant problem. Still, other administrators make both claims in the same conversation. Police administrators in general give the impression of wanting sexual orientation to be a non-issue, however, when questioned about the reasons for having no open gay male officers, and when presented with the complaints and concerns expressed by the open lesbian officers, they concede that homosexuality is still an important issue for the agency. Second, the administration's belief they are taking an "active" posture on gay and lesbian issues does not match the "proactive" desires of many lesbian officers and gay/lesbian community members. Even with these differences, administrators and gay/lesbian officers agreed during interview that having open gay and lesbian officers is the single most important component to improving the acceptance of gays and lesbians in the police agency. Administrative support and cultural awareness training specifically on sexual orientation issues were also considered important, but not as significant as having open role models.

Students were asked their opinion about the level of acceptance for gays and lesbians in the agency. Ten students out of a class of 17 responded to this request. Ten (60%) respondents felt the agency was not homophobic. As one student stated, "lesbians are out and seem to be more accepting, but gay males are not. That probably has to do with the MACHO attitudes of most males in police work." There was a dissenting voice, "[gays and lesbians are] accepted but still some covert resistance with comments made by administrators— they need to go through the course first." It is interesting that students hold this fairly schizophrenic attitude because none reported witnessing a gay-bashing in the agency nor felt that gays and lesbians were ridiculed. Of those students who made

suggestions as to how to improve the situation, all of them suggested more education on gay and lesbian concerns.

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Program administrators and training instructors were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. Cultural awareness training is highly valued by the Site #1 police administration and community. The components of the program evolved from the city's Human Rights Commission.

There are three sources defining the goals of the CA program. The *Site #1 Police Department—Cultural Awareness Program*, states that CA is:

cost efficient and consistent with the philosophy of community-oriented policing and problem-oriented policing . . . intent of the program is that behaviors both internal to the department and external in the community will be modified . . . prevent discriminatory or prejudicial behaviors . . . to include the idea that there is more than one way to be a 'good cop' . . . An approach that is highly effective is the sharing of our human stories. (p.4).

The student manual given at the CA training, *Site #1 Police Department—Cultural Awareness Training* states that CA:

Promote higher level of understanding, acceptance, and appreciation for diversity within the department and our community. Provide information that will enhance employee safety and communication skills when dealing with individuals from different cultures, races, ethnic backgrounds and varying values. (p.3).

Finally, the interviews with community and police personnel revealed the goals of CA are:

to “sensitize” the student to the issues of cultural differences and similarities. “Sensitizing” on sexual orientation includes the dimensions of making people relax enough about the issues of sexual orientation such that they can discuss the issues and reduce their stereotype beliefs. Police professed a desire to see behavioral changes that would improve job performance but they did not want specific behaviors mandated.

Merging these sources, one could conclude that the primary goal of Site #1’s CA training is to bring about changes in police behaviors toward greater employee safety and increased effectiveness in communicating with a diverse community. It is hoped that this will be achieved through higher levels of understanding of social interactions that are developed through the sharing of “our human stories.” Although the police professed a desire to see behavioral changes that would improve job performance, they did not want specific behaviors mandated. To achieve these goals, instructors are expected to act as role models and facilitators, and are not expected to be trainers or experts on the subject. Likewise, panel members are expected to share their life stories and act as role models.

Most respondents shared that the primary information about sexual orientation to be transmitted during training is that gays and lesbians are no different from society as a whole and share many common concerns with the general population. Gay and lesbian respondents expanded upon this perspective and said more detail information would also be provided, including bisexuality, definition of terms, that sexual orientation is not a sexuality issue, and that sexual orientation is inborn (essentialist perspective).

Researcher's Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

Site #1 Police Department was highly supportive of this study. Not only did they provide access to observe the entire 40-hour CAT, allow pre-/post-testing of students and the extensive interviewing of instructors, students, administrators and the police chief, but they also assigned a police officer to take me to meet with local gay and lesbian community leaders and bar owners. Overall, twenty persons participated in the interview portion of the research including 10 gay/lesbian community members, 4 gay/lesbian officers and/or instructors, 3 non-gay officers and/or instructors and 3 police administrators (including the police chief). Some students in the CAT course participated in the interviews. I also participated in a couple of ride-alongs. During the week-long CAT, I was requested to share about particular topics with which he was knowledgeable. Site #1 takes great pride in their program and spends considerable resources toward making the police department responsive to the needs of its diverse community.

The PERQ was distributed to students on the first day of CAT and instructed to complete it at home. Four days later at the conclusion of the sexual orientation training, students were instructed to turn their answer sheets over and take the PERQ a second time at home. All materials were retrieved from the students the following day.

I had some impact on class proceedings. On several occasions during five days of observations, I was called upon as a subject matter expert. Although friendships were developed with a number of students, one student directly told me (in very negative terms) that I should not be there taking notes and the class would be better without my presence. During interviews, several students expressed opinions that the PERQ opened their eyes and influenced the questions they subsequently asked during the gay and lesbian panel.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: CAT classes were scheduled 8:30 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday. Participants in the classes were a mix of both sworn (including the Police Chief) officers and police civilian employees who were released from their normal duties for the entire week at full pay. Of the seventeen (17) persons attending, 5 were women and 12 were men. These included three police officers, five new police officers, two police administrators, one person from animal control, and six persons (4 women and 2 men) who were civilian police employees. The class was informal with no one in uniform. During the sexual orientation training on the fourth day of the class, two high level administrators entered the classroom and stood at the back—something that had not happened during the rest of the week. The program structure consisted of instructors presenting a theoretical model, having students work through activities, and hear personal experiences shared by fellow police personnel. Approximately two panels were presented each day—each for almost 2 1/2 hours. The panels were the primary source of information on Hispanic/Latino, African-American, White European male, women, Asian-American, lesbians and gay men, and Middle Eastern cultures. A seventy-three (73) page Cultural Awareness Training Manual that included articles, worksheets and evaluations were provided to each student.

Instructor(s): The CAT program developed a group of 24 trainers through a Train-the-Trainer class taught some months earlier in Site #1 by the college professor who helped create the program. One African-American male police officer and a lesbian police officer were the trainers for the program observed for this study. At subsequent classes, other sets of trainers would be used with some overlap during the course of the program.

Setting: Classes were held in a conference room in the city's Convention Center. The flat desks were arranged in a U-shape seating six persons to a side. At the front of

the room there were two flipchart stands with paper, TV and dry marker board. Free pastries and other foods were made available in the morning and after lunch.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

For the first hour of the 2 1/2 hour program, the video “Growing Up Gay” produced by Brian McNaught was shown. This video demonstrates the absurdity of the notion that gays and lesbians choose to be outcasts from society and that being gay in our society is extremely difficult. During the viewing, students sat passively watching. After a short break, a panel of gay and lesbian employees from the police agency and gay and lesbian community members shared their stories and answered questions. The panel consisted of two lesbian officers, one male officer in uniform from a different police agency, and two male community members. Initially, the panel members followed a pre-set format of questions presented by the instructors. Primarily, panel members were asked to share their coming-out stories and their relationships with their families. This was very stilted with no student involvement. About 30 minutes into the presentation, the lesbian instructor deviated from the set questions—which started a freer flow of interaction. Not until 42 minutes into the 90 minute panel was the first question fielded by a student. For the remainder of the panel presentation, approximately 10 more students asked questions. Students focused in asking questions of the police officers on the panel and were interested in their experiences in the agency and with their families. In particular, the male officer was asked why there were no open gay male officers in this agency. Approximately five of the questions were wrapped in anti-gay moral judgments such as, “Aren’t you afraid that if you have children they will turn out gay?” Overall, the panel

members shared information on coming out, being gay in a police force, age of sexual identity, family dynamics, dealing with homophobia and heterosexism, instance of gay-bashing, working with gay or lesbian officers, being harassed simply for being the friend of a homosexual, the historical harassment experienced by gays and lesbians from police, insensitivity shown by minorities toward gays and lesbians, appropriate word usage, youth suicide and the development of a strong support system. The instructors did not seek closure at the end of training.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

Classroom observations support that “sharing of our human stories” is indeed the primary instructional method used by Site #1’s CAT as outlined in their goals. The opening video used 1/3 of the training time and was a weave of the speaker’s (Brian McNaught) personal life, research on sexual orientation and the experiences one faces growing up in a heterosexist society. A panel composed of police personnel used the remaining allotted time. The police panel members shared experiences as related to choosing and entering the world of law enforcement, and contrasted those experiences with being gay or lesbian. The panel members less well received were the two male civilian members. Showing the video and panel presentation constituted 71% of the instructional time. Only 29% of class time was used for limited student involvement.

The content of the gay and lesbian panel emerged from the personal stories related by panel members. As such, specific information that would enhance a person’s understanding and subsequent job performance became a hit or miss proposition. Although the goals of the training did not want specific behaviors mandated, without specific content goals it was impossible to determine if the panels provided the needed information to effect the desired behavioral changes.

Finally, the panel revealed a conflict between lesbian officers' impressions of homophobia within Site #1's police agency. One officer claimed to have little or no problems— "no one challenges me . . . I was so concentrated on being a police officer. Enough people are pro-me that they will cover me." Another panelist claimed to have continual problems. As noted in the interviews, harassment of lesbian officers has declined from a few years ago, but all lesbian officers related that they still continue. Officers who are more aggressive report less harassment. This stems from two sources: (1) being aggressively open does reduce the amount of direct confrontation from other persons, and (2) often tied to an aggressive stance is a psychological denial of instances of harassment.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

The two instructors were not trained teachers and unfortunately demonstrated their inability to structure class discussions and activities during the week. That is not to say that they were not well liked and held with high professional esteem as police officers. They appeared to lack the skills for effective classroom processes nor were they experts on the material being presented. When showing a video or conducting an activity, they did not prepare the students for the experience, but simply turned on the video or read the directions for the activity. They were continually unable to draw students into class discussion or relate what was shared to the theory being explored. Even the simple task of dividing the class into smaller groups became a confused situation. The instructors choose groups that were either too large or not spatially arranged for engagement. Besides not preparing students for an activity, the instructors did not attempt summary or closure for any topic. Although the instructors were officially known as facilitators and explained they were not teachers or subject matter experts, their classroom function

required them to be teachers and subject matter experts. A major flaw in the program was not having a trained teacher structure the program processes and not having subject matter experts available.

The police officers on the panel were better received by the students than the gay community members. Particularly effective was having the one gay male police officer in uniform while on the panel. He appeared to obtain the greatest interest and respect from the students as evidenced by the number of questions he received, plus the content of the questions centering upon his police experiences. In contrast, a statement made by the elder community member, “the only difference between a straight man and a gay man is two drinks,” caused considerable commotion among the students and was remembered negatively the next day.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

Classroom observations revealed that the module on sexual orientation solicited the most reactions from students—as measured by the number of questions emanating from the students and the activity level during review of the panel. However, interviews of the gay and lesbian panel members suggested the participation level of this particular set of students was lower than previous classes. This is interesting, because of all the panels presented during the week, the gay and lesbian panel had the greatest student participation. One could conclude that the entire week had been less involving for students than previous CAT and that sexual orientation training in general is the most involving for students.

- A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: Ten students of a class of 17 responded.)

Students were impressed most by viewing the video “Growing Up Gay” (which was a last minute insertion). This, and listening to the candid lives of the panelists were considered positive experiences. The diversity within the gay and lesbian panel was also thought to be important, although the “flippant” manner of one gay community member was considered to be negative.

- B. What did students want to know or were concerned about? (Note: Eleven students of 17 responded.)

From classroom observations, students appeared interested in the feelings the gay and lesbian officers of the panel had when they were young. Because they perceived homosexuality to be rare, uncommon, essential, homosexuals identified as the “other,” and confused about their gender, many questions regarding the “causes” and “naturalness” of homosexuality were voiced by students. During class, one self-identified Christian fundamentalist suggested that discussion of the “other” side of the issues would be important (issues of “biased” research and reparative therapy). The follow-up panel discussion indicated religious condemnation of homosexuality was an important issue for many students.

- C. Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: Eight students of 17 responded.)

Students responses indicated a need for more information (literature, video, etc.) and more time for discussion.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

The agency strongly supports CAT and is echoed by all administrators and most officers and employees. The sexual orientation training seemed to involve students more than the other sub-topics and was felt to be an important contributor to the acceptances of gays and lesbians.

The stated goals for the training emphasized changing behaviors of officers so as to enhance employee safety and communication when dealing with individuals from different cultures. The program hoped that through police employees sharing their personal stories fellow employees would become “sensitized” to the issues of cultural differences without “mandating specific behaviors.” Unfortunately, the behaviors and professional skills needed by police officers when dealing with gays and lesbians were never specified and was left to emerge from the panel presentation and student questions. Students were left confused and with many questions unanswered as evidenced during interview. Furthermore, students were interested in the “causes” of homosexuality and associated religious injunctions—topics on which none of the facilitators or panel members could give expert information and which fell outside the goals of the program.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

Students were prepared for the panel through use of the video, “Growing Up Gay.” This opened many lines of questions that were presented to the panel. However, because of the scripted manner of the panel, student participation was limited. The instructors/facilitators were active officers and should have been an appropriate role model for the students, but failed to discuss their personal experiences where sexual orientation

and policing intersect. The panel also failed in most cases to be the appropriate role model for the students. Only the openly gay and lesbian officers provided students with some of the information they requested. Furthermore, since none of the instructors or panel members were experts on sexual orientation, valuable information was missing from the presentation. Students indicated they wanted technical information on sexual orientation besides other kinds of information. The instructors also failed to provide meaningful practice for the student or attempt closure on what had been taught. Overall, this class structure provided marginal amounts of information to students and failed in many educational processes.

Site #2

Site #2 is one of the largest cities of California's Central Valley. The population of 400,000, is served by approximately 484 sworn officers of which 42 are female and 442 are male officers. Most officers are trained at the Site #2 Police Academy which is one of the basic recruit academies associated with the local community college. The academy does accommodate recruits and advance-officer training for other nearby police departments. Cultural Awareness Training (CAT) started in 1988 when the department contacted the instructors to develop a CAT program. Initially, 4 hours were devoted to the training which grew to its current 30 hours of training—6 hours more than the POST mandate. The instructors of the training displayed great pride in their overall program, yet felt inadequately prepared to train on sexual orientation.

Gay and Lesbian Community:

As reported by the gay and lesbian bar owners, Site #2 gay and lesbian community is extremely diverse; however it is relatively closeted. There is no specific organization that acts as a liaison between the gay and lesbian community and police. Most contact with the police is either from bar owners or local AIDS organizations. Bar owners were split between appreciating the police assistance or claiming that harassment by police officers continues—although such police harassment has declined the past 10 years.

Police Subculture:

Neither of the heterosexual instructors nor heterosexual students knew of gay-bashing in the police department. They felt that the acceptance of gays and lesbians was mixed, with some officers accepting while many, if not most, were somewhat negative toward gays and lesbians. Of the bar owners, one reported of beatings that have occurred recently and that the police did not act as “supportive as they should have.” There are no open gay or lesbian officers.

In the academy, one student interviewee said the acceptance of sexual orientation issues ranged from “genuine interest to out and out outrage . . . [and] it is youthful recruits who were closed-minded” having the most negative attitudes. Continuing, she said that she too was very conservative when she started police work, but learned “that many different kinds of people are out there. I have had to learn to be more accepting.” The discussion during sexual orientation training was overtly negative with less than 1/5 of the students showing non-judgmental interest in learning more about the issue. The instructor reported that, “the academy has a lot of resistance to sexual orientation training. Younger male cadets are open about ‘I don’t like homos. Why do you have to study

them. You are trying to cram them down my throat.’ Verbal bashing is common through [the use of] jokes.”

Students were asked to assess the acceptance of gays and lesbians in the academy. Fifteen students out of 43 responded to this question. Five students reported that gays and lesbians were not accepted. Four students suggested trying to improve the situation through education, e.g., “I would continue to do these types of classes to help improve the situation.” Only two students of the class thought the academy was not homophobic. Also, two students made negative comments including, “I feel that by improving the situation with gays in our society more people should go to church and believe in the bible to learn the fact that homosexuality is wrong.”

Students were asked to write a statement about their feelings or beliefs about homosexuals or homosexuality. From a class of 43 students, 37 responded to this request. Negative statements were made by twenty-six (70%) students. Of those negative statements, half (15 students, 57%) made a moral or religious condemnation of homosexuals and seven (27%) believed homosexuals to be psychologically sick and/or confused about their gender. Only four (11%) students of the class believed that gays and lesbians should have equal rights and/or are “just like everyone else.”

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Training instructors were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. Both instructors emphasized the goal of sexual orientation training is to assist students in becoming aware of their feelings and attitudes and that “[you] can’t change behavior until they understand their beliefs.” Once self-awareness is achieved,

then the training focuses on “changing behavior from intolerance and misunderstanding to tolerance and respect.” The instructors felt they needed to create a positive learning environment and for them to be seen as sources of information—thereby “facilitating them up the scaffold.” One instructor was “not sure sexual orientation training belongs with cultural awareness training . . . for example, when gays talk about TB or AIDS, the discussions are different—not because they are different, but because of the cultural milieu. The cultural mechanisms are different—like in 1950 saying that black women are equal to white men.”

The instructors felt it was important for students to know the incidence of homosexuality in both the “general populations and in law enforcement,” the definitions of sexual orientation and how the behaviors are related to everyone, and that gay and lesbian relationships are “infinitely more than sexual activity. If you back the sex out, what you have left is a positive human interaction.”

Being Ph.D. candidates in education, both instructors were well versed in educational theory and utilized teaching methods based on “adult learning models that are life-long.” They based their teaching model on Vygotsky’s “zone of proximal development,” whereby students’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll) are the basis for assisting students to greater levels of understanding by “scaffolding” (Vygotsky). As one instructor stated, “Knowledge through scaffolding is powerful.”

Researcher’s Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

The instructors at Site #2 Police Academy were very supportive of the study. Not only did they provide transportation during each of the three days of the study, but they used 1 1/2 hours of the total CAT program to administer the PERQ. The PERQ was distributed to students at the beginning of CAT. They completed the test once, held onto

the materials, and at the completion of CAT, turned over their answer sheets and took the PERQ a second time—at which point they turned in all materials. As such, these classes had one of the highest rates of student participation in the study. After the class, two students participated in the follow-up interviews. Recent changes in program administration precluded interviewing any program administrators. In the community, one gay male and one lesbian bar owners were interviewed. Contacts with the local AIDS or college gay organizations resulted in no volunteers for interviewing.

My presence produced a mix response. One student thanked me for conducting the study with the hopes that “discrimination can be prevented.” Other students believed that, “by his comments in class and hypocritical attitude he [Chuck Stewart] did more harm than good to his crusade and confirmed our biases on gays,” it “seems the guy is looking for a date,” and they recommended to “take him out of the class.” In contrast, another student suggested bringing in another researcher who “was willing to talk about his/her subject that the person is researching. He wasn’t any help.” Thus, my attempt to limit my interaction with the class by only responding as an subject-matter expert to questions asked by the instructor, resulted students forming vastly different opinions of my attendance. One student appreciated the PERQ while another student thought it was biased and suggested that the class should “concentrate on the history of homosexuality and sexual deviance then consider your sexuality. 1-800-need-help.”

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: Although this particular recruit class met for the same 21 weeks as all other recruit classes, it was the first class to experiment with different class hours. Students met between 10 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday. This later time schedule was thought to be more accommodating to the students since they could take care

of personal needs before class time. The students enjoyed the later start time, but the later ending time made the day seem extremely long. Of the forty-three (43) uniformed students, 7 were women and 36 were males. Most were hired recruits with approximately 3 or 4 in-service personnel and a few speculative students (i.e., persons paying their own way through the academy and who have not been yet hired). Only 18-days remained before this class graduated. During breaks, students casually left and entered the classroom. Just before sitting, they were expected to stand at attention. During break, they usually milled around.

Instructor(s): A husband and wife team were the instructors for most of the cultural awareness training. During the sexual orientation training, only the husband who is a 22-year veteran and county criminologist, conducted the class (not in uniform).

Setting: Training took place in the Community College setting with students coming from many surrounding agencies. The room was set with rows of desks sitting 6-8 on one side and 2 or 3 on the other with an aisle down off-set center. At the front were a chalk board and TV along with a table on which the instructor displayed books and other resources.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

The male instructor took an open-dialogue approach to conducting the sexual orientation training. He opened the training by asking the class as a whole, why sexual orientation was “such a volatile issue . . . [and] my daughter has asked me why people make such a big deal out of homosexuality. What am I going to say to her?” He solicited students to share their concerns and wrote these topics on the board. Twenty-

three students participated in the activity and topics were developed on; fear of the unknown, lack of education, distortion of facts, lack of familiarity, difficult to relate, threat to (hetero)sexuality, out of norm, religious values, AIDS, repression of sexual themes, stereotypes, shock value of sexual theme, negative peer pressure, invisibility, and sexual identity. Most of these topics reflected the negative attitudes held by students. The instructor called upon me as a subject-matter expert on three occasions. After this 41 minute beginning, the class resumed for another 91 minutes during which the instructor delved deeper into the previously mentioned topics. Approximately 27 students asked questions that primarily supported the beliefs that homosexuals are deviant, diseased and sinful. Students and instructor were unconvinced by the “research” and the instructor emphasized that people “select facts to fit their paradigm.” Procedures for handling domestic violence were given, students were encouraged to “ask” gays and lesbians when in doubt about their relationships, and to find out what “they” want. The instructor closed the last 30 minutes of class with a lecture about “backing the sex out of homosexuality, leaving you with people like everyone else—people who love each other and face the same life problems.” He also included a long monologue (30 minutes) on Christian values—stating that homosexuals who accept Christian scripture injunctions against homosexuality will stay celibate, and that Christians are to help those who hurt and are in need, such as those with AIDS. “Respect comes from knowledge, and tolerance comes from respect.”

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

The instructors used an open investigative approach to the training. Opinions, beliefs, attitudes and feelings about homosexuals and homosexuality were solicited from students for approximately 77% of the time and used to encourage self-awareness. The

last 30 minutes of class (approximately 1/4 of the total instructional time) was direct lecture aimed at “backing the sex out of homosexuality” and used to demonstrate that gays and lesbians are the same as heterosexuals. This monologue included overt references to Christianity. The instructor stated, “One of the things that comes up, are people with religious objections to sexual orientation training. Religious objections are powerful things. Who we are is determined by religion and morals. . . You are instructed to love all. We get into the religion because beliefs are what this is about.”

Although the instructor saw himself as a source of information to assist students “up the scaffold” on sexual orientation information, he admitted that he was a new student to the subject. During the training, he was unable to answer student questions and indirectly dismissed the topic when he stated that people “select facts to fit their paradigm.” Thus, one major goal of the training, to provide accurate information, was not met.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

The instructors were well received by students and thought to be “dynamic speakers.” As one student commented, “I admire [the instructors] for their work because they are non-judgmental. I wish my parents were that way.”

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: 23 students out of a class of 43 responded to this question.)

Thirteen respondents (56%) felt the class was a positive experience toward overcoming stereotypes yet four (15%) of the respondents believed the information was wrong, one-sided and distorted. As one student stated, “The

problems with religion and homosexuality were never addressed. The suggestion of leaving the sex out of it and trying to think of a gay couple as simply people who love each other was a good one.” A few students mentioned the instructor was “dynamic” yet objected to being “pressured to accept this lifestyle.”

- B. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: 35 students out of a class of 43 responded to this question.)

Eighteen respondents (52%) were interested in the psychology of gays and lesbians and “what makes them this way?” Seven respondents (23%) were interested in gay politics and gay perspective, particularly as to “why are so many people coming out of the wood work?” Finally, four (12%) respondents made heterosexist statements, such as “Why is there the need for gays and lesbians to try and force their beliefs on us?”

- C. Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: 24 students out of a class of 43 responded to this question.)

Twelve respondents (48%) mentioned that more time, information, and additional time for questions/answers would improve the training. The topics to be covered include: police issues, religion and morality, “other” side of pro-gay rhetoric, family issues, genetics, AIDS, and causes of homophobia.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

The instructors of CAT at Site #2 Police Academy are leaders on the subject in California law enforcement, yet the CAT program at the academy seems to be an isolated program that has little direct impact on the academy or agency. Although the academy comes under community college anti-discrimination rules, “Students are given a handbook, but many don’t think they have to follow the policies.” There were no open

gay or lesbian students, although the instructor reported “one or two are recognizable during CAT.” During the interviewing process, the instructor replied in hushed tones that “there is one staff member who is open to me, but not open to everyone.” The class seemed very homophobic with 70% of respondents expressing negative beliefs and/or feelings about homosexuality. CAT seems to be conducted in a vacuum with little integration with other programs at the academy.

A concern expressed by the instructor was relinquishing CAT to other instructors. During other sections of CAT, a different instructor conducted the class. It was obvious this person was not a trained teacher and was unknowledgeable about the materials. The primary instructor stated, “I am very concerned about passing CAT onto others due to their lack of ability.” Due to direct familial experience with homosexuality (a gay brother dying of AIDS), the alternate instructor could have had much to contribute to the sexual orientation training.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

This program is based on current educational theory using self-awareness activities to help students become aware of their beliefs, feelings and knowledge about sexual orientation. The instructor attempted to “scaffold” upon this awareness leading to a greater understanding of gays and lesbians. The instructor appeared to lack the knowledge regarding sexual orientation needed to bring students to a new level of understanding. Sexual orientation training proved to be difficult for the instructor to adequately address due to his lack of knowledge on the subject.

The instructor appeared to be a good role model for the tolerance and acceptance of gays and lesbians even though he was a heterosexual male officer. For many students, the instructor was the kind of person they wanted to be. Thus, the effectiveness of the class stemmed from the strength and dynamics of the instructor's personality and his skill at classroom procedures, not from his knowledge of sexual orientation. Although I was taken a back by the overt Christian comments made by the instructor, for many students this seemed to have an impact—yet it covertly maintained gays and lesbians in second-class status by reinforcing religious condemnations.

The instructor failed to provide specific information about appropriate police behavior, distribute reference materials or hold students responsible for participating in the class or for their own learning. Also, there was no time or activity given to allow students to practice what they learned. Finally, the closure attempted at the end of the training was mostly a religious call for tolerance and not a summation of what was learned.

Site #3

The instructors who taught at Site #2 Police Academy also teach at many other locations. One such location is Site #3, located on the south-east side of California's San Joaquin Valley. The community college-based academy serves a farming community of 88,000. The local police department has 95 sworn officers, 10 of whom are women and 85 who are men. There are no open gay or lesbian officers on the department.

The academy director attended POST's T-of-T (*Train-the-Trainers*) and was impressed by the instructors. He asked them to develop a CAT program at his academy. In 1992, a 24 hour CAT program was initiated by the instructors.

I did not observe the class or conduct interviews. However, the instructor claimed that the class was very similar in content and process as Site #2 Police Academy. He collected statements and questions from the students besides administering the PERQ. The class contained 39 recruits of which there were 5 women and 34 men.

Police Subculture:

The instructor reported that:

This is a very conservative group [academy class] and more resistant to the total package of human relations training. They were polarized on sexual orientation, and about 60% of them were decidedly resistant. One person even said that they would flunk an officer out of training if they discovered they were homosexual. That gave us an excellent opportunity to discuss the ramifications of doing so. One person has a brother who is gay and has active AIDS.

Students were asked to write statements regarding their feelings and/or beliefs about homosexuals and homosexuality at the beginning of the training class. Out of a class of 39 students, 34 responded to this question. Of all academies which completed this assignment, Site #3 was the most negative. Twenty-six (75%) respondents made negative statements. Of those making negative statements, eleven made religious or moral condemnations of homosexuality—“morally wrong, will cause the downfall of society,” or “homosexuality is an abomination and a sin. Men who lay with men and likewise women who lay with women shall not inherit the kingdom of god.” Similarly, six of the negative statements expressed the belief that gays and lesbians should stay hidden—“I believe that homosexuals are their own person and should keep their sexual preferences silent.” Finally, six of the negative statements thought homosexuality to be a psychological disorder—“homosexuals are mentally ill”—with gays and lesbians being confused about their gender roles—“male homosexuals are more feminine.”

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

- A. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: 31 students from a class of 39 responded to this question.)

Site #3 students were the most polarized of all surveyed academies regarding training on sexual orientation. Primarily, twenty (64%) of them wanted technical (scientific) information about sexual orientation—e.g., “why are some people homosexual” and “do they see the opposite sex as heterosexuals see the same sex?”—almost double the rate reported by the other academies. Yet, nine (28%) of the respondents continued to make negative statements reinforcing heterosexist beliefs and challenging the need for the course and the accuracy of the information. Again, this was the highest response for all locations. Thus, Site #3 students seemed very polarized by wanting technical information on sexual orientation while 1/3 of the class made statements to the contrary—“why do they force their agenda on others that do not want or accept it?”

Site #4

Site #4 is located in a large metropolitan area of the San Francisco Bay Area. Its population of 752,000 is served by approximately 1850 sworn officers. Of these officers, approximately 230 are female and 1620 are male. Most officers are trained at the Site #4 Police Academy, one of the independent basic academies of the California police training system. Because of hiring freezes by the police agency and budget constraints in the early 1990s, the academy has opened its doors to other local agencies to provide training for their new recruits. Cultural Awareness Training (CAT) has a long history with the academy, and training on sexual orientation dates back to 1982. Over the years, sexual

orientation training has evolved from simply taking recruits on field trips to the local gay community to walk around and visit bars, to the more structured training that it currently conducts. In response to Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST) mandates for 24-hours of CAT for each recruit, the academy has implemented a week-long series of culture days including: “Gay Day,” “African-American Day,” “Hispanic Day,” and “Asian Day.” These culture awareness days consume most of that day’s schedule (approximately 6 hours each). Everyone interviewed at this site stated that they took great pride in the sexual orientation training conducted by their Police Academy. They believed their program to be the best, most comprehensive and in existence longer than any such program.

Gay and Lesbian Community:

Being one of the larger and more politically active gay and lesbian communities in the nation, it could best be described as diverse as the metropolitan city where it resides. It is estimated that, “20% of the city’s population are gay or lesbian” (statement from video shown in class about the history of the city’s gay and lesbian community). The city has a long history of gay activism that has influenced the development and deployment of its police. In the past, police harassed gay bars and often over-reacted to demonstrations and other political activism by the gay community. For the past 15-years, the police continually showed great restraint during political demonstrations, sometimes risking the safety of fellow officers. As one instructor stated, “The gay and lesbian community is 99% supportive of the police.” This comment was echoed by bar owners and patrons. The number one complaint from the gay community toward police was similar to complaints from the city at-large—“slow response time”— indicating that sexual orientation was rarely an issue.

There is no one gay community group that acts as a liaison with the police department. Instead, as specific issues come to a head, the organizations involved meet formally with the police department. It has been the gay police officers' organization that has significantly impacted the inclusion and development of sexual orientation training. Through their efforts, training has evolved into a more structured program and for more hours.

Police Subculture:

Harassment based on sexual orientation are virtually non-existent within the police department. The training instructor reported that an internal study of the department found approximately "75% of the women officers are lesbians." Even with a significant number of the male officers being gay, there have been no recent complaints filed against the department by either a civilian or a police officer. An instructor reported that there are some gay and lesbian officers who "have problems, but they are not popular and not happy people. . . maybe marginal people."

The academy seemed equally supportive of gays, having one sergeant and one staff officer who are openly gay to both staff and students. As one administrator explained, "[gays and lesbians] are very accepted because they have been part [of the department] for so long." In the class, two of the women recruits were open lesbians. However, during the sexual orientation training's *Self-Awareness Activity*, approximately 2/3 of student responses were extremely anti-gay. On the question of how the student would respond to someone of the same sex making a pass at them, approximately five students said they would physically "hit" the gay person. Many students seemed surprised at the level of hatred expressed by so many of the recruits. This activity revealed that even in cultures

that are supportive of gays and lesbians, in-coming recruits harbor many anti-gay feelings and beliefs.

Students were asked about the support gays and lesbians receive in the academy. From a class of 30 recruits, only 7 students responded to this question. Three students felt the academy was not homophobic whereas four witnessed acts of discrimination against gays and lesbians. Finally, one student commented, “I would say the acceptance of homosexuality is very narrow and limited in my academy class.”

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Program administrators and training instructors were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. The academy director believed that the goals for sexual orientation training require more than just “sensitizing” students, but also to provide specific techniques for dealing with different cultures. One instructor emphasized that the academy is often a different environment than on the job and frequently recruits complain that their Field Training Officer (FTO) will make negative statements such as, “When you have been on the job as long as I have, you can pick them out.” Another goal was for gays to be presented in a positive light since they historically have been maligned by the media.

The instructor and program administrator believed that the content in sexual orientation training included: sexual orientation as “part of a persons’ being” and being gay or lesbian “does not affect job performance or your rights as an officer or citizen”; history of gays in the U.S.A. to show discrimination and empowerment; the 1974 APA declassification of homosexuality as a mental illness; and examples where death occurred

during a police investigation in an otherwise insignificant event but that sexuality became an issue.

One of the instructors wanted students to share their feelings and beliefs during class. Much of the class was expected to revolved around lecture, video presentation and asking questions.

Researcher's Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

Site #4 Police Academy was initially very supportive of this study. They were the first academy to respond to the solicitation for participation. Because of delays with my ethics review committee, observation and testing at the academy was postponed for 6 months and instead, became the last data to be gathered. Days before arriving at the academy, I was informed that testing of the recruits (PERQ materials had been sent to them two months earlier) would not be allowed because the survey looked at attitude changes—something the administrator claimed the program was not designed to accomplish. Upon arrival, the academy director approved the testing but it then was impossible to conduct a pre-test. Instead, the PERQ was distributed after the training and students returned the materials the next day. Not only did this snafu make pre-/post-analysis impossible, but administrators emphasized to the students that the survey was voluntary and was to be completed on their own time, stating that the “academy neither endorses nor opposes the research or its findings.” As a result, only 7 out of 30 students completed the survey and no other data was made available to me. Interviewing also became an ordeal. The academy director allocated a 1-hour interview into his busy schedule. One developer of the sexual orientation training program also scheduled time to be interviewed. However, the actual instructor of the observed class was unavailable any time during the four days I was in town, failed to keep a mutually agreed upon phone

interview, and did not return subsequent phone calls. I commenced to interview leaders of the gay and lesbian community including bar owners. Overall, six persons participated in the interview—academy director, lesbian curriculum designer, two bar owners (and informally with some patrons), and two leaders of the community. Unfortunately, no student in the class volunteered to be interviewed.

My impact was minimal since I did not interact with any of the students or make comments during the sexual orientation training. Furthermore, since the PERQ was not administered until after the class, it had no impact on class proceedings.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: Recruit training at the academy lasted 22 weeks, meeting between the hours of 7:45 am to 4:45 pm, Monday through Friday. Of the thirty (30) hired uniformed police recruits in the observed class, 7 were women and 23 were men. This was their sixth day in training. Break times were informal, with students casually dismissed and casually returned. A 15-minute line-up did occur at lunch with marching practice. One recruit related that the goal of the academy was to help everyone pass, not to prove a point of weeding people out. The following week, a class from the Sheriff's Department was scheduled to join this class of police recruits.

Instructor(s): The instructor was one of several designers of the current sexual orientation training. She had significant influence in its development, is recognized as a leading authority on the training, and has testified twice to Congress about the training. She is an active officer who is an open lesbian.

Setting: The room setting included rows of flat desks facing the front, isle down the middle with chalk board and TV on roll cart. The sexual orientation training is dubbed "Gay Day," and was the first day of the recruits' CAT.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

The lesbian officer/instructor wrote her name and telephone number on the chalk board during her introductory statement of program goals. Immediately, she showed without comment the 23-minute video, “Looking at San Francisco’s Gay and Lesbian Community.” Next, students were solicited to share stereotypes (nouns and adjectives) used to describe gay men and lesbians during the 8-minute *Stereotype Activity*. Approximately 16 students participated sharing mostly negative stereotypes with much class laughing. The instructor directed students to write down on a piece of paper how they would react to 10 scenarios she read aloud as part of the 35-minute *Self-Awareness Activity*. Once the writing was completed, she collected the papers and randomly redistributed them back to the students. As she reread the questions, she selected students to read aloud the papers in front of them. Approximately 83 student readings were obtained with mostly negative attitudes towards gays and lesbians—including sanctioning physical harm toward a gay or lesbian making a pass at a heterosexual person. Students showed surprise at the results of the readings. After a 15-minute break, the instructor shared her *Personal Story*. During this 24-minute period, she told of her coming out, experiences with the police force, her relationship with her family and issues surrounding her having a child. Only four students asked questions centering on child rearing. The instructor next weaved video highlights from television news broadcasts covering gay and lesbian protest demonstrations with a dialogue of her involvement as a police officer during the civil strife. She discussed ACT-Up (she approved their achievements), Queer Nation (she disapproved of their anarchists’ tactics), and the conflict she had over performing her duty

as a police officer to up-hold the law with “turning in her brothers and sisters.” Only a handful of students asked questions during this 24 minute lecture although they seemed enraptured in hearing about her “war” experiences. After a 1-hour lunch break, class resumed with a showing of the 25-minute video, “Gay Cops” from *60 Minutes* with Mike Wallace. No students asked questions and the instructor closed the video by stating that gay cops are still fighting for their rights. Immediately, this flowed into a 5-minute lecture on *Domestic Violence and Hate Crimes*. The instructor stated that she believes that domestic violence is increasing and that she now makes approximately one call each day. During these calls, she emphasized that it is important to not assume that the big person is the aggressor and that the officer must ask the status of the relationship. To illustrate hate crimes, she told a story about a recent physical attack she personally experienced while off-duty and “luckily I’m a cop with a gun and he went to jail.” Another 15-minute break led into the showing of the 90-minute video, “The Times of Harvey Milk.” This was shown without comment or class discussion. The training ended without any attempt at closure.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

The class emphasized the history and politics of the local gay community as evidenced through the use of many video sources which took approximately 2 1/4 hours of the 4 hours of instruction time. The instructor’s shared personal story and video on gay cops used another hour of instructional time. Student self-awareness and awareness of class attitudes on homosexuality and/or gays and lesbians were achieved through two activities using approximately 45 minutes of instruction time. Police techniques for use during domestic violence and/or hate crime investigations took approximately 5 minutes of instruction time. Thus, from this structure, it is evident that the training gave mostly

information on local gay politics and history, less but equivalent time to the personal side of being a gay or lesbian cop and student awareness of their attitudes and beliefs, and very little time to specific police procedures. The training presented gays and lesbians in a positive light and “sensitized” students that gays and lesbians are essentially the same as heterosexuals, but failed to provide much concrete specific techniques for dealing with gays and lesbians.

The primary method of instruction was lecture/video and constituted 70% of class time. Approximately 30% of instruction time engaged student participation and was provided through instructor-led activities. No attempt was made to assess levels of student comprehension, bringing topics to closure, or having students assume responsibility for participating and learning content.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

The students accepted the instructor very well. As one respondent wrote, “I was impressed with the instructor’s personal history. It brought closer her humanity and ‘naturalness’.” The instructor displayed skill at class management, directing activities and making the environment safe for students to participate. It was observed that the instructor mostly made eye contact with the women in the class and paid significant attention to the one or two lesbians in the class.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: only 7 out of 30 students responded to this question.)

Four things stood out in the minds of the students: group activities and videos (2 students); the clear, friendly instructor (1 student); the many examples of

police situations where there is a gay/lesbian connection (1 student); and, the learning that gay stereotypes are not true (1 student).

- B . Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: only 5 out of 30 students responded to this question.)

Students suggested: more diverse speakers, role playing, more films, and more gay and lesbian police officer experiences demonstrating the improvement toward the acceptance of homosexual officers.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

The agency strongly supports CAT. Sexual orientation training represented almost one-fifth of the entire CAT program and was well received by academy administrators and the police department. This integrated approach reflected the academy director's belief that sexual orientation training is part of a multi-pronged approach which includes administrative support, having open gay and lesbian officers and community involvement.

A wide range of goals were expressed for the training, reflecting political and personal emphasis. Almost no time was given to specific police procedures in situations containing a gay/lesbian aspect. Instead, these practices were left to emerge from the sharing of the instructor's personal story—which rarely happened.

Education Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory.)

Students were first prepared for the topic through use of the video on local gay and lesbian history. The *Stereotype* activity exposed students to the pervasive negative gay and

lesbian stereotypes. This was further expanded for the student through the *Self-Awareness* activity, revealing the environment in which students work. Unfortunately, the instructor failed to seize the opportunity and extend student awareness to the social processes that keep gays and lesbians disenfranchised and how that impacts the work of police. (These processes were discussed in the video, “Look at San Francisco’s Gay and Lesbian Community,” but this was shown before students went through the self-awareness activities. It would have been more effective to reverse the order of the presentation.)

Using the last 90 minutes of class to show the video, “The Times of Harvey Milk,” was repetitious of the first video shown. Also, the instructor seemed bored during the showing which indirectly conveyed the message that it was not worth viewing.

The instructor, by being an open lesbian officer of many years experience and of high repute, was a perfect role-model for the students. Through her extensive use of story-telling about police work and how sexual orientation issues often play an important part in some kinds of crimes and investigations, she demonstrated that she is the kind of police officer recruits want to become. This was excellent. It would have improved the class if the instructor had included gay male officers and persons of color. The greatest weaknesses in the class were: (1) the lack of relevant practice by students, (2) not making students responsible for their own learning—either through relevant assignments or testing, (3) no materials were handed out despite covering immense quantities of information, (4) the instructor gave very limited information on specific police behaviors and, (5) failed to summarize or seek closure of topics.

Site #5

The Site #5 is one of the largest police departments in Southern California serving a city of almost 4 million residents with approximately 7,780 sworn officers. Currently, there are approximately 1,230 female and 6,550 male officers on staff of which there are 9 open gay and lesbian officers. The police academy is not associated with a community college and is one of the few self-contained police academies in the state. CAT has a long history with the academy and sexual orientation training dates back to the late 1980s. In 1992, because of changes in state law requiring sexual orientation as one of the issues CAT was to include, the academy expanded the existing training from 2 hours to 3 1/2 hours. To accommodate the new training format, the community gay and lesbian police liaison organization created a 175-page curriculum and teaching package. Both the gay and lesbian police organization and the police academy express great pride in such a comprehensive curriculum and training program and believe their effort to be the best in the nation.

Gay and Lesbian Community:

The gay and lesbian community is one of the largest and most politically powerful gay and lesbian communities in the world. It is richly diverse and trying to characterize the dynamics of the community in a few short words is impossible. The first public gay protest march anywhere in the U.S. was conducted here in 1967. The subsequent relationship between police and the gay community has been tumultuous. Twenty-five years of conflict between police and the gay community including numerous lawsuits, complaints, action committees and the formation of liaison organizations has significantly changed police practices and impacted state-wide CAT as mandated through POST.

Bar owners and political leaders of the gay community report that relations with police have improved significantly over the past 10 years. Police harassment of bar owners and businesses catering to homosexuals has virtually ceased. Misconduct by a few officers still continues, but these are considered to be singular events more related to management problems of a very large bureaucracy and not part of particular patterns.

Political leaders and liaison gay organizations are very aware of internal police functioning. The community at-large, like most communities, is basically ignorant of police policy. However, they believe the agency as still being a dangerous place to be openly gay or lesbian.

Police Subculture:

The low number of open officers is testament to the adverse conditions that still prevail in the agency. As reported by one lesbian instructor, lesbian officers are “more accepted because of the acceptance of masculinity— which the stereotype of lesbian officers is hyper-masculine. The gay male assumption is feminine, thus gay male officers are assumed to be unable to perform their job.” One 10-year gay male police veteran was “impressed by the women who engage in the most difficult male work yet have long hair and wear lipstick” and that anyone who acted feminine or perceived to be feminine had the most problems being accepted by the other officers. This officer also believed that gay male officers “need to be on the job a lot longer and be good officers . . . [and] not be feminine acting.” Discussion of homosexuality in the agency was limited and an instructor reported that it appeared to act as a deterrent by “attempting to control behavior.”

There seemed to be a difference in the levels of acceptance of gay and lesbian officers by the police agency. In upper management, there seemed to be greater

acceptance. A gay male instructor believed the middle management level (Sgt., Lt., Watch Commanders at the division level) is “where the breakdown occurs” and this affects acceptance by the patrol officer. Often middle managers would not tell “officers (who use negative terms) that it is unacceptable.” The problem between older and first-line supervisors (middle managers) has been described as an “inversion layer” where police subculture is thickest. Many of the respondents indicated that significant change toward creating a gay-friendly environment will not occur until “some of the managers get out there to see the problems.”

A 10-year open gay police officer reported:

It used to be that when you got on the job, the FTO [field training officer] would say forget the academy bullshit, now you will learn what is ‘real’ police work. Now I don’t hear this. I believe that police work is becoming more technical, that academy work is more valued. 10-years ago, officers would say that we really beat niggers, etc., but now we don’t. If the old boy ways are kicked out, you are left with what is taught in the academy.

Often, when a gay or lesbian officer transfers to a new division, the “division must be ‘prepared’ before the employee arrives. We should not have to ‘prep’ a division before any employee arrives.”

The agency has a strict non-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation. Unfortunately, the history of the agency continues to influence the policy’s impact. The previous chief issued a non-discrimination memo and stated numerous times that “discrimination against gays and lesbians will not be tolerated,” but this was countered by other statements by the chief that encouraged gay stereotyping.

In the academy, gays and lesbians are becoming better accepted as evidenced by the increase in the number of open gay and/or lesbian recruits. When students in the observed class were asked to write statements about the feelings or beliefs about

homosexuality or homosexuals, 29 out of 45 responded and sixteen (55%) wrote negative comments. Of these negative statements, five were heterosexist statements such as “this is a ‘straight’ society, therefore, you should have to play by the ‘straight’ rules.” Another three of these negative statements portrayed homosexuality as a disease and reinforced gay stereotypes— “gays get upset easily and believe that they are abnormal.” Eight (26%) of the total statements were positive and emphasized that “gays and lesbians are as equal as any other person.”

The sexual orientation class was quiet and not combative with the instructors. Although negative stereotypes were held by a majority of the students, student conduct toward the instructors was respectful.

Administration’s support for sexual orientation training was evidenced when trainers were instrumental in removal of one recruit from the sexual orientation training because of their overt homophobic attitudes displayed in class. However, no recruit has ever been dismissed from the academy due to overt homophobia.

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Training instructors were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. Most respondents wanted accurate information about sexual orientation designed to breakdown stereotypes presented in a safe environment as their primary goal. The hope was that students would become “sensitized” to the issues. Respondents also felt that it was important for students to meet open gay and lesbian officers and to learn specific skills needed to interact safely and with respect.

All respondents wanted course content to attack anti-gay stereotypes— specifically to show that gays and lesbians are normal and not “sick,” gay men are not pedophiles, that there are no physiological differences between gays and non-gays, and that gays do not recruit. All but the gay male sergeant expressed an essentialist perspective and intended to teach that homosexuality is “born” and not a “preference.” The gay male sergeant’s position:

I have probably taught the course 100 times. Many gays and lesbians would like to present it as fact— Simon Levy, Kinsey— and this could be a double-edged sword . . . that science could be used against us. I have had many students challenge this, they think it is biased. My personal feeling that there is a strong bio/genetic link and a social construction. It is inappropriate to spend 4 hours talking research with beat-officers.

Content on gay history and culture emphasizing that the “gay agenda’s” big secret is simply a call for equal rights was also mentioned. Finally, the misconception of AIDS being a gay disease was considered important for students to know. Only one respondent mentioned the need for information about the impact homophobia has on individuals and institutions.

The respondents intended sexual orientation training to include lecture, group discussion, questions and answers, some audio-visual including blackboard use and video presentation, and prepared charts or overhead transparency. All respondents mentioned how important it is for the classroom atmosphere be relaxed and conducive for sharing. This was primarily to be achieved through the use of humor and a buddy system of multiple instructors sharing their personal stories relating the diversity within the gay and lesbian community. Only the non-police gay instructor made the point that “I refuse to accept or tolerate predatory behavior. I don’t think it helps us, not to answer challenge, e.g., someone will challenge our statistics or be unable to accept my perspective as real and

valid such as the way I have said. I never accept or back down when someone challenges me.”

Researcher's Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

This academy proved to be the most difficult to work with. The gay and lesbian community liaison organization and the training instructors welcomed me and provided great assistance during interviews. The greatest difficulty was obtaining approval to administer the PERQ. When the academy reviewed the PERQ, the staff psychologist said that it was inappropriate to give the questionnaire to recruits because “it will do them irreparable harm” and this caused them to block all access to the academy. In discussion, it seemed that Part 4 of the PERQ caused the most concern and they objected highly to students being asked about their current and future sexual and gender identities. Ultimately, due to my persistence and other illusive factors, I was allowed to observe one class with the stipulation that no student be interviewed or talked to, and the PERQ was not to be administered. Course evaluations and other documents were also denied to me. One class activity had students write down questions they had regarding homosexuality or about the instructors themselves. These were collected and answered later in the class. Not only were these written questions from the observed class saved, but the instructors had saved hundreds of written questions from previous classes—which were provided to me for analysis.

My presence during the sexual orientation training was minimal since I did not make any comments during class nor interact with any students. The PERQ was not administered and thus did not sensitize students to the training. A total of seven persons were interviewed (3 women, 4 men)—all of them current or past sexual orientation training

instructors at the academy. Two of the interviewees were civilian trainers who had never been police officers.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: Students attended classes from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday. Police training lasts 28 weeks. Break times were informal with students casually entering and exiting the classroom. The class consisted of 45 uniformed recruits of which 5 were women and 40 were males. All recruits were one week away from graduation. Sexual orientation training is conducted as a separate self-contained module and counts toward the CAT requirements. During the training, two police administrators stood quietly at the side of the room.

Instructor(s): Open gay or lesbian officers wanting to participate in sexual orientation training must first observe a class. If still interested, they are invited to “share their story”—how they came to realize they were homosexual, their coming to grips with that reality, forming their identity, family and interpersonal relations and how this is related to becoming a police officer. After repeated experiences of participating at this stage, they may evolve to a more active level of participation as an instructor.

Setting: Classes were held at the academy in one of the classrooms designed to accommodate not more than 50 students. Students were seated at individual desks in rows facing the front. The room contained a chalk board and TV.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

Before the team of co-presenters entered the classroom, the students were instructed by the commanding officer not to ask questions about religion or politics during the training. When the instructors arrived, the lesbian instructor introduced the training team, gave her professional credentials and stated the program goals—including stating that they were not there to “change anyone minds or beliefs.” After the 15-minute *Introduction* a gay male officer shared his life story including the realization that he was gay even though he was in a heterosexual marriage with children. No students asked any questions during the 15-minute presentation. Next, a lesbian officer told her story for another 15-minute *Sharing Stories*. She shared her experiences and emotional conflicts surrounding being a closeted lesbian officer. At the conclusion of this sharing, the instructor polled the class about how many of them *Knew Someone Gay*. Approximately 25 students raised their hands. This immediately flowed into the *Stereotype Activity*. Here, the instructor asked students to share their knowledge concerning gay and lesbian stereotypes (occupations and physical characteristics). These mostly negative comments were written on the chalk board. Approximately 43 students participated with much laughter during this 25-minute activity. After a 10-minute break, a heterosexual male staff officer share his 23-minute story about his son recently coming out gay. He explained how he and his wife were initially in denial about their son’s homosexuality and would pray, “Please God, just make him bisexual.” This led to their participation in PFLAG and sense of regret for all the anti-gay jokes he told over the years. Students seemed attentive during the stories, but still did not ask any questions. The instructor then led the class through a 13-minute *Gay Lifestyle Activity*. A heterosexual student was asked to

share how he conducted his daily routine, e.g., sleeping takes 8 hours. This was presented in chart form on the chalk board. Next, one of the lesbian officers shared her daily routine. The instructor noted that the routines were virtually identical except for the sexual partners. No questions were asked by students, but much laughter ensued when it was evident that neither the heterosexual student or lesbian instructor engaged in much sex. At this point, the instructor directed students to write questions they may have had about homosexuality on cards. These were collected for later use. Next, the instructor conducted a 40-minute lecture on appropriate police behavior during *Points-of-Contact* with the gay and lesbian community. The seven topics included: (1) traffic stops, burglary, robbery; (2) lewd conduct and prostitution; (3) hate crimes; (4) domestic violence; (5) civil disobedience; (6) bars; and, (7) personal contact including death, AIDS, co-workers and the showers. For each situation, the instructor gave personal experiences, theory, and suggested professional behavior. No students asked questions during this section. Finally, the last 30-minutes of class were devoted to *Questions and Answers*, where answers were given to the previously collected *Question Cards*. Only three students asked questions beyond the cards. No closure was attempted by the instructor at the end of the 3 1/2 hour training.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

Lecture was the primary teaching methodology. Approximately 2 hours of the training (representing 60% of the allotted time) was used for lecturing on *Personal Stories* (63 minutes), *Points-of-Contact* (40 minutes) and statement of goals (10 minutes). Instructor led activities and discussions comprised the remainder of the training (38%)—answering student questions (*Questions and Answers*, 30 minutes), *Stereotype Activity*

(27 minutes) and *Gay Lifestyle Activity* (13 minutes). No small group or individual activities were engaged.

The content of the class covered a broad spectrum of information. The *Personal Stories* gave deep insight into the conflicts between discovering that one is gay or lesbian or having a child who is homosexual, and the expectations of family and society. Choosing a police career and the impact that had on one's homosexual behavior demonstrated the conceptual differences between identity and behavior. The speakers' sharing of discrimination experienced as a gay or lesbian police officer in conjunction with the *Stereotype Activity* helped students to become aware of their own feelings and beliefs, and acted as a springboard for accurate information to dispel many anti-gay stereotypes. The *Gay Lifestyle Activity* further reinforced the inaccuracies of the gay stereotype. The *Points-of-Contact* gave specific behavioral information in police situations where sexual orientation was relevant. This part of the lecture was punctuated by the guest speakers' sharing their experiences. Finally, the *Questions and Answers* section was structured so that students could safely ask questions and with anonymity.

The course followed very closely the written curriculum and adhered to the goals stated by the instructors during the interviews. Breaking down stereotypes and presenting appropriate police behaviors in a gay or lesbian context were the two major areas covered by the training. Academic information about sexual orientation was informally given and sexual orientation was presented from an essentialist perspective.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

The primary instructor demonstrated great skill at processing students through the materials. The assistant speakers displayed a wide range of personalities—from quiet and withdrawn to being forthright and almost combative. Yet the use of humor discouraged

personal attacks from students. Unfortunately, no students were interviewed and the class evaluations were unavailable to obtain their opinion of the instructors. Finally, none of the instructors attempted closure at the end of specific activities.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

A. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: 39 students of a class of 45 responded.)

Sixteen (42%) respondents wanted technical information about sexual orientation. They were equally interested in the psychological “causes” of homosexuality and issues of family, e.g., “Do you wish you had children?” Other areas of interest for respondents included: personal information about the instructors—“Have you ever felt alienated by co-workers?” (5 responses, 13%); professional conduct by officers—“How do you tell your T. O. [training officer] that you don’t like his jokes about gays and lesbians” (5 responses, 13%); negative statements against gays and lesbians—“Why do gays go around making a bigger deal out of it than I. I don’t go around joking and talking about the fact that I’m heterosexual” (6 responses, 15%); and, issues of gay perspectives and politics—“Would you like the gay and lesbian community to be categorized as a separate group in terms of affirmative action?” (7 responses, 17%).

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

The agency has a long history of being anti-gay. Even as it implements new policies and expands sexual orientation training, momentum of previous problems and pending lawsuits make it difficult for gay and lesbian officers to come out. CAT has a long history with the agency, but the current format of having sexual orientation training as

a separate module disconnected from the rest of CAT undermines the coherence of the program. Furthermore, the “inversion layer” of middle-management reinforces police subculture that emphasizes hyper-masculine attitude and behavior—the primary obstacle to gay men and women officers.

It is in this agency atmosphere that sexual orientation training at the academy is often seen as “bogus” and gays not representing a “real culture.” Just a few years back, as the sexual orientation trainers would be leaving the room, the sergeant-at-arms would announce to the class that everything they just heard was “false and PC crap.” This no longer happens and instructors report that the animosity and outright hatred they experienced in the past have reduced significantly. The observed class seemed to enjoy the training and only two or three students expressed comments that could be considered severely homophobic or heterosexist. Although students knew the anti-gay stereotypes, only 14% of them went out of their way to make negative statements within their questions. Thus, anti-gay sentiments may still be held by a majority of the students, but they are covertly held opinions. It is unfortunate that instrumental empirical testing and interviews with students were not allowed.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

The combination of instructors provided near perfect role-models for the students. These instructors were the kinds of officers the recruits want to become. All were very direct and could “talk the talk,” since they “walk the walk.” Having two lesbian officers and two male officers (one gay and the other heterosexual with a gay son) presented a

greater diversity than could have been accomplished with only one instructor. To complete the diversity of the instructors, they need to include instructors who are persons of color.

Instructors were clear in their goals for the class. They adhered closely with the goals of the curriculum and the goals stated in interviews. This clarity of goals and clarity of classroom process provided direct instruction with little ambiguity.

An important component of the training is to help students become aware of their own beliefs and feelings about homosexuality and to see this in context with the police subculture. The *Stereotype Activity* and *Gay Lifestyle Activity* were narrow in focus and presented very few opportunities for students to learn about their own beliefs. These stereotypes could have been extended into a discussion revolving around social institutions using stereotypes to disenfranchise gays and lesbians, thus becoming a major source of conflict between gays and lesbians and police—but this was not done. Instead, students were helped to identify a few of their beliefs concerning homosexuality, but they were not assisted in learning the social mechanisms involved and the impact on them as police officers.

Police officers who shared personal stories in combination with the *Points-of-Contact* lecture, provided relevant material; however, a number of things were missing from the training. First, no time or activity was provided for students to practice what they had learned. Second, closure was not attempted on any topics. Third, even though the training covered immense quantities of information, no materials were handed out. Fourth, students were not held responsible for participating in the learning or demonstrated that they had in fact, learned anything.

Additional Data:

The primary sexual orientation trainer for the Site #5 Police Academy maintained a file of questions written by students from the past few years. All total, I was given 376 additional responses beyond the ones collected during the observed training. The primary category in which students had questions concerned technical information (33%) regarding sexual orientation. Within this primary category, students were most interested in the psychological “causes” of homosexuality (23% of this category), issues of family and interpersonal relationships (23% of this category), and issues of discrimination (11% of this category). The secondary category of questions dealt with personal questions about the instructor (23%), with half the respondents concerned about having children and raising them in a gay household. Gay politics (17%), negative statements against gays and lesbians (14%), and professional conduct by officers (13%) were the three categories of lesser interest to students.

Site #6

The Site #6 Police Academy is a regional training center attached to a community college and staffed by four different police agencies and the sheriff department. It took on its regional structure in response to economic factors that made a one-agency academy economically unfeasible. CAT at the academy has followed POST mandates and only recently included training on sexual orientation. CAT also expanded in response to a city police altercation seven years ago. A white police officer shot a black man during a scuffle who later claimed that the officer made slurs toward him. This caused great controversy in the city and resulted in the entire 3,000 employees going through sensitivity training in one year. The trainer used a technique called “verbal judo” that was remembered by every

officer interviewed as “brain-dead.” Subsequently that trainer was held in disrespect. From this incident, the city and the academy made greater efforts toward diversity issues.

The majority of recruits in the academy came from the largest police agency in the area. The city’s population of 1.1 million, is located in Southern California. Site #6 has approximately 1977 sworn officers of which 274 are women and 1703 are men. Recently, a captain level police officer was promoted to oversee diversity in the agency. The academy program is highly valued and thought by the program consultant to be “light-years ahead.” The agency administrator held similar beliefs and stating, “We are far ahead [on diversity issues and training] of most other cities.”

Gay and Lesbian Community:

Being a metropolitan area large enough to support its own gay and lesbian community services center, the community is richly diverse. The community is politically active with a gay and lesbian police officer’s organization and an annual gay pride parade and festival. Interviews with bar owners reported that relations with police have improved significantly over the past 10 years. No longer do police raid bars. Instead, vice squad officers immediately identify themselves to the bar owners when they come in. The owners felt much of the gay bashing which still exists stems from people not using common sense. This contrasted with political activists who claim that, “Gays and lesbians should be able to walk anywhere at anytime of day or night.”

A recent brouhaha regarding participants in the gay pride parade reveals much of the tension that still exists in the city. The former mayor of the city became a radio talk show host promoting conservative ideology, including sponsoring a group who wanted to march in the gay pride parade under the banner “Normal People.” The application was illegible and was rejected. The “Normal People” organization resubmitted their

application, but again it was illegible and rejected. The court upheld the right of the gay pride parade organizers to reject the application. Of course, the former mayor cried discrimination. While this was going on, the police chief approved the request from the gay police organization to march in the parade in uniform and to sponsor a recruitment booth at the festival. While marching in the parade, the open gay police officer reported, “The other officers turned their backs on us while going by.” In contrast, an interview with a heterosexual male police officer conducted during a ride -along revealed,

[police] administrators ‘bend over backwards’ [said many times during the interview] for the gay and lesbian community. For example, during the gay pride parade, officers are instructed not to arrest anyone, but rather keep the peace . . . and it is not fair that gays and lesbians can march in the Labor Day and St. Patrick Day Parades, but that heterosexuals were barred from marching in the gay and lesbian parade. . . if I had marched in my uniform in a parade, I would have been reprimanded, but the gay officers weren’t.

Most of the gay community members were aware that the City has an anti-discrimination policy that includes sexual orientation. This policy extends to both employment and housing.

Police Subculture:

The police agency has had complaints and lawsuits filed against it for sexual orientation discrimination. The last such suit was filed more than three years ago. The effect of these complaints was the decision to “recruit at the gay and lesbian parade.” The gay and lesbian police organization also reported recruits coming out in class and experiencing subsequent harassment, open officers being passed over for promotion, and that “it has not become a non-issue because there is still locker room talk, whispers and talk behind your back.” The previous police chief issued a “zero-tolerance” memo about the harassment of gays and lesbians. The director of the gay and lesbian community

services center reported that the new police chief “is committed to following the letter of the law and is beholding to a very conservative police association . . . [and] has not done the same leadership.” The director also stated that “most of the feedback is that the police performs appropriately. When it is not, the officer is identified and is taken aside by administration. This showed how administration support is more important.” Finally, the city withdrew from supporting the Boy Scouts of America because of their refusal to allow a gay male police officer to continue as the official liaison between the police and the Scouts.

Asking how many open gay and lesbian officers there are on the police force revealed some discrepancies. Police administrators thought there were approximately five; bar owners said the same number; the gay and lesbian police organization stated that there are “five males and two females out of 1900 officers”; whereas other gay police officers reported that there were eight. However, the heterosexual police agency diversity administrator said, “Many officers have come out of the closet.”

A frequent comment made is that because no one ever witnesses a gay-bashing there must not be any problems for gays and lesbians. One of the consultants for CAT stated, “[I have] never been present during any discussion of homosexuality. This is a reflection of [how good of a job they do] addressing the issues.” However, gays and lesbians are everywhere in significant numbers and there should be constant conversations that indicate homosexuality. Thus, if the issue is being adequately addressed, why is it never heard?

At the academy, there were two complaints in the past year. One occurred between recruits. Each was investigated and resolved. But what does ‘resolved’ mean? One academy administrator reported, “I know of several instances where some male recruits had difficulty with the lesbian officers. I had a discussion with the group and it ‘solved

itself’.” None of the academy administrators had witnessed gay bashing and believed that “there is no ridicule of gays and lesbians [in the academy],” yet these are the same administrators who were involved with the complaints filed during the past year. As a further indicator that homosexuality is a hushed up issue, one academy director shared, “the issue does not disturb me. In my family, I have a cousin who is a lesbian [said with an almost inaudible lowered voice]. I don’t dwell on this and have a lot more in my life that I value.”

When academy students were asked to write a statement about their feelings or beliefs on homosexuality or homosexuals, only 3 out of 105 students replied. All responses were negative, such as, “I feel if an individual wants to conduct homosexual acts, it is his business. But if he/she brings it in the workplace or is open about being gay, then he should receive a warning. Any further attempts to exploit should result in discipline. This is reasonable.”

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Program administrators and training instructors were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. The respondents agreed that the two most important goals of sexual orientation training were to “promote the equal treatment” of gays and lesbians and to increase their awareness to gays and lesbians through breaking down stereotypes. The male heterosexual diversity administrator emphasized that administrators need to consider while evaluating officer performance that, “Ethnicity, race, and sexual orientation are sometimes used to fog the issue[s] and are [used as] scapegoats to evade performance issues and that there are only 2 or 3 [categories of people]—

heteros, homos and bisexuals.” The CAT consultant took a more organizational approach and claimed that sexual orientation training needed to “promote an organizational perspective on diversity and show organizations that it is in their vested interest to give police officers skills in people, peers and community.” Only one person, a lesbian community member, mentioned that training goals must not try to change values or beliefs.

Respondents conveyed the belief that heterosexuals and homosexuals are more alike than different. All the gay and lesbian officers and community members thought that sexual orientation is inborn and not a choice and that scientific information needed to be presented to support that position. The three heterosexual male police administrators unknowingly took a deficit position concerning homosexuality when they suggested training content that, “shows the [gay] lifestyle is not wrong,” “how they think,” “no specific facts since they do not deserve any treatment beyond what others have,” and “you don’t have to accept sexual orientation, just understand it as it relates to performance . . . there is a right or wrong way, no in-between.”

In the past, the gay and lesbian panel simply told their personal coming out stories. Course evaluations indicated these were boring to the recruits. The panel now limits the telling of personal stories and aims at a more structured format. Open discussion, creating a supportive atmosphere for candid sharing and video presentation of the history of the gay and lesbian movement were methodologies respondents intended to use. The male heterosexual diversity administrator believed that lecture, written assignments and expert testimony would be used in training. Ultimately, all respondents believed that, “No matter how technical you make the class, it still gets back to personal stories.”

Researcher’s Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

The police academy was very supportive of me and assigned a training officer to coordinate class observations and data collection. However, from the very beginning, things kept getting fumbled. Originally, training was scheduled for early June. This date was slipped to August at which time I went to the academy. Survey materials were distributed to all 105 students but only 15 students completed the PERQ and over half of the questionnaire booklets were never returned. Also, the observed class was not sexual orientation training, but rather sexual harassment. After a few more months, sexual orientation training was rescheduled for November. The class was to be divided into two and sexual orientation training given to each half on the same day. I attempted to observe both trainings, but plane delays resulted in missing the first class. Once I arrived, it was discovered that the second class was canceled and the students had been combined into one large class for the first sexual orientation training. Thus class observation was not accomplished. Instead, class observation was reconstructed through intensive interview. Finally, the distribution of materials for post-testing was worse than the pre-testing. Only three students (out of 105) completed the PERQ and again almost half of the questionnaire booklets were not returned. No students volunteered for interview and only two students returned evaluation forms. Overall, student participation was dismal and administration seemed unwilling to encourage greater involvement with the research.

Typically, 3 to 4 sexual orientation trainings take place each year, but during this research, training dates were slipped and eventually skipped. Ultimately, only 2 trainings occurred almost 10 months apart, resulting in one or two classes missing sexual orientation training. Police administration explained that this occurred due to scheduling conflicts within the academy.

Participation in alternate interviews was much more successful. Participants included: two heterosexual male academy administrators; two bar owners—one lesbian

and one gay male; one male heterosexual officer during ride-along; one heterosexual male police agency administrator responsible for diversity; one heterosexual female CAT agency consultant; two open gay police officers; and panel members including a lesbian city manager who also publishes one of the local gay and lesbian newspapers, civilian gay male city prosecutor, and the lesbian director of gay and lesbian services center.

Administering the PERQ most likely had little impact on the class because very few students actually completed it and the time between pre- and post-testing was about four months. Likewise, I had no contact with the class and very little impact. Finally, observing classes, engaging in ride-along and interviewing were conducted over a total of 5 days.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: This academy is known for being an “In-and-Out” academy in which students alternate between class and field work for the 7 months of training. Students are exposed to issues of culture through a 1-week field experience with students volunteering their time with one of the local support organizations and through formal CAT. The observed class had 105 uniformed recruits of which 19 were women and 86 were men. All but 18 students were hired as recruits. Students casually entered and exited the classroom, with breaks often including line-ups and calisthenics.

Instructor(s): Sexual orientation training relied upon the local gay and lesbian community center for speakers and the training itself. A uniformed officer introduced the panel and the panel members (non-officers) shared their experiences.

Setting: The classroom was extremely large with rows of flat tables and an aisle running down the center. The front of the room had a chalk board and TV. During the sexual orientation training, six administrators stood along the sides of the room.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

The female director of the local gay and lesbian community services center acted as panel moderator. After a brief introduction, *Coming Out Stories* were shared by three of the civilian panel members. This encouraged approximately eleven students to ask questions that focused on the causes of sexuality and supported the belief that homosexuality is a deviance. One of the panel members was an open gay city prosecutor who provided technical information about homosexuality including the Kinsey chart, genetic vs. choice arguments, stereotypes, etc. After the 50-minute lecture and a 10-minute break, the second hour of training included 40 minutes on *Police Scenarios* and 20 minutes for *Questions and Answers*. For the *Police Scenarios*, a 1-page handout was given to each student that listed 4 scenarios including: (1) father reports a teenage runaway, (2) drive-by name calling, (3) domestic fight, and (4) beating in a public park known for sexual activity. The male prosecutor led the class in an open discussion about these scenarios from which eight students asked for classifications of the law. The final *Questions and Answers* section was largely un motivating with only seven questions being asked from a room of over 100 persons. These questions covered domestic violence, heterosexual double standard, hate crimes and teenage runaways. No closure was attempted at the end of the training.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

Lecture was the primary teaching methodology that constituted 46% of class time. Even when students could be involved, very few did. One lesbian panel member reported,

“probably not more than 10 people spoke and 5 of those repeated. The larger the class the less likely they will participate.” Even during the student participation sections that comprised 36% of class time, the gay male city prosecutor reported, “the class died after the scenarios section. Although there were a few more questions, it died.”

Content emerged from three activities. The two coming out stories helped spark questions about the formation of sexual and gender identities and particularly issues of homosexuality. Some of the panel members reported excessive time had been spent on bisexuality and thought that having a bi-sexual woman on the panel confused the issue. Sexual orientation was presented as genetically determined. The *Police Scenarios* presented technical legal information and described appropriate police conduct. The final *Questions and Answers* section took 18% of class time and touched upon a number of issues little participation by students was noted. Thus, the total course content was expected to emerge from three structured activities and primarily from student questions.

No assessment of student comprehension or closure of topics was attempted. The goal for “equal treatment” was stated many times during the training. The goal to increase awareness to gays and lesbians through breaking down stereotypes was indirectly addressed. Lack of planning for specific content weakened the ability to achieve that goal.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

Unfortunately, no student evaluations of the instructor or panel members were made available. Also, I was unable to observe the training. The instructor and panel members may have been dynamic and skillful at presenting the information. Indirectly, the low number of student questions suggests that the instructor and panel members lacked the skill to involve students.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

- A. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: Only 6 students of 105 responded.)

Five of the responses involved making moral statements condemning homosexuality, e.g., “if homosexuals have a need to be ‘out of the closet’ in order to be happy, why can’t that apply to those who have sex with animals, the man-boy love association, and any other deviant/unconventional behavior (prostitutes, polygamist, etc.) Won’t this cause a downward pressure on public morality?” The only real question was if morality could be legislated.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

Although the police agency made strong anti-discrimination statements about sexual orientation, the low number of open gay and lesbian officers indicates there are continuing conflicts within the agency. Predominately, people do not see or hear overt gay bashing and incorrectly assume that sexual orientation is a non-issue. Subtle discriminations continue and are mirrored by the police diversity administrator who voices deficit positions concerning gays and lesbians. These mixed signals influence the academy instruction.

The academy has allocated too little time and has over-sized classes for the sexual orientation training. The program goals are too broad with insufficient guidance for program development. Content is expected to emerge from three activities with only one activity (scenarios) aimed at specific police information. As an individual module, sexual orientation training is not connected to the overall CAT program and is unsupported through the agency. As students complained, “Why do we have to study this stuff, we already know this . . . [and] why gays and lesbian and not African-Americans or other

groups?” Finally, it was reported that the panel was better focused than in previous classes, yet very little student interaction took place indicating a lack of skill in motivating students.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

Neither the instructor nor panel members were appropriate role-models. None of these people were the kind of people the recruits wanted to become. The gay male city prosecutor was the closest to being a police officer, yet his “very flashy” demeanor and civilian status made him a less than ideal role-model.

The goals for the training were vague and no assessment of student understanding of sexual orientation was attempted. Subsequently, the instructors were unable to prepare information for the students or assist students to higher levels of understanding. Some of the personal stories were relevant and solicited student involvement.

Once a new skill is taught, practice is necessary. The scenario activity would have been the perfect opportunity to practice new skills but students were not adequately prepared due to lack of specific content. At no time was closure attempted for any of the activities or discussions. Finally, students were not held responsible for what they learned, either through application on a test, homework, reflective project, or other individual activity.

Site #7

I was hired to teach sexual orientation training at one of the basic academies in Southern California. The Dean of the academy encouraged me to experiment with teaching methodologies and course content. As such, I became a participant-observer at this location. The subsequent two sections (Sites #8 and #9) will discuss what was changed since the initial training (Site #7) and present the data that was collected.

Site #7 Police Academy is a basic academy associated with a community college located in the eastern section of Los Angeles County. The academy serves many of the neighboring police agencies. CAT has followed POST mandates and recently included sexual orientation training. The academy Dean is active in developing CAT at the state level and believes that “law enforcement is at the forefront of training because it is mandated, but when it comes to addressing cultural issues, law enforcement is catching up.”

Gay and Lesbian Community:

The immediate area surrounding Site #7 Police Academy is a suburban community of Los Angeles. Gays and lesbians are invisible and are only seen at a few cruise spots or through the college student organization. There are no gay or lesbian bars, no AIDS support group or organized political groups. Gays and lesbians often travel to Los Angeles or West Hollywood to participate in gay culture.

Police Subculture:

The academy culture is ascertained from four sources: interviews with the Dean, recruit volunteer and instructor; and classroom observations including student statements. The Dean reported:

the academy is not very accepting [of gays and lesbians]— does not want to talk about it. I think you are tolerated as long as you don't become visible. I think we have 2 employees who are gay/lesbian and they are accepted. No one bothers them and they do not broach the subject. Not an issue in workplace. The issue is not accepted in workplace. Realistically, the mere fact that I can identify them, shows how open it is. I never thought about this until asked this question. I base my judgment on the reaction I had in getting the [civilian] sexual orientation training instructor hired— it was very difficult.

A student reported:

The class was unruly to the instructor. He seemed generally very nice. He seemed very interested in teaching us while students seemed most interested in harassing him. The students were very negative. In the shower [after the sexual orientation training] started a witch hunt for the 10%. Buddies would joke with each other “are you one of the 10%ers?” Overall maturity level [of the class] seemed low. I'm bothered by the level. I am concerned that I will have to work with these kinds of guys. A couple of days later they were still joking around.

As the instructor, I sensed the academy to be very homophobic. The other instructors showed interest in my work and the Dean was very supportive, but no gay or lesbian staff member came forward and identified themselves to me. The recruit class was extremely hostile toward me during training.

When asked what official policies protect gays and lesbian in the workplace, the Dean stated, “the community college is regulated under Title 9, Title 6, Cal law, etc.” Also, the Dean reports that there have been no complaints filed in the police academy based upon anti-gay discrimination.

One panic phone call was received from a lesbian student who was concerned about completing the PERQ accurately. She was fearful of being discovered at the academy. Although I tried to convince her that all data was confidential, she indicated that she most likely would not turn in the questionnaire.

Students were asked to write comments on the acceptance of gays and lesbians in the academy. Out of 94 students in class, only 18 replied to this question. Seven respondents believed that homosexuality is not accepted—“they are ridiculed until we have to confront them during a situation or incident.” Six respondents claimed, “I have never seen/heard about gay bashing except on television.” Three students reported that the academy is not homophobic. Finally, a few negative comments were made, including “educate people about the vices of sexual deviants.”

In another activity, students were asked to write statements concerning their beliefs and/or feelings about homosexuals or homosexuality. Out of 94 students, 39 students responded. Twenty-seven (70%) students made negative statements—the second highest level of negative statements of all academies in this research. Of these negative statements, nine (33%) made moral and religious condemnations—“In the Bible, in the book of Genesis it states that God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve. Also that because of unnatural relationships they were given in them diseases”; six (22%) made statements about feeling uncomfortable being around gays—“I’d be afraid to spend time with a fag because he might try and pick me up”; and, five (19%) said that homosexuality is a mental disorder—“Homosexuals are sick puppies,” and “Homosexuals have had a traumatic incident in early childhood which caused them to gravitate toward members of the same sex.” Of the remaining statements, six (15%) were generally positive statements including this humorous perspective by a non-gay student—“There is nothing wrong with gay guys. They are usually good looking guys who work out. Since they like each other, they as a result leave us straight single guys more women to choose from,” and five (13%) made factual statements about homosexuality—“[gays and lesbians are] discriminated against.”

Program Goals and Intended Content/Methodology:

Program administrators were asked to state the goals of the sexual orientation training program, list the content they expected to present and explain the teaching methodologies they expected to use. This information will be compared to actual observations to assess compliance. The Dean believed the goal for CAT should be to provide awareness about other cultures. Given the limited time for training and student level, the Dean stated, "Training gives only basic awareness and hopefully self-awareness . . . [and] we are kidding ourselves if we think we can do more." I took a more proactive position, wanting to change beliefs, knowledge, attitudes and values of students away from negative gay stereotypes so as to make their behaviors be more gay positive. Also to illustrate and transmit the skills needed to effectively communicate and work fairly with the gay subculture. I saw my position as a provider of information and facilitator of educational processes. I understood the importance of being a role model for students, and was apologetic for not being an appropriate role model because I do not have a law enforcement background.

The Dean wanted accurate information presented to students, although he unintentionally took a deficit position, stating, "No accurate information [exists] on what causes it." The Dean hoped the information will "help to eliminate myths and convey the message that no matter what our personal feelings and values are, they will treat gays and lesbian equally and learn what legally should be done."

As instructor, I also wanted to provided accurate information with the goal of showing that, homosexuality is normal, natural and very common and that sexual orientation is stigmatized in our culture. This stigmatization accounts for homophobia and heterosexism and facilitate gay-bashing and discrimination. Anti-gay stereotypes affect police performance and puts them at risk for complaints from fellow employees and the

community. We need to deconstruct polar gender- and sexual-identities and bring these concepts down to the personal level by showing that many police officers have engaged in homosexual behavior and homosexuality represents a ‘hidden knowledge’.

Teaching methodology suggested by the Dean included:

experiential activity to develop self-identity. This issue is so explosive and value laden, that to try and make any changes in this group would make more damage than good . . . This whole area doesn’t deal with culture, its human behavior. One of the things I do in my class is to get them to talk, that it’s a comfortable atmosphere to share. I don’t tell them what is right or wrong because this questions their life choices and creates resentment and defensiveness—thus they shut up.

As the instructor for the class, I believed in using many individual and small group activities to assist students toward becoming aware of their personal beliefs, attitudes and feelings. Accurate information on human sexuality gives students the knowledge needed to overcome stereotypes. Presentation of points-of-contact supports appropriate conduct. Together, the newly discovered self-awareness and appropriate police behaviors can be applied to real police situations.

Researcher’s Acceptance and Data Acquisition:

The Dean of the academy fought for more than a year to allow me to come on staff as the instructor of sexual orientation training. The first two recruit classes were taught identical content with identical methodology (here referred to as Site #7). The PERQ was given to students two or three days before the sexual orientation training and asked to complete it at home. They held onto the survey materials, and after the sexual orientation training were instructed to turn their answer sheet over and take the PERQ a second time. All materials were recovered the next day. Additionally, students were asked to write

questions they may have and/or statements about their beliefs and feelings regarding homosexuals and homosexuality. These written materials were collected. Although students were asked to volunteer for interview, only one participated. Course evaluations were provided to me for one class.

I had significant impact on the students because of my status as instructor. Administering the PERQ sensitized students to issues they otherwise may not have considered. Finally, each time the course was taught and assessment materials distributed, one or more students would call me in panic. They were concerned about being identified gay or lesbian if they answered accurately. These students disclosed that the small network of gay and lesbian recruits talked amongst themselves about the fear they had being found out. Although I reassured them that all materials and interviews were confidential, they indicated that many would decline participation.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: Recruit training lasts 19 weeks. CAT is conducted for the minimum POST requirement of 24-hours, of which 4 hours are devoted to sexual orientation training. Two different classes were taught and observed each with approximately ninety-four (94) uniformed recruits attended—at the ratio of 2 women to 92 men. These classes were approximately half way through with the training program. The academy was very formal with students being marched (run) in and out of the classroom, standing at attention before sitting, and engaged in lineup and calisthenics during breaks. During sexual orientation training, the Dean of the school and occasionally other instructors observed the class.

Setting: The classroom was not air-conditioned which made teaching in 100 degree smoggy summer weather very uncomfortable. Flat tables with two people to a desk

were arranged in rows with one isle along one wall. The front of the classroom had a dry marker board, TV, electric roll-down screen, flipcharts and an overhead projector.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

During the 5-minute *Introduction*, I stated the goals of the training and shared some personal background information including my academic credentials, political activism, my long career as a professional ballet dancer and my being fairly effeminate since childhood. Also, a 72-page Sexual Orientation Booklet was distributed. Next, I engaged students in a 30-minute *Stereotype Activity* using small groups to write gay and lesbian stereotypes on flipchart paper followed by a class-wide discussion. All students were involved, there was much nervous laughter, and most the terms were extremely negative. Following this, I lectured on *Homophobia* using three transparencies and referred students to three topic papers in the booklet. I discussed the similarities between homophobes and police subculture. Students were surprised at the primary expulsion of lesbians from the military (9 women to every 1 man). Next, students were engaged in the 8-minute *Gay "Lifestyle" Activity* where heterosexual and homosexual daily life routines were compared to demonstrate that there are no differences between gays and straights (identical to the activity discussed in Site #5). Four students participated in the activity with much of the class laughing at the realization that sex constitutes very little of anyone life. Just before the break, I had student write questions they may have had about homosexuality to be answered later. After a 15-minute break, a 40-minute lecture on scientific information on sexual orientation was given. I attempted to present the Shively and DeCecco gender-sexual-emotional identity theories along with cross-cultural analysis

to broaden the essentialist perspective promoted by biological researchers and Kinsey. Fourteen students asked questions, seemed highly agitated and were primarily rejecting of the research. Next, the 20-minute video “Who’s Afraid of Project 10” was shown to highlight the tragedy of gay teen suicide. Even still, class discussion resulted in two students stating that counseling for gay and lesbian youths should not be provided by schools. The 15-minute break was used to engage students in a *Famous Gays and Lesbians* activity, where students work from a list of gays and lesbians and try to discover the name of the famous person that was attached to their backs. Upon return from break, students shared their surprise at who was included in the list. I then lectured for 5-minutes on *Hate Crimes* using one transparency and referred students to one article and one topic paper in the booklet. Next, I lectured for 10-minutes on *Homophobia within Police Agencies* referring students to three topic papers in the booklet. The fear of being discovered to be gay was personalized through a verbal round-robin reading by students of the poem, “I Fear.” Twenty-eight students were involved in the poem reading and six questions were fielded about the status of the Mitch Grobeson’s suit and the issue of outing. This flowed directly into a 15-minute lecture of *Points-of-Contact*. This lecture was supported by three topic papers and community resource list. Using *Points-of-Contact* as a lead-in, a 15-minute small group activity and instructor-led discussion was conducted on *Appropriate Police Behavior*. Twenty-four students participated in the discussion, mostly taking the politically correct position to each scenario. Finally, a 15-minute *Questions and Answers* session was conducted using the questions submitted earlier as the initial base. Many students hands went up for more questions, but time ran out for the 3 hours and 34 minute class.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

Lecture was the primary instructional methodology and was used 43% of the time. Lecture was used to transmit content on homophobia, basic information on sexual orientation, teen suicide and hate crime specifics. Instructor-led discussion or activities were the next favored instruction methodology. It was used 33% of the time and included the Stereotype Activity, Gay Lifestyle Activity, Homophobia within Police Agencies, and Questions and Answers activity. Individual or small group methods were used 16% of the time for conveying information on famous gays and lesbians and appropriate police behavior. Lecture with some questions and answers was used only for police points-of-contact.

The delivered content followed closely the curriculum written by the instructor for the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force*. The content was highly structured and overwhelming considering the 86 pages of materials given each student. Sexual orientation was not presented from an essentialist perspective, rather one that includes both genetic and environmental explanations and attempted to deconstruct students polar concepts of gender- and sexual-identities. Appropriate police behaviors during point-of-contact followed the recommendations of the curriculum. The content closely matched the goals stated by the curriculum.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

I was not well received and students displayed a polar attitude about the course. From a class of 94 students, 43 completed evaluation forms and stated: the instructor was defensive and had a negative attitude (9 students, 21%); the instructor was knowledgeable and very informative (7 students, 16%); instructor was biased and tried to impose his values (6 students, 14%); the instructor was pleasant and good but needed more time (5 students, 12%); and, the instructor rushed through materials (4 students, 9%). As one

student wrote, “[instructor] was outnumbered and left too open for criticism . . . Overall good info for cadets to know because our class showed a lot of ignorance and fear toward something they did not know and understand.” In contrast, other students wrote, “If the instructor was more open and not defensive and did not rush through everything, maybe the class would of learned a lot more” and “he brought materials that was written by gay men and said that that was correct. Why didn’t he bring books by straight men, the kind that all of us thought would be correct.”

During the training, there were times when students were frustrated by the rush of materials and my having to cut off questions and debate in order to proceed to the next topic. Of particular interest, after the video on teen suicide that featured the open lesbian teacher, Virginia Uribe, issues of open gay teachers in the classroom came up. One student stood up and said that he would remove his child from a class where the teacher was openly gay or lesbian. I said to the student, “Look me in the eyes and tell me that I am not your equal.” The student hesitated and said that was not what he meant, “Just that I don’t want my child to grow up thinking it is OK.” I repeated the demand emphasizing that, “What you have just said implies that I am not your equal, and I don’t accept that.” Other altercations such as this occurred during class and is probably the source of the belief that I was defensive.

The Dean commented, “the problem with the instructor is he is advocating a cause and it builds resistance. There is a difference between conveying information or advocating a cause. The class should emphasize awareness, facts and feeling. This is difficult because there really are no known facts about homosexuality.”

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

- A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: Out of a class of 94 students, 36 made written responses to this question.)

Nineteen respondents (53%) thought the content was a positive experience, especially learning that gays and lesbians “are normal people.” In contrast, four (11%) of respondents felt the content was biased and wrong, and did not emphasize “deviant homosexuals.” Furthermore, five (13%) respondents thought the instructor was too militant, biased, defensive and tried to change people’s views. Finally, four (11%) respondents remembered the group activities including the famous gays and lesbians.

- B. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: Out of a class of 94 students, 84 responded to this question.)

Respondents were interested in technical information about sexual orientation (37 students, 44%). Primarily they wanted to know about the psychology and ‘causes’ of homosexuality. Even though students were asked to write a question regarding homosexuality, instead, twenty-four (28%) chose to write statements condemning homosexuality on moral grounds—“do you honestly feel God condones homosexuality?”, and challenging research—“Why does the gay community continually use spurious or false research and present it as fact?” Sixteen (19%) respondents were interested in personal questions about the instructor including why he is not married, does he have female friends, and his relationship with his family.

- C. Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: Out of a class of 94 students, 32 responded to this question.)

Ten (32%) respondents wanted more class time and more time devoted to questions and answers. Eight (24%) mentioned the need for greater diversity in

instructors and mostly wanted open gay and lesbian officers as instructors. The same number of respondents (eight, 24%) also wanted more content on police topics.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

The academy had taken a proactive approach to sexual orientation training, devoting 1/6th of its' CAT to this issue. No other subgroup, e.g., African-Americans, was given as much time or emphasis. The academy Dean encouraged me to experiment with teaching methodology and content and to photocopy full books of information for distributing to students for future reference. Furthermore, the Dean led a protracted political fight to obtain my services as sexual orientation instructor against the conservative elements at the academy. Yet the many deficit position comments about gays and lesbians made by the Dean, along with the absence of open gay and/or lesbian staff members or students suggests the academy environment is decidedly homophobic. I found the students at this academy held some of the strongest negative beliefs and feelings about homosexuals and homosexuality encountered in the entire research project. This is also the only academy from which panicked students called me to discuss survey confidentiality. It is within the context of this homophobic atmosphere that sexual orientation training was conducted.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

Although the training followed a very successful curriculum and training process that is well received at other agencies and academies, it became clear that I (the instructor)

was not an appropriate role model for the students. Students respond best to instructors who are the kinds of persons they aspire to emulate. In police recruit training on sexual orientation, the best role-model would be an open gay or lesbian active officer of many years experience and who is well respected for his/her professionalism, conforms to gender stereotypes, and is well liked for his/her personality. I am not from a law enforcement background, was viewed as an intellectual and outsider due to my academic affiliations and degrees, was somewhat gender non-conforming because of my many years as a ballet dancer, and my political activism painted me to be antagonistic to police.

Instead of assessing what students knew and building upon that knowledge, I started with the topic of controlling sub-populations based on stereotypes. Using that awareness, academic content on human sexuality was delivered along with the consequences of stigmatization. This process prepared students for the delivered content, but because it was not personalized through some other process, it made the relevancy of the material unclear. Once appropriate behavior was discussed through points-of-contact lecture and activity, students were given the chance to practice their new found knowledge. This was effective. The ending questions and answer activity provided indirect closure on the training, but this could have been better formalized. Students were not held responsible for participating in the training or for demonstrating that they learned the intended content. Although I knew the 85-pages of handout materials was impossible to cover, I was encouraged by the Dean to distribute them since homosexuality is “hidden” and students could review them at home.

This class was very similar to Site #7, but with changes reflecting the input from the previous class and in recognition that most of these students were police administrators. The changes included:

1. The inclusion of a self-awareness activity based on a Forced-Choice value clarification technique in the first hour. (For details of this technique, see Appendix F.)
2. In the second hour, the amount of time spent on discussion regarding the sources and causes of sexual orientation was reduced and the video, “Growing Up Gay” was used as the lead into the discussion of sexual orientation theory. In this video, Brian McNaught brilliantly weaves the experiences of growing up gay in a heterosexist and homophobic society with research on human sexuality and identity formation. The video, “Who’s Afraid of Project 10” was eliminated.
3. In the third section of the class, a small group activity was included to discuss appropriate officer behavior in police situations that contained a gay or lesbian content. Less time was spent on the theory and history of hate crimes, but more time was spent on point-of-contact.
4. The class did not have enough time to conduct a question and answer period.
5. To build student responsibility for demonstrating that they learned the intended course content, students were required to complete a homework assignment in order to obtain credit for participating in the training. This assignment was ungraded and asked students to; (1) tell about three things they remember about the class, (2) identify three things that could improve the class, and (3) respond to a scenario where they have been assigned responsibility for cultural awareness training on sexual orientation at their agency and what they would do or say to

convince resistant officers that homosexuality is both normal, natural and very common.

Police Subculture:

Unfortunately, no students from this class volunteered to be interviewed for the research. However, students were asked to write statements about their feelings and beliefs on homosexuals and homosexuality. Thirty-five (35) of the 38 students responded. Fourteen (41%) respondents made negative statements about gays and lesbians, particularly religious and moral condemnations such as, "This is why God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. Your gay agenda is strictly a 'sex' issue." They also believed that gays and lesbians should "stay in the closet" and are confused about their gender. Eleven (32%) respondents made positive statements about gays and lesbians and felt they should have equal rights. One student said, "When I was younger I thought all homosexuals should be shot. But as I get older I learn more. I now know they are people just like I am. To each its own." Finally, nine (27%) respondents simply made a factual statement about gays and lesbians.

Although 41% of responses were negative, this is the lowest number obtained from any of the agencies or academies participating in this activity. I conclude that the initial level of homophobia in this group was lower than other groups at this academy.

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: This was an advanced-officer training program of thirty-eight (38) uniformed officers and administrators including 9 women and 29 men. All students came from a particular local agency which contracted with this academy to fulfill the POST requirement for CAT. The class structure was extremely casual.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

This 3 hours and 31 minutes training used many of the elements used in Site #7 and will not be fully described here. A 72-page booklet was distributed to all students and was referred to during the training besides the use of overhead transparencies. The training included a 5-minute *Introduction*, 35-minute *Stereotype Activity*, 12-minute *Homophobia* lecture, and a 2-minute *Gay “Lifestyle” Activity*. Student participation was similar to Site #7. A new element was the inclusion of a 10-minute *Self-Awareness Activity* based on a Forced-Choice value clarification technique. By requiring students to prioritize scenarios that contained a homosexual situation, they became aware of their values and feelings. All students were observed to be engaged in this activity and were particularly disturbed by two of the scenarios: (1) discovering their teenage son engaging in homosexual behavior, and (2) a male police officer leaves his wife after discovering that he is gay. Again, just before the break students were directed to write questions for later discussion. After break, 31 minutes of the hour video—“Growing Up Gay,” were used to vividly demonstrate the difficulties faced by gay people growing up in a heterosexist society. Key concepts from the video were written onto the chalk board and used to flow directly into a 32-minute lecture on *Basic Information on Sexual Orientation*. Twenty-five students asked questions and primarily made negative comments challenging the research as being biased and that the material was covered too fast. The *Famous Gays and Lesbians* activity was conducted during the 15-minute break with much student participation. After the break, *Hate Crimes* was presented for 5 minutes. Small group activities were used to process the 30-minute *Harassment of Gay and Lesbian Officers*

activity. Here students were asked to work in groups of four to discuss and find solutions to specific police scenarios that involved gays and lesbians. All students were engaged and the consensus was that strong administrative directives could solve most of the problems. Having gotten students to think about their behavior on the job, 30 minutes were then devoted to a lecture on *Points-of-Contacts*. To close the training, I asked students to take home and complete an assignment that was due the next day. This assignment placed students in the position of being responsible for the sexual orientation training program at their agency and asked them what they would do to improve the environment for gays and lesbians.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

More time was spent on self-awareness, the stigmatization of gays and lesbians, and Points-of-Contact than at Site #7. Less time was spent on specific sexual orientation content and questions and answers. New to this training, were scenarios applicable for police administrators. The amount of time allocated for pure lecture was slightly reduced and more individual or small group activities were engaged.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

Unfortunately, student evaluations were not available from the class. In review of student responses to the question of what stood out in their mind, twice as many respondents (7%) thought the instructor was, “very positive,” “induced good group participation and thought,” and “so open and felt good discussing situations with us.” A minority of respondents (2%) felt the instructor “was trying to get us to give our approval” and “the openness of the instructor seemed to shock some students . . . [and] was a bit too graphic for my likes.” These were significantly different student comments

than Site #7 where on the same question 13% of students expressed disapproval of the instructor and no student gave a positive rating to the instructor.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

- A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: Out of a class of 38 students, 31 students responded to this question.)

The respondents were equally divided over the issue of content. Eleven (35%) respondents thought that content specifically on sexual orientation was a positive experience— “The lecturer was very positive and the barrage of previously unknown information was positive.” An equal number of respondents thought the content was negative and challenged the accuracy of the statistics— “I cannot believe 75% of this information.” Finally, four (13%) respondents mentioned the class activities as being memorable. One student wrote, “I received mixed emotions with the [stereotype] activity because being a heterosexual black male, I observed that the same people who chose the words for my race are the same persons that set the standard for all out war on all groups regardless of racial boundary or sexual orientation.

- B. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: Out of a class of 38 students, 28 students responded to this question.)

Technical information about sexual orientation, particularly on psychology and AIDS was mentioned by twelve (42%) respondents. Personal information and feelings— “how did you tell your parents you were gay”— about the instructor were sought by seven (25%) respondents. Even though students were asked for questions, six students (22%) gave anti-gay statements such as “why don’t they

conceal their sexual acts from our of crowds of children” and “why should homosexuals have special rights?”

- C. Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: Out of a class of 38 students, 31 students responded to this question.)

Eleven (35%) respondents felt that more overall time, more time allocated for questions and answers and more activities were needed. Nine (29%) respondents wanted more information specifically aimed at law enforcement and the causes of discrimination and homophobia. Classroom materials were mentioned by four (13%) respondents who wanted more visual aides, videos, handout materials and to identify when materials were written by heterosexuals. Interestingly, two (6%) respondents wanted information about the “other” side to be presented, specifically — “Bring in former gays or lesbians to share their experience . . . Discuss constructive ways to help those who want to change their life style to the normal standard.”

- D. Response to the homework assignment. (Note: Out of a class of 38 students, 29 students completed this assignment.)

Ten students (35%) recommended that to overcome resistance to accepting gays and lesbians, supervisors should emphasis the code of ethics that all people are to be treated the same. But, in the same breath, six (21%) respondents stated that they could not teach that homosexuality is normal, natural and common, because they do not believe that that is true and that they have no right to try and change peoples beliefs. For example, students wrote, “Support code of ethics but can’t defend homosexuality because against Jesus Christ,” or “equal treatment deserves same rights but not persuade that natural or normal because it isn’t.” For two (7%) respondents, they went so far as to say they could not administer the

program because, “don’t believe it, thus couldn’t teach it” or “not normal or natural, thus could not administrate the program.” Respondents mainly suggested the use of educational programs that included gay and lesbian speakers, videos, teaching materials and collaborations with other agencies. One student suggested a change in measuring police productivity from the number of arrests to an analysis of types of arrests to see if particular populations are over-represented.

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

Although the academy was the same, this particular group of students were distinctively less homophobic than the recruit classes. That is not to say this class or the agency they come from was not homophobic. Approximately half the respondents made anti-gay comments somewhere in their writings.

The goals for the training shifted away from academic research on sexual orientation and more toward self-awareness and specific application for police administrators. These were achieved through more use of individual and small group activities and less lecture. Finally, I seemed better received than by the recruits even though the same personal presentation was made.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

Although I was not the appropriate role-model for this class of police administrators, I seemed to be better received or tolerated. This may reflect the less homophobic beliefs displayed by the class in general and/or that academics may have more in common with police administrators.

The use of a self-awareness activity in conjunction with the stereotype activity provided a greater understanding about the mechanisms of stigmatization. The video, “Growing Up Gay” greatly summarized the need to lecture on sexual orientation, but the speaker in the video is again not the appropriate role-model for these students. From their new understanding about homosexuality and stigmatization, students were allowed to explore police administrative scenarios that contained a gay and lesbian concern. Finally, a review of point-of-contact helped to bring closure to the training.

The homework assignment attempted to allow students to reflect upon course content and put them in a real situation where they would need to apply their new knowledge. However, this assignment caused much commotion. The Dean of the academy revealed to the instructor that the contracting agency complained about the assignment because it violated labor laws to require employees to do work during their off-duty time. Also, unspecified complaints about the content and purpose of the assignment were made to the agency who then complained to the Dean of the academy.

Site #9

This class was an evolution of Site #7 and Site #8 with changes based on input from the previous three classes. These changes include:

1. During the personal history, all references to my 25-year career as a professional classical ballet dancer were removed, plus any references to my being effeminate as a child. It was hoped that this would make me more acceptable and a better role-model for students.

2. All references to my gay activism, including participation in public demonstrations or wrongful termination based on sexual orientation discrimination were not disclosed. Again, it was hoped that this would make me more acceptable.
3. Because of the inability to obtain openly gay or lesbian officers to come and speak to the class, the first activity was to watch the “Gay Cops” segment of *60-Minutes*.
4. The *Stereotype Activity* was simplified and controlled to limit the use of derogatory terms. It was hoped this would reduce the negative feelings and comments that sometimes arises from this activity. This negativity has been observed to spread over into other discussions and activities.
5. The section on sexual orientation theory was reduced in time and complexity, the multi-dimensional Shively and DeCecco model was discontinued and the normal sexuality distribution was substantiated through comparison of distributions found in heterosexist societies with those where homosexuality is institutionalized. I did not want to go so far as to promote the erroneous essentialist argument. Thus, sexual orientation was presented as a combination of biology and environment, stating that the better question is to ask why our society discriminates against anyone who is not heterosexual.
6. The *Points-of-Contact* section was expanded by including police stories to illustrate each of the points. It was desirable to use open gay and lesbian police officers for this activity, but none were available.
7. The use of a homework assignment was discontinued due to the poor acceptance in the last class of police administrators and no other reflective assignment was devised.

Police Subculture:

No students volunteered to participate for the interview portion of the research. However, I received a number of panic phone calls from gay and lesbian recruits concerned over the confidentiality of the survey. These students indicated that the gays and lesbian recruits whom they knew would not participate in any parts of the research.

I asked the Dean if there were any gay or lesbian staff members at the academy and if he would approach them about participating in the training. The Dean contacted one of the lesbian instructors who contacted me. She was hesitant at first to participate as she was open only to a handful of people. After discussion and sharing instructional materials with her, she consented to participate in the sexual orientation training. However, she was not available due to scheduling conflicts.

Students were asked to write statements about their feelings and beliefs about homosexuals and homosexuality. Of the 65 students, 62 responded to this activity. Thirty-seven (60%) respondents felt that homosexuality is morally wrong, a mental disorder and that they should stay hidden. For example, one student wrote, "Gays are wrong and have a sick mind in being able to release their sexual frustration in a unnatural sex act." Another student wrote, "What's the point of people saying you're gay, what do you people have to prove to us. You don't hear heterosexuals telling people that they are heterosexual." Thirteen (21%) respondents made positive statements about gays and lesbians and their right to equal treatment. Finally, twelve (19%) respondents simply made factual statements.

Students were also asked directly about the academy culture. Forty-one (41) students out of the class of 65 responded. Eighteen respondents (44%) held negative beliefs about gays and lesbians. Ten of these negative statements were moral and religious condemnations of homosexuality. One student reported, "Awful!!! The most

homophobic people I've known. The jokes and comments are so bad, I can't say what to do to stop it." Another student wrote, "Law enforcement in general is a homophobic profession. We joke among ourselves, in a sense "prove" our masculinity, and will continue to do so. I would love to be able to say "it stops here," but I won't be that naive." Another student wrote, "The police academy ridicules homosexuality in part because of the lack of understanding and being afraid of being thought of being homosexual." Ten (24%) respondents claimed to have not seen any discrimination against gays and lesbians. Education was suggested by five (13%) respondents as a means of improving the situation. And another five (13%) respondents claimed that the academy was not homophobic. Interestingly, three (7%) respondents believed that, "The prejudice imposed on gays are[sic] greatly exaggerated."

Observation of Training Program:

Program and Participants: This recruit class was similar to the previous recruit classes except that it was smaller, with sixty-five (65) uniformed recruits including 3 women and 62 men.

Sexual Orientation Training Observation:

(See Table 4.1 for cross-agency comparison and Appendix C for complete documentation.)

Much of the 3 hours and 43 minutes of training is similar to the training described in Site #7 & #8, and will not be repeated here. After the 10-minute *Introduction* in which I restricted my presentation to reduce objectionable characteristics, the 23-minute video "Gay Cops" from *60-Minutes* with Mike Wallace was shown. This led directly to the 30-minute *Harassment of Gay and Lesbian Police Officers* activity. All students were

actively involved and their comments suggested that their responses to conflict would be situationally based. After a 10 -minute break, student were asked to write questions on cards they had about homosexuality for answering at a later time. A *Stereotype Activity* was conducted for 30 minutes that was a variation on what had been used at Sites #7 & #8 and attempted to control student responses such that negative statements would be kept to a minimum. As usual, students had a fun time with this activity. I then lectured on *Sexual Orientation Basics* for 15 minutes, using the student comments made earlier as a guide for selecting which information to present. Five students challenged the research as being biased and self-identified Christian fundamentalists made their counter-points. Again, each activity and/or lecture was supported by a 62-page booklet and overhead transparencies. During the 15-minute break, students were engaged in the *Famous Gays and Lesbians* activity. After the break, I lectured for 60 minutes on *Points-of-Contact*. Twelve students made comments clarifying points of law. Students then were asked to share their *Personal Contact* they may have had with gays and lesbians. Six students shared having worked with gays and lesbians and one student share an experience of being “hit” upon by someone of their same sex. The question cards collected earlier were brought out and a few were selected for comment during the 15-minute *Questions and Answers* activity. Finally, I attempted closure during the last 5-minutes of training—trying to tie the content of the training back to the training goals. Also, I shared with the class that it had been brought to my attention that often a witch hunt for gays and lesbians ensues after I conduct a sexual orientation training. I told the students that such a witch hunt would not be tolerated and that it was their responsibility to intervene and stop gay-bashing.

Analysis of Observed Methodology and Content:

Individual or small group activities were the primary instructional methodology constituting 29% of class time. These activities were used to allow students to explore personal views on police scenarios that contained gay and lesbian elements. Lecture with some questions and answers was the second most used instructional methodology. This was used 27% of the time and used to explore point-of-contact discussion. The use of video and formal lecture were used 24% of the time. This methodology showed the gay cop video and presented basic information on sexual orientation. Finally, instructor-led discussion was used 20% of the time to help students understand the process of stigmatization and closure through questions and answers.

The academic research on sexual orientation was severely reduced but did not oversimplify into an essentialist perspective. Much more time was allocated to presenting personal gay and lesbian police experiences and exploring the impact homophobia has on police working conditions. Students were not held responsible for learning the content as assessed through testing, homework assignment or other means. Closure on topics was sporadically attempted.

Assessment of Instructor(s)/Panel:

Although no students volunteered to be interviewed from this class and the student evaluations were unavailable, only one respondent mentioned on the survey of improvements for the class that he/she thought I was biased. In contrast, a few students mentioned that they thought I was good. One student stated, “[I] could use some help while he is teaching. It’s kind of ruff [sic] standing in front of 50 or so homophobic cadets.” This is a major change over the instructor evaluations at Sites #7 and #8.

Student Reactions to the Sexual Orientation Training:

- A. What stood out in their minds? (Note: Out of 65 students, 43 students responded to this question.)

Sixteen (37%) respondents thought that content dispelling anti-gay stereotypes and issues of heterosexism were positive experiences. Some students commented, “Positive, honesty, felt I was told real truth,” and “this was the first time I was involved in an open discussion about homosexuals and it was good.” In contrast, five (12%) respondents disagreed with the content and “felt the presentation was very biased,” or “I was disgusted with how this training was presented. Especially the language that was used. Contradictions of facts.” Eight (19%) of respondents felt the instructor was outstanding, “Enjoyed his humor and realism about being gay.” Finally, seven (16%) respondents mentioned the used of the gay cop video and group activities as being most memorable.

- B. What did students want to know or were concerned with? (Note: Out of 65 students, 53 responded to this question.)

Twenty-one (39%) students were interested in technical information about sexual orientation. They wanted to know about the role-playing in gay relationships, family and children issues, AIDS and discrimination. Students wrote, “Do homosexuals feel threatened by heterosexuals,” and “How do you feel when you are with a lover. Does the pain of intercourse soon subside or does it last long (serious).” Even though students were asked to write questions about homosexuality, thirteen (25%) chose to write a negative comment instead. Eleven (21%) respondents wanted to know about gay and lesbian politics and perspectives. For example, one student wrote, “If you do not want to be discriminated against, why do you find it necessary to come out?” Finally, nine (17%) respondents were curious about the personal feelings and beliefs of the instructor. Students wrote, “How hard is it to do this class?”, “Have you ever wanted children of your own?”, and “What type of men do you date and are you against interracial relationships?”

- C. Student suggestions for improvements to the training. (Note: Out of 65 students, 38 responded to this question.)

Twelve (32%) respondents wanted greater emphasis given to topics of family issues, demonstrating that gays and lesbians are normal, and police issues. Ten (26%) respondents felt that open gay and lesbian officers needed to be present to talk about their experiences. More total time for training was mentioned by six (16%) respondents. Four (11%) of respondents wanted more videos, activities and teaching materials. One student said, “the subject was presented very well. All

areas seemed to be covered. Regardless of how well the training is given, I just don't think everyone is ready to change the values and morals."

Conclusions Regarding Sexual Orientation Training:

This group of recruits seemed equally anti-gay as had the previous two recruit classes (Site #7) when comparing their written comments about personal beliefs and agency culture; however, their classroom behavior was not as aggressive toward the instructor. This class went much more smoothly. When students made suggestions to improve the training, the previous two classes made many negative statements about me and "bias" materials, while this class praised me.

The goals for the training further shifted away from academic research on sexual orientation and brought in police personal experiences and more time to gain self-awareness. More time was spent on individual and small group activities. These provided the foundation for practicing appropriate police behaviors in situations that involved gays and lesbians.

Educational Conclusions:

(See Appendix D for visual tabulation of training methodology compared with education theory that includes assessments of training effectiveness.)

By modifying my personal information, I was viewed less antagonistically. Although I am still not the ideal role model for this training, I attempted to compensate by bringing in open gay and lesbian officers to assist with the class. Unfortunately, none were available and thus the gay cop video was used to fill this gap. The course structure attempted to start with the harassment of gay cops as a lead-in to self-discovery about one's beliefs and feelings surrounding gays and lesbians at work. The *Stereotype Activity*

and *Basic Information on Sexual Orientation* built upon the self-awareness to assist students to a new level of understanding about the mechanism of stigmatization. The *Points-of-Contact* lecture and activity demonstrated appropriate police behaviors as the relevant consequence of the new knowledge. The personal contact activity was not at the right position in the educational sequence and should have been used earlier to personalize the discussion of gay cops. Closure was attempted and students were not required to demonstrate that they learned the intended content.

Participants' Suggestions for Assessing the Effectiveness of Sexual Orientation Training

Sexual orientation training is only minimally assessed by academies and the state commission overseeing the police academies (POST). One of the questions asked during interviews with students, instructors, program administrators and community members was for their suggestions for assessment strategies to determine training “effectiveness.” A wide-range of suggestions were made reflecting the difficulty in performing such assessment and the confusion arising from differences in program goals. For example, the academy director at Site #4 believed that their sexual orientation training met state CAT requirements and that it sensitized officers, but whether officers were prepared to “deal in a protected/professional manner with all the problems they may encounter in dealing with gays and lesbian culture—we have a lot of work to do.” For lack of better ideas, this director suggested the use of “so-called experts” to assess the effectiveness of their training program.

Job Performance: Many interviewees took a macro-perspective of training goals and suggested assessing the effectiveness of sexual orientation training through the use of beat officer performance reviews in gay and lesbian communities, feedback at community

meetings, interviews of closeted gay cops, etc. All of these suggestions were related to how officers perform on the job. A gay male city prosecutor believed that job performance is imperative since, “assessing in class does not get accurate information . . . [it is more important to know if] they use the information in the field.”

Longitudinal Study: Similar to the job performance macro-perspective, most training sites suggested a longitudinal study of students, administrators and the community. As one 23-year veteran male instructor stated,

training has occurred when performance has improved. In CAT, there is a difference between training and education. Training can be quantified to performance and behavior. Education, you don't know what they have learned. I think CAT should expect a certain level of performance that is the same as behavior.” To evaluate these changes, “we need feedback from the field to see how effective the training, but that never occurs. I don't know of any agency that communicates between training and FTO. I know it is a fact that FTO still tell probs that everything they learned in the academy is wrong and that now they will learn ‘real police work’.

Formal Assessment Strategies: Many respondents believed that some form of formal testing could help assess the effectiveness of sexual orientation training. Often this suggestion was combined with suggestions for assigning homework and student interviews to get “feed-back” on the training. All training sites had students complete some short evaluation form and/or completing the state required multiple-choice evaluation form at the end of the entire cultural awareness training program. Informally known as “evals,” a conflict over their appropriateness emerged from the interviews. For example, at Site #5, some respondents favored the current evaluation forms because “they are honest because they are anonymous.” Consequently this trainer believed the training was effective because “the evals are very positive. I don't recall a negative assessment,” and “the gay and lesbian training shines above the others, even though we are the most controversial.” However, the person who has conducted the most training at Site #5

revealed that there have been many negative evaluations with some recruits stating that “they believed the training is bogus and that more time should be spent on tactics.” Thus, a conflict seems to exist between instructors’ perceptions at the same site over the accuracy and appropriateness of formal assessment. Similarly, Site #6 instructors acknowledged that “evals” are not considered accurate because “many people fill them out haphazardly.” Overall, most respondents mentioned wanting to create some kind of test that could be used at the end of the training or in a pre-/post-test analysis.

Program Suggestions Made by Interviewees

Interviewees were asked for their suggestions toward improving sexual orientation training. Although many of the comments were directed at their own programs, there were general comments applicable to all.

Methods: A program consultant at Site #1 best summed up the comments made by most respondents. She suggested that a “multitude of teaching/learning approaches that are meaningful and credible to police [should be used] and recognize the fact that everyone learns differently.” To that end, the academy director at Site #4 suggested more problem solving exercises that emphasized actual behaviors more than “just sensitizing them to cultural difference.” Other respondents wanted more video tape presentations where officers shared their work related experiences. Role-playing activities and situational simulations were suggested by many respondents, yet one gay officer at Site #6 refined that position and suggested that “small groups and collectively attaining closure” would be important. Similarly, the academy director at Site #7 wanted more time allocated for interactives allowing students to discover their own positions, and more time for police scenarios. In terms of the instructional style, the Dean at Site #7 believed his academy’s sexual orientation training is the “most definitive . . . most formalized . . . [and] most extensive,” but that the instructor needs to take a more “even-handed approach,” and try

not to “convert” students since there “is very little [accurate] research” on homosexuality.

Time Allotment: Without exception, the sites that conducted approximately two hours of sexual orientation training felt that the time allocation was far too short. For example, instructors of Site #2 stated, “Two hours is inappropriate because not everyone can be engaged. The minimum is 4 hours.” Those sites conducting approximately 4 hours of training on sexual orientation believed this to be sufficient time. One instructor at Site #5 related, “I can pretty much cover it all in 3 1/2 hours and I start to run out of things to say.”

Class Size: At the training sites with class size approaching 100 students, instructors reported that “much smaller classes are needed—at least in half or one-third.” Even at the training sites with smaller classes, many instructors desired “limiting class size to 20,” and as one academy dean believed, “smaller classes help to facilitate question and answer activities and problem solving exercises.”

Materials: Many respondents mentioned that they wished they had more information and literature with handouts. Half of the interviewees further stated that they would like short videos demonstrating “appropriate” police conduct during points-of-contact with the gay and lesbian community. Only at Site #7, where a 75-page booklet was distributed to students, did the instructor and program administrator suggest a reduction in handout materials.

Trainers/Instructors: An openly gay sergeant at Site #5 expressed his belief about who makes the ideal instructor,

I think we do a really good job. Most important is having good open gay and lesbian officers. Having marginal, cry-baby officers gives a bad taste. NY Charlie Cocrahn was great and when he came out, everyone was impressed and accepted his homosexuality. Civilians can do a good job, but if they don't know how to work with officers they will fail. I work the

first 10 min. by showing that I am one of them. It is terrible to have an anti-police instructor. It is important to have non-stereotypical officers to teach. Don't use earring-out fags or bulldyke instructors. Many gay cops who have problems most often bring it on themselves. It becomes a game. As soon as cops smell blood, they come in for the kill.

Most of the interviewees felt that the instructors must be gay or lesbian and preferably active police officers. At the sites where only one instructor was used, respondents often suggested having more than one instructor and persons of different genders, race, and ethnicity representing "greater diversity other than just one white male."

Other suggestions: A number of respondents suggested a simple solution to improving the status for gays and lesbians in the police agency—more open gay and lesbian officers. Three sites suggested having students engage in service with gay and lesbian organizations. A common suggestion was to expand training to all personnel, not just recruits. A non-police gay male instructor took a more radical position regarding improvements of conditions for gay and lesbian officers:

The biggest stumbling block is religion. These are political businesses that seek to perpetuate themselves by heterosexual reproduction and they are the cause of war. I think a lot of police officers are conformist and subsequently religious. Even though it is a paramilitary command structure, if they hired people who thought for themselves, diversity issues would tend to fade because of the creativity of the workforce. The problem within the gay and lesbian community and the department is trying to be too 'PC'— that is how it got started. Taking the PC road may or may not work. Officers coming out is most important thing.

One area that is often overlooked is the issue of holding students responsible for learning the materials. Currently, no testing is conducted on sexual orientation content. A 27-year police veteran commented, "In all the CAT, is there any testing? People say you can't test, yet we should be tested. It does not have to be minority specific, but how they are discriminated against." Thus, testing on sexual orientation was suggested. The CAT program consultant at Site #6 took an organizational approach and suggested that

“diversity must become an organizational value and training is only one component. Diversity needs to be treated as more than just a program, but it must show up in performance evaluations, and day-to-day operation decisions.” Finally, a few individuals suggested more time to prepare lessons, more technology to make it more fun, a train-the-trainers program, having cops walking beats in the gay and lesbian community, training the entire city personnel, money for materials, money to pay for professional instructors, a professional staff member for sexual orientation training, and taking students to the community.

What Forces Contribute Most to the Acceptance of Gays and Lesbians?

During interview, subjects were asked to identify and prioritize the factors contributing to a gay supportive work environment. Four major factors were identified—sexual orientation training, administration support, open gay and lesbian officers, and community pressure. Respondents were almost unanimous in stating that community pressure was the least effective and only caused “resentment.” However, one community activists countered, “Without pressure from the gay and lesbian community, none of this would have ever happened. It may be distasteful, but it opens doors and changes policies.” Respondents were equally split over sexual orientation training, administration support and having open gay and lesbian officers as being the more important. Some respondents severely resisted prioritizing the factors and emphasized that all must act concurrently in order to affect a gay supportive work environment. As the program director at Site #7 stated, “each must occur concurrently and that it is personal experiences” that have the greatest impact.

“Appropriate” Police Behaviors in Gay and Lesbian Scenarios

One goal of this research was to reach a consensus on “appropriate” police behavior in gay and lesbian situations. Three scenarios were paraphrased from the behavioral assessment instrument designed for this research (describe in Chapter 3) and presented to interviewees for their suggestions. The three scenarios represent the most common interactions police personnel experience while on the job that involve gays and lesbians.

Scenario #1: After many years of working with a partner you enjoy and respect, he/she share with you that he/she is gay/lesbian. You are told this in the strictest confidence. What would you say and do?

Gay and lesbian police officers gave fairly similar responses. One lesbian officer/instructor at Site #1 summed it best when she said, “the officer should keep the information confidential, feel pride that he/she trusted them enough to share the deeply personal information, to accept graciously, and encourage the gay/lesbian officer to come out to other personnel.” A gay male officer at Site #5 emphasized that the officer should feel “flattered” that the person shared the information. The two heterosexual instructors at Site #2 felt that the partner should recognize that coming out is a sign of trust, and similarly suggested that the officer respond with a statement such as, “That’s interesting and I feel honored that you shared with me and I’ll keep the confidence.” They further suggested that the officer ask many questions to demonstrate his/her genuine interest. In contrast, most heterosexual officers and administrators responded differently. For example, the heterosexual officers at Site #6 uniformly responded with “So!” and the male heterosexual diversity administrator added, “Keep it confidential because it is not an illegal act.” The Dean at Site #7 likewise suggested that the officer “not do anything” and that “it changes nothing.” Finally, community members at Site #6 expressed a desire

for much more compassion and showing interest besides just keeping it confidential. One of the more unique answers to this question was from the CAT program consultant at Site #6. She believed that since the scenario stated the officers had been partners for a long time, then the receiving officer should “apologize for not creating an environment that was safe for them to share.”

Scenario #2: You arrive at a domestic argument between two women. Both are angry, yelling and look disheveled. What would you say and do?

Most all respondents agreed that the women should first be separated, calmed, interviewed without bias, determine if a crime was committed, and make the appropriate arrest or referral. The heterosexual instructor at Site #2 who is a doctoral candidate in educational psychology, suggested that the women be separated and seated since this will help them change their behavior, and have them write with pencil on paper so as to help them “refocus and to go from emotional state to cognitive state.” Many of the respondents felt it was important to establish the relationship between the women. For example, one administrator at Site #4 felt it was necessary to “find out if they are a couple for our safety because they are more likely to lash out at us if they are a couple.” Similarly, the gay male city prosecutor at Site #6 wanted officers to remember, “Caution, they will kill me as easily as in a heterosexual situation . . . we are not social workers, if something goes wrong, we become liable.” It was the lesbian respondents who emphasized that the relationship between the women should not be assumed and that the investigating officers need to ask the status of the relationship. Furthermore, one lesbian officer at Site #5 said that if they suspected the women were lesbian lovers and unwilling to open up about their relationship, she “would open up to them to make them feel at ease.”

Scenario #3: Two men have been badly beaten in a park by a gang of young adult males. This park is known for being a gay cruise spot. While interviewing the men at the scene, what would you say and do?

This scenario revealed much confusion about proper police procedures when dealing with a potential hate crime. Most respondents felt that medical assistance needed to be called first and that the victims needed to be handled with sensitivity. However, deciding whether to inquire about the victims' sexual orientation or the legal process involved in reporting a hate crime confused many police personnel. For example, the administrators at Site #4 and instructors at Site #2 believed that officers should ask the men if any negative statements were made. If the men were suspected of being gay, the investigating officers should continue pressing them about what words were said, and if need be, ask the men if they were gay explaining the need to file a potential hate crime report. Similarly, about half of the gay and lesbian instructors of Site #5 and Site #1 wanted to ask if the victims were gay or if they knew they were in a gay cruise spot. However, the other half of the gay and lesbian instructors and officers felt that it was not necessary to ask the victim's sexual orientation directly and instead "engineer this so they don't have to come out." Similarly, many respondents would ask the victims if they thought the attack was motivated by hate while other respondents said they would only ask if derogatory words were used during the attack since it is the responsibility of the police officer to file the hate crime report. Finally, most of the respondents would "assure them [victims] that the issue would be taken seriously." The gay male city prosecutor of Site #6 wanted the officers to "not blame the victim . . . [and not say] 'what the fuck are you doing down here'."

Section 2 – Instrumental Empirical Research

Instrumental empirical testing was used as an attempt to quantify changes in student attitudes, feelings, knowledge, identities and behaviors on sexual orientation resulting from cultural awareness training (CAT) focusing on sexual orientation information. Likewise, instrumental empirical testing of instructors, program administrators and community members was conducted to quantify the level of homophobia surrounding the training. Appendix E presents comprehensive tables of statistical data for each of the training sites. This section will discuss the major trends observed in the instrumental empirical data.

The empirical testing instrument is described in detail in Chapter 3. Succinctly, the *Police Empirical Research Questionnaire* (PERQ) was a one-hundred question survey comprised of 6 different sections. Part 1 used the *Modified Attitude Towards Homosexuality* (MATH) (Price, 1982; MacDonald, Jr., et al., 1973) to assess student attitudes and beliefs toward homosexuality. Part 2 used the *Index of Homophobia* (IHP) (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980) to assess student feelings toward homosexuals and homosexuality. Part 3 used the *Homosexuality Knowledge Index* (HKI) (Sears, 1991) to assess student knowledge about homosexuality. Part 4 was newly created for this research and used the Shively and De Cecco theories on gender-sexual-emotional identity to assess student understanding about changes in these identities (identified as *Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, Emotional Identity*, Stewart 1994). Part 5 used the *4-Item F Scale* (Lane, 1955) to assess student beliefs on authoritarianism. Part 6, was created for this research to assess student behavioral response to police situations where homosexuality had a component (*Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality*, Stewart 1994). Scoring of these tests indicated that homophobic responses gave a low score and gay-

affirming responses yielded a high score. These scores were normalized on a hundred point scale with 0 being completely homophobic and 100 being totally gay-affirming.

Part 4 of the PERQ caused much controversy (see discussion earlier in this chapter). Some agencies thought that asking questions about current and future gender-sexual-emotional identities was too personal. The intent of the questionnaire was to see if students shifted away from an exclusively heterosexual or exclusively homosexual identity, and toward a more complex identity as they received information about the social construction of sexuality. But because of the continuing controversy, only the question about current sexual orientation was kept and used to differentiate responses between heterosexual and homosexual respondents. Also, data collected from the *4-Item F Scale* was ultimately deemed not necessary for this study and was discarded.

There are many caveats concerning the research data:

1. Students: (a). The PERQ was distributed to students for pre-testing days, sometimes months in advance to training. Thus, students at each site had potential environmental influences and histories that are not equal. (b). After taking the PERQ the first time, students were asked to hold onto the test materials. After training, students were asked to turn the answer sheet over and take the PERQ a second time. This was done so tracking of individual responses was possible and the stronger Pooled T-test statistical method could be used for analysis. However, one agency in particular had four times as many students take only the pre-test and not the post-test. For some reason, student participation varied significantly. (c). Not all students participated. In some academies, 85% of students participated in pre-/post-testing, while in others it was only 3%. Thus, participation in testing was very self-selective. Since virtually no students volunteered to be interviewed, there

are significant questions about the factors determining student participation. (d) Are the responses honest? There are many indicators that some students were not honest in their responses. First, the training was highly controversial and many students were disrespectful of the instructor, researcher and/or the material. Second, since students held onto the materials for a number of days, it is possible that they could have changed answers. Third, at two academies where the post-test was completed in class, a few students were observed copying their answers from the front side of the answer sheet (pre-test) on to the back side of the answer sheet (post-test). A review of data revealed a small number of students whose pre- and post-tests were identical. This is virtually impossible, but the responses were not discarded from the data analysis. Fourth, phone calls from panic stricken gay and lesbian students indicated that they would not participate in the questionnaires out of fear of being identified by their fellow students.

2. Police Personnel and Community Members: These persons were vested in cultural awareness training and not representative of their communities. Again, only half of the persons asked to complete the PERQ did so. Thus, the responses from these persons are highly selective.

Students Attending Sexual Orientation Training Responses

Table 4.2 presents the median pre-/post-test scores for heterosexual students who attended sexual orientation training. The only test that reported statistically significant changes in pre-/post-scores was Part 2—Feelings about Homosexuals (*IHP*). Site #1 and Site #9 saw student feelings toward gays and lesbians become more positive after training, whereas two other sites—Site #2 and Site #6—reported student feelings becoming more negative after training. Are there educational commonalities to explain

these trends? Site #1 training used a video and panel made up of gay and lesbian police personnel from the agency. Site #9 training was a highly structured workshop with many individual and group activities taught by a gay academic/activist. Site #2 training was a teacher-led inquiry into student feelings and taught by a heterosexual police educator with clear religious overtones. Site #6 training consisted primarily of a panel of civilian gays and lesbians with some direct instruction on appropriate police behaviors. Thus, the reasons associated with the measured changes in feelings toward gays and lesbians seemed unclear and possibly not related to educational methodology.

In Appendix E, estimates based on qualitative and empirical evidence are made about the levels of homophobia expressed at each training site. The term “homophobia” is used broadly and incorporates more than just the fear of being in close proximity to homosexuals, but is used to incorporate all anti-gay sentiments, beliefs and behaviors. Site #4 was estimated to have the lowest levels of homophobia, followed by Site #1. The remaining five sites—Site #2, Site #3, Site #6, Site #7, and Site #9—seemed similar in their high levels of homophobia. Heterosexual students from the academy with the least homophobic environments (Site #4) also scored much higher (less homophobic) on virtually all tests. Heterosexual students from the agency with the second least homophobic environment (Site #1) scored approximately second highest (less homophobic) on most tests. Students at the five academies with the highest levels of homophobia (Site #2, Site #3, Site #6, Site #7, and Site #9) scored similar low scores (high homophobia). Although formal correlation analysis was not conducted between agencies, it appears that heterosexual students in gay friendly environments reflect those values by scoring lower levels of homophobia (high scores). Conversely, heterosexual students in anti-gay environments, scored much higher levels of homophobia (low score).

Table 4.2

**Pre- and Post-Test Mean PERQ Scores of
Heterosexual Students Attending Sexual Orientation Training**

	Site #1 service	Site #2 recruits	Site #3 recruits	Site #4 recruits	Site #5 recruits	Site #6 recruits	Site #7 recruits	Site #9 recruits
student type	17	43	39	30	45	105	94	65
class count	13	34	28	6	—	3	28	55
# respondents								
Part 1 — Attitudes	65.9/ 68.7	56.4/ 52.8	51.2/ 52.6	78.0	—	67.3/ 72.3	56.3/ 54.9	58.7/ 56.6
Part 2 — Feelings	51.2/ 57.6* ¹	42.4/ 37.2* ²	36.7/ 35.9	60.6	—	58.8/ 56.7* ³	37.2 35.7	41.6/ 43.9* ⁴
Part 3 — Knowledge	63.5/ 67.8	66.5/ 61.2	67.2/ 67.9	79.2	—	75.0/ 77.1	67.4/ 65.4	65.0/ 63.1
Part 6 — Scenarios	78.7/ 78.1	75.1/ 75.1	78.0/ 77.5	76.9	—	84.6/ 79.5	76.9/ 80.2	74.0/ 71.2

Notes: The first number is the pre-test score and the second number is the post-test score with a slash separating them. Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing. Site #4 students took the PERQ only once, whereas the other sites completed both pre- and post-tests. Site #5 students were not allowed to take the PERQ.

*The differences between pre- and post-test scores were not statistically significant except those marked with an asterisk. (1) Feelings became more positive after training, with Pooled $\bar{x}=6.44$, $sd=5.95$, $t=3.91$, $df=12$, 2-tail sig=.002. (2) Feelings became more negative after training, with Pooled $\bar{x}=-5.15$, $sd=11.23$, $t=-2.67$, $df=33$, 2-tail sig=.012. (3) Caution, only 3 respondents in this pool. Feelings became more negative after training, with Pooled $\bar{x}=-2.08$, $sd=.72$, $t=-5.00$, $df=2$, 2-tail sig=.038. (4) Feelings became more positive after training, with Pooled $\bar{x}=2.26$, $sd=8.34$, $t=2.01$, $df=54$, 2-tail sig=.049.

In reviewing the raw data, it was immediately evident that gay and lesbian people had significantly different scores on the various tests. These few respondents' scores were removed from the class total and are tabulated in Table 4.3. These are very few responses and the reader is cautioned about making generalizations about homosexuals as a group. What is noticed is that the scores for homosexual students attending sexual orientation training were much less homophobic than the average scores for heterosexual students. Also, the environment in which training took place seems to influence homosexual student responses. In gay-affirming environments (Site #4), gay and lesbian students exhibit less homophobia than when in gay-negative environments (Site #9).

**Table 4.3
Pre- and Post-Test PERQ Scores of**

Homosexual Students Attending Sexual Orientation Training

	Site #1 service	Site #2 recruits	Site #3 recruits	Site #4 recruits	Site #5 recruits	Site #6 recruits	Site #7 recruits	Site #9 recruits
student type	17	43	39	30	45	105	94	65
class count	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	2
# respondents								(mean)
Part 1— Attitudes	86.6/ 89.3	—	—	92.0	—	—	—	64.3/ 61.6
Part 2— Feelings	90.0/ 83.8	—	—	93.8	—	—	—	48.8/ 48.8
Part 3— Knowledge	75.0/ 93.8	—	—	81.3	—	—	—	71.9/ 71.9
Part 6— Scenarios	84.6/ 84.6	—	—	69.2	—	—	—	92.3/ 88.4

Notes: The first number is the pre-test score and the second number is the post-test score with a slash separating them. Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing. Site #4 students took the PERQ only once, whereas the other sites completed both pre- and post-tests. Site #5 students were not allowed to take the PERQ.

Responses by Police Personnel and Community Member Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training

Training does not occur within a vacuum. The community of persons surrounding the training has a direct impact on the acceptance of the training and its overall effectiveness. Besides interviewing police personnel and gay and lesbian community members, all were asked to participate in instrumental empirical research by completing the PERQ. Approximately half of those given the PERQ returned completed forms. Again, the raw data suggested that the responses by heterosexuals were different than the responses by homosexuals. Thus, the data was divided according to those two sexual orientations.

Table 4.4 presents the PERQ scores of heterosexual police officers (primarily program administrators). Results are mixed with police administrators possibly being less homophobic than their recruit classes. Interestingly, the heterosexual police officer who

has a gay off-spring responded with some of the highest gay-affirming scores of the study.

Table 4.4
PERQ Scores of
Heterosexual Police Officers and Administrators
Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training

	Site #1 2 (mean)	Site #2 —	Site #3 —	Site #4 1	Site #5 1*	Site #6 2 (mean)	Site #7 —	Site #9 —
# respondents								
Part 1— Attitudes	80.8	—	—	89.3	94.6	46.0	—	—
Part 2— Feelings	66.9	—	—	66.3	98.8	28.8	—	—
Part 3— Knowledge	84.4	—	—	81.3	93.8	62.5	—	—
Part 6— Scenarios	80.8	—	—	76.9	92.3	80.8	—	—

Notes: Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing.

* Heterosexual police officer who is a co-instructor and has a gay off-spring

As expected, gay and lesbian police officers who are instructors of sexual orientation training answered with near-perfect gay-affirming scores (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5
PERQ Scores of
Homosexual Police Officers
Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training

	Site #1 4* (mean)	Site #2 —	Site #3 —	Site #4 —	Site #5 2* (mean)	Site #6 2* (mean)	Site #7 —	Site #9 —
# respondents	92.4	—	—	—	95.5	92.4	—	—
Part 1— Attitudes	90.6	—	—	—	92.5	90.0	—	—
Part 2— Feelings	89.1	—	—	—	100	93.8	—	—
Part 3— Knowledge	90.4	—	—	—	84.6	96.2	—	—
Part 6— Scenarios								

Notes: Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing.

* Current or previous instructors of sexual orientation training.

So few heterosexual community members who are involved with sexual orientation training participated in the research. As seen in Table 4.6, data is mixed and no trends are discernible.

Table 4.6
PERQ Scores of
Heterosexual Community Members
Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training

	Site #1 2*1 (mean)	Site #2 —	Site #3 —	Site #4 —	Site #5 —	Site #6 1*2	Site #7 —	Site #9 —
# respondents	75.5	—	—	—	—	89.3	—	—
Part 1— Attitudes	68.8	—	—	—	—	91.3	—	—
Part 2— Feelings	75.0	—	—	—	—	93.8	—	—
Part 3— Knowledge	84.6	—	—	—	—	76.9	—	—
Part 6— Scenarios								

Notes: Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing.

* (1) Have gay or lesbian children, (2) Cultural awareness training program developer.

Table 4.7 presents the PERQ data for homosexual community members who had an interest in sexual orientation training. As expected, the homosexual sexual orientation trainers obtained near-perfect scores on the PERQ. Even though these respondents were not police officers, they obtained similar near-perfect scores on Part 6— Police Scenarios.

Table 4.7
PERQ Scores of
Homosexual Community Members
Not Attending Sexual Orientation Training

	Site #1 3 (mean)	Site #2 —	Site #3 —	Site #4 —	Site #5 1* 100	Site #6 4* (mean)	Site #7 —	Site #9 —
# respondents	3 (mean)	—	—	—	1*	4* (mean)	—	—
Part 1— Attitudes	89.3	—	—	—	90.2	95.3	—	—
Part 2— Feelings	92.5	—	—	—	96.3	97.5	—	—
Part 3— Knowledge	77.1	—	—	—	100	92.2	—	—
Part 6— Scenarios	82.1	—	—	—	100	98.1	—	—

Notes: Scoring is on the scale; 0 = gay-negative, and 100 = gay-positive. Site #8 did not participate in any instrumental empirical testing.

* Sexual orientation trainers.

Conclusions Concerning Instrumental Empirical Research

Ultimately, this research is interested in changes in student knowledge, feelings, attitudes and behaviors attributable to sexual orientation training. This section looked at the instrumental empirical data as related to training effectiveness. The instrumental empirical data was also compared with the qualitative research to find relations between the training environment and training effectiveness.

Only *Part 2— Feelings about Homosexuals* (based on the Index of Homophobia) of the PERQ showed statistical significance between pre- and post-training for some of the training sites. In some cases, students' feelings about homosexuals became more

positive while in other cases the feelings became more negative. Attributing these changes to training methodology is unclear. Measures of changes in students' attitudes and knowledge showed no statistical difference between pre- and post-test. Finally, the *Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality*, as currently constructed, proved not to be discriminating and should not be used by other researchers until it is modified. Regardless of how homophobic a response people made on the other portions of the PERQ, virtually everyone scored similarly.

Although administrators seemed less homophobic than their recruits, the levels of homophobia measured in police administrators and recruits at their site seem related. For example, if the overall agency was gay-affirming then both the administrators and their recruits would score more gay-positive than in a gay-negative environment and vice versa. This suggests that recruits reflect their academy administrators and that the administrators select students who reflect their own values.

Finally, homosexual students and instructors, and heterosexuals with gay and/or lesbian children report overall greater acceptance of gays and lesbians than heterosexuals.

Section 3 — Homophobia Level Estimate

Considering the impact an organization's culture can have on the function of its employees and the effectiveness of training programs, it is important to ascertain the overall level of homophobia within an organization. Combining the data obtained through interviews, training observations and document review, along with instrumental empirical measures, this section attempts to determine a broad estimate on the level of homophobia within the participating police academies and agencies. The qualitative data has been scaled as follows: Level 1— virtually no homophobia; Level 2— low levels of homophobia, lesbians somewhat accepted, gay males not accepted; Level 3— moderate levels of homophobia, lesbians tolerated, dangerous for gay males; and, Level 4—high levels of homophobia, dangerous for all non-heterosexuals. For the instrumental data, Hudson & Ricketts (1980) (see Chapter 3) developed a scale for their IHP instrument. According to their scale as applied to the instruments used for this research, levels of homophobia based on instrumental research include: Level 1 (scores 76% to 100%)— high non-homophobia; Level 2 (scores 51% to 75%)—low non-homophobia; Level 3 (scores 26% to 50%)—low homophobia; and, Level 4 (scores 0% to 25%)—high homophobia. Thus, for both qualitative and instrumental data, levels of homophobia are estimated in the same direction with Level 1 being the most gay-positive and Level 4 being the most homophobic. For this discussion, the following nomenclature will be used: Level 1— virtually no homophobia, Level 2—low homophobia, Level 3—moderate homophobia, and Level 4—high homophobia.

Site #1: Interviews with students and police personnel indicated that gays and lesbians are conditionally accepted by the agency. Lesbians were fairly accepted while gay men are not—suggesting a homophobia Level 2. With 76% of the class participating in

the instrumental research, three of the tests indicated low levels of homophobia (Level 1-2). This was a very small class and caution must be used in reaching conclusions based on just 13 responses. Conclusion: The agency class exhibited low levels of homophobia (Level 1-2).

Site #2: Class observations and student written responses indicated a very high level of homophobia within the academy and recruits (Level 4). Thirty-four students (approximately 79%) participated in the instrumental research which indicated moderate levels of homophobia (Level 2-3). In contrast with the high level of homophobia revealed in feelings about gays and lesbians, students were able to give less negative response to police scenarios. Conclusion: The academy class exhibited high levels of homophobia (Level 3-4).

Site #3: The instructor report and student written responses indicate a very high level of homophobia within the academy (Level 4). Twenty-eight students (approximately 72%) participated in the instrumental research which indicated moderate levels of homophobia (Level 2-3). Only on the police scenarios did students respond at a lower level of homophobia. Conclusions: The academy class exhibited high levels of homophobia (Level 3-4).

Site #4: Very few students or police personnel participated in the research. Although the class was observed to hold overwhelming anti-gay sentiments (Level 3), the written comments were much less homophobic (Level 1). The instrumental data is inconclusive since only 6 out of 30 students (20%) participated and no pre-test was given. However, the instrumental data does suggest that respondents fall somewhere between no to low levels of homophobia (Levels 1-2). Conclusion: The agency class seems conditionally accepting of gays and lesbians (Level 2).

Site #5: Observations of the academy class and their written statements indicate a moderately high level of homophobia (Level 3). Unfortunately, no instrumental testing of students was allowed. Instrumental testing did occur with people who had vested interest in the course and who were very knowledgeable. Conclusion: The academy class seemed moderately homophobic (Level 3).

Site #6: Class observations and student written responses were all very homophobic (Levels 3-4). Similarly, interviews with police personnel painted the agency very homophobic (Levels 3-4). Unfortunately, only 3 out of 105 recruits participated in the pre- and post- instrumental testing and results should not be considered representative of the whole. Conclusion: The agency and academy displayed moderate levels of homophobia (Level 3).

Site #7: Class observation, student interviews and student written comments were extremely homophobic (Level 4). Twenty-eight out of 94 students (approximately 30%) participated in instrumental testing which suggested moderate levels of homophobia (Level 2-3). Conclusion: The academy class was moderately homophobic (Level 3-4).

Site #8: Classroom observation and student written comments were moderately homophobic (Level 2-3). No instrumental testing was conducted.

Site 9: Classroom observations and student written responses indicated a moderate level of homophobia in the recruit class (Level 3). Fifty-five out of 65 students (approximately 85%) participated in instrumental testing. The Part 2— Feelings towards gays and lesbians rated a moderate level of homophobia (Level 3), while all other measures were low (Level 2). Conclusion: The academy class seemed moderately homophobic (Level 3).

A few general observations can be made from this data. First, the instrumental data always rated the same or slightly less homophobic than the qualitative estimates. This

could be the result from scales not being matched, my being more receptive in identifying homophobia in qualitative estimates, the miss-match of populations due to the voluntary aspect for participation (e.g., no overtly homophobic person volunteered for interview), and/or respondents skewed their responses for the instrumental assessments (Did respondents give less homophobic answers on instrumental testing because they thought they should?). Second, there seems to be a positive relationship between qualitative and instrumental assessment. In sites where the qualitative assessments were low in homophobia, the instrumental assessments were also low. In sites where the qualitative assessments indicated high homophobia, the instrumental assessments were also high. Finally, of the assessment instruments, the IHP always yielded more negative scores than the other assessment instruments, and seemed to better reflect the qualitative data at estimating the level of homophobia within the police academy or agency. Also, the IHP is the only assessment instrument to record a statistically significant change in pre-/post-test scores. Thus, the IHP may be the more accurate instrument for assessing levels of homophobia.

CHAPTER 5 — SUMMARIES, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summaries

Nine different sexual orientation trainings were observed and data collected. Two of the training sites were basic academies associated with large metropolitan police departments. Four of the training sites were basic academies connected to California Community Colleges and served local police agencies. Police recruits made up the student population at all but one of the observed basic academy classes—the other class being an in-service for police administrators. One training site was an In-Service program for all personnel within a small police department.

Training observations were analyzed using psycholinguistic/humanistic education theory (see Appendix D). Interviews with students, instructors, program administrators, and gay and lesbian community activists used the Overt-Institutional-Societal model of homophobia to assess the culture in which sexual orientation training was conducted. Interviews were also used to gather data on appropriate police behaviors in situations that had gay and/or lesbian components. Empirical testing was conducted on students to assess changes in attitudes, feelings, knowledge, identities, and behaviors concerning homosexuality. The same empirical testing was conducted with some of the other interviewees. Out of 438 students who were observed, 167 completed pre-/post-testing and 6 participated in interviews. Twenty-two instructors/panel members, 10 program administrators, and 18 community members were also interviewed. Approximately half of the interviewees completed the instrumental tests.

In general, there were three teaching approaches observed for sexual orientation training. One approach was to use a panel of gays and lesbians to share their life stories

and allow course content to emerge from these stories (herewith referred to as the *Panel Method*). Two sites used this approach:

1. Site #6 used a panel consisting of civilian members (4 gays and lesbians) obtained through the local gay and lesbian community services center. Between panel members sharing stories and specific information on human sexuality and police behaviors being presented, almost 2/3 of class time was used for lecture and limited questions and answers activity. No individual or small group activities were used. Educational analysis of this site revealed this was the least effective training of all those observed because the instructors were not appropriate role models, length of training was too short (less than 2 hours), class size was too large (105 students), there were no self-awareness activities, no discussion of gay and lesbian stigmatization, and too little specific police application. Instructors presented an essentialist sexual orientation perspective. Class observations and student written responses were all moderately homophobic. Unfortunately, only 3% of recruits participated in the pre- and post-instrumental testing and results could not be considered representative of the whole. (Perhaps the low rate of participation is another indicator of the academy's moderate level of homophobia?) Interviews with police personnel also painted the agency moderately homophobic. Only a few gay and lesbian police officers were open in the agency, there were no open staff members at the academy, and the academy has had only one or two open recruits in the past few years. The academy and agency have strong anti-discrimination statements, but complaints based on sexual orientation discrimination have recently been filed. Administrators showed fear when talking about homosexuality and took a deficit perspective on

homosexuality. Support for sexual orientation training was tentative and poor. Overall, the training was ineffective and sexual orientation training appears to be marginally supported as evidenced by the moderate levels of homophobia displayed by students and administrative personnel.

2. A panel of police personnel (5 gay and lesbian officers) was used at Site #1. Here, the instructors, length of training (almost 2 1/2 hours) and class size (17) were good. Lecture, and limited questions and answers activity represented 100% of training time. No individual or small group activities were used. Showing the video, “Growing Up Gay” assisted in demonstrating homophobia and the effect it has on gays and lesbians. However, allowing content to emerge primarily from panel members sharing stories, reduced training effectiveness so much that this site rated in the lower half of observed training methodologies. Instructors presented an essentialist sexual orientation perspective. With 76% of the class participating in the instrumental research, three of the tests indicated moderately low levels of homophobia. Only *Part 2— Feelings* toward gays and lesbian instrumental test was statistically significant and showed a positive (less homophobic) change of approximately 10%. Caution: this was a very small class and these conclusions are based on just 13 responses. Administration makes strong statements supporting sexual orientation training, but does not take a proactive approach to including gays and lesbians in the agency and took a deficit perspective on homosexuality. Interviews with students and police personnel indicated that gays and lesbians are conditionally accepted by the agency. Lesbians were fairly accepted while gay men were not. Overall, the agency’s panel members were excellent, training methodologies and content were lacking,

the agency appears to conditionally support sexual orientation training, and instrumental testing was unrevealing for most measures except that feelings toward gays and lesbians improved slightly.

A second approach was to open discussion immediately from the beginning of class and solicit concerns students had about homosexuals and homosexuality (herewith referred to as the *Open Dialogue Method*). Topics emerged from the class-wide discussions and content came from the instructor or subject matter expert.

1. Only one instructor used this method at Sites #2 and #3. The instructor was a respected heterosexual officer/educator of limited expertise on homosexuality and subsequently was a good, but not excellent choice, for training instructor. The length of training (almost 2 1/2 hours) and class size (43 students) also were not ideal. Lecture, and questions and answers activity consumed 100% of training time. No individual or small group activities were used. By allowing content to emerge from student concerns, combined with lack of expertise on the content, the training at this site was rated next to last in educational effectiveness. Because the instructor took time out of class to administer instrumental testing, 72 to 79% of students participated which revealed appalling high levels of homophobia in the classes. Student comments and written responses about gays and lesbians were vicious. Only at one site was empirical testing significant on *Part 2—Feelings* toward gays and lesbians which reflected students becoming more anti-gay (by almost 14%) at the conclusion of training. There were no open gay or lesbian recruits or staff members at the academy. The instructors took a deficit perspective regarding homosexuality. Overall, the training conditions were not good, the instructor was a fair but not an

excellent choice, content failed to be addressed from the *Open Dialogue Method*, feelings toward gays and lesbians worsened, empirical testing was mostly unrevealing and the exceedingly high levels of homophobia and deficit perspective impacted the agency's support of sexual orientation training.

A third approach was much more structured and followed closely to established curriculum (herewith referred to as the *Structured Method*). The *Structured Method* included: lecture, student activities, and specific content delivery. Three different instructors used this method at five different training sites.

1. At Site #5, the team of instructors (2 lesbians, 1 gay male, 1 heterosexual male), length of training (almost 3 1/2 hours) and class size (45 students) were ideal. The team demonstrated expert knowledge, classroom management skills, and was by far, the best training team observed. Content followed a set curriculum with lecture and question and answer activities representing 60% of class time. No individual or small group activities were used. The biggest failings of the training were the lack of student involvement in solving problems or increasing their self-awareness about gays and lesbians. In terms of instructional methodologies, this training site was ranked in the middle of observed trainings. Instructors presented an essentialist sexual orientation perspective. Unfortunately, no empirical testing of students was allowed but written statements by students indicated a moderate level of homophobia in the academy and agency. Considering the current lawsuits against the agency over sexual orientation discrimination, the low number of open gay or lesbian officers, no open staff members, and the agency administrators' reluctance to

participate in the research, the level of homophobia in the agency could be deemed moderate to high and conditionally supportive of sexual orientation training. Overall, instructors were ideal, instructional methodologies were good but could have been more inclusive of students, and the agency's culture seemed moderately homophobic which impacted the effectiveness of sexual orientation training.

2. At Site #4, the instructor (1 lesbian) was an excellent role model and clearly skilled at classroom processes. Class size was fair (30 students) and length of training was excellent with four hours devoted to sexual orientation training. A full 82% of class time was used for video, lecture and question and answer activities. No individual or small group activities were used. Much material was covered concerning local politics and police response to protest demonstrations. Students gained excellent self-awareness on their feelings about homosexuals through a number of activities. The failings of the training revolved around students receiving little specific information on human sexuality, no discussion of stigmatization, nor appropriate police behaviors in gay and lesbian situations. The instructor presented an essentialist sexual orientation perspective. Students were also not involved in solving problems which resulted in this training ranking in the middle of observed instructional methodologies. Instrumental data collection was limited. Very few students or police personnel participated in the research. Although the class was observed to hold overwhelming anti-gay sentiments, the written comments were much less homophobic. The instrumental data was inconclusive about training effectiveness since less than one-fourth (20%) of the class participated and no pre-test was given. Administration gave

strong support for sexual orientation training and the police culture was virtually non-homophobic—the best seen at any academy. Overall, training rated in the middle of effectiveness for observed trainings, the agency seemed accepting of gays and lesbians, the recruit class seemed more negative than the agency, and instrumental data on training effectiveness was incomplete and non-revealing.

3. I taught three different sexual orientation trainings at one site (referred to as Sites #7, #8, #9). Each time the course was taught, various elements of the content and methodologies were varied. Although I was almost the worst candidate for instructing in law enforcement environments, by modifying my personal presentation I was able to improve my acceptance by students. The length of training was almost four hours and ideal, but class sizes were horrendous (up to 94 students) with poor classroom conditions. Yet, by evolving the curriculum to come in line with educational theory, the instructional methodologies and content became very effective rating in the top of the observed sites. I used many individual and small group activities (up to 29% of class time) to involve students in self-awareness, overcoming stereotypes, and solving problems, and distributed an 85-page booklet of information. The biggest drawback of the training was the lack of lesbian and gay police officers to share their stories and the inappropriateness of the instructor. The two recruit classes were moderate to highly homophobic as expressed in interview, written comments, instrumental testing and classroom behavior. The in-service class of police administrators was not as homophobic. The last class (the one that complied closest to education theory), recorded a statistically significant improvement (approximately 5%) in student feelings toward

gays and lesbians. Other instrumental measures were unrevealing about training effectiveness. Academy administrators supported sexual orientation training and fought political battles to hire the instructor, but the administration viewed homosexuality as a deficit and was unaware of any open gay or lesbian personnel. Overall, I was able to overcome many of my role-model deficits through manipulation of my presence. Instruction methodologies conformed closer to education theory with each subsequent class, and therefore became more effective. The academy culture was very homophobic and recruits reflected that homophobia.

Research Questions Reviewed

In Chapter 1, five research questions were presented. This section will address each one and present the research findings.

Issue #1 Training and Program Goals: Training on sexual orientation is occurring because gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transsexuals and transvestites are fighting to overcome their stigmatization and oppression caused by a heterosexist and homophobic society. Educational approaches to overcoming stigmatization require instructional goals stated in both behavioral and attitudinal domains and designed to maximize the interaction of gay-positive attitudes and behaviors within a meaningful exchange. This means that organizational goals need to support anti-discrimination policies based on sexual orientation, making the work environment safe and supportive for all employees, and improving relations with all customers. Training goals support the organizational goals through: (1) informing students about the organizations' anti-discrimination policies, (2) facilitating self-awareness so students can evaluate their compliance to the organizations' goals, (3) providing accurate information on homosexuality and society's stigmatization of

gays and lesbians to assist students in replacing negative feelings, attitudes and behaviors with gay-affirming feelings, attitudes and behaviors, and (4) engaging students in developing strategies for overcoming homophobic and heterosexist behaviors found in the work place.

Interviews with instructors, program administrators, students, and gay and lesbian civilians revealed that training and programs goals were often vague. When comparing interviewee responses with the four training goals presented in the previous paragraph, most respondents wanted sexual orientation training to “sensitize,” obtain greater “acceptance,” “present gays and lesbians in a more positive light,” show that gays and lesbians are “normal, not sick, are not pedophiles, do not recruit,” eliminate “myths and stereotypes,” and show that sexual orientation is “not a choice.” All these goals fall within the realm of goal #3 (providing accurate information to dispel myths and change attitudes). Only three interviewees mentioned “equal treatment” (goal #1), two mentioned “self-awareness” (goal #2), and two mentioned that employee safety (goal #4) were appropriate goals. Thus, most police personnel and training instructors are unclear about how training goals reflect back to the anti-discrimination policies of the police agency or academy, and fail to tie homophobia and heterosexism with racism, sexism and stigmatization.

Training observations confirmed the confusion most training sites had about sexual orientation goals. Only the *Structured Methods* attempted to cover all four training goals. Even then, most of the *Structured Methods* emphasized self-awareness or accurate information. One training site engaged students in solving problems and developing strategies. Educational analysis showed that trainings which attempted to address all four training goals were more effective.

Without exception, every training instructor announced to the class that they were not there to “change your values or beliefs” but instead, to give information that will

“make you better professionals.” The training attempts to change behaviors and attitudes regardless of the instructor’s pronouncements. In Chapter 2 it was shown that both behaviors and attitudes reinforce and change concurrently, that it is impossible to change only one, and that this is what is sought in sexual orientation training. However, it is necessary to recognize that every instructor felt the need to make such pronouncements to reduce student resistance to participating in training.

Issue #2 Training Assessments: Assessing levels of homophobia and gay attacks in the community does not give a direct measure of training effectiveness since many other factors are influential. Similarly, assessing levels of homophobia in police agencies are not directly related to training effectiveness. Instrumental assessment of training effectiveness (pre- and post-testing of student attitudes, feelings, knowledge and behaviors about homosexuals and homosexuality) proved to be mostly unrevealing (see Appendix E). The failure to detect change may have resulted from student lying, a selective subpopulation of students who did participate, and/or many other factors. Only the *Index of Homophobia* (feeling toward homosexuals) showed statistical significance for a number of training sites. The primary methodology used to assess training effectiveness was classroom observations using education theory.

One assessment instrument asked students what they remembered about the training. If the speaker was dynamic, that is what they remembered. If a particular video or activity was engaging— whether positively or negatively— that is what they remembered. Asking this kind of question was unrevealing about the effectiveness of program subtleties. Interestingly, from 10 to 15% of students had a compelling need to make negative comments about homosexuality, even though this question did not request such comments.

“Evals,” as students refer to the evaluation forms they often complete after attending cultural awareness trainings, provide an assessment on how well the student

liked the class and instructor, but is not an assessment of training effectiveness. It is important for students to respect and enjoy the instructor and class. Negative evaluations should not automatically conclude that training was ineffective, but rather a different balance needed to be met in finding appropriate instructors and instructional methodologies.

Issue #3 Influence of Police Culture on Training Effectiveness: The police culture toward gays and lesbians had a significant influence. From the very beginning when recruits were selected to attend the academy, the attitudes and feelings police administrators held about homosexuality were reflected in the attitudes and feelings held by recruits. Instrumental testing revealed that if an overall agency was gay-affirming then both administrators and their recruits would score more gay-positive than in a gay-negative environment and vice versa. This suggests that recruits reflect their academy administrators and administrators select students who reflect their own values.

Only one training site could have been classified as virtually non-homophobic. They had many open gay and lesbian officers, and open gay and lesbian administrators. Training devoted a large chunk of the entire cultural awareness program to sexual orientation and made anti-discrimination an important value within the police organization. All other training sites measured moderate to high levels of homophobia. At these homophobic sites, gay male officers were never accepted and it was believed “dangerous” for them to come out. Lesbian officers, if tolerated, were accepted reluctantly. Furthermore, program administrators at these homophobic sites felt that sexual orientation training was important but held deficit positions about homosexuality. Sexual orientation training was presented as a separate module and perceived to be unrelated to police work. Even if the training was excellent, the homophobic police culture prevented gay-affirming values to permeate the organization.

Bringing in an outside panel of gay and lesbian community activists was the least effective training. This is not surprising since it reflects the academies' non-commitment to overcoming homophobia. It is simple to go out and get gays and lesbians to come talk to the academy, but it is much harder to develop gay and lesbian officers capable of conducting sexual orientation training. If a law enforcement organization is vested in overcoming homophobia, it must make the effort to provide an environment safe enough for officers to come out, and also to participate in sexual orientation training.

Issue #4 Training Parameters: Administration's support for sexual orientation training has the most influence. Their beliefs and feelings set the tone for establishing an environment that is free of heterosexism and homophobia. Administrators need to be honest and recognize if they hold deficit beliefs about homosexuality. There is much more to creating a safe work environment than simply stating that discrimination will not be tolerated. Instead, administrators need to embrace and value people of differing sexual orientations and act as role-models of acceptance for all employees. Instructional effectiveness based on psycholinguistic/humanistic perspective requires:

1. Instructors to be appropriate role-models for students (necessitating different instruction teams for different groups of students), subject matter experts, skilled at group instruction, and respected law enforcement professionals.
2. Contents need to reflect training goals and the reality of law enforcement work—specifically:
 - a. Students need to become aware of their own attitudes, feelings and behaviors toward homosexuality. Self-Awareness Activities used by some of the training sites were excellent. Other sites used Stereotype activities and claimed these achieved self-awareness but did not. Stereotype activities demonstrated the use of language to

marginalize subpopulations. Every training needs to include some kind of self-awareness activity.

- b. Students need to become aware of their fellow workers and societal attitudes, feelings and behaviors toward homosexuality, and how these are used to stigmatize and oppress gays and lesbians (show the link between homophobia, racism, sexism and stigmatization). However, the skilled instructor will be aware of the over-all level of homophobia in the class and not allow a wave of anti-gay sentiments veer the class toward reinforcing homophobia. Instead, the skilled instructor will control self-awareness activities to promote pro-gay attitudes and feelings. Also, students often believe that gays are seeking “special rights” through their “gay agenda,” which obfuscates the terrible legal discrimination gays and lesbians face on a daily basis. This issue must be addressed.
- c. Accurate information about human sexuality to dispel myths and stereotypes are needed to overcome homophobia. Most instructors presented an essentialist perspective that is a simple answer which limits discussion and removes sexual choices from moral consideration. However this is incomplete and inaccurate.
- d. Students need to hear about the personal lives of gay and lesbian law enforcement personnel, particularly as it relates to their acceptance of being homosexual in a heterosexist society, and their desires to be in law enforcement. Having a greater diversity of gay and lesbian instructors was the number one suggestion students made for improving sexual orientation training.

- e. Detailed information needs to be presented about police interactions with gays and lesbians (points-of-contact). (Some specific behaviors have been culled from interviews and are discussed in Issue #6 Police Behaviors.)
- f. Students need to be involved in developing strategies for overcoming homophobia.

Students were asked to submit questions about sexual orientation. An overwhelming majority wanted more science-based information on sexuality and particularly what “causes” homosexuality. Questions were also asked on the following: (1) the relationship between homosexuality and AIDS, (2) personal feelings of the instructor concerning their realization about being homosexual and their relationship with their families, and (3) many political questions about what the gay community wants. Even though students were asked to submit questions, instead a large segment of the class (from 14% to 28%) ignored the direction and instead negative statements against gays and lesbians.

- 3. Instruction methodologies must recognize the social aspects of learning and lean toward a blend of individual and small group activities, instructor led activities, class-wide discussions and questions and answer activities, and direct lecture. The greater the amount of lecture or passive video watching, the less effective the training. Students must become involved and at a personal level.
- 4. Social interactions aimed at self-awareness and personal growth requires time. The minimum time acceptable for effective sexual orientation training is 4 hours. All attempts at shorter instructional sessions were much less effective.

5. Many interviewees expressed their concerns that sexual orientation training is almost exclusively reserved for recruit training. If law enforcement organizations value this training, then all personnel should attend.

Students were asked to make suggestions for improving the sexual orientation training. Predominately, students (and administrators during interview) wanted a diverse team of instructors comprised of open gay and lesbian officers. More time, more activities, more videos and more information primarily on gay and lesbian family relationships were also suggested. Approximately 10% of all responses wanted the “other side” of the issues presented, specifically to hear from “ex-gays” and about reparative therapies.

Issue #5 Police Behaviors: One major goal stated for sexual orientation training is to modify police behaviors to be more respectful of gays and lesbians. To ascertain what these behaviors should be, three different gay and lesbian scenarios were presented to interviewees and they were asked what behaviors should be manifest by police officers. There were two lines of responses reported by interviewees. Most police administrators, heterosexual employees and students made very few suggestions and often stated, “Treat them just like everyone else.” In contrast, most gay and lesbian interviewees, police administrators vested in organizational change, and all instructors, gave elaborated answers pointing out the influence a gay or lesbian component has on police behavior.

Of those persons who gave elaborated responses, there was fair agreement as to appropriate police behaviors in gay or lesbian situations:

1. When a long-time partner comes out gay or lesbian— (a) feel honored the partner shared the personal information, (b) inquire as to why this information is being shared at this particular time, (c) that since they were long-time partners, to apologize for not making it safe earlier in their partnership and for any possible homophobic remarks and jokes, (d)

KEEP IT CONFIDENTIAL— it is up to the gay or lesbian person to tell other people unless they explicitly authorize telling other people, (e) ask questions to show genuine interest, and (f) recognize that being out will not change professional conduct.

2. During a domestic dispute between two women assumed to be lesbians— (a) the women should be separated, calmed down and interviewed, (b) ask what the relationship is between the women because domestic disputes between couples are the most dangerous, (c) determine if a crime was committed being aware that research has shown that the wrong persons are arrested 80% of the time when involving gay or lesbian couples due to gender stereotyping (Arnett, 1994), and (d) make an arrest if necessary. A few lesbian officers stated that they would come out to the women if it seemed necessary to obtain a better investigation.
3. When responding to a suspected gay bashing in the park— (a) obtain medical services if needed, (b) conduct an interview asking for details of what happened and descriptions of assailants, (c) about half of the interviewees felt it was necessary to ask the men if they were gay, while other interviewees said the men's sexual orientation was immaterial because the law cared only about what derogatory language, if any, was used during the attack, (d) ask what was said by the assailants, (e) inform the victims of the hate crime laws, (f) it should be reported as a hate crime if either the officer suspects that the attack was motivated by hate or the victims requests that the report be filed as a hate crime, and (g) reassure the victims that the crime will be taken seriously and to not blame the victim. A few gay and lesbian officers stated that they would try to engineer the investigation such that the victims do not have to come out gay or lesbian,

and that if the victims or witnesses seemed hesitant to talk, then the gay or lesbian officer would come out to them to secure their confidence.

Cultural awareness program administrators and sexual orientation training instructors need to be aware of the reticent heterosexual officers and most recruits have toward recognizing the unique behavioral requirements needed during police interactions with gays and lesbians. The elaborated responses by the gay and lesbian respondents revealed a greater depth of understanding that needs to be explored during sexual orientation training.

Conclusions

This research is the first formalized evaluation on the effectiveness of sexual orientation training. More than anything, this project points out the need for observations, and willingness to learn different methods to teach this controversial subject. Some of the training was effective and reflected the efforts made by the academy or agency to provide the best possible training. Even in the worst training, there were potential elements of effectiveness to learn—an effective activity, a good handout, a particular perspective, etc. Hopefully, more research will be conducted to find those nuggets of effectiveness so that others may improve their efforts.

One of the recurring themes made by law enforcement administrators was that “there are no problems” regarding discrimination against gays and lesbians since they have not heard of any complaints. When these administrators were asked if there were any open gay or lesbian personnel in their agency, often they would indicate they suspected there might be, or that it was common knowledge a particular person was, but they themselves had never spoken with that person on the subject. In reality, the “suspected” homosexual was not being accepted, otherwise the administrators would

have known much more about his or her personal life and would have socialized in ways that would have allowed the “suspected” homosexual to be open. By not “seeing” the problem, they wrongfully assumed there was no problem. This “blind eye” to the agency’s homophobia and heterosexism, and the all too common deficit beliefs about homosexuality, permeated the agency and negatively impacted the sexual orientation training.

One of the more surprising and disturbing findings of this research is the level of self-deception found among training instructors and program administrators concerning their cultural awareness training program. Every agency and instructor interviewed believed that their cultural awareness training program was far superior than anyone else’s—that their cultural awareness training program was the best and “light-years” ahead of the rest. Yet, none of these persons ever observed training conducted by other agencies or instructors. In fact, until I went from academy to academy to observe sexual orientation training, no one from California POST had ever formally observed the cultural awareness trainings conducted at the academies. POST does not field audit the very cultural awareness training it mandates. Yet these people believed that not only were they doing a good job, but that they were leaders in the field—a field they had not researched. As detailed in Chapter 4 and Appendix D, some of the sexual orientation trainings were fairly effective reaching maybe 70% of their potential. Other trainings were dismal and violated most of the elements of effective instruction. Obviously the pride they hold about their programs is usurping their motivation to improve their programs.

Students were not generally involved and vested in sexual orientation training. Lecture, passive video watching and limited interactions with instructors or panel members consumed most of training time—and for most academies virtually 100% of the time. Individual and small group activities were rarely used. Problem solving on police scenarios in which homosexuality played an important component was rarely used.

Furthermore, students were not held accountable for participating in the class or demonstrating they had learned the content. Although testing in the academy occurs for most other knowledge domains, cultural awareness and sexual orientation were not tested—which sends the message to students that this kind of knowledge is not important to police work.

The lack of testing for content presented at sexual orientation training is just one of many examples of structural deficits in the entire law enforcement training program of California. It was reported that officers are not tracked during their careers from the academy, to field training, and then on the job. Similarly, there is no communication among these three levels of training regarding officer performance. Correlating student training performance with field training performance and job performance would provide important evidence concerning the effectiveness of training programs. Without these feedback loops, improving the effectiveness of training programs is virtually impossible.

How important is it to involve students? Let me relate one of the more memorable interviews I conducted while on a ride-along. For approximately 4 hours, I rode in a police car on patrol with a male officer. Invariably he told me his life story and opinions about policing, gays and lesbians, and life. This officer was an extremely macho heterosexual ex-Navy seal who prepared daily for tri-athlete competition. He recognized that his physical training was limiting his time spent with his wife, so he intended to arrange a harness in his small backyard pool so he could at least conduct stationary swimming training at home. He entered policing because he did not know what else to do after the Navy, but he found the job boring and overpaid for what he was expected to do. He was very much offended by what he saw as special rights and privileges being given gays and lesbians, and how during the gay pride parade, officers were instructed to ignore violations and simply keep the peace. He held many other strong opinions about policing. After a couple of hours, I proposed a scenario and asked what he would do. I asked him

how he would make sexual orientation training better and more effective if he was assigned as program administrator. I emphasized that his job performance evaluations depended upon making the training effective. Incredibly, for the next 20-minutes he became flustered and confused. Although we were on our way to investigate a reported public intoxication, he kept missing his exits from the freeway. We would get off the freeway, turn around and head back to the correct exit, but again missing it. This happened three times. He commented that “I can’t believe I keep missing the off-ramp. No one has ever asked me a question like that.” He thought that training on Asians was needed because they are “so different” but otherwise he fumbled around trying to make suggestions. Ultimately, he did not know what to do and was completely surprised someone would ask for his suggestions.

This was an important interview because it highlighted that students are not asked to participate or have responsibility in cultural awareness training, but instead it is something “done” to them. Following this interview, I attempted to implement a reflective homework assignment in the sexual orientation classes I taught. The same question—what would you do to make the training more effective if you were program administrator—caused a terrible backlash and the assignment was abandoned (See Chapter 4, Site #8 for discussion).

The title “Cultural Awareness Training” and all its variations are misleading. I propose that the title of these programs be changed. There is nothing inherently interesting about gays and lesbians, African-Americans, Hmong, Jews, etc. Instead, these are groups that American society has negatively identified and marginalized upon that identification. This is called stigmatization. Police have historically been enforcement agents for oppressing stigmatized groups. It is because of changes in political perspectives that oppressions of particular stigmatized groups are no longer tolerated. Therefore, what interests police is how gays and lesbians are stigmatized and how this

affects work performance—both interpersonally and with customers. The current titles for trainings on homosexuality—“Sexual Orientation Training,” “Alternative Lifestyle Training,” and “Gay Day,”—exclude many subpopulations and promote inaccurate perceptions. For example, Sexual Orientation Training implies an essentialist perspective on human sexuality that is inaccurate. “Alternative Lifestyle” implies that there is a “normal” lifestyle (which is heterosexual). Likewise, “Gay Day” leaves out lesbians, bisexuals, transsexuals, and transvestites. Let me suggest that “Cultural Awareness Training” would be better identified if it were called “Training on Socially Stigmatized Communities” and training on the stigmatization of persons who do not conform to the heterosexual norm be called, “Training on Sexual Stigmatized Communities.” Another benefit in relabeling “Cultural Awareness Training” to “Training on Socially Stigmatized Communities” is that it forces law enforcement agencies to evaluate their actual training needs instead of relying upon the simplified notions of “culture.”

Appendix F presents a comprehensive program and instructional model for teaching “Training on Sexual Stigmatized Communities” in law enforcement. This model can be easily adapted for other kinds of stigmatization trainings.

Recommendations

This research is the first of its kind and just scratches the surface. Some of the analysis may be skewed because of difficulties in obtaining representative samples. Participating agencies and academies who volunteered should not be considered representative samples of basic police training academies. Despite agreeing to participate, several academies restricted testing and collection of other data. More research needs to be conducted on this topic with the following considerations:

1. Student participation was problematic. At training sites where time in class was devoted to administering the assessment instruments, much higher student participation rates were obtained. Even still, the highest participation rate was 84%. Without in-class testing, participation rates plummeted to a low of 3%. Similarly, all written assignments benefited from being performed in class instead of on student's own time. It could be those students choosing not to participate may be the very students this training is trying to reach. Future research needs to obtain better agency cooperation and in-class testing and data collection.
2. The instrumental tests were mostly unrevealing for pre-/post-test analysis. Only the *Index of Homophobia* showed changes at some of the sites. A detailed analysis needs to be made of the other assessment instruments to determine why they are not revealing statistically significant changes.
3. Vincent (1974) argued that simply comparing the means of pre-and post-test scores can be misleading since the attitude that the educational experience is trying to change may already be possessed by some of the students. He emphasized that researchers need to have a goal attitude in

mind when creating assessment instruments and to compare only those sub-groups that need the most change.

4. The two assessment instruments developed for this study— *Gender Identity-Sexual Identity-Emotional Identity*, and the *Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality*—were either too controversial to administer, or not discriminating between respondents. Both of these instruments need revision and further testing.
5. Not attempted in this research was cross-correlation between levels of homophobia and other psychological characteristics identified in Chapter 2 (police stereotypes—authoritarian, prejudicial & bigoted, needing to be in control, cynical in nature—and the characteristics of homophobes).
6. Once a reanalysis of the instrumental data is completed, a composite instrument that accurately measures attitudes, feelings and behaviors within a questionnaire of less than 50 items needs to be developed. Every agency and academy expressed a desire for a low-cost assessment instrument for evaluating the effectiveness of their sexual orientation training. Interviews and written evaluations are deemed too costly for wide-spread use.

Most importantly, it is recommended that research be continued and replicated. The more we learn about effective training on sexual stigmatized communities, the faster our society can overcome homophobia and heterosexism.

Bibliography

Arnett, C. (1994). Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council. 220 San Vicente Blvd. #309, Santa Monica, CA. 90402. (310) 393-6676

Vincent, R.J. (1974, March/April). New scale for measuring attitudes. *School Health Review*, 5, 2, 19-21.

APPENDIX A — PERQ PART 4— Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, Emotional Identity

This is a copy of *PART 4— Gender Identity, Sexual Identity, Emotional Identity* from the PERQ developed for this research

Note: All responses are confidential, will not be shared with any persons other than the researcher, will not be shared with any agency or institution, and will be destroyed at the end of the research. Please answer as you truly believe and feel, not how you think you are supposed to answer.

This section assesses your relationship to other people and your sexual orientation. Please bubble in the response that best reflects your feelings.

Relationships

65. Current relationship
- A. single
 - B. coupled living together
 - C. coupled living apart
66. Current sexual activity
- A. no sexual partners
 - B. one committed partner
 - C. multiple partners

Sexual orientation

67. I identify myself as:
- A. Exclusively homosexual
 - B. Predominantly homosexual
 - C. Bisexual
 - D. Predominantly heterosexual
 - E. Exclusively heterosexual
68. In the future, I would like to identify myself as:
- A. Exclusively homosexual
 - B. Predominantly homosexual
 - C. Bisexual
 - D. Predominantly heterosexual
 - E. Exclusively heterosexual
69. In terms of comfort with my current sexual orientation, I would say that I am:
- A. Very comfortable
 - B. Mostly comfortable
 - C. Comfortable
 - D. Not very comfortable
 - E. Very uncomfortable

This section assesses your understanding of your gender, sexual and emotional identities.

Please use the following scale to mark the response that best reflects your feelings:

- A. Exclusively female
- B. Mostly female with some male component
- C. Equal female and male components
- D. Mostly male with some female component
- E. Exclusively male

<u>Item</u>	[female ← male]				
	A	B	C	D	E
<u>Physical Identity</u>					
70. I was born a biological _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Future Physical Identity</u>					
71. Ideally, I wish I had been born as a biological _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Gender Identity</u>					
72. I think of myself as a physical _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
73. In my sexual fantasies, I imagine myself as a physical _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Future Gender Identity</u>					
74. Ideally, I would like to think of myself as a physical _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
75. In my sexual fantasies, I wish I could imagine myself as a physical _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Sex-Role Identity</u>					
76. My interest, attitudes, appearance and behaviors would be considered to be _____ (as traditionally defined).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Future Sex-Role Identity</u>					
77. I wish my interests, attitudes, appearance, and behaviors would be considered to be _____ (as traditionally defined).	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Sexual Orientation Identity</u>					
78. My sexual behavior has been with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
79. My sexual fantasies have been with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
80. My emotional attachments (not necessarily sexual) have been with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<u>Future Sexual Orientation Identity</u>					
81. I wish my sexual behavior would be with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
82. I wish my sexual fantasies would be with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
83. I wish my emotional attachments (not necessarily sexual) would be with _____.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

APPENDIX B — PERQ PART 6— Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality (PBSH)

This is a copy of *PART 6— Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality (PBSH)* from the PERQ developed for this research. The bullets represent the correct answer.

Note: All responses are confidential, will not be shared with any persons other than the researcher, will not be shared with any agency or institution, and will be destroyed at the end of the research. Please answer as you truly believe and feel, not how you think you are supposed to answer. This section asks you what behaviors you would use when interacting with gays and lesbians in typical police situations. Please bubble the response that best reflects how you anticipate behaving.

88.

You have been assigned to a new position and your partner is openly gay/lesbian. You respond by:

- A. accepting the assignment and welcoming him/her into your life.
- B. refusing to shake his or her hand.
- C. asking for a transfer to a different assignment.
- D. accepting the assignment and staying alert for misconduct by the gay/lesbian partner.
- E. asking for a different partner.

89.

A 3:00 AM radio call reports that a civilian is being beaten outside a bar in what is locally identified as the gay district. You are nearby and respond by:

- A. laughing to your partner that some fag has probably broken a finger nail.
- B. immediately picking-up the call.
- C. taking your time to pick-up the call, hoping that some other unit will do so.
- D. driving slowly to the scene of the crime.
- E. taking your dinner break.

90.

Two men have been badly beaten in a park by a gang of young adult males. This park is known for being a gay cruise spot. While interrogating the men at the scene, you say:

- A. “serves you right for engaging in public sex.”
- B. “did you try and pick-up on the other guys?”
- C. “besides this being an assault, do you want this reported as a hate crime?”
- D. “are you two boy-friends?”
- E. “did your assailants call you names when they attacked you?”

91.

You arrive at a domestic argument between two women. Both are angry, yelling and look disheveled.

- A. You give most of your attention to the more masculine acting woman.
- B. You say, "Why don't you dykes just find a man."
- C. You take care to get each woman's story without influence from the other.
- D. You assume the smaller woman is the "fem" and you physically protect her from the other woman.
- E. You attempt to discover the legal tenant and try to have the other woman leave.

92.

While arresting a male prostitute on the street, a scuffle breaks out and the man must be forcibly placed into the squad car. At the station, he makes a claim of "police brutality" stemming from his being gay. You respond by:

- A. inflicting pain on him in ways it cannot be detected.
- B. making note of his accusation on his arrest forms.
- C. threatening him with violence if he doesn't shut up.
- D. threatening to cite him for more crimes.
- E. seeing that he is placed in a cell where he has a greater chance for being raped.

93.

You have worked for many years with a gay/lesbian partner. You have enjoyed his/her company and respected his/her professionalism. But, recently you are starting to hear rumors that the other officers believe that you are also gay/lesbian. What do you do?

- A. Make it known to everyone at every opportunity that you are heterosexual.
- B. Go out of your way to participate in heterosexual activities.
- C. Reduce your social interactions with your gay/lesbian partner.
- D. Make no effort to clear up the misunderstanding and answer truthfully when asked about your sexual orientation.
- E. Play with the other officers' heads and tell them that you are gay/lesbian.

94.

After many years of working with a partner you enjoy and respect, he/she shares with you that he/she is homosexual. You are told this in the strictest confidence. You respond by:

- A. telling other officers that your partner is lesbian/gay.
- B. keeping up a front that the relationship has not changed.
- C. maintaining a respectful relationship as before and not telling anyone about the sexual orientation of your partner.

- D. put distance between you and him/her including stopping off-duty socializing.
- E. asking for a transfer.

95.

Your supervisor of your same gender makes a sexual advance towards you. You decline, but he/she is persistent and continues to solicit you for months. You feel that this is sexual harassment. What do you do?

- A. Ask for a transfer.
- B. Threaten the supervisor with violence.
- C. Give in to the pressure so as to keep your job.
- D. "Out" the supervisor by revealing the secret to your co-workers.
- E. File a misconduct claim against the supervisor.

96.

It is midnight and you are called to inspect a lesbian bar for possible overcrowding. During your public safety inspection, you:

- A. tell the women that a man would fix them right.
- B. immediately clear out the bar.
- C. check for overcrowding and ABC violations, and leave if it is determined that there are no violations.
- D. put on protective gear before checking for overcrowding and ABC violations.
- E. find the bar is overcrowded and you order the bar closed. While the patrons are leaving, you make a point of telling the ones who are wearing wedding rings to return home to their husbands.

97.

A very young boy who looks about 10-years old, is seen on a Friday morning trying to hitch a ride along a street known as a gay prostitution area. There are older boys nearby also hitch-hiking who are known prostitutes. What would you do?

- A. Do nothing.
- B. Stop the boy, ask him a few questions and if need be, take him to the station to call his parents.
- C. Pick-up the boy, take him to the station, and call the boy's parents.
- D. Stop the boy, tell him that he is in a known prostitute area and that he should leave.
- E. Stop the boy and tell him its illegal to engage in prostitution.

98.

Arriving at the scene of a bad auto accident, you see an adult female cradling a small toddler in her arms and an adult male kneeling next to and holding the hands of an adult male who is on the ground. You discover that the toddler is in cardiac arrest and the adult male on the ground is lightly bleeding but conscious. Which would you do?

- A. Call for medical support.

- B. Call for medical support and start CPR on the toddler.
- C. Call for medical support, start CPR on the toddler and once the toddler shows some life, put on protective gloves and help the injured adult male.
- D. Call for medical support, put on protective gear, start CPR on the toddler and once the toddler shows some life, help the injured adult male.
- E. Call for medical support, start CPR on the toddler and give verbal directions to the uninjured male about assisting his friend.

99.

The lesbian and gay community is in uproar because of the recent passage of anti-homosexual legislation by your city council. Demonstrators by the thousands are marching toward city hall. You are called in to form a barrier in front of city hall. The crowd is angry and a shoving match starts between some demonstrators and the officer next to you.

- A. You assist your fellow officer while trying to maintain the safety of all.
- B. You put on latex gloves and a face guard before giving assistance.
- C. You pull out your baton and start swinging at the demonstrators.
- D. You step in between the demonstrators and your fellow officer.
- E. You call for more assistance while yelling, "faggots, get back."

100.

You have been assigned undercover duty in a public park known for its sexual activity. Two men are observed fondling each other's genitalia. While investigating for lewd conduct, one of the men pleads to not be arrested because he is married and doesn't want his wife or employer to know of his illegal activity.

- A. You let the married man go because it is obvious that he was seduced by the other man.
- B. Both men are given warnings but not arrested.
- C. You tell the men that they are disgusting perverts.
- D. You make the arrests and make notes of any comments they may make.
- E. You ask the unmarried man if he comes to the park often and to give you leads as to where the most illegal activity occurs at the park.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

APPENDIX C — Documentation of Sexual Orientation Training at Nine California Police Agencies and Academies

Sexual orientation training was observed at nine California police agencies and academies. The following is documentation of these observations. Although no instructor identified major topics while they were teaching, the titles given each topic (presented in italics) were obtained through interview with instructors and/or review of curriculums (when available).

Training Site #1

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 2 1/2 hours, with actual instruction time being 2 hours 23 minutes (143 minutes).

Class Resources: Seventy-Three (73) page *Cultural Awareness Training Manual* that included articles, worksheets and evaluations with a 5 -page gay and lesbian bibliography. Also, a 294-page reference manual consisting of articles covering cultural issues was made available.

Instructors: One lesbian officer, one heterosexual African-American male officer.

Panel: Two Site #1 lesbian officers, one male officer in uniform from a different police agency, and two male community members.

• Begin Training

Heterosexism; 53 minutes; video (“Growing Up Gay” by Brain McNaught).

— The video presented the absurdity of gays and lesbians choosing to be outcasts from society and that being gay in our society is extremely difficult. This video also mentioned the major issues of family relationships, incidence of homosexuality, essentialist arguments, sexual and gender identity formation, suicide and stigmatization.

— There were no student responses.

• Break

Gay and Lesbian Panel; 90 minutes; panel presentation, questions and answers, class discussion.

— Panel members initially followed a scripted set of questions, but soon the lesbian instructor deviated from the questions and allowed a freer format of questions from the students. The content of these questions included: coming out gay, being gay in a police force, age of sexual identity, family dynamics, dealing with homophobia and heterosexism, instances of gay-bashing, officer response to working with lesbian officers, being harassed simply for being the friend of a homosexual, historically gays and lesbians have been harassed by police, insensitivity shown by minorities toward gays and lesbians, appropriate word usage, youth suicide, and having a strong support system being essential to survival.

— There were 10 student questions with the first one not occurring until 42 minutes into the panel. The students were subdued with almost half the comments condemning homosexuality as a sin or disease.

• End Training

Training Site #2

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 3 hours, with actual instruction time being 2 hours 12 minutes (132 minutes).

Class Resources: No handout materials or contact numbers specifically for the sexual orientation training. There were other materials handed out for different sections of the cultural awareness training.

Instructor: Heterosexual Male criminologist (not in uniform).

- **Begin Training**

Why is this an issue? 41 minutes; instructor-led class discussion.

— Instructor started with the question of why sexual orientation is such a volatile subject. He solicited student comments and wrote these on the chalk board. The identified issues included: fear of the unknown, lack of education, distortion of facts, lack of familiarity, difficult to relate, threat to (hetero)sexuality, out of norm, religious values, AIDS, repression of sexual themes, stereotypes, shock value of sexual theme, negative peer pressure, invisible, and sexual identity. The instructor called on me as a “subject matter expert” three times during the class.

— The resultant student interaction of 23 responses mostly supported anti-gay stereotypes and took exception to the subject experts comments.

- **Break**

Open Discussion of Highlighted Issues; 91 minutes; instructor-led class discussion.

— Instructor highlighted three of the topics listed on the board and led the class in a more in-depth discussion about the sources of these issues. Information was provided regarding: research on sexual orientation both cultural and biological, AIDS transmission, psychology of stigmatization and teen suicide, and media emphasis of stereotypes. Students and instructor were unconvinced by the “research” and the instructor emphasized that people “select facts to fit their paradigm.” Procedures for handling domestic violence were given, students were encouraged to “ask” gays and lesbians when in doubt about their relationships, and to find out what “they” want. The instructor closed the last 30 minutes of class with a lecture about “backing the sex out of homosexuality, leaving you with people like everyone else—people who love each other and face the same life problems.” He also included a long monologue on Christian values—stating that homosexuals who accept Christian scripture injunctions against homosexuality will stay celibate, and that Christians are to help those who hurt and are in need, such as those with AIDS. “Respect comes from knowledge, and tolerance comes from respect.”

— Responses from 27 students continued to support the perception that homosexuals are deviant, diseased and sinful.

- **End Training**

Training Site #3

Same as Training Site #2

Training Site #4

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 5 1/2 hours, with actual instruction time being 4 hours (240 minutes).

Class Resources: No handout materials; name and telephone number of instructor were written on the chalk board.

Instructor: Lesbian active officer (not in uniform).

- **Begin Training**

Introduction; 5 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor wrote her name and contact telephone number on the chalk board. She shared her professional status and the goals of the training.

Political Status and History of Local Gay and Lesbian Community; 23 minutes; video (“Look at San Francisco’s Gay and Lesbian Community”) and lecture.

— Content included theory and evolution of lesbian and gay community, being out makes one feel better about oneself, lesbian mothers, religion, the lesbian and gay community is one of the better places to patrol, off-duty officers are sometimes gay-bashed, and health/mortality related issues for gay officers with HIV or AIDS.

Stereotype Activity; 8 minutes; instructor-led class activity.

— Students were solicited to share stereotypes (nouns and adjectives) used to describe gay men and lesbians. These were written on a chalk board. The goal was to help students relax (ice breaker) around this topic and to direct students against using these words.

— Students responded with much laughing and 16 student responses reflected negative stereotypes.

Self-Awareness Activity; 35 minutes; instructor-led class activity.

— Ten lesbian and gay situations were read to the students and asked to write down how they would react or feel. The papers were collected and randomly redistributed to the students. The instructor then called on students to read the papers. The goal of this exercise was to help students identify their own feelings about homosexuality and to become aware of the feelings shared by their classmates.

— There was much student interaction with 83 mostly negative student responses— some were supportive of gay bashing. This was an important finding because it showed that even people who are committed to upholding the law might resort to violence if a pass was made to the officer by someone of the same sex.

- **Break**

Personal Story; 24 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor shared her personal story, years on police force, that she was always attracted to women and felt that sexual orientation is genetic, came out lesbian in college, just ended a long-term relationship, issues surrounding her having a child, and that lesbians are not man-haters.

— Four student questions, primarily about child rearing.

Politics in the Lesbian and Gay Community; 24 minutes; lecture and video (highlights from television news broadcasts).

— Discussed the politics of ACT-Up (she approved of their achievements), Queer Nation (she disapproved of their anarchists’ tactics) and city-wide demonstrations such as those that occurred after the AB101 veto. The instructor shared her involvement as a police officer during the various demonstrations, including up-holding the law even if that meant turning in her “brothers and sisters.”

— Few student questions about her position as a cop under fire.

- **Break**

Gay Cops; 25 minutes; video (“Gay Cops” from *60 Minutes* with Mike Wallace) and lecture.

— Showed the acceptance of lesbian and gay cops varies significantly from agency to agency. Instructor said she always instructs administrators first, then patrol officers. The video concludes that gay cops are still fighting for their rights.

Domestic Violence and Hate Crimes; 5 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor said that domestic violence is increasing and that she makes approximately one call each day. She stressed the importance of treating people equally, don’t assume

the big person is the aggressor, and ask the status of the relationship. Hate crimes can occur to anyone, e.g., she recently was physically attacked and gay-bashed while off-duty on the street and “luckily I’m a cop with a gun and he went to jail.”

- Break

Gay Politics of the Community; 90 minutes; video (“The Times of Harvey Milk”) and lecture.

- Showed the evolution of gay politics in a large metropolitan area and demonstrated that cops often over-react or under-react to public demonstrations.

- End Training

Training Site #5

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 3 1/2 hours, with actual instruction time being 3 hours and 12 minutes (202 minutes).

Class Resources: No handout materials; instructors’ names and contact number to local gay and lesbian center were written on chalk board.

Instructors (team): Two lesbian officers not in uniform of which the primary instructor was a retired officer. Co-Presenters included a gay male officer in uniform, and a heterosexual male staff officer whose gay son recently came out.

- Begin Training

Pre-Introduction; 4 minutes; directive.

- Students were instructed to not ask questions about religion or politics.

Introduction; 15 minutes; lecture

- The instructor gave a history of the gay and lesbian police liaison organization, her professional credentials, and stated that her goal was to give information about the gay and lesbian community including statistics and professional conduct—but not to change their minds or beliefs.

Sharing Stories; 15 minutes; lecture.

- A gay male police officer shared his coming out and the impact on his life and police career. Issues included: not realizing he was gay until many years into marriage, sought support from other gay cops and Gay Fathers, and coming out can be difficult for others—particularly your partner.

Sharing Stories; 15 minutes; lecture.

- A woman officer shared her story about coming out lesbian. Issues covered included: dating heterosexually and marriage to cover feelings, negative parental reaction, when forced into therapy her psychologist sided with her and instructed her parents to “get over it,” retreating to the closet for safety reasons following her hiring on the force, and experiencing acceptance by fellow officers when she did come out.

Knowing Someone Gay; 2 minutes; class activity.

- Instructor solicited by show of hand, how many students knew someone gay.

- Twenty-five students raised hands.

Stereotype Activity; 25 minutes; class activity, lecture.

- Instructor solicited stereotypes (occupations and physical characteristics) about gay men, lesbians and police from students. These were written on the chalk board. The instructor concluded by stating that stereotypes originated from a source of reality, are learned from parents, are perpetrated through our media and are not applicable for 9 out of 10 persons. Also, she stated that in a heterosexist society, gays and lesbians are generally invisible and blend in.

- Much laughter and student interaction with 43 student responses that reflected mostly negative stereotypes.

- Break

Sharing Stories; 23 minutes; lecture.

— Heterosexual male staff officer who shared about his son recently coming out gay. The issues discussed included: the fear, guilt and shame parents sometimes feel when a child comes out homosexual; denial when he and his wife would pray, “Please God, just make him bisexual”; finding support in PFLAG; realizing that homosexuality is not an illness and there is nothing to cure (citing the 1973 APA declassification of homosexuality); remembering all the negative anti-gay jokes he told over the years and how hurt his son must have felt; realizing his son is the same person now as he was before coming out; and finally “police officers are to do the right thing, and if they hear hate words against any particular group, they should have the courage to stop the bashing.” This speaker used note cards to assure covering important issues and made numerous jokes about his long-time marriage and his wife being overweight.

Gay Lifestyle Activity; 13 minutes; instructor-led class activity.

— Instructor solicited input from the class on what the “average day” is like for a straight person, then compared that with a gay person’s “average day.” Goal was to show that there are no differences except that “family” for gays and lesbians often include more extended members. Instructor shared that only 16% of households are structured around the idealized nuclear family. Also, the only difference between straights and gays is sex.

— One student and one instructor shared their lives to complete the chart. There were no other student responses.

Question Cards; 4 minutes; directive.

— The students were directed to write a question they may have about homosexuality or homosexuals and stated that they could ignore the directive given to them before class and ask any question including ones about religion and politics. These were collected and used during the questions/answer period at the end of class.

Points-of-Contact; 40 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor listed 7 situations on the chalk board where police officers would come into contact with gays and lesbians. These included: (1) traffic stops, burglary, robbery; (2) lewd conduct and prostitution; (3) hate crimes; (4) domestic violence; (5) civil disobedience; (6) bars; and, (7) personal contact including death, AIDS, co-workers and the showers. For each situation, the instructor gave personal experiences, theory, and suggested professional behavior.

Questions and Answers; 30 minutes; instructor-led class discussion.

— Instructor selected eleven questions submitted by the students. The instructors and/or co-presenters gave their perspective on each question. These topics included: parent influence over sexual orientation, heterosexual double standard, gender stereotypes, marriage and commitment ceremonies, you can’t tell who is gay or lesbian so you must ask, cross-dressers are mostly heterosexual, gay and lesbian promiscuity is a myth, gays and lesbians want equal rights not special rights, the Gay Pride Festival as a chance to poke fun at the stereotypes, and the proper procedure for reporting a hate crime.

— Three students asked questions beyond the ones previously submitted.

- End Training

Training Site #6

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 2 hours, with actual instruction time being 1 hour and 50 minutes (110 minutes).

Class Resources: A one-page handout of police scenarios that included a gay or lesbian component was given each student. Names of panel members and the telephone number for the gay and lesbian center were written on the board.

Instructor (identified as the panel moderator): Lesbian director of gay and lesbian community center.

Panel Members: Gay male city prosecutor, lesbian city manager and editor of local gay and lesbian newspaper, and bi-sexual woman.

- **Begin Training** (Note: This observation is reconstructed from participant interviews and not actually observed by me.)

Coming Out Stories; 50 minutes; lecture.

— Three of the panel members (male prosecutor, lesbian editor and bi-sexual woman) told their coming out stories. This encouraged students to ask questions which brought about discussion on: sexual orientation being genetic vs. choice, Kinsey chart, homosexuality in animals, homosexuality thought to be caused by molestation, embarrassment of the outrageous behaviors seen at the Gay Pride Parade, male sexuality and promiscuity, and concerns for the other ethnic/racial/cultural groups receiving treatment like this training. The issue of bi-sexuality consumed more than 20 minutes of the panel.

— Approximately 11 student questions focused on the causes of sexuality and supported the belief that homosexuality is a deviance.

- **Break**

Police Scenarios; 40 minutes; instructor-led class activity supported with one-page handout.

— Handout presented four scenarios— (1) father reports a teenage runaway, (2) drive-by name calling, (3) domestic fight, and (4) beating in a public park known for sexual activity. The male prosecutor led the class in an open discussion about these scenarios.

— Eight student responses asking for clarification of law.

Questions and Answers; 20 minutes; instructor-led class discussion.

— The moderator fielded questions from the students. Topic included: domestic violence, heterosexual double standard, hate crimes, and teenage runaways.

— Seven student responses.

- **End Training**

Training Site #7

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 4 hours, with actual instruction time being 3 hours 34 minutes (214 minutes).

Class Resources: 72-page Sexual Orientation booklet, 13-page *Famous Gays and Lesbian* handout, instructor's name and telephone number on marker board.

Instructor: Civilian gay male academic authority on sexual orientation

- **Begin Training**

Introduction; 5 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor wrote his name and contact telephone number on the board and stated the goal of the class was to give information that would assist police officers improve their job performance. He shared his professional affiliations— in police, academia and within the gay and lesbian community. He also shared his becoming aware of being gay by the third grade, and his response to feelings of isolation was to become a workaholic, gain degrees and become a professional ballet dancer. He also shared that he had been fairly effeminate since childhood.

Stereotype Activity; 30 minutes; small group activity with instructor-led class discussion.

— On flipchart paper, the instructor wrote the following titles: heterosexual males, homosexual males, heterosexual females, homosexual females, police officers. The

instructor modeled the activity using markers to write on the flipchart paper, nouns and adjective for each of these categories. The students were divided into five groups to complete each sheet. Once completed, the instructor led the class in discussion about stereotypes, how language is used to control certain groups and reinforce power in other groups, and how lesbians are kept invisible.

— Full student involvement, much laughing at the overtly negative terms and 12 student responses surprised by the results.

Homophobia; 13 minutes; lecture supported by three transparencies and referral to three topic papers in booklet.

— The instructor discussed the similarities between homophobes and police subculture and how this is an important source of conflict between the police and gay and lesbian community. The definitions and kinds of homophobia were presented along with the only known research showing the costs associated with homophobia (e.g., the expulsion of lesbians and gays from the military).

— One student surprised that the military primarily discriminates against lesbians.

Gay “Lifestyle” Activity; 8 minutes; instructor-led class activity supported by one transparency and referral to two topic papers in booklet.

— Instructor asked for student participation to chart the amount of time during the day that time is allocated for particular functions, e.g., 8 hours for sleeping, 45 minutes for eating, etc. This pie chart demonstrated that sexual behavior accounted for an almost insignificant amount of the “average” person’s day. This was compared with a gay person’s day showing that they are the same and thus the infamous “gay lifestyle” is not true and a stereotype attempting to control a subculture.

— Four student responses and some laughing.

Questions; 2 minutes; directive.

— Students were directed to write a question they may have on sexual orientation. These were collected.

• Break

Basic Information on Sexual Orientation; 40 minutes; lecture supported by nine transparencies and seventeen topic papers in booklet.

— The instructor presented that sexual orientation is the result of genetic and environmental influences. To that end, he presented the gender-sexual-emotional identity theories of Shively and DeCecco and contrasted that with the bi-polar Kinsey model concluding with a normal distribution of “sexuality” which states that only a small percentage of the population is strongly committed to a narrow range of sexual experiences and that approximately 80% of the population is capable of both homosexual and heterosexual behaviors—but that cultural norms skew the population toward either of these two behaviors. To support these conclusions, cross-cultural research was presented. Other issues were touched upon: gay and lesbian adolescence including teen suicide, family and interpersonal relationships, health concerns for gays and lesbians, minority dynamics, chronology of United States Lesbian and Gay Movement, and heterosexism.

— Fourteen student responses tended to be highly agitated and rejecting of the research claiming it to be biased and untrue.

Teen Suicide; 20 minutes; video (“Who’s afraid of Project 10”).

— Video presentation of the stresses associated with being a gay or lesbian teenager in our heterosexist society. Interviews with the founder of Project 10 and various religious and political leaders highlight the controversies in providing counseling services for these high-risk teens in the public schools.

— Two student responses supported the position that counseling for gay and lesbian youths should not be provided by the schools.

- Break (the following activity was conducted during break).

Famous Gays and Lesbians; 15 minutes; paired activity supported with a 13-page handout along with self-stick labels that have some of the names from the handout printed on them.

— As students left the room for break, they were handed a 13-page listing of famous gays and lesbians along with a label stuck to their back with one of these names written on it. During break, they were instructed to ask their neighbor questions that could be answered with either a yes or no to help them identify the name on their back. After break, a class discussion was lead by the instructor.

— Nine student responses—mostly surprised at the inclusion of Abraham Lincoln, J. Edgar Hoover, and Eleanor Roosevelt on the list.

Hate Crimes; 5 minutes; lecture supported by one transparency and referral to article and one topic paper in booklet.

— Instructor presented the latest statistics on hate crimes and the causes for under-reporting.

Homophobia within Police Agencies; 10 minutes; lecture, class reading, instructor-led class activity supported with three topic papers in booklet.

— The issues of homophobia within police agencies were presented through a reading of the Sgt. Mitch Grobeson lawsuit and documents from the ACLU report on harassment of gays and lesbians. The fear of being discovered to be gay was personalized through a verbal round-robin student reading of the poem, “I Fear.” Finally, the issue of “outing” was discussed.

— Twenty-eight student verbal readings of “I Fear,” 3 questions about the status of the Mitch Grobeson’s suit, and 3 students objected to “outing.”

Points-of-Contact; 15 minutes; lecture, class reading supported by three topic papers in booklet.

— Students were selected to verbally read to the class point-of-contact covering: domestic violence, hate crimes, “lewd” conduct, activism and civil disobedience, public safety, victims of violence, youth, prostitution, and medical emergencies. The instructor made reference to a community resource list and summary paper.

Appropriate Police Behavior; 15 minutes; small group activity, instructor-led discussion supported by one topic paper in booklet.

— The class was divided into small groups of 4 students, assigned one of 13 scenarios in which sexual orientation played a part in police behavior, and asked to discuss how police officers should respond. A spokesperson for each group reported orally to the class with the instructor tying the various responses together.

— Twenty-four student responses mostly taking the politically correct solution.

Questions and Answers; 15 minutes; lecture.

— The previously collected questions were reviewed and answered by the instructor.

— Many student hands went up for more questions, but class time concluded.

- End Training

Training Site #8

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 4 hours (5:00 pm to 9:00 pm), with actual instruction time being 3 hours and 31 minutes (211 minutes).

Class Resources: 72-page Sexual Orientation booklet, 13-page *Famous Gays and Lesbian* handout, instructor’s name and telephone number on marker board.

Instructor: Same civilian gay male academic authority on sexual orientation.

- **Begin Training**

Introduction; 5 minutes; lecture.

— see Site #7.

Stereotype Activity; 35 minutes; small group activity with instructor-led class discussion.

— see Site #7.

— Full student involvement, much laughing and giggling regarding saying and writing “naughty” words.

Homophobia; 12 minutes; lecture supported by three transparencies and referral to three topic papers in booklet.

— see Site #7.

Gay “Lifestyle” Activity; 2 minutes; instructor-led class activity supported by one transparency and referral to two topic papers in booklet.

— see Site #7.

— Three student responses and some laughing.

Self-Awareness Activity; 10 minutes; individual then small group activity, instructor-led class discussion supported by one worksheet in booklet.

— A Forced-Choice value clarification technique was used to help students identify their feelings concerning homosexuality. Individually, students prioritized scenarios that contained a homosexual situation, then tried to reach consensus within a small group. These were orally reported to the class, and a class consensus was reached and written on the board. The gay instructor revealed how he would prioritize the scenarios thereby contrasting the different perceptions. He then opened discussion.

— Much student interaction with most students reporting all the scenarios to be negative— particularly the discovery of their teenage son engaging in homosexual behavior or a male police officer leaving his wife after discovering that he is gay.

Questions; 2 minutes; directive.

— Students directed to write question they had regarding sexual orientation. These were collected for later use.

- **Break**

Pain of Growing Up Gay in a Heterosexist Society; 31 minutes; video (“Growing Up Gay,” by Brian McNaught).

— This video presented the absurdity that gays and lesbians would choose to be outcasts from society and that being gay in our society is extremely difficult. During the video, covered topics were noted on the board.

Basic Information on Sexual Orientation; 32 minutes; lecture supported by nine transparencies and seventeen topic papers in booklet.

— see Site #7. The instructor used topics brought up in the video to flow directly into a generalized discussion of sexual orientation. The instructor did not take much time for discussion and emphasized that a complete course on human sexuality would take at least 20 weeks with 4 weeks alone devoted to merely defining sex. The instructor asked students to read on their own.

— 25 student comments, primarily taking exception to the research as being biased and that the material was covered too fast.

- **Break (the following activity was conducted during break).**

Famous Gays and Lesbians; 15 minutes; paired activity supported with a 13-page handout along with self-stick labels that had some of the names from the handout printed on them.

— see Site #7.

Hate Crimes; 5 minutes; lecture supported by one transparency and referral to article and one topic paper in booklet.

— see Site #7.

Harassment of Gay and Lesbian Officers; 30 minutes; small group activity, instructor-led class discussion supported by one paper in booklet.

— Students were divided into small groups of four and asked to discuss and reach consensus on appropriate police behavior concerning scenarios derived from the ACLU report on harassment of gay and lesbian officers. These were reported to the class and a discussion of their findings was conducted by the instructor.

— All students became involved with most comments suggesting that the problems could be easily solved through strong administrative directives.

Points-of-Contact; 30 minutes; lecture, class reading supported by three topic papers in booklet.

— see Site #7.

Assignment; take home and returned the next day.

— Writing assignment. (This caused great concern for the contracting agency and difficulty for the academy director. See later comments.)

• End Training

Training Site #9

Time: Sexual orientation training was scheduled for 4 hours (11:30 am to 3:30 pm), with actual instruction time being 3 hours and 43 minutes (223 minutes).

Class Resources: 62-page Sexual Orientation booklet, 13-page *Famous Gays and Lesbian* handout, instructor's name and telephone number on marker board.

Instructor: Same civilian gay male academic authority on sexual orientation.

• Begin Training

Introduction; 10 minutes; lecture.

— Instructor presented the goals of the training, the instructor's personal story where his response to discovery that he was gay was to become an overachiever (declined to mention his 25-years career as a ballet dancer or his effeminacy). Instructor mentioned other coming out stories told by police officers.

Gay Cops; 23 minutes; video ("Gay Cops" from *60 Minutes* with Mike Wallace).

— Showed how the acceptance of gay and lesbian cops varies significantly from agency to agency and that gay cops are still fighting for their rights.

Harassment of gay and lesbian police officers; 30 minutes; small group activity, instructor-led class discussion supported by one paper in booklet.

— See Site #8.

— All students were deeply involved and their comments suggested that their responses would be situationally based.

• Break

Questions; 5 minutes; directive.

— Students directed to write on a scrap piece of paper a question they may have on sexual orientation. These were collected.

Stereotype Activity; 30 minutes; instructor-led class activity supported by one paper in booklet.

— The instructor placed three columns in the board: gay males, gay females and police officers. Students were solicited to offer stereotypic occupations, etc. (but not an endless list of pejoratives). Class discussion revolved around these being stereotypes and few people meet more than one of the characteristics.

- Many student interactions with some giggling.
 - Sexual Orientation Basics*; 15 minutes; lecture supported with one transparency and 9 topic papers in booklet.
 - A simplified description of the incidence of sexuality based on a normal distribution was presented. Limited evidence was given with respect to biology and cross-cultural studies. Students were referred to reading materials, again emphasizing that a full-semester course on human sexuality would just begin to scratch the surface.
 - Five students challenged research as biased and self-identified Christian fundamentalists made their points.
- Break (the following activity was conducted during break).
 - Famous Gays and Lesbians*; 15 minutes; paired activity supported with a 13-page handout along with self-stick labels that have some of the names from the handout printed on them.
 - see Site #7.
- Points-of-Contact*; 60 minutes; lecture, class reading supported by three topic papers in booklet.
 - This is an expansion of what was presented in Site #7.
 - Twelve student comments used to clarify issues of law.
- Break
 - Personal Contact*; 15 minutes; instructor-led class discussion.
 - Students shared their personal experiences working with gays and lesbians or if they had a friend or family member who was.
 - About 6 students shared their experiences— both good and bad.
 - Questions and Answers*; 15 minutes; lecture.
 - The instructor read and responded to many of the questions submitted earlier. At one point he became tearful in recounting about the death of a lover. This seemed to touch many of the students.
 - Five more student questions mostly challenging the research on sexual orientation.
 - Closure*; 5 minutes; lecture.
 - The highlights of the day's program were reviewed and related back to the goal of the training— to improve work performance through knowledge about sexual orientation issues. Also, the instructor gave direct orders to the students that they were not going to start a witch hunt and try to discover who was gay or lesbian in the class. If anyone witness that happen, the instructor said that they had a duty to intervene and stop the behavior or if need be, report it to the academy administrators.
- End Training

APPENDIX C (continued)

– Comparison of Instructional Times for 8 Different Police Sexual Orientation Trainings

Indicator of Student Involvement

Key—
Box Shading

Lecture/video with almost no questions or student involvement—	Level 1 (no shading)
Lecture with some questions and answers made by students—	Level 2
Instructor led class discussion or activity with moderate student involvement—	Level 3
Individual or small group activity with follow-up class discussion and much student involvement—	Level 4

—**Bold line** between sections represents Breaks

Table C1— Instructional Time and Activity Schedule

time	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
5	Heterosexism— video, “Growing up gay.” <i>Level 1</i>	Why is this an issue?— instructor led class discussion <i>Level 2</i>	Introduction <i>Level 1</i>	Introduction, Professional Credentials, Goals— lecture <i>Level 1</i>	Coming Out Stories— Panel and lecture <i>Level 1</i>	Introduction <i>Level 1</i>	Introduction <i>Level 1</i>	Introduction <i>Level 1</i>
10			L/G Local Community History— video, “Look at San Francisco’s Gay and Lesbian Community.” <i>Level 1</i>	Sharing Stories— gay male officer <i>Level 1</i>		Stereotype Activity <i>Level 3</i>	Stereotype Activity <i>Level 3</i>	Gay Cops-- video, “Gay Cops.” <i>Level 1</i>
15			Stereotype Activity	Sharing Stories—		Stereotype Activity	Stereotype Activity	
20								
25								
30								
35			Stereotype Activity	Sharing Stories—		Stereotype Activity	Stereotype Activity	

Table C1 (continued).

time	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
40			<i>Level 3</i>	lesbian officer <i>Level 1</i>		Homophobia— lecture <i>Level 1</i>		Harassment of G/L officers— activity and discussion <i>Level 4</i>
45		Open discussion of highlighted issues. <i>Level 2</i>	Self-Awareness Activity <i>Level 3</i>				Homophobia— lecture <i>Level 1</i>	activity and discussion <i>Level 4</i>
50				Knowing someone gay				
55				Stereotype Activity <i>Level 3</i>	Police Scenarios Activity <i>Level 3</i>	Gay Lifestyle Activity and Question Cards <i>Level 3</i>		
60	Gay and Lesbian Panel <i>Level 1</i>					Self-Awareness Activity <i>Level 4</i>		
65						Basic Information on		
70			Personal Story <i>Level 1</i>			Sexual Orientation— lecture <i>Level 1</i>	Question Card activity - <i>L4</i>	Question Card activity - <i>L4</i>
75							Heterosexism— video, “Growing up gay.” <i>Level 1</i>	Stereotype Activity <i>Level 3</i>
80				Sharing Stories— heterosexual officer with gay son <i>Level 1</i>				
85								
90								
95			Politics in L/G		Questions and Answers Activity <i>Level 2</i>			
100	(no questions were asked		Community— lecture with news video segments <i>Level 2</i>	Gay Lifestyle Activity <i>Level 3</i>				
105	until 42- minutes	Closure— lecture <i>Level 1</i>				Teen Suicide— video, “Who’s afraid of Project 10.” <i>Level 1</i>	Basic Information on Sexual Orientation— lecture <i>Level 1</i>	Basic Information on Sexual Orientation— lecture <i>Level 1</i>
110	into the panel) <i>Level 2</i>							
115				Question Card activity - <i>L4</i>				

Table C1 (continued).

time	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9			
120			Gay Cops-- video, "Gay Cops." <i>Level 1</i>	Point-of- Contact— lecture (Break occurred part way through this) <i>Level 1</i>				Famous Gays and Lesbians— activity conducted during Break <i>Level 4</i>			
125											
130											
135			Domestic & Hate Crimes <i>L2</i>	Questions and Answers Activity <i>Level 3</i>					Famous Gays and Lesbians— activity conducted during Break <i>Level 4</i>	Points-of- Contact— lecture/activity <i>Level 2</i>	
140											
145			L/G Politics— video, "The Times of Harvey Milk." <i>Level 1</i>						Hate Crimes— lecture - <i>L1</i>	Homophobia within Police Agencies— lecture/activity	Hate Crimes— lecture - <i>L1</i>
150											
155											
160											
165											
170											
175											
180			Appropriate Police Behavior— activity <i>Level 4</i>	Harassment of G/L officers— activity and discussion <i>Level 4</i>					Points-of- Contact— lecture/activity <i>Level 2</i>		
185											
190											
195	Questions and Answers— activity <i>Level 2</i>		Personal Contact—								
195											

Table C1 (continued).

time	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
200								activity <i>Level 4</i>
205								
210								Questions and Answers—
215								activity <i>Level 3</i>
220								
225								Closure— lecture - <i>L1</i>
230								
235								

Table C2— Times Spent at Each Level of Student Involvement and Percent of Total Time that Represents

time	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
	143 minutes	132 minutes	240 minutes	202 minutes	110 minutes	193 minutes	211 minutes	223 minutes
level								
1	101 min./ 71%	30 min./ 23%	167 min./ 70%	122 min./ 60%	50 min./ 46%	83 min./ 43%	85 min./ 40%	53 min./ 24%
2	42 min./ 29%	102 min./ 77%	29 min./ 12%	0	20 min./ 18%	15 min./ 8%	30 min./ 14%	60 min./ 27%
3	0	0	44 min./ 18%	76 min./ 38%	40 min./ 36%	63 min./ 33%	39 min./ 18%	45 min./ 20%
4	0	0	0	4 min./ 2%	0	30 min./16%	57 min./ 28%	65 min./ 29%

APPENDIX D — Educational Analysis of 8 Different Police Sexual Orientation Trainings

Sexual orientation training was observed at 8 different training sites (see Chapter 4 for detail descriptions). An analysis of instructional methodologies is made here by comparing observations to the educational perspective presented in Chapter 3. Table D presents a visual representation of that analysis and should prove helpful in determining effectiveness of instructional methodologies. For each analysis item, an estimate was made of how well it complied to psycholinguist/humanistic educational perspective.

Psycholinguistic/Humanistic Educational Perspective Item Analysis

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>
1.	Instructor(s)— (should be more than one instructor) Were these the type of people the students wanted to emulate? were they knowledgeable and skilled?
2.	Length of Training— 4 hours is recommended.
3.	Size of Class— A ratio of 15 students to each instructor is recommended.
4.	Introduction— Was instructor and program introduced by program administrator?
5.	Goals— Did instructor present training goals to students?
6.	Self-Awareness— By some means, were students allowed to become aware of their beliefs, feelings about homosexuals?
7.	Sexual Orientation Research— Was accurate information given on human sexuality and did these emerge from students?
8.	Overcoming Stereotypes— The myths and stereotypes of gays and lesbians were addressed and linked to homophobia, racism, sexism and the processes of stigmatization.
9.	Personalizing Gays and Lesbians— Personal stories told by gay and lesbian instructors or panel members.
10.	Societal, Internalized, Institutionalized Homophobia— Just how bad is it for gays and lesbians? (stereotype activities).
11.	Points-of-Contact— Were behaviors during police contact with gays and lesbians discussed?

12. Strategies for Overcoming Homophobia— Were students engaged in problem solving situations with a gay and/or lesbian component?
13. Closure/Resource materials— Did instructor attempt summaries and closure after different topics? Any resource materials handed out to students to keep?
14. Meeting Local Gay and Lesbian Police Organization Members— Did students meet such representatives?
15. Evaluations— Were students asked to evaluate the training?

Note: Items #1-3 (appropriateness of instructor, length of training and size of class) were grouped and ranked. Items #4-15 (instructional methodologies) were grouped and ranked. Ranking allows for fast assessment of compliance to educational theory. Ranking used equal weight analysis which may not be accurate. For example, is instructor appropriateness equal in importance as length of training or class size? Also, separating instructor appropriateness from instruction methodologies denies the strong influence they have on each other.

<u>Estimate of Compliance to Theory</u>	Level Box Shading
Excellent Compliance	Level 1 (no shading)
Good Compliance	Level 2
Fair Compliance	Level 3
Poor Compliance	Level 4

Note: The more light boxes, the better instruction complied with education theory.

Table D— Compliance of Observed Instructional Methodology to Education Theory

Item	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
1	5 gay and lesbian police personnel, somewhat skilled, very knowledgeable. <i>Level 1</i>	1 heterosexual male officer of high respect, skilled but limited knowledge. <i>Level 2</i>	1 lesbian officer of high respect, skilled and very knowledgeable. <i>Level 2</i>	4 gay and lesbian police officers, 1 heterosexual officer, all very skilled, all very knowledgeable. <i>Level 1</i>	4 gay and lesbian community members, somewhat skilled, somewhat knowledgeable. <i>Level 3</i>	1 gay male academic who is gay activist and somewhat effeminate, very skilled, subject matter expert. <i>Level 3</i>	1 gay male academic who is gay activist and somewhat effeminate, very skilled, subject matter expert. <i>Level 3</i>	1 gay male academic who downplayed activism and effeminacy, very skilled, subject matter expert. <i>Level 2</i>
2	2.4 hours. <i>Level 2</i>	2.2 hours. <i>Level 2</i>	4 hours. <i>Level 1</i>	3.4 hours. <i>Level 1</i>	1.8 hours. <i>Level 3</i>	3.2 hours. <i>Level 1</i>	3.5 hours. <i>Level 1</i>	3.7 hours. <i>Level 1</i>
3	17 students to 2 instructors and 5 panel members. <i>Level 1</i>	43 students to 1 instructor. <i>Level 2</i>	30 students to 1 instructor. <i>Level 2</i>	45 students to 4 instructors and co-instructors. <i>Level 1</i>	105 students to one panel. <i>Level 4</i>	94 students to 1 instructor. <i>Level 4</i>	38 students to 1 instructor. <i>Level 3</i>	65 students to 1 instructor. <i>Level 4</i>
4	excellently introduced by administrator and video from chief. <i>Level 1</i>	no introduction. <i>Level 4</i>	marginally introduced. <i>Level 2</i>	good introduction. <i>Level 2</i>	good introduction. <i>Level 2</i>	marginally introduced. <i>Level 3</i>	marginally introduced. <i>Level 3</i>	marginally introduced. <i>Level 3</i>
5	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	not observed.	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>	goals stated well. <i>Level 1</i>
6	no self-awareness activity. <i>Level 4</i>	good open dialogue method. <i>Level 2</i>	excellent self-awareness activity. <i>Level 1</i>	self-awareness partially from stereotype activity. <i>Level 3</i>	no self-awareness activity. <i>Level 4</i>	self-awareness partially from stereotype activity. <i>Level 3</i>	self-awareness activity but in wrong sequence. <i>Level 2</i>	self-awareness from harassment activity. <i>Level 2</i>

Table D (continued).

Item	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
7	very limited research emerged from student questions. essentialist position stated. <i>Level 4</i>	very limited research given. essentialist position stated. <i>Level 3</i>	limited research emerged from student questions. essentialist position stated. <i>Level 3</i>	accurate research but essentialist perspective. <i>Level 2</i>	limited research emerged from student questions. essentialist position stated. <i>Level 3</i>	overload of information and handouts. combined radical feminist deconstruction of sexual identity. topics emerged from video. <i>Level 2</i>	overload of information and handouts. combined radical feminist deconstruction of sexual identity. topics emerged from video. <i>Level 2</i>	reduced information and handouts. mild combination of essentialism and constructionism perspectives. emerged from students. <i>Level 1</i>
8	limited information emerged from panel on stigmatization or gay politics. <i>Level 3</i>	no information given and deficit position reinforced. <i>Level 4</i>	homophobia not linked to stigmatization, but gay politics presented by video. <i>Level 2</i>	gay lifestyle activity gave some awareness. <i>Level 2</i>	no information about stigmatization given. <i>Level 4</i>	gay lifestyle activity gave some awareness. stigmatization not addressed. <i>Level 2</i>	gay lifestyle activity gave some awareness. stigmatization not addressed. <i>Level 2</i>	gay lifestyle activity gave some awareness. stigmatization not addressed. <i>Level 2</i>
9	excellent personal stories by panel members. Needed police stories. <i>Level 2</i>	no personal stories given. <i>Level 4</i>	excellent personal story told by instructor. Needed more than just the instructors' story. <i>Level 1</i>	many excellent stories by appropriate role models. <i>Level 1</i>	some stories but inappropriate role models. needed police stories <i>Level 2</i>	limited personal story of instructor but inappropriate role model. needed police stories. <i>Level 3</i>	limited personal story of instructor but inappropriate role model. needed police stories. <i>Level 3</i>	limited personal story of instructor. used gay cop video for police stories. <i>Level 2</i>

Table D (continued).

Item	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
10	very limited information emerged from panel. <i>Level 3</i>	no information given. <i>Level 4</i>	excellent stereotype activity. needed more on legal status. <i>Level 2</i>	adequate stereotype activity. could have given more legal status. <i>Level 2</i>	some historical information given. could have given more legal status. <i>Level 3</i>	excellent stereotype activity but in wrong sequence. much information on legal status. teen suicide. <i>Level 2</i>	excellent stereotype activity. video on growing up gay. much information on legal status. <i>Level 2</i>	adequate stereotype activity. Gay cop video. harassment of gay and lesbian officer small group activity. <i>Level 1</i>
11	no behaviors discussed. <i>Level 4</i>	no behaviors discussed. <i>Level 4</i>	very little specific information. <i>Level 3</i>	excellent coverage of points. <i>Level 1</i>	limited information given. <i>Level 3</i>	good coverage of points. <i>Level 2</i>	good coverage of points. <i>Level 2</i>	excellent coverage of points. <i>Level 1</i>
12	no problem solving activities. <i>Level 4</i>	no problem solving activities. <i>Level 4</i>	no problem solving activities. <i>Level 4</i>	no problem solving activities. <i>Level 4</i>	4 scenarios discussed by class. needed individual work. <i>Level 3</i>	student problem solving engaged through police scenarios. <i>Level 1</i>	student problem solving engaged through police scenarios. <i>Level 1</i>	student problem solving engaged through police scenarios. <i>Level 1</i>
13	closure not attempted. small bibliography handed out. <i>Level 3</i>	closure attempted with religious monologue. no handout materials <i>Level 3</i>	no attempts at summary or closure. no handout materials. <i>Level 4</i>	closure attempted through Q&A. no handout materials. <i>Level 3</i>	closure not attempted. no handout materials. <i>Level 4</i>	closure not attempted. 85-pages of materials handed out. <i>Level 2</i>	closure attempted through homework assignment. 85-pages of materials handed out. <i>Level 2</i>	closure and summary attempted. 75-pages of materials handed out. <i>Level 1</i>

Table D (continued).

Item	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
14	no representatives or information. <i>Level 4</i>	no representatives or information given. <i>Level 4</i>	no representatives or information given. <i>Level 4</i>	telephone number written on board. <i>Level 2</i>	no representatives or information given. <i>Level 4</i>	no representatives. materials handed out. <i>Level 2</i>	no representatives. materials handed out. <i>Level 2</i>	no representatives. materials handed out. <i>Level 2</i>
15	limited. <i>Level 3</i>	not observed.	not observed.	limited “evals.” <i>Level 2</i>	no observed.	limited “evals” and research questionnaire. <i>Level 2</i>	limited “evals” and research questionnaire. <i>Level 1</i>	limited “evals” and research questionnaire. <i>Level 1</i>
#1	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	2
#2	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1
#3	1	2	2	1	4	4	3	4
Rank	top (2)	middle (3)	middle (3)	best(1)	worst(6)	bottom (5)	middle (4)	middle (4)
#4-15								
-1	2	1	3	3	0	2	3	7
-2	1	1	3	6	2	7	7	4
-3	4	2	2	2	4	3	2	1
-4	5	7	3	1	5	0	0	0
Rank	bottom (5)	bottom (5)	middle (4)	middle (3)	worst (6)	middle (3)	top (2)	best (1)

Table D (continued).

Item	Site #1	Site #2, #3	Site #4	Site #5	Site #6	Site #7	Site #8	Site #9
Comments	<p>Instructor and class size were excellent while length of training was good. Rank=top.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies stressed hearing about personal stories, but failed to convey information on human sexuality, stigmatization, or appropriate police behaviors. Rank=bottom.</p>	<p>Length of training, instructor and class size were good. Rank=middle.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies emphasized self-awareness but failed to convey information on human sexuality, stigmatization or appropriate behaviors. Rank=bottom.</p>	<p>Length of training was excellent, instructor and class size were good. Rank= middle.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies were equally mixed from excellent to poor. Excellent goals, self-awareness and personal interactions. Fair to poor on specific information of sexuality or police behaviors. Rank=middle.</p>	<p>Instructors, class size and length of training was excellent. Rank=best.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies were mostly good and covered most items of the curriculum effectively. Greatest failing was involving students in problem solving. Rank=middle.</p>	<p>Instructors and length of training were fair while class size was poor. Rank=worst.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies emerged from panel presentation and was fair to poor in conveying specific information on human sexuality, stigmatization or appropriate police behaviors. Rank=worst.</p>	<p>Length of training was excellent, instructor was fair and class size was poor. Rank=bottom.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies were mostly good emphasizing much information and many handouts. Excellent problem solving. Needed better personal stories from police and more self-awareness. Rank=middle.</p>	<p>Length of class was excellent. Instructor and class size were fair. Rank=middle</p> <p>Instruction methodologies were mostly good emphasizing much information and many handouts. Excellent problem solving. Needed better personal stories by police officers. Rank=top.</p>	<p>Length of class was excellent. Instructor was fair and class size was poor. Rank=middle.</p> <p>Instruction methodologies were mostly excellent with excellent small group activities for self-awareness, student problem solving and closure. Needed better personal stories by police officers. Rank=best.</p>

APPENDIX E — Qualitative and Instrumental Data / Levels of Homophobia Tables

These tables present both the qualitative and empirical data collected for each of the training sites and attempts to assess the levels of homophobia in the training class and in the surrounding police culture, and present conclusions concerning training effectiveness. Not all types of data were collected for each site. Missing data is indicated by a dashed line. A shading scheme is used to visually clue readers to levels of homophobia.

Sources of Data include:

Qualitative and Empirical Data

(Note: At the end of each type of qualitative data, an assessment of the homophobia is made and designated as —*Homophobia Est.*)

1. Two types of interview/observation data were considered:
 - a. Interviews of persons associated with the training— students, instructors, panel members and program administrators— who commented on the training class, and direct class observations (referred to as *Interviews/Observations: On Training Class*).
 - b. Comments made about the police culture during interview of police personnel and gay and lesbian community members besides direct observations (referred to as *Interviews/Observations: On Police Culture*).
2. Student Written Responses include:
 - a. Students were asked to reflect upon their own academy or agency and write an assessment of the acceptance of gays and lesbians and/or the discussion of homosexuality (referred to as *Student Written Response: On Police Culture*).
 - b. During training, students were asked to write statements on their feelings or beliefs about homosexuals or homosexuality and these were collected (referred to as *Student Written Response: Belief Statements*).
 - c. During the training, students were asked to submit questions they had about sexual orientation. Instead many indicated their disapproval of the training by making negative statements against gays and lesbians. The percent of negative statements is a possible indication of the level of homophobia. In the study, the highest observation was 28% recorded in an academy that is extremely homophobic. A 4-point scale was developed upon this upper bound. Thus, 0-7 is high non-homophobia, 8-14 is low non-homophobic, 15-21 is low homophobia, and 22-28 is high homophobia (referred to as *Student Written Response: % Neg. Statements*).
 - d. At the end of training, students were asked to write three things they remembered most about the training. Often students commented on the reaction of the class (referred to as *Student Written Response: On Class Reactions*).

Instrumental Data:

3. PERQ data is divided into 3 categories of respondents (students, police personnel (including administrators), community members) and two sexual orientations (heterosexual and homosexual as defined by Part 4 of the PERQ) as follows:
 - a. Part 1 of the PERQ measured attitudes and beliefs towards homosexuals and homosexuality (referred to as; *Attitudes: Heterosexual Students, Attitudes: Homosexual Students, Attitudes: Heterosexual Police, Attitudes: Homosexual Police, Attitudes: Heterosexual Community, Attitudes: Homosexual Community*).
 - b. Part 2 of the PERQ measured feelings about homosexuals and homosexuality (referred to as; *Feelings: Heterosexual Students, Feelings: Homosexual Students, Feelings: Heterosexual Police, Feelings: Homosexual Police, Feelings: Heterosexual Community, Feelings: Homosexual Community*).
 - c. Part 3 of the PERQ measured knowledge about homosexuality (referred to as; *Knowledge: Heterosexual Students, Knowledge: Homosexual Students, Knowledge: Heterosexual Police, Knowledge: Homosexual Police, Knowledge: Heterosexual Community, Knowledge: Homosexual Community*).
 - d. Part 6 of the PERQ measured behaviors in police scenarios that included a gay or lesbian component (referred to as; *Scenarios: Heterosexual Students, Scenarios: Homosexual Students, Scenarios: Heterosexual Police, Scenarios: Homosexual Police, Scenarios: Heterosexual Community, Scenarios: Homosexual Community*).

TABLE E1— Indicator of Levels of Homophobia

Qualitative Data • Interviews • Written Comments	Box Shading	Instrumental Empirical Data — PERQ Scores (see literature review for details and scores are normalized to 100%) (Note: Homophobia Estimates will be indicated only for respondents exceeding 20% of total class count. This nomenclature is based on Hudson & Ricketts, 1980. See Chapter 3.) • Part 1 — Attitudes/Beliefs Towards Homosexuals/Homosexuality • Part 2 — Feelings about Homosexuals • Part 3 — Knowledge about Homosexuality • Part 6 — Police Behavioral Scenarios on Homosexuality
Virtually No Homophobia—	1 (no shading)	76% to 100% — High Non-Homophobia
Low Levels of Homophobia: Lesbians Accepted, Gay Males Not Accepted—	2	51% to 75% — Low Non-Homophobia
Moderate Levels of Homophobia: Lesbians Tolerated, Dangerous for Gay Males—	3	26% to 50% — Low Homophobia
High Levels of Homophobia— Dangerous for all non-heterosexuals	4	0 to 25% — High Homophobia

Heterosexual or Homosexual Identity Ascertained from PERQ Part 4:

Responses on the PERQ are analyzed, in-part, according to the sexual orientation of the student. In preliminary review of the data, no respondent identified themselves as bisexual. Thus, responses were categorized either as heterosexual (indicated by checking off the *exclusive* or *predominantly* heterosexual identity boxes in Part 4 of the PERQ) or as homosexual (those having checked off the *exclusive* or *predominantly* homosexual identity box).

TABLE E2 — Training Site #1

Number of Students in Class: 17. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 14. Number of Interviewees: 20.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	—		—
	On Police Culture	n=20; Mixed comments, safe for lesbian officers, “dangerous” for gay male officers, strong administrative support.		Homophobia Est.=2.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	n=10; 63% report agency not homophobic, but gay males are not out.		Homophobia Est.=2.
	Belief Statements	—		—
	% Negative Statements	—		—
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=13)	x=65.87, sd=23.20	x=68.68, sd=22.92 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-2.82, sd=5.74, t=-1.77, df=12, 2-tail sig=.102
	Homosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=1)	x=86.6	x=89.3	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=80.80, sd=1.89	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=4)	x=92.41, sd=6.70	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=2)	x=75.45, sd=23.36	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=3)	x=89.29, sd=4.46	—	—

TABLE E2— (continued).
Training Site #1

Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=13)	x=51.15, sd=22.38	x=57.60, sd=22.21 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=6.44, sd=5.95, t=3.91, df=12, 2-tail sig=.002
	Homosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=1)	x=90.0	x=83.8	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=66.88, sd=11.49	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=4)	x=90.63, sd=4.62	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=2)	x=68.75, sd=12.37	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=3)	x=92.50, sd=7.50	—	—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=13)	x=63.46, sd=21.02	x=67.79, sd=28.28 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-4.33, sd=29.80, t=-.52, df=12, 2-tail sig=.610
	Homosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=1)	x=75.0	x=93.8	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=84.38, sd=4.42	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=4)	x=89.06, sd=5.98	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=2)	x=75.00, sd=17.68	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=3)	x=77.08, sd=34.42	—	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=13)	x=78.70, sd=15.11	x=78.11, sd=13.99 Homophobia Est.=1.	Pooled x=.59, sd=6.63, t=.32, df=12, 2-tail sig=.753
	Homosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=1)	x=84.6	x=84.6	—

TABLE E2— (continued).
Training Site #1

	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=80.77, sd=5.44	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=4)	x=90.38, sd=3.85	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=2)	x=84.62, sd=0	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=3)	x=82.05, sd=8.88	—	—
Site #1— Overall Assessment	Interviews with students and police personnel indicate that gays and lesbians are conditionally accepted by the agency. Lesbians are fairly accepted while gay men are not. With 76% of the class participating in the instrumental research, three of the tests indicate moderately low levels of homophobia. Testing on police scenarios revealed the lowest level of homophobia. Only the Part 2— Feeling towards gays and lesbian instrumental test was statistically significant. Caution, this was a very small class and these conclusions are based on just 13 responses. <u>Conclusion:</u> The agency exhibits low levels of homophobia (Homophobia Est. = 1 to 2) and instrumental testing was unrevealing for most measures except that feelings towards gays and lesbians slightly improved.			

TABLE E3 — Training Site #2

Number of Students in Class: 43. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 34. Number of Interviewees: 6.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=43; Observed 4/5 class very negative.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Police Culture	n=6; No open students or staff, comment on how homophobic the academy is.		Homophobia Est.=4.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	n=15; 35% report gays not accepted, 14% made negative statements, only 16% made positive statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	Belief Statements	n= 37; 70% Negative statements plus other stereotypes.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	% Negative Statements	n=35; 13% neg. statements		Homophobia Est.=2.
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=34)	x=56.36, sd=18.65	x=52.78, sd=21.09 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=3.57, sd=12.96, t=1.61, df=33, 2-tail sig=.118
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=34)	x=42.35, sd=21.33	x=37.21, sd=22.94 Homophobia Est.=3.	Pooled x=-5.15, sd=11.23, t=-2.67, df=33, 2-tail sig=.012
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=34)	x=66.54, sd=17.80	x=61.21, sd=21.42 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=5.33, sd=16.58, t=1.87, df=33, 2-tail sig=.070
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=34)	x=75.11, sd=14.68	x=75.11, sd=16.84 Homophobia Est.=1.	Pooled x=0, sd=8.03, t=0, df=33, 2-tail sig=1.000

TABLE E3— (continued).
Training Site #2

Site #2— Overall Assessment	Class observations and student written responses indicate a very high level of homophobia within the academy and recruits. Approximately 79% of students participated in the instrumental research which also indicates high levels of homophobia. In contrast with the high level of homophobia revealed in feelings about gays and lesbians, students were able to give less negative response to police scenarios. Only the Part 2 — Feeling towards gays and lesbian test was statistically significant with students becoming more anti-gay by the end of training. <u>Conclusion:</u> The academy class exhibited high levels of homophobia (Homophobia Est. = 3 to 4), and training increased negative feelings towards gays and lesbians.
--	---

TABLE E4 — Training Site #3

Number of Students in Class: 39. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 25. Number of Interviewees: 1.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=1; Instructor reports 60% class very resistant and negative.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Police Culture	—		—
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	—		—
	Belief Statements	n=34; 75% negative statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	% Negative Statements	n=31; 28% neg. statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=51.24, sd=19.96	x=52.62, sd=20.44 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-1.37, sd=6.45, t=-1.13, df=27, 2-tail sig=.270
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=36.65, sd=23.14	x=35.94, sd=23.04 Homophobia Est.=3.	Pooled x=.71, sd=6.18, t=.61, df=27, 2-tail sig=.546
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=67.19, sd=14.19	x=67.86, sd=13.47 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-.67, sd=11.83, t=-.30, df=27, 2-tail sig=.767
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=78.02, sd=10.20	x=77.47, sd=14.94 Homophobia Est.=1.	Pooled x=.55, sd=12.82, t=.23, df=27, 2-tail sig=.821
Site #3— Overall Assessment	Instructor report and student written responses indicate a very high level of homophobia within the academy. Approximately 72% of students participated in the instrumental research which indicated high levels of homophobia. Only on the police scenarios did students respond at a low level of homophobia. However, none of the pre- and post-test changes were statistically significant. <u>Conclusions:</u> The academy class exhibited high levels of homophobia (Homophobia Est. = 3 to 4) and instrumental testing failed to indicate effectiveness of training.			

TABLE E5 — Training Site #4

Number of Students in Class: 30. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 0. Number of Interviewees: 6 (no students).

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=30; Observed 2/3 of class held anti-gay beliefs.		Homophobia Est.=3.
	On Police Culture	n=6; All respondents report no or little anti-gay sentiments, no complaints filed recently.		Homophobia Est.=1.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	n=7; 44% believe not homophobic, 33% gay-bashing not seen, 1 student concern.		Homophobia Est.=1.
	Belief Statements	—		—
	% Negative Statements	—		—
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training		Post-Training
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=6)	—		x=77.98, sd=12.04 Homophobia Est.=1.
	Homosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=1)	—		x=92.0
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=89.3		—
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=6)	—		x=60.63, sd=23.11 Homophobia Est.=2.
	Homosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=1)	—		x=93.8
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=66.3		—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=6)	—		x=79.17, sd=15.65 Homophobia Est.=1.

TABLE E5— (continued).
Training Site #4

	Homosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=1)	—	x=81.3	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=81.3	—	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=6)	—	x=76.92, sd=6.88 Homophobia Est.=1.	—
	Homosexual Students: Post-Test only (n=1)	—	x=69.2	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=76.9	—	—
Site #4— Overall Assessment	Very few students or police personnel participated in the research. Although the class was observed to hold overwhelming anti-gay sentiments, the written comments were much less homophobic. The instrumental data is inconclusive about training effectiveness since less than one-fourth (20%) of the class participated and no pre-test was given. However, the instrumental data does suggest that respondents fall somewhere between high to low levels of non-homophobia. <u>Conclusion:</u> The agency seems conditionally accepting of gays and lesbians (Homophobia Est. = 2), and instrumental data on training effectiveness is incomplete and non-revealing.			

TABLE E6 — Training Site #5

Number of Students in Class: 45. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 0. Number of Interviewees: 7.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	Observed majority students holding negative stereotype beliefs.		Homophobia Est.=3.
	On Police Culture	n=7; Mixed response, mostly dangerous.		Homophobia Est.=4.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	—		—
	Belief Statements	n=29; 55% negative statements, 29% positive statements.		Homophobia Est.=3.
	% Negative Statements	n=39; 14% neg. statements.		Homophobia Est.=2.
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data				
Part 1 — Attitudes	Respondents	Pre-Training		Post-Training
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=94.7		—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=95.54, sd=1.26		—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=90.2		—
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=98.8		—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=92.50, sd=3.54		—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=96.3		—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=93.8		—

TABLE E6— (continued).
Training Site #5

	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=100, sd=0	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=100	—	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=1)	x=92.3	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=84.62, sd=0	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=100	—	—
Site #5— Overall Assessment	Observations of the academy class and their written statements indicate a moderately high level of homophobia. Unfortunately, no instrumental testing of students was allowed. Instrumental testing did occur with people who had vested interest in the course and were very knowledgeable. <u>Conclusion:</u> The academy class seemed moderately homophobic (Homophobia Est. = 3), and no conclusions can be made about training effectiveness.			

TABLE E7 — Training Site #6

Number of Students in Class: 105. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 3. Number of Interviewees: 12.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=12; No open academy staff, recruit complaints, shame in lesbian relatives.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Police Culture	n=12; Mix comments, mostly negative, few open officers.		Homophobia Est.=3.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	—		—
	Belief Statements	—		—
	% Negative Statements	n=3: All negative.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Class Reactions	—		—
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=3)	x=67.26, sd=15.73	x=72.32, sd=21.11	Pooled x=-5.06, sd=6.27, t=-1.4, df=2, 2-tail sig=.297
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=12)	x=67.56, sd=19.89	—	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=45.98, sd=28.41	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=92.41, sd=5.68	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=89.29	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=4)	x=95.31, sd=1.69	—	—
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=3)	x=58.75, sd=9.44	x=56.67, sd=10.03	Pooled x=-2.08, sd=.72, t=- 5.00, df=2, 2-tail sig=.038

TABLE E7— (continued).
Training Site #6

	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=12)	x=55.31, sd=25.22	—	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=28.75, sd=24.75	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=90.00, sd=3.40	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=91.25	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=4)	x=97.50, sd=2.89	—	—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=3)	x=75.00, sd=16.54	x=77.08, sd=19.09	Pooled x=-2.08, sd=3.61, t=-1.00, df=2, 2-tail sig=.423
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=12)	x=74.48, sd=12.05	—	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=62.50, sd=17.68	—	—
	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=93.75, sd=8.84	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=93.75	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=4)	x=92.19, sd=11.83	—	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre- and Post-Test (n=3)	x=84.62, sd=7.69	x=79.49, sd=8.88	Pooled x=5.13, sd=4.44, t=2.00, df=2, 2-tail sig=.184
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=12)	x=78.85, sd=15.08	—	—
	Heterosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=80.77, sd=5.44	—	—

TABLE E7— (continued).
Training Site #6

	Homosexual Police: Tested once (n=2)	x=96.15, sd=5.44	—	—
	Heterosexual Community: Tested once (n=1)	x=76.92	—	—
	Homosexual Community: Tested once (n=4)	x=98.08, sd=3.85	—	—
Site #6— Overall Assessment	Class observations and student written responses were all very homophobic. Similarly, interviews with police personnel painted the agency very homophobic. Unfortunately, only 3% of recruits participated in the pre- and post- instrumental testing and results should not be considered representative of the whole. The only instrumental test that showed significance was the Part 2- Feelings towards gays and lesbians. But again, the sample size (3) is much too small to accept this finding. <u>Conclusion:</u> The agency and academy display moderate levels of homophobia (Homophobia Est. = 3) and instrumental testing about training effectiveness was non-revealing due to the low participation rate.			

TABLE E8 — Training Site #7

Number of Students in Class: 94. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 28. Number of Interviewees: 3.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=2; Class unruly, very negative and homophobic, gay recruits called in panic.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Police Culture	n=3; Academy resisted hiring gay instructor, no open staff members, students harassed each other with impunity.		Homophobia Est.=4.
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	n=18; Only 18% report academy not homophobic.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	Belief Statements	n=39; 70% neg. statements. Only 15% pos. statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	% Negative Statements	n=84; 28% neg. statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Class Reactions	Teacher outnumbered and attacked by students.		Homophobia Est.=4.
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=56.35, sd=15.33	x=54.94, sd=16.74 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=1.40, sd=6.59, t=1.13, df=27, 2-tail sig=.270
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=22)	x=54.67, sd=17.55	—	—
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=37.23, sd=13.55	x=35.67, sd=13.71 Homophobia Est.=3.	Pooled x=1.56, sd=6.22, t=1.33, df=27, 2-tail sig=.195
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=22)	x=40.40, sd=14.98	—	—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=67.41, sd=15.62	x=65.40, sd=19.06 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=2.01, sd=13.51, t=.79, df=27, 2-tail sig=.439

TABLE E8— (continued).
Training Site #7

	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=22)	x=60.80, sd=20.15	—	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=28)	x=76.92, sd=18.37	x=80.22, sd=14.11 Homophobia Est.=1.	Pooled x=-3.23, sd=11.16, t=-1.56, df=27, 2-tail sig=.130
	Heterosexual Students: Pre-Test only (n=22)	x=72.73, sd=18.95	—	—
Site #7— Overall Assessment	<p>Class observation, student interviews and student written comments were extremely homophobic. Approximately 30% of students participated in instrumental testing which suggested moderate levels of homophobia. The Part 2— Feelings towards gays and lesbians rated the highest level of homophobia whereas police scenarios rated the lowest. None of the instrumental testing was statistically significant. <u>Conclusion:</u> The academy class is moderately to very homophobic (Homophobia Est. 3-4) and instrumental testing was unrevealing as to training effectiveness.</p>			

TABLE E9 — Training Site #8

Number of Students in Class: 35. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 0. Number of Interviewees: 0.

Source		Comments	Significance
Qualitative Data			
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=29; 20% could not accept homosexuality to be normal, 8% could not administer cultural awareness program because of homosexuality.	Homophobia Est.=2.
	On Police Culture	—	—
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	—	—
	Belief Statements	n=35; 41% negative statements, 32% positive statements.	Homophobia Est.=2.
	% Negative Statements	n=28; 22% neg. statements.	Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Class Reactions	n=31; 35% were positive about course content, 35% challenged the course content.	Homophobia Est.=2.
Instrumental Data	None	—	—
Site #8 — Overall Assessment	Classroom observation and student written comments were moderately homophobic. No instrumental testing was conducted. <u>Conclusion:</u> The academy class is moderately homophobic (Homophobia Est. = 2 to 3), and training effectiveness went unmeasured by instrumental means.		

TABLE E10 — Training Site #9

Number of Students in Class: 53. Number taking PERQ Pre- and Post-training: 25. Number of Interviewees: 0.

Source		Comments		Significance
Qualitative Data				
Interviews/ Observations:	On Training Class	n=2; Panic phone calls from gay and lesbian recruits.		Homophobia Est.=3
	On Police Culture	—		—
Student Written Responses:	On Police Culture	n=41; 55% moral condemnations, 13% agency not homophobic.		Homophobia Est.=3.
	Belief Statements	n=62; 60% neg. statements.		Homophobia Est.=3.
	% Negative Statements	n=38; 24% neg. statements.		Homophobia Est.=4.
	On Class Reactions	n=43; 11% felt training was biased and disgusting.		Homophobia Est.=1.
Instrumental Data				
	Respondents	Pre-Training	Post-Training	
Part 1 — Attitudes	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=55)	x=56.59, sd=13.16	x=58.67, sd=16.10 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=2.08, sd=9.72, t=1.59, df=54, 2-tail sig=.119
	Homosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=2)	x=64.29, sd=39.14	x=61.61, sd=35.36	Pooled x=-2.68, sd=3.79, t=-100, df=1, 2-tail sig=.500
Part 2 — Feelings	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=55)	x=41.63, sd=15.37	x=43.84, sd=16.18 Homophobia Est.=3.	Pooled x=2.26, sd=8.34, t=2.01 df=54, 2-tail sig=.049
	Homosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=2)	x=48.75, sd=30.52	x=48.75, sd=30.52	—
Part 3 — Knowledge	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=55)	x=65.00, sd=17.29	x=63.07, sd=21.53 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-1.93, sd=20.48, t=-.70, df=54, 2-tail sig=.487

TABLE E10— (continued).
Training Site #9

	Homosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=2)	x=71.88, sd=13.26	x=71.88, sd=13.26	—
Part 6 — Police Scenarios	Heterosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=55)	x=73.99, sd=17.42	x=71.19, sd=21.67 Homophobia Est.=2.	Pooled x=-2.80, sd=16.84, t=-1.23, df=54, 2-tail sig=.223
	Homosexual Students: Pre-and Post-Test (n=2)	x=92.31, sd=10.88	x=88.46, sd=5.44	Pooled x=-3.85, sd=5.44, t=-1.00, df=1, 2-tail sig=.500
Site #9— Overall Assessment	Classroom observations and student written responses indicated a moderate level of homophobia in the recruit class. Approximately 85% of students participated in instrumental testing. The Part 2— Feelings towards gays and lesbians rated a high level of homophobia, while all other measures were moderate. Only Part 2 — Feelings test was significant level with a .049 and indicated a slight improvement about feelings towards gays and lesbians. <u>Conclusion:</u> The academy class seemed moderately homophobic (Homophobia Est. = 3) and instrumental testing was mostly unrevealing as to training effectiveness except that feelings towards gays and lesbians improved slightly.			

APPENDIX F — Comprehensive Program and Instructional Model for “Training on Socially Stigmatized Communities”

by Chuck Stewart, Ph.D., University of Southern California, School of Education, Department of Administration and Policy, 1995.

Often “diversity training” is something “done” to students, perceived as punishment and attempts to instill guilt. Sexual orientation training is one of the newest additions to cultural awareness programs in law enforcement, is probably the most controversial, and unfortunately falls into the same “diversity training” trap. Too often, training on gay and lesbian issues originated in response to lawsuits and complaints resulting in community trainers who sometime berate police officers for their alleged prejudice. However, many of the issues brought up by sexual orientation training challenge conventional thought on diversity training and point toward a reassessment of overall program goals and perspectives.

Gay and lesbian culture is often ridiculed for not being an “authentic” culture, and therefore it should not be afforded the same treatment as other cultural groups. Students frequently complain that “sexual orientation training,” or “alternative lifestyle training” is really “homosexuality training” in disguise. Also, questions are raised as to why sexual orientation training receives so much time and emphasis in comparison with other minorities. Each of these concerns point out that it is not anything inherent in groups to warrant diversity training, but that particular groups are stigmatized by social and institutional processes. Law enforcement has often historically been a conservative function of the state and reinforces cultural norms. The legal protections and social norms concerning gays and lesbians are in flux. As such, police organizations are caught between their historical position as oppressors of gays and lesbians with enforcing the new more protected status afforded gays and lesbians by recent changes in law. Thus, law enforcement organizations are faced with overcoming historical forces where they have been partially instrumental for reinforcing gay and lesbian stigmatization. “Diversity training,” “cultural awareness training,” “multi-cultural education,” or “human relations training” are not actually issues of cultural difference, but should instead be viewed as issues of overcoming the stigmatization of particular groups. With this perspective, I propose that training on persons who do not conform to the heterosexual norm be titled, “Training on Sexual Stigmatized Communities.”

All organizations need to examine their employee and customer population to ascertain which groups it reinforces stigmatization and then address those issues through multiple strategies—including training. Presented is an instructional model that provides the framework for a highly effective learning experience available for overcoming stigmatization. Although the content is explicitly on sexual orientation within law enforcement, other stigmatized groups could use the same teaching strategies supplanting sexual orientation content with their own issues. The overall term I suggest for this training is “Training on Socially Stigmatized Communities.”

Goals: A clear set of goals is an essential first step. Vague goals such as to “sensitize” or “increase awareness” do not aide in developing a coherent program, and smacks of political correctness. Particularly, the term “sensitize” should be avoided because it implies that persons are not sensitive to other people needs—which is highly offensive to law enforcement personnel who frequently save lives, provide assistance to people in need and are often the first persons to arrive at situations of medical emergencies. Goals need to emphasize how learning about homosexuality will benefit the organization, agency personnel and interactions with customers. For example, in law enforcement, goals could include: (1) Police personnel will obtain a better understanding

of the agencies' commitment to non-discrimination for gays and lesbians, (2) Exploring personal thoughts and feelings about homosexuality will facilitate self-awareness of the issues and help police personnel identify where they are in agreement and/or conflict with the agency's non-discrimination policy, (3) Accurate information on homosexuality will assist police personnel to replace negative stereotypes they may hold, and help resolve personal conflicts with the agency's non-discrimination policy, (4) The effect of homophobia and heterosexism on the workplace environment and interactions with customers will be explored, and (5) Strategies for overcoming homophobia and heterosexist behavior in the agency and with customers will be developed by students and police administrators in support of identifying appropriate police behaviors. These are suggested goals, but each law enforcement agency needs to customize their own goals, keeping them specifically targeted toward overcoming the stigmatization of gays and lesbians. Homophobia reduces worker effectiveness and subjects an organization to potential lawsuit. It is in the interest of the organization and its members to eliminate homophobia and to accept gays, lesbians, bisexuals, transgenders as equals. Employees who cannot or will not adhere to these goals should be encouraged to change or quit law enforcement.

Instructor(s): Who are the ideal instructor(s) in a police environment?

Psycholinguistic educational theory believes that instructors need to be the kind of persons students want to become. Consequently, different kinds of instructors are needed for different kinds of audiences. For recruit classes, appropriate instructors should be masculine acting (new police go through a hyper-masculine identity stage), no-nonsense yet easy-going, gay and lesbian police officers (both genders need to be present) who are well respected for their professionalism, have a sense of humor and are well liked. For middle managers, instructors need these same qualities but must be a rank above the students. At the highest levels, many police chiefs take a more academic view of themselves and policing (many have graduate degrees) and instructors should have years of police experience, academic credentials and again be well respected.

Obviously, finding open gay and lesbian police personnel with these qualities, along with experience as teachers, is difficult for all but the largest law enforcement agencies. Thus, some other combination of persons could be used to meet these needs. Sexual orientation training requires: (1) at least one person who is skilled in classroom techniques and group processing skills; (2) a subject-matter expert; (3) at least one gay male police officer and one lesbian police officer preferably from the academy or agency where the training is being conducted who are willing to share their life stories; and, (4) all these people must be gender conforming (emphasizing a masculine demeanor), well respected and well liked. Heterosexuals may be instructors, but two officers who are gay or lesbian need to be present to share their experiences. Hopefully, the teaching team will contain persons of color, disabilities (caused while on duty), etc., to demonstrate that gay culture encompasses much more than just gay white males. It is also instructional to have a police officer who is the heterosexual parent of a gay or lesbian child.

If inappropriate persons are used on the teaching team (or panel), strong student resistance often results. Even if teaching skills and content are excellent, students will report negative teacher evaluations that puts pressure on program administrators to take action. Administrators need to work with the teaching team to obtain a balance in training skills and appropriate role models. Similarly, panels made up of community activists are notoriously ineffective because these are not the kinds of persons law enforcement personnel identify with, and in fact, represent some of the very people with whom police have historically come into conflict.

Psycholinguistic Education Perspective: For learning to occur, the information must be comprehensible, meaningful, and modeled by teachers in an authentic manner. In

both teaching and administering, effectiveness of the process is directly related to the serious social obligations precipitated between participants. It is the meaning associated with the social obligations that allows for learning to occur. The greater the social obligations, the greater the exchange of information, skills, attitudes and behaviors. The effectiveness of the information exchange is related to the skill of the teacher or administrator to model the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors in a comprehensible, meaningful and authentic manner. People form social obligations with other people they see themselves becoming. Learning occurs between people who choose to be like each other. “You learn from the company you keep.”

In this context, instruction needs to start with exploring students’ understanding of gender, sex and police work (Moll refers to this as ‘Funds of Knowledge’). Self-awareness activities help facilitate the first step. This prepares students to receive comprehensible information on the processes of gay and lesbian stigmatization, i.e., overt homophobia, institutional homophobia, societal homophobia and internalized homophobia. However, this cannot be irrelevant information. Instead, the information must be kept meaningful by relating it to student’ self-identity as law enforcement personnel. For example, trying to explain sexual orientation variance using the Shively and De Cecco (1993) *tri-continua model* based upon gender identity, social sex-role, and sexual orientation to persons who find Kinsey’s bipolar model unbelievable, would not be an effective place to start. Similarly, a deep analysis of the biological component of sexual orientation is possible only with persons familiar with genetics and biological brain research. Furthermore, much of the recent research and literature on sexual orientation is based on advanced feminist theory and many of the concepts are foreign to all but the educated elite.

Assisting students to greater levels of understanding requires meaningful information they will use, i.e., authentic learning. Real problems of gay and lesbian stigmatization experienced between police personnel and with the community allow students to use (practice) their newly gained understanding and to extend their knowledge to a personal level. Scenarios or role-playing activities are effective for authentic learning.

Finally, making summaries and seeking closure on each sub-topic helps students relate their newly gained knowledge to the goals of the training.

TRAINING PROGRAM

Once training goals have been developed between the agency and instructor, the training team is assembled and training commenced. This section outlines an effective training program on sexual stigmatized communities. An effective training program requires a minimum of 4 hours, as so much of the program involves individual and group activities. Self-awareness takes time, and putting that into practice takes even longer. Reduced time allotments severely impact the effectiveness of the program. A 50-minute lecture on homosexuality designed to ‘sensitize’ employees to the issue is impossible and reinforces the perception that the information is not important. Ideal class size should not exceed 15 students per instructor. Remember, effective teaching requires serious social obligations to be established between students and instructors, which are impossible when class size becomes too large or time allotment is too short.

• Introduction

It is imperative that program administrators, or preferably the police chief, introduce the instructors and stresses the importance of the sexual stigmatization training. Homosexuality is not a deficit and should not be referred to by negative terms. For

example, administrators have been known to say, “We don’t know what causes it,” “These people deserve respect just like the rest of us,” we need to “learn how they think,” “there are no known facts about sexual orientation,” or “Ethnicity, race, and sexual orientation are sometimes used to fog the issue and are scapegoats to evade performance issues and that there are only 2 or 3 [categories of people]— heteros, homos and bisexuals.” These comments only promote heterosexism and continue the stigmatization of gays and lesbians. Hopefully, the program administrator will have made pre-training preparations by personally meeting with each of the students to emphasize the importance of the training to the agency. It is best if administrators keep their comments in line with the established training goals and share a personal experience (such as witnessing a gay bashing) that underscores the terrible oppression gays and lesbian experience and the department’s commitment to overcoming prejudice.

• **Goals of Training and Safe Environment**

Instructors need to state verbally and/or write on the board the goals of the training. Since sexuality, and in particular homosexuality, is such a sensitive issue in our society, students experience much anxiety. Instructors need to acknowledge the anxiety level of the room by commenting that the primary source of this anxiety is generally ascribed to a lack of information we received about sex while growing up—that our sex education classes in school were inadequate (or lacking completely) and that homosexuality was either hidden (no books in the school library) or painted with negative stereotypes. Anxiety about a taboo subject is expected and hopefully the training will raise student understanding and lower their anxiety.

For students to attain self-awareness about their feelings, attitudes and beliefs on homosexuality, the classroom environment needs to be safe for students to ask questions and share feelings. Ground rules for sharing help facilitate open discussion. Therefore, instructors need to verbally state, and/or write on the board instructions such as: (1) “There are no stupid questions;” (2) “Even though we may disagree with someone’s comments, allow the person to finish;” (3) “Avoid put-downs;” and, (4) “We will agree to disagree.”

• **Self-Awareness**

People often make homophobic or heterosexist comments or jokes, but are unaware that they have done so. Most people are unconscious of their feelings and beliefs about homosexuals and homosexuality. Thus, the first step in sexual orientation training is to provide the means for students to become aware of their feelings and beliefs. A number of self-awareness activities seem to achieve these ends and are presented below.

1. *Self-Awareness Scenarios*: Students are asked to write down on a blank piece of paper how they would react or feel to 10 situations concerning gays and lesbians. These situations could be read to the class, written on the board or passed out on a handout. (See the *Modified Attitude Towards Homosexuality Scale* or the *Index of Homophobia* for examples, or create your own— such as “If a police officer of the same sex made a pass at me, I would . . .,” “When I see two police officers of the same sex holding hands, I feel . . .,” “My daughter told me that she is lesbian and wants to bring her police officer lover to Thanksgiving dinner. I tell her . . .,” or “In my agency, gays and lesbians are . . .”). Often, instructors make an erroneous mistake at the step of the process. Some instructors have been observed collecting and randomly redistributing the responses back to the

class with which the instructor rereads the first situation and calls on students to read the papers in front of them aloud. This allows students to assess the level of acceptance or hatred of gays and lesbians by other members in the class, but particularly with extremely anti-gay classes, it reinforces negative attitudes. In this case, students who are highly homophobic will observe that most other students hold similar beliefs and that it is acceptable to be homophobic, whereas the student who is unsure or does not have strong feelings one way or another, will observe that their peers are homophobic and may decide that it is safer to go along with the anti-gay sentiments. Verbally sharing anti-gay sentiments may establish that it is OK to be homophobic. Conversely, if the class is gay-friendly, verbally sharing positive gay sentiments helps to reinforce gay acceptance. Thus, it is suggested that once students write down their personal feelings during a self-awareness activity, in classes that are homophobic, these not be shared with the class verbally but rather the instructor shares the responses non-homophobic persons would make to each situation. In classes that are gay positive, students should be encouraged to share their statements. In either case, the instructor is controlling responses to role-model non-homophobic feelings and behaviors.

2. *Forced-Choice Value Clarification:* Several gay and lesbian scenarios (similar to above) are written on the board, orally read or given to students on a handout. For example, we will assume seven scenarios. Students are asked to rank these as being acceptable and good (#1), to being unacceptable and bad (#7) without duplication of ranking. Since there are only 7 statements and 7 rankings, students are forced to prioritize the statements, thereby gaining self-awareness about their feelings and beliefs about homosexuality. Again, if the class is homophobic, students should not be allowed to express negative statements. Instead, the instructor should share responses a non-homophobic person would make. If the class is gay positive, then students should be encouraged to share. Because of the forced-choice nature of the activity, discussion surrounding the relative merits and concerns about homosexuality are addressed.
3. *Continuum Choice:* Four blank flip chart papers are placed at the front of the room, spaced well apart. A scenario is read to the class and four possible responses are written, one on each paper. One student at a time is asked to come to the front of the class and stand in front of the paper that best reflects his or her beliefs and to give their reasons for the choice he or she made. These discussions bring up many of the issues of stigmatization. Scenarios could include, "In the police agency, how would you describe the acceptance of gays and lesbians or the discussion of homosexuality? Would it be very accepting, somewhat accepting, somewhat hostile, very hostile (these four choices are the responses written on the flip chart paper)." A couple of scenarios should be used.

All of these activities generate much discussion, with many of the negative stereotypes and myths about gays and lesbians emerging. The *Self-Awareness Scenarios* activity handles larger groups well and provides a safe-anonymous atmosphere. The *Continuum Choice* activity gets students up and moving with good visual reinforcement, but it can be intimidating for many students to participate. The *Forced-Choice Value Clarification* activity balances between these other activities. Instructors are encouraged to try all three and see which best compliments their teaching style. Remember, the purpose

of the activity is for students to become aware of their own feelings and beliefs and for non-homophobic responses to be modeled. If the group displays intense homophobia, try to minimize this and reinforce gay-friendly attitudes and behaviors. You want to make homophobes feel isolated and out of touch with the norms of the group.

At this point of the training, students have gained a better awareness of their own beliefs and feelings about homosexuality. Also, many questions regarding sexuality have emerged. Before work applications can be discussed, basic information on sexuality needs to be given to make the process of stigmatization of gays and lesbian comprehensible.

• **Sexual Orientation Research / Overcoming Stereotypes**

One police administrator commented, “research is selected to fit a person’s paradigm.” Another academy dean said, “No accurate information [exists] on what causes it.” Indirectly, these men implied that research presented in sexual orientation training is nothing more than selectively chosen statistics attempting to legitimize homosexuality.

There is much research on human sexuality. Historically, sexologists were interested in sexual “deviance” and selected homosexuality. Because of the heterosexual norm, early research was skewed toward “proving” the deviance. Particularly before the 1970s, when sex researchers looked for homosexuals to study, they went to bars, mental hospitals and jails because that is where “they” could be found. Is it no wonder they found this subpopulation to have higher incidences of alcoholism, mental disorders and criminal behaviors? Early researchers typically did not challenge the assumptions that their subpopulation accurately represented the gay and lesbian population. This problem still exists today because of the difficulties in definitions and finding a population that is neither homogeneous nor wants to be identified.

Two major camps have evolved around sexual identity. The essentialists believe that genetics and biological forces are responsible for sexual, affection and gender identities. Constructionists believe that social forces are the responsible agents. Although these two camps are often presented as competing paradigms, they are actually complementary having ardent supporters in each camp acknowledging the influences of the other.

Most instructors of sexual orientation, either in police or business arenas, take an essentialist perspective—saying that sexual orientation is not a choice. This is a simple answer that limits discussion and removes sexual choices from moral consideration. However, it is incorrect. The often-quoted Kinsey study, biological twin study and paternal brother study, are used as evidence that approximately 8 to 10% of “mankind” is homosexual. These studies attempt to say the research is universal, but it is not. Their measurements were made in societies that hate and condemn homosexuals, places where gays and lesbians have a vested interest in staying hidden. If 10% of “mankind” is homosexual, then in other cultures the same percentage should be found. That is not the case. There are whole societies in which everyone engages in homosexual relationships from about age 8 to age 30, at which time they are expected to get heterosexually married and bear children (although they may continue homosexual behaviors). In these cultures, homosexuality is institutionalized for everyone, and the Western concepts of sexuality make no sense. Cross-cultural analysis is important and demonstrates how sexuality is contextually based. (Two books I would recommend; [1] as a general textbook on human sexuality— Blumenfeld, W., & Raymond, D. 1988. *Looking at gay and lesbian life.*, and [2] for a cross-cultural analysis— Williams, W. 1986. *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture.*)

Human sexuality is vastly complex. It is this complexity that makes it inappropriate to attempt a serious discussion of sexual orientation research in a short workshop environment. Instead, a truncated list of the major myths regarding homosexuality may be addressed. These myths will emerge from the self-awareness activities and the subject-matter expert can provide limited information. The most common myths include: all homosexuals are confused about their gender, carry AIDS, are sexually promiscuous, are emotionally unstable, became homosexual due to some childhood trauma or some parental influence, that lesbians are man-haters, and, gay males make sexual advances on heterosexual men. Students should be encouraged to take college classes on the subject and/or conduct their own readings. Instructors need to provide reading lists and/or distribute topic papers for students to take home and read on their own.

One activity effective at dispelling the myth that gays and lesbians live differently is:

1. *Gay Lifestyle Activity*: Two large circles are drawn on the chalk board. A heterosexual student is asked to share how he/she spends his/her day. The instructor draws lines cutting the circle into segments representing the number of hours devoted to each item. For example, sleeping consumes approximately 8 hours each day, so approximately 1/3 of the circle is marked off (in pie cuts). Once the entire 24-hours are blocked off, one of the homosexual officers shares his/her daily activity. Invariably the circles are very similar. The instructor could emphasize that time spent with family is approximately the same, but that gays and lesbians are usually more involved with friendship networks and "extended families" than biological ones. Much laughter occurs during this activity when it is realized that "sex" usually consumes not more than 15-minutes each day, if that, regardless if the person is heterosexual or homosexual.

In presenting the sexual orientation research, it is important to keep in mind the training is not a comprehensive course on human sexuality but aimed at reducing homophobia in the workplace. It presents information on the subtle and not so subtle ways in which society stigmatizes and reinforces oppression, leading to important group discussions on these issues. The instructor needs to guide the sexual orientation research questions, showing how homophobia is linked to racism, sexism and processes of stigmatization.

It is during this section that the most discussion and debate occurs. There is always a contingent of people who challenge the accuracy of the research, some vehemently so. In particular, some students claim the research presented by the instructor is "biased" (similar to the comments made by program administrators). One trainer was observed to bring along about 15 academic books and indicated that a majority of the authors were heterosexual. This does not appear to overcome the objections since these students are entrenched in their belief and no amount of data or research will change their minds. (Not surprisingly, none of these students have ever read on the subject.) Debate often brings the class to a halt and is counter-productive. If this occurs, instructors must end the stalemate by stating something like, "I agree with your right to disagree, but we must move on. This is accurate information on homosexuality and you are encouraged to conduct your own research and study." To respond to religious objections to homosexuality, I suggest saying, "Some religions are anti-gay, others are neutral, and still others have special roles for homosexuals as religious leaders. Because the U.S. legal system is based on separation of church and state, you as a public employee cannot impose your religious beliefs over the other people you are working with or the diverse community you serve. If you cannot take a neutral stance, you should consider some other line of work other than law enforcement."

• Personalizing Gays and Lesbians

The presentation of sexual orientation research causes distress for many students. Most of the information is contrary to what they have been lead to believe and for many, it puts them in conflict with their moral and religious convictions. At this point, it is important to attach a human face to the issues. A number of activities are helpful in accomplishing this:

1. *Personal Stories*: (a) Gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender law enforcement officers tell their life stories. Besides telling when they first became aware they were not heterosexual, they need to tell about becoming police officers and the conflicts they faced about being out or closeted. If possible, include a heterosexual police officer who has a gay or lesbian child. This brings up issues of parents and friends who must also come out when someone they know comes out gay or lesbian. Each speaker should not talk longer than 15 minutes, including answering questions from students. (b) Students in the class could be asked to share their personal experiences with either being gay or lesbian, having a relative who is homosexual, or working with someone who is gay or lesbian. Sometimes, people will share a “bad” experience such as being “hit” upon, but this gives the class an opportunity to discuss heterosexual double standards.
2. *Famous Gays and Lesbians Activity*: Students are handed a list of famous gays and lesbians. A label is stuck to their back with one of the names from the list written on it. Students are asked to walk around and ask their neighbors questions that can be answered with either a yes or no to help them identify the name on their back. After students identify the name on their backs, they sit down and a class discussion is led by the instructor. Much controversy can erupt with the inclusion of Abraham Lincoln, Eleanor Roosevelt and J. Eager Hoover and a subject matter expert should be prepared for student disbelief. (Major gay and lesbian bookstores have many biographies and books of “lists” available from which to make a list for your activity.)
3. *Gay Cops*, video from 60-Minutes with Mike Wallace—This is a wonderful 20 minute segment of interviews with gay and lesbian police officers, FBI agents and others.

Having fellow officers share their stories is the most effective method of personalizing information on homosexuality. THIS IS A NECESSITY. If this is not possible, a video of police officers needs to be made. The other two activities—Famous Gays and Lesbians and *Gay Cop* video—should only be used as optional enrichment activities.

• Just How Bad Is It For Gays and Lesbians in Our Heterosexist Society?

Sharing personal life stories presents evidence and opens discussion on the various ways gays and lesbians are oppressed and stigmatized. Most people are unaware of how difficult it is to be homosexual in a heterosexist society. Students often complain that gays and lesbians are seeking “special rights” and that we have a secret “gay agenda.” What we want is the bashing, the firings, losing our children in custody battles, losing our housing, and the hatred thrown toward us to stop. Our “gay agenda” is to obtain the same rights and considerations afforded all people.

This section of the training gives information to show that discrimination against gays and lesbians continues from a multitude of social, institutional and legal forces in our society, and these forces have a direct impact on the workplace. The training needs to show how this discrimination harms efficient operation of the department and that it is a major reason why the department is firmly committed to ending discrimination. When police spend their energies hiding, or being worried about discrimination, they cannot do their job well.

Societal Homophobia: One of the major ways a society controls and oppresses groups of people is through the use of language. Stereotypes denigrate people into controllable boxes. Stereotype activities are effective at revealing how these processes are used to control gays and lesbians. The following three stereotype activities have slightly different emphasis and instructors are encouraged to experiment with them to find which is the most effective for their teaching needs:

1. Stereotype Activity #1: Use four pieces of flip chart paper or four columns on the chalk board. At the top of one is written “names,” the next paper has the words “images/mannerisms,” the next has the word “professions,” and the final paper is titled “other words.” Starting with the first column, students are asked to call out names used to describe gays and lesbians. Words such as *faggot*, *dyke*, *fairy*, *queer*, *bulldagger*, *sissy*, *lezzie*, *butch*, *homo*, etc. will commonly be given. Moving to the next column (images/mannerisms), students will say words such as *lisp*, *swishy*, *limp wrist*, etc. On the next column, students will say professions such as *hair dresser* (for men) and *truck driver* or *cop* (for women). On the last column, the most negative words are shared including *AIDS*, *promiscuous*, *child molester*, etc.
2. Stereotype Activity #2: Three pieces of flip chart paper or three columns on the chalk board are used. At the top of the first column is written the word “homosexual males,” second column— “homosexual females,” and the third column— “police officers.” Starting at the first column, students are asked to share names, professions or words to describe homosexual males. This process is continued for the next two columns. Words similar to Stereotype Activity #1 will be obtained. Under the “police officers” column, students will suggest words such as *donut*, *motorcycles*, *sunglasses*, *divorce*, etc. Instructors should emphasize that all three columns contain stereotypes which are sometimes true, but generally are not. Also, the media is one of the primary carrier of these images.
3. Stereotype Activity #3: “Lesbian Invisibility”: Four pieces of flip chart paper or four columns on the chalk board are used. At the top of the first column is written “Heterosexual Males,” the second column— “Homosexual Males,” the third column— “Heterosexual Females,” and the fourth column— “Homosexual Females.” Students are asked to participate by providing synonyms and adjectives for each of the categories. Variations of the same word are not allowed (e.g., once you have mother, grandmother is repetitious). (Note: the suggested order of solicitation is—Heterosexual Male, Heterosexual Female, Homosexual Male, Homosexual Female.) Words similar to Stereotype Activity #1 will be obtained. Students will discover that our language reinforces the following stereotypes: heterosexual males— “good,” powerful and unemotional; heterosexual females— “good,” weak and emotional; homosexual males— “bad,” weak and emotional; and, homosexual females— “bad,” and strong. Students will be lead to conclude: (a)

Heterosexual males (particularly white males) maintain their social dominance by assigning words that keep minorities submissive; (b) Even though heterosexual females are perceived as "good", they are maintained as submissive to males by assigning them emotional, unstable, and weak qualities; c) Although homosexual males could be part of the "male dominance", they are perceived as "bad" and assigned emotional, unstable, weak qualities similar to that of heterosexual females; d) The column for homosexual females is not as long as the other three columns. This is always the case! Sociologists explain that heterosexual males could be threatened by homosexual females who are perceived as being strong and who do not need them. Our culture has thus solved this problem by making lesbians invisible. To acknowledge a minority is to empower it. Our language has few terms to recognize homosexual females. This is known as Lesbian Invisibility; (e) There are no positive synonyms for homosexual males; (f) Homosexual females have only one positive or neutral term—Lesbian; and, (g) AIDS has been attached to all homosexuals.

The previously mentioned activities have proven to be quite popular, but instructors should be warned that many of the male students will become quite boisterous, trying to out yell each other. Such behaviors can generally be interpreted as attempts to prove to peers that they could not possibly be homosexual. These activities run the risk of reinforcing anti-gay sentiments if the class gets out of hand and too vicious. Try to keep stereotype activities brief. Also, invariably you will be asked about your own sexuality. If you attempt to avoid answering this question, they will assume you are not heterosexual. This could be very threatening to your self-esteem if you are heterosexual or a closeted homosexual.

Once the charts are completed, the instructor: (a) gives more information regarding the origins of some of the words and research to discount the stereotypes, and (b) leads the class in further discussion regarding the stereotype for gay males as feminine and the stereotype for lesbians as masculine, thus reinforcing the myth that gays and lesbians are gender "confused." The instructor must get the students to question the necessity that all people must conform to only one gender role that is considered "appropriate" for their sex. Other conclusions can be reached about the use of language to control gays and lesbians (see "Lesbian Invisibility" conclusions in Stereotype Activity #3).

Internalized Homophobia: Hearing a constant barrage of negative stereotypes and comments has a significant impact on gays and lesbians while forming their identities in childhood. Accepting the reality of being a person society has deemed sinful and sick often includes a period of self-doubt and self-hatred. Internalized homophobia has direct consequences for the workplace and explains why gays and lesbians need to "come out" and share their personal lives with fellow workers. Activities that illustrate internalized homophobia include:

1. Life Story: One of the teaching team should share their life story emphasizing the internal conflicts he or she experienced while forming their gay or lesbian identity and how they overcame the self-hatred.
2. Videos: Alternatively, there are several videos that graphically present internalized homophobia. These include:
 - "Who's Afraid of Project 10?" 23 minutes. Describes both sides of the issue of whether or not lesbian and gay high school children should have access to gay counseling and support groups. Interviews with Virginia Uribe and political opponents. Also, interview with mother of a boy who committed suicide because he was gay.

- “What if I’m Gay,” 55 minutes. The video shows five teenagers facing the question of their sexuality in a high school setting. Very well done. Explores the repressed sexuality aspects of homophobia.
 - “Growing Up Gay,” 55 minutes. Brian McNaught’s excellent homophobia workshop includes detailed descriptions of what it was like to grow up gay and his resolve to be the “best little boy” to compensate for his “secret.”
3. Guided Fantasy: One training instructor uses a role reversal technique to give heterosexuals the feelings and experiences of what it would be like to grow up in a society that is *homosexist*, i.e., homosexuality was the norm and heterosexuals were the outsider. For details of this technique, see McNaught, B. 1993. *Gay Issues in the Workplace*. This is also presented in his video listed above— “Growing up gay.”
 4. “I Fear”: A police officer wrote a wonderful poem that expressed his fears of being discovered to be homosexual. See, Stewart, C. 1992.
 5. “Heterosexual Questionnaire”: One training instructor developed a series of questions that are typically asked of homosexuals in which the roles are reversed. For example, “When did you discover that you were heterosexual?” or “A disproportionate majority of child molesters are heterosexuals. Do you consider it safe to expose your children to heterosexual teachers?” or “With all the societal support marriage receives, the divorce rate is spiraling. Why are there so few stable relationships among heterosexuals?”
 6. “Shared Weekend Activity”: Because of the historical, social, religious and legal restrictions gays, lesbians and bisexuals have experienced, most find their survival is dependent upon staying in the closet. This means that many gays, lesbians and bisexuals do not share most aspects of their private lives with their family, friends, or co-workers. However, it takes much effort to learn how not to share since it is culturally acceptable to pry into each other’s lives. For example, on Monday morning at work, the first thing employees do is share with each other what they did on the weekend. They tell what they did, where they went, who accompanied them, etc. Gays and lesbians are faced with: (1) either telling the truth and possibly be subjected to social rebuke or worse; (2) lie and use the opposite gender when telling their story (metaphorically known as “Monday Morning Pronoun”); (3) tell their story by making it gender neutral; or, (4) avoid telling anything. In this activity students are randomly paired and told, “For three minutes, you are to tell your partner everything you did this past weekend. However, you are not to indicate the gender of the person(s) you interacted with. That means that you cannot use their name or any other proper noun, and no pronouns such as he/she/him/her. The other partner is to keep track of how many times you make a mistake or each time you use the word *we* by raising their finger for each mistake. If you make more than three mistakes, your partner is to stop you and ask, ‘Who are *we*?’” After three minutes are up, the students switch roles and start again. When the second three minutes are over, have a couple of students share with the class how difficult it was to share their personal life under these conditions and discuss the psychological implications resulting from a lifetime of hiding.

The most important activity is the first activity. Instructors sharing personal stories emphasizing the pain of growing up gay in a heterosexist society is very powerful. This

continues the personal contact between instructors and students and allows for a law enforcement emphasis.

Institutional Homophobia: At this point of the training class, a short lecture on the connection between stigmatization, oppression, sexism, homophobia and heterosexism should be given to tie in the stereotype activity and internalized homophobia. (See Pharr, S. 1988. *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism.*) Again, many people are unaware that gays and lesbians can still be legally discriminated against in most states and cities throughout the U.S. and at the federal government level. Even when there are legal protections, they are often limited and still do not afford equal protection for people who are not heterosexual. A very concise listing of the legal status of homosexuality in the United States is presented in Hunter, N. D., Michaelson, S. E., & Stoddard, T. B., 1992.

• **Points-of-Contact**

By this time, students have increased self-awareness about their beliefs and feelings on homosexuality. They have learned a great deal of information which may be used to counter myths and stereotypes concerning gays and lesbians. This information has been personalized through the sharing of stories and other activities and they have learned about the process of stigmatization. The next section of training deals with specific applications as related to interpersonal relations at work and interactions with customers. Points-of-Contact is primarily conducted through lecture, police officers sharing personal experiences and answering student questions.

1. Point-of-Contact: Employees come in contact with gays and lesbians at two levels: interpersonal in the work environment, and with the customer. Situations that need to be covered in interacting with customers include: (a) traffic stops, burglary, robbery (sexual orientation has virtually no impact in these situations unless civilians share the information or officers make inappropriate remarks or actions due to gay and lesbian stereotypes); (b) lewd conduct and prostitution (sexual orientation has a greater significance here due to the historic misuse of these laws used to harass homosexuals); (c) hate crimes (sexual orientation is very important since gay-bashing is the nation's number one hate crime); (d) domestic violence (sexual orientation is very important since studies show that in gay or lesbian domestic violence cases, officers arrest the wrong person 80% of the time due to gender role stereotyping); (e) civil disobedience (gay activism and protest demonstrations were significant during the 1980s and are expected to continue into the 1990s); (f) bars (police have historically harassed gay bars more than non-gay bars); and, (g) death and injury reporting (officers are frequently the first persons to report a death or severe injury to the victim's significant other and the hidden nature of many gay or lesbian relationships are important considerations determining officer conduct). The work environment also includes many gay and lesbian police personnel. Here, the situations that need to be included for discussion are: co-workers coming out, AIDS hysteria, rumors and witch-hunts, and inclusion of gays and lesbians in office social functions.

The specific content of the *Points-of-Contact* needs to be closely defined by the law enforcement agency. The agency should designate a committee to evaluate police behavior in context with gay and lesbian issues. To make the blanket statement, "we treat everybody the same," ignores the problem and perpetuates heterosexism. Everyone can not be treated the same because the differences are real; heterosexism is so institutionalized that the discriminations and oppressions against gays and lesbians are

virtually imperceptible. Ignoring those differences can lead to injury, complaints and lawsuits. A series of *Points-of-Contact* behaviors were included in the curriculum developed by the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force* which may serve as a good starting point from which other agencies can develop their own. It must be emphasized that agencies need to analyze their particular conditions and develop their own *Points-of-Contact*.

- **Strategies for Overcoming Homophobia**

Although *Points-of-Contact* covered many different situations, both at work and while working with customers, students need to put into practice what they learned. The most effective way to engage students is to have them strategize in small group settings about finding solutions to specific work related problems. The process calls for various police scenarios in which homosexuality is a pivotal factor, be distributed to small groups of students (not more than 4 persons). These scenarios are developed as follows:

1. *Police Scenarios:* Each agency should develop their own scenarios based upon complaints or lawsuits filed against them. One set of scenarios was developed using an ACLU report on homophobia found in a police agencies. Another set of scenarios was adapted from the *Modified Attitude Towards Homosexuality* (MATH, Price 1982) placed in police situations. Yet another set of scenarios was obtained from nation-wide reports of situations where the lack of understanding about gays and lesbians turned otherwise innocuous police situations into deadly confrontations. All of these scenarios included situations such as: (a) father reports a teenage runaway, (b) drive-by name calling, (c) domestic fight, (d) beating in a public park known for sexual activity, (e) gay, lesbian, bisexual, transsexual, transvestite officers coming out, and (f) rumors about co-workers.

The group utilizes the information they have learned to develop strategies for overcoming homophobic and heterosexist behaviors, i.e., to achieve the training goals. These are shared with the class and the instructor processes them through discussion to reach consensus if possible. To relate the list of strategies to the training goals, the strategies should be categorized under *reactive* and *proactive* responses. Under *reactive* strategies, measures such as educating co-workers about AIDS, citing agencies anti-discrimination policy, and other reactions to a homophobic remark are frequently mentioned. Under *proactive* strategies, personal responses and agency responses are possible. Personal proactive strategies often include talking positively with co-workers, openly celebrating gay pride month, and using inclusive language (i.e., encouraging employees to bring their *spouse* to police social function excludes gay and lesbian *partners* or *significant others*). Agency proactive strategies include explicit non-discrimination policies and others to be discussed at the end of this article.

- **Closing**

Working on police scenarios in which homosexuality is a significant factor allows students to transfer what they have learned to an authentic setting. This reinforces social obligations with other members of the class and allows for these connections to continue on the job and in the agency.

Closure: Instructors need to summarize the experiences and relate them back to the training goals. Instructors need to make summary statements at the conclusion of each topic.

Meeting Local Gay and Lesbian Police Organization Members: If students have not already met members of the local gay and lesbian police organization, they should do so before they leave.

Evaluation: Evaluations are needed to get feedback regarding instructor and course content effectiveness. Unfortunately, most course evaluations are nothing more than popularity contests and do not give the kind of information needed to properly assess training effectiveness. The agency needs to create an evaluation form that probes deeper than a simple rating system. It is important to ask for written statements about what parts of the training stood out in their minds, whether these were negative or positive experiences, and why they were significant to them. Similarly, students should be asked to list three things they think would improve the training. It is important to involve students in making the training better.

Resource Materials: Homosexuality is a “hidden knowledge.” In school, when sex education is taught, if homosexuality was mentioned, it usually occupied one-half page under sexual deviance. Schools and libraries did not (and still often do not) have books on homosexuality. Many times, this training will be the first time an openly gay person has talked to police officers about homosexuality. The anxiety level of participants indicates the lack of knowledge possessed by students. Law enforcement agencies are encouraged to provide written resource materials to all students— not just bibliographies, but actual articles of academic research is desirable. The cost of duplicating materials is trivial when compared to the costs of having out-of-service officers involved in training. Short, concise topic papers, including points-of-contact and community and national police organizations, are available through the curriculum published by the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force* (see address below).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO OVERCOME POLICE HOMOPHOBIA

Sexual orientation training is only one facet of a comprehensive anti-discrimination program. There is a direct connection between the support by police administration for sexual orientation training and the effectiveness of that training. Below are suggestions for police administrators to implement in assuring a comprehensive, effective program. These recommendations come from a number of sources: Cizon (1970), St. George (1991), Stewart (1993), and Davidson, (1991). Remember, training cannot be a separate module, but must be part of a comprehensive program to reduce homophobia throughout the department and agency.

1. Policy (to overcome *Institutional* and *Overt Homophobia*): These changes are primarily political, yet establish police cultural norms and set the stage for the development of a symbiotic relationship between all officers, including gays and lesbians.
 - a. Sexual Orientation should be included in the department's non-discrimination policies. However, this is not sufficiently inclusive since transgender and transsexualism are not technically sexual orientations. An

- inclusive policy needs to recognize people of differing sexual, affectional and gender identities, and wording to that effect should be specified.
- b. Policies need to be implemented that strictly prohibit the use of homophobic and heterosexist remarks, either verbal, written, computer-transmitted or otherwise. Strong disciplinary action needs to be taken when inappropriate conduct—unsafe actions, posting flyers, “practical jokes” — are directed toward gays and lesbians. If an employee needs to be dismissed stemming from overt homophobic behavior, this needs to be done publicly and quickly.
 - c. Policies should be implemented which encourage gays and lesbians to come out of the closet, accompanied by an effective process for seeking assistance when harassment is suspected.
2. Administrative (to overcome *Societal* and *Institutional Homophobia*): Each of these proposed changes represents a commitment by a police administration to a nondiscriminatory police force. Policies are ineffective if not implemented and supported by administrators and officers. Most importantly, by having police administrators model appropriate behavior for mutually beneficial relationships, the officers and recruits will likewise exhibit similar behaviors so as to actively participate in the police “club.”
- a. The leaders of the police agency need to set an example by not tolerating prejudice and by stopping the proliferation of heterosexism. The quasi-militaristic culture of the police needs to be altered to one that is less exclusionary and “masculine,” toward one that promotes beneficial relationships between all officers and between the police and the community.
 - b. Thorough investigations need to be made whenever incidences of police brutality against lesbians and gay men occur, whether from the community or the police itself.
 - c. Formation of an independent and empowered civilian committee, including gays and lesbians, whose purpose is to oversee adherence to department policies on non-discrimination, etc.
 - d. Gays and lesbians need to be specifically targeted for recruitment. One chief said there was no need to take special efforts since homosexuals are everywhere and 10% of all recruits will be gay or lesbian. A remark of this sort is much too simplistic because direct recruitment of gays and lesbians sends the signal that the issue is important and the persons obtained through direct recruitment will be role models for other closeted homosexual personnel.
 - e. Open gays and lesbians should be appointed to the police employment division to which complaints concerning harassment or other discriminatory practices may be addressed in maximum confidence.
 - f. To be successful, agencies need a full action-oriented administrative commitment ranging from the police chief to the Sergeant and Field Training Officer. This commitment involves a critical review of management strategies, the award system, general orders, recruiting, training, performance evaluations and promotions so they can be brought in line with anti-discrimination policies.
 - g. In United States society, approximately 4 - 10% of the population identifies as gay or lesbian (although the number of people who engage in both homosexual and heterosexual behaviors is much larger). Within law enforcement, the number of openly gay or lesbian officers should be

- approximately the same. If less than 4% of the law enforcement personnel are openly gay or lesbian, this indicates there are significant problems in the agency. Even in agencies with many open lesbian but no gay males, there are significant problems. Administrators need to be cognizant of the number of open gays and lesbians in their agency.
- h. When an open gay or lesbian officer is promoted or receives some type of award for meritorious performance, the awards ceremony and press release needs to state that they are gay or lesbian. Similarly, when community meetings are held and open gay or lesbian officers participate, their sexual orientation should be made public. Remember, unlike other racial, ethnic or cultural heritage, sexual orientation is not a visible distinction. Unless it is claimed and stated, it remains hidden.
3. Selection Process (to overcome *Overt* and *Institutional Homophobia*): The selection process has been used to maintain the normative boundaries of police subculture. By removing the homophobic and heterosexist gatekeepers, Institutional and Overt Homophobia will be reduced.
 - a. The application and hiring process needs to remove all discriminatory remarks and questions indicating sexual orientation.
 - b. Similarly, applicants should be screened to see if they hold discriminatory attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. Through screening, it is hoped that police subculture will represent a higher ethical order than simply reflecting the values of the community.
 4. Training Program (to overcome *Internal* and *Societal Homophobia*): The primary purpose of these changes is to bring “meaning” to the training program, a meaning that will help the student understand and overcome their Internal and Societal Homophobia. Only through “meaning” is comprehension possible and the potential for attitude change maximized.
 - a. The academy cultural awareness training should specifically address gay and lesbian issues, and include administrators, long-time employees and recruits—and the training should be on-going. By limiting gay and lesbian cultural awareness training to recruits, a strong message is being sent that gay and lesbian issues are not important to the everyday actions of “real” police.
 - b. Gay and lesbian trainers should not be allowed to be the subject of jokes or belittlement, as has been reported by other researchers. This behavior undermines the credibility of the trainers and reinforces the heterosexist environment.
 - c. The cultural awareness training should include simulations of appropriate and inappropriate behavior. It is through these simulations that the officer gains meaning—the most important element for effective learning. However, it is important that these simulations not be presented as reinforcers of stereotypic police norms, but rather as new methods of problem solving and interacting resulting in a new definition of police subcultures.
 - d. The knowledge gained from the gay and lesbian cultural awareness training should be included in the knowledge part of recruit testing, thereby validating the importance of mastering the materials.
 - e. Field simulations need to be developed and integrated into the existing evaluative simulations. Closely related to simulations of appropriate and inappropriate behavior, field simulations are a powerful change element. It is through day-to-day interactions with the civilian population that

- prejudices are reinforced. Field simulations must not gloss over the realities of police work, but neither should they reinforce police biases toward gays and lesbians. Instead, field simulations should yield a different perspective of police officers serving the community, a community that includes gays and lesbians.
- f. Training officers need to be selected on their basis of abilities and non-discriminatory attitudes. If the person is highly homophobic, recruits will mirror these attitudes and behaviors, or else face ridicule and suspicion from their peers.
 - g. Most sexual orientation instructors state at the beginning of class they are not there to change anyone's beliefs or values—that a person has a right to their own beliefs but that they are there to learn appropriate behaviors. Persuasion theory now recognizes that behaviors and beliefs are inexorably linked. Both change simultaneously and it is impossible to change one without the other. The goals stated for sexual stigmatization training include the changing of behaviors and ultimately values will also change. When sexual orientation instructors make their opening statements, they are placating the fears of administrators and students. In actuality, change of values and feelings are goals of the training.
5. Police Socialization (to overcome *Societal Homophobia*): Probably one of the most damaging aspects of police subculture is its norm based on a mythic “ideal” officer that very few officers are able to meet. The police stereotype is reinforced by policy, administration, the screening process, training and through the day-to-day operations. In reality, however, police personnel parallel the dominant culture and not the police myth. This difference causes an imbalance that persuasion theory accurately predicts as emotional conflict. To resolve these differences, police administrators need to demilitarize the police and redefine their role more to that of social worker than that of soldier.
- a. Police agencies need to challenge the mythic “ideal” officer—being authoritarian, “masculine”, bigoted and racist, needing to be in control and cynical. This needs to start at the administrative level, and implemented through the de-militarization of police subculture.
 - b. Often people report that they have no problems with sexual orientation issues at their agency because there are no complaints. When asked if there are any open gay or lesbian officers, they report, “I think there might be one or two . . . people that I suspect but they have never come out to me.” In this situation there are significant problems. If gays and lesbians were comfortable to be open, you would hear about their lives— who they date, their partners, their children, what they did the past weekend with their lovers, etc.— the same things you hear from non-gay personnel. Since gays and lesbians are only suspected, the environment is obviously not safe for them to come out. The problem is not with the gay and lesbian personnel, but with the non-gays who establish the heterosexist norm. Law enforcement agencies need to take proactive measures making it safe for gays and lesbians to come out. For example, the social functions for employees need to explicitly state that gay and lesbian employees are welcomed. If there are collections made for weddings, births and deaths, be sure to include gay and lesbian unions for recognition.
 - c. Research has shown that the most effective way to overcome prejudice is to expose a person to people whom he or she admires and who represents the discriminatory class. Rotating open gay and lesbian officers into

partnership with heterosexual officers helps to reduce prejudice between the two groups.

Closing Comments

The training on sexual stigmatized communities and program recommendations presented here are proven strategies. It is inexcusable for law enforcement agencies not to implement effective programs for overcoming homophobia within their agency. We need to get away from the all too common community panel who are asked to conduct sexual orientation training and simply share their coming-out stories for two hours. Sexual orientation training needs to be conducted by competent and knowledgeable personnel, including gay and lesbian officers. The agency must become vested in the goal of overcoming homophobia. If an agency does not have competent staff with adequate skills to conduct training on sexual stigmatized communities, it would behoove the department to hire expert trainers who are willing to use the recommendations suggested by this research—including paying the costs associated with duplication of handout materials, etc.. Funds budgeted for effective training on sexual stigmatized communities are well spent allocations benefiting the agency, officers and the public.

RESOURCES

• Assessment Inventories

(Modified) Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale (MATHS). Price, J. (1982, October). High school students' attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Journal of School Health*. p. 469. Price modified the *ATHS* as described in MacDonald, Jr., et al., 1973. Measures beliefs and attitudes toward homosexuals and homosexuality.

Index of Homophobia (IH). Hudson, W., & Ricketts, W. (1980). A strategy for the measurement of homophobia. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5(4), 357-372. Measures feelings toward homosexuals and about homosexuality.

Homosexuality Knowledge Index (HKI). Sears, J. (1991). Educators, homosexuality, and homosexual students: Are personal feelings related to professional beliefs? p. 50, in Karen M. Harbeck (ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula*. New York: Harrington Park Press. Measures knowledge level on homosexuality.

Attitude Toward Homosexuality Scale (ATHS). MacDonald, A.P. Jr., Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40(1), 161. Original measure on beliefs and attitudes toward homosexuals and homosexuality.

• Books/Curriculum/Activities

Blumenfeld, W. 1992. *Homophobia: How we all pay the price*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Blumenfeld, W., & Raymond, D. 1988. *Looking at gay and lesbian life*. Boston: Beacon Life.

Cizon, F.A., & Smith, W.H.T. (1970). *Some Guidelines for successful police-community relations training programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Davidson, J. (1991). *The LAPD and the lesbian and gay community*. Written testimony by the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California and submitted to the Special Independent Commission of the Los Angeles Police Department.

Hunter, N. D., Michaelson, S. E., & Stoddard, T. B., 1992, *The rights of lesbians and gay men: The basic ACLU guide to a gay person's rights*. Southern Illinois University Press.

McNaught, B. 1993. *Gay Issues in the Workplace*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Pharr, S. 1988. *Homophobia: A weapon of sexism*. The Women's Project, 2224 Main, Little Rock, AR 72206. Chardon Press.

St. George, J. (1991, November 30). Sensitivity training needs rethinking. *Law Enforcement News*, 17, 347.

- Stewart, C. 1992. *Training for law enforcement: gay and lesbian cultural awareness*. Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Police Advisory Task Force, PO Box 931135, Los Angeles, CA, 90093.
- Stewart, C. 1995. Sexual orientation training in law enforcement agencies: A preliminary review of what works, in the forthcoming book by Sears, J. & Williams, W. (eds.), *Combating homophobia and heterosexism; Affirming dignity and diversity: Strategies that work!* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stewart, C. 1995. *The efficacy of sexual orientation training in law enforcement agencies*. Doctoral dissertation at the University of Southern California.
- Stewart, C. Unpublished. *33-Classroom Activities for Sexual Orientation Training*. Contact author directly at: 710 W. 27th Street #10, Los Angeles, CA 90007 (213) 749-1443, (213) 749-4074 (Fax), ckstewar@aludra.usc.edu.
- Williams, W. 1986. *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Video
- “Gay Cops,” 20-minute video from *60-Minutes* with Mike Wallace.
- “Growing Up Gay,” 55 minutes, 1994. Brian McNaught. TBR Production, P.O. Box 2362, Boston, MA. 02107
- “What if I’m Gay,” 55 minutes, CBS Schoolbreak Special, 1987. Coronet/MTI film & Video, 108 Wilmot Road, Deerfield, IL 60015.
- “Who’s Afraid of Project 10?” 23 minutes, Project 10, Fairfax High School, Los Angeles, CA, 1988.

TRAINING ON SEXUAL STIGMATIZED COMMUNITIES— CHECKLIST

This checklist is a summary of the elements required to obtain the most effective training on sexual stigmatization. Student activities are written with *italicized* typeface.

Training Preparations

1. Goals: Clear goals developed with agency used to reinforce agency commitment to non-discrimination, self-awareness of potential conflict with agency policy, overcoming stereotypes through accurate information, effects of homophobia on workplace, and strategies for overcoming homophobia including identification of appropriate behaviors.
2. Instructors: A team of two or more instructors (including both females and males) who are respected police personnel, subject matter experts, skilled at instructional methodologies, and gender-conforming or leaning toward masculine mannerisms.
3. Resource Materials: Handouts including anti-discrimination policy of the agency, lists of local and national gay and lesbian centers and law enforcement organizations, basic information on human sexuality aimed at dispelling the most common myths and stereotypes, and police scenarios where homosexuality has an important impact.
4. Student Preparation: The program administrator should meet with each of the students to emphasize the importance of the training and to quell any fears students may have about confidentiality, etc.
5. Length of Training/Size of Class: Minimum time for training is 4 hours and class size should not exceed 15 students per instructor.

Training Program

6. Introduction/Goals:
 - (a) Training and instructors introduced by program administrator
 - (b) Goals stated by instructors
 - (c) Ground rules for creating a safe environment conducive for sharing
7. Self-Awareness Activity: To allow for self-awareness about feelings, beliefs, knowledge about homosexuals and homosexuality and to gain awareness about the level of homophobia within the classroom.
8. Sexual Orientation Research / Overcoming Stereotypes
 - (a) Addressing myths and stereotypes that emerged from Self-Awareness Activity with accurate information. *Gay Lifestyle Activity* helps dispel myths.
 - (b) Emphasis needs to link homophobia with racism, sexism and the processes of stigmatization.
9. Personalizing Gays and Lesbians: Most important to have respected gay and lesbian law enforcement personnel share their life stories concentrating on their conflict with being homosexual in a heterosexist society and their decision to become police officers. Other *activities* (including *Famous Gays and Lesbians*, or *Gay Cop* video) could supplement this section.
10. Just How Bad Is It for Gays and Lesbians in Our Heterosexist Society?
 - (a) “Gay agenda” is equal rights, not special rights.

- (b) Societal Homophobia—*Stereotype Activity* to show how gays and lesbians are marginalized and controlled by societal forces.
 - (c) Internalized Homophobia—The impact of heterosexism on gays and lesbians takes a terrible emotional and psychological toll. Use *activities (Guided Fantasy, I Fear, Heterosexual Questionnaire, Shared Weekend Activity)* and videos (“Who’s Afraid of Project 10?,” “What if I’m Gay,” “Growing Up Gay”).
 - (d) Institutional Homophobia— Survey the legal status of homosexuality and the restrictions faced by gays and lesbians.
11. Points-of-Contact: Specific applications to interpersonal relations at work and interactions with customers.
12. Strategies for Overcoming Homophobia: Combining all the information to solve specific work related *scenarios activities*.
13. Closure/Meeting Local Gay and Lesbian Police Organization Members: Summarize and bring to closure the training, and allow students to meet with representatives from local gay and lesbian police organization.
14. Evaluations: Obtain student evaluations of the training. These need to be more than simple “popularity” evaluations.

Administrative Support for Training Program

15. Administrative Follow-up: See the previous sections to find suggestions for vesting the law enforcement organization toward non-discrimination of gays and lesbians. Without follow-up, this training will be denigrated and viewed as a separate issue unrelated to the work environment.
- (a) Policy— Prohibit discrimination against gays and lesbians and to encourage gays and lesbians to be open.
 - (b) Administrative Changes— Administrators need to stop tolerating anti-gay comments and actions, be concerned if few officers are open gays or lesbians, publicly recognize the achievements of gay and lesbian officers, and review management policies that may be exclusionary.
 - (c) Selection Process— Application needs to remove discriminatory language, and help weed out bigoted applicants.
 - (d) Training Program— Cultural awareness training should specifically target sexual stigmatization, specify appropriate response, include field simulations, and recognize that training does involve the changing of values besides behaviors.
 - (e) Police Socialization— Reduce police stereotypes, and make agency safe for gays and lesbians to be open.