

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

2020

LGBTQ+ Civil Rights: Local Government Efforts in a Volatile Era

Nicole M. Elias

CUNY John Jay College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_pubs/483

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Nicole M. Elias
City University of New York

**Research Symposium:
Pursuit of Civil Rights and Public Sector Values in the 21st Century: Examining Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s Vision in the Trump Era**

LGBTQ+ Civil Rights: Local Government Efforts in a Volatile Era

Abstract: *LGBTQ+ issues at the local level pose some of the most pressing civil rights challenges in the current U.S. context. This analysis provides insight into what is taking place in major municipalities and how these efforts can be improved to bolster equity and civil rights for LGBTQ+ populations. At a time when identity, language, and public sector values are inherently intertwined and constantly changing, the following question is ripe for analysis: how are major U.S. municipalities addressing the civil rights needs of the LGBTQ+ population? To answer this question, an analysis of government websites from the top 10 U.S. cities by population is conducted, examining the policies, programs, and services that municipalities offer LGBTQ+ residents and the language used to frame these policies, programs, and services as expressions of power, representations of identity, and the website presentation itself.*

Evidence for Practice

- Municipalities should adopt comprehensive policies, programs, and services to promote LGBTQ+ civil rights that take into account the varied needs of their diverse populations.
- The language used in LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services should be carefully considered, because language has the potential to build inclusion and trust among administrators and LGBTQ+ residents.
- Municipalities should not only develop more inclusive LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services but also work to improve their accessibility and web presence so that knowledge of these efforts is readily available to LGBTQ+ individuals.

Sex, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation are complex topics that are prompting new policy and administrative responses within public agencies (Elias 2017). As the LGBTQ+ population becomes more visible and salient in public discourse, local, state, and federal governments are increasingly addressing civil rights for this population. Often, administrators are faced with questions of how to create policy and make decisions based on evolving conceptions of sex and gender (Elias et al. 2018). Transgender individuals are especially vulnerable to discrimination and violence (Bradford et al. 2013; Colvin 2007; Elias and Colvin 2019; Grant et al. 2011; Sellers 2014).

Many U.S. states and municipalities have passed laws protecting employees on the basis of gender identity, with “20 states plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico and over 200 municipalities having some type of gender identity and gender expression protections for employees in the public or private sector” (Waterfield 2017). Many municipalities and states have adopted LGBTQ+ antidiscrimination laws (see appendix A and appendix B in the Supporting Information online). For example, New York and

Massachusetts enacted protections for transgender individuals in public accommodations (Creamer 2018), and New York City passed legislation to allow gender-neutral options on birth certificates (Sullivan 2018). Yet, despite the LGBTQ+ population’s unprecedented degree of political and social acceptance in the current U.S. context, LGBTQ+ individuals are frequently targets of discriminatory acts and punitive structures and policies in some jurisdictions.

Many municipalities have no LGBTQ+ protections or actively legislate against LGBTQ+ civil rights. To date, 26 states in the United States have no explicit prohibitions on discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in state law (Movement Advancement Project 2018b). In three states (Arkansas, North Carolina, and Tennessee), cities are explicitly banned from passing nondiscrimination provisions that would protect LGBTQ+ people (Movement Advancement Project 2018a). In this volatile area of policy, most public administrators have the latitude to promote civil rights by offering services and protections, which may originate in any of the three branches of government at the federal,

Nicole M. Elias is assistant professor in the Department of Public Management at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York and codirector of Women in the Public Sector. Her research focuses on social equity in public administration and policy, with an emphasis on the ethics of administration, management of human resources, and policy impacts on different populations. Her forthcoming work includes two coedited volumes: *Ethics for Contemporary Bureaucrats: Navigating Constitutional Crossroads* and *Handbook of Gender and Public Administration*.
Email: nelias@jjay.cuny.edu

Public Administration Review, Vol. 80, Iss. 6, pp. 1075–1086. © 2020 by The American Society for Public Administration. DOI: 10.1111/puar.13188.

state, or local level, with the longevity depending on the institution (Knauer 2012). Therefore, LGBTQ+ individuals often encounter inconsistent legal and policy environments with respect to relationship formation, parenting, health care, immigration status, housing, eligibility for government benefits, taxes, employment, education, and safety (Knauer 2012, 749). This heightens the need to better understand civil rights disparities in U.S. jurisdictions, particularly if the Donald Trump administration is successful in redefining gender by curtailing Title VII protections for the LGBTQ+ population.

Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352, 78 Stat. 241), individuals are protected from discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, national origin, and religion (Guy and Fenley 2013). Title IX also protects individuals from sex discrimination in education programs and activities that receive federal financial assistance. Transgender individuals fall under the Title VII and Title IX category of sex. If the Trump administration's proposed redefinition of gender as "a biological, immutable condition determined by genitalia at birth" is adopted, this would essentially define transgender identity out of existence (Green, Benner, and Pear 2018), and transgender individuals would lose their Title VII and Title IX protections. In this turbulent policy and administrative environment, more research on what is taking place and how to improve LGBTQ+ civil rights is needed.

This research aims to explore the way local government initiatives conceptualize and address LGBTQ+ civil rights issues. The importance of this work is twofold: first, it draws attention to and promotes understanding of LGBTQ+ civil rights in municipalities, which is an area of public administration scholarship that is in need of greater attention; second, going beyond a content or policy analysis, this research utilizes critical discourse analysis to apply a critical lens to municipal policies, programs, and services and the way this content is presented on public-facing government websites. Wallmeier, Helmig, and Feeney (2019) argue that a starting point for knowledge construction is to emphasize and examine language use, and discourse analysis allows for such inquiries. At a time when identity and public sector values are inherently intertwined and constantly changing, the following question is ripe for analysis: how are major U.S. municipalities addressing the civil rights needs of the LGBTQ+ population? To answer this question, an analysis of website content from the 10 largest U.S. cities by population is performed to better understand the treatment of the LGBTQ+ population and discourse surrounding this population.¹ Local government "is more proximate and accessible to individuals than state or federal government," and local policy issues "are likely to be more immediate and comprehensible to individuals than state and federal policy" (Nabatchi and Amsler 2014, 64S).

Given that municipalities are "laboratories of democracy" (Tafoya 2018), they have a significant role in shaping public opinion about LGBTQ+ civil rights and in influencing how LGBTQ+ civil rights are addressed beyond the local level. Major municipalities are the focus of this research, because they play such a critical role in the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals within their jurisdictions, particularly when considering civil rights inconsistencies across jurisdictions. The major themes of "legal protections," "community outreach/education," and "quality of life" frame this analysis, and

from these themes, more nuanced subthemes are developed (see appendix C).

In addition to answering this research question, the findings suggest means of promoting public service values for the LGBTQ+ population. This project addresses the role of public administrators pursuing civil rights and promoting public sector values by exploring public-facing programs, policies, and initiatives that guide administrative action in major U.S. municipalities. Ultimately, this research contributes to our limited understanding of normative foundations and local policy, programs, and services that impact LGBTQ+ civil rights.

Theory

Inequities that LGBTQ+ communities are experiencing now occupy a prominent position in the public consciousness, and governments are beginning to respond to these pressing challenges. LGBTQ+ individuals face disproportionate rates of discrimination and violence (Grant et al. 2011). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer (LGBQ+) people have higher rates of mental health problems, abuse, harassment, and victimization (Katz-Wise and Hyde 2012, 143–144). Transgender people are more likely to live in poverty than cisgender people; face harassment and discrimination in school and the workplace; and experience economic insecurity, homelessness, poor health outcomes, and discrimination in public accommodations (Grant et al. 2011). LGBTQ+ people experience cultural victimization, "which refers to the impact of living in a heterosexist society" (Katz-Wise and Hyde 2012, 143). This has been linked to trauma, shame, stigma, and a negative self-conception.

Civil rights are a mechanism for achieving social equity and legal equality for marginalized groups, as they provide protections that dominant groups already inherently enjoy (Ross 1999). Legal civil rights protections provide recourse when a person or group is wronged. Equality, as the debate on civil rights and affirmative action in the United States shows, has been interpreted increasingly as formal equality—as part of a right not to be treated differently—rather than as substantive equality—oriented toward the achievement of equality of outcomes for structurally disadvantaged communities (Grigolo 2017). While the importance of promoting social equity is salient and well documented in the literature (Blessett, Fudge, and Gaynor 2017; Gooden 2017), research on government action pertaining specifically to the LGBTQ+ community is extremely limited and tends to focus on the federal government. This literature review is divided into three sections: the public value of social equity; municipalities promoting civil rights generally; and municipalities promoting LGBTQ+ civil rights specifically. These three streams of scholarship provide a basis for understanding policy, programs, and services targeting the LGBTQ+ population.

Public Value of Promoting Civil Rights for Greater Social Equity

Governance in the United States aims "to promote the general welfare, provide defense, and solve social problems" (Naylor 2020). Formal government institutions represent important resources in terms of funding, power, and expertise (Warner 2001). Administrative responsiveness to marginalized populations varies

across time, agencies, and location. Social equity is not a right made explicit in the U.S. Constitution, but rather “a term that implies fairness, right, and justice” (Guy and McCandless 2012, S6), and centers on “fair and just treatment, justice, and the equal and equitable distribution of benefits to the society at large” (Ricucci and Van Ryzin 2016, 22). In addition to American democratic ideals, the leading interdisciplinary public service organization, the American Society for Public Administration, has a Code of Ethics that specifically names social equity as a core societal principle (Gooden 2017). Public service continues to respond to marginalized populations as governments face increasingly complex societal problems and evolving means of service delivery (Piatak 2014). Yet this is no easy task. Gooden (2015, 3) highlights the hesitation to tackle the “big” social equity challenges with the concept of “nervous government”—a government hesitation to create or advance social equity initiatives.

Although issues of equity and justice are central concerns of public administrators and they must constantly take into account social climate in order to promote equity, if organizations are too uncomfortable to engage with new and potentially controversial topics, such as LGBTQ+ protections, they will be unable to achieve equity in governance (Gooden 2015, 4). Social equity has always been a core value of public administration, and it has grown in importance over the past few decades (Frederickson 2005). Only recently “have other fields, disciplines, and bodies of professional practice stepped up their consideration of social equity,” so it can be said that public administration has led the way when it comes to social equity (Frederickson 2005, 32). A theoretical commitment to social equity should be paired with concrete public service practices (Gooden 2017, 825). Despite a long-standing commitment to fairness as an administrative principle, public administrators face the reality that public servants and policy in the past have contributed to and widened inequities (Nisar 2018). To remedy these disparities, Guy and McCandless (2012) consider social justice and equity to be one of the pillars of public administration and public service. Frederickson (2005, 33) highlights the ability of public administration to impact equity disparities: “American politics has tilted the playing field toward the privileged and away from the under-privileged,” were it not for public administrators dedicated to social equity, inequality would be much more severe. In the current context, especially related to LGBTQ+ civil rights, public administrators should do more to address disparities. As Gooden (2017, 825) emphasizes, simply measuring existing disparities is not enough; in recent years, however, more tools have become available to assist state and local governments in combating inequities.

A more proactive approach to social equity by local-level administrators is needed. Many governments have recognized this need and created specific policies and initiatives to promote social equity. These “range from narrow programs within a specific government agency or unit to broad-based approaches that are part of an overarching jurisdictional social equity or justice strategic plan” (Gooden 2017, 825). Governments at every level have developed diversity programs, such as programs aimed at increasing the number of women, people of color, and disabled people in their workforces (Ricucci and Van Ryzin 2016, 22). Often on matters of civil rights and social equity, local and municipal governments

will enact protections where state and federal government policy is lacking (Movement Advancement Project 2018a).

Municipalities Promoting Civil Rights

Governments seeking to promote social equity and civil rights create policies designed to enhance the political power and economic well-being of disadvantaged and marginalized populations (Blessett, Fudge, and Gaynor 2017). There are numerous examples of governments crafting policies to protect and serve marginalized members of their communities, including people of color, low-income people, women, and people with disabilities. Frederickson (1990) uses the *Brown v. Board of Education* case to demonstrate that public agencies have the capacity to actively promote civil rights. Frederickson argues that in *Brown*, simply ruling that segregating public schools by race is unconstitutional is the minimum government effort required to promote social equity. He questions whether more could be done to repair the damage caused by a century of racially segregated school systems, suggesting that government should take a more proactive approach to address social inequities (Frederickson 1990).

Since Frederickson’s social equity work in the 1990s, scholars have applied this lens to affirmative action (Broadnax 2000; Saunders 2011), public financial management (Kioko et al. 2011), equal employment (Golland 2011; Ruijer 2012), and social justice, mental health and substance abuse (Merritt 2014) topics over the past three decades. Affirmative action is one example of a larger proactive government program that attempts to address a social inequity by promoting the education and employment of people of color across all municipalities (Nay and Jones 1990); yet affirmative action has been largely politicized and replaced with “diversity and inclusion” initiatives (Elias 2013).

The role and nature of municipal action surrounding civil rights is gaining momentum, but it remains in flux. Local governments, in particular, are identified as institutions capable of filling gaps and adding value for more equitable rights (Grigolo 2017). Recent efforts by municipalities to promote civil rights have moved from “civil rights” to a more encompassing discourse of “human rights.” For example, local-level human rights efforts often involve a more proactive approach in the form of legislation banning discrimination in housing based on the source of an individual’s income, prohibiting the consideration of arrest or conviction in employment decisions, and prohibiting discrimination in employment based on credit history (Johnson 2016). Grigolo (2017) suggests that while local governments enhance the relevance of human rights, human rights also bolster the power and credibility of local governments. Namely, local municipalities practicing human rights show the influence not only of human rights on the city, but also of the city on human rights (Grigolo 2017). At the end of the twentieth century, many cities saw a shift in their rights discourse from civil rights to human rights, which has expanded the practice from a more legal and individualistic policy approach, centered on the treatment of complaints toward the individual citizen, to one that takes into account broader and formal human rights questions and community issues (Grigolo 2017). From this discursive and practical shift, it is important to examine how these larger trends impact the LGBTQ+ population, specifically.

Municipalities Promoting Civil Rights for LGBTQ+ Populations

A guiding principle inherent in public ethics is that government officials are obliged to serve all members of the public, irrespective of who they are or where their lives have taken them (Johnson, Rivera, and Lopez 2018). Although municipal LGBTQ+ efforts have increased significantly in recent years, there are still limited policies, programs, and initiatives for this target population (Human Rights Campaign n.d.-a). According to the Human Rights Campaign, municipal efforts toward the LGBTQ+ community typically take the form of comprehensive nondiscrimination laws, city executive and police LGBTQ+ liaisons, discrimination reporting practices, LGBT elected or appointed officials in senior leadership roles, direct services, and inclusive health benefits (Human Rights Campaign n.d.-a). LGBTQ+ civil rights may originate with any of the three branches of government at the federal, state, or local level, but the scope and the longevity of a given right often depends on the institution that granted it (Knauer 2012). More specifically, the most significant single achievement of the LGBTQ+ movement in promoting civil rights has been its successful struggle for marriage equality in the United States (Johnson, Rivera, and Lopez 2018). This momentous win was not a clear or easy path to policy; it involved numerous key actors, levels of government, and branches of government.

Beyond marriage, LGBTQ+ policy is an emerging policy arena in which diffusion and administering while “learning as you go” is the norm. Jurisdictions that pass policies to better serve LGBTQ+ community members often become case studies, providing policy makers with opportunities to evaluate and refine the effectiveness of emerging ideas that can be adopted in other jurisdictions, also known as the snowball effect (Shipan and Volden 2006). Urbanism and social diversity influences are the most likely explanations for LGBTQ+ inclusive municipal policies, according to Cravens (2015). Of the studies that examine local adoption of LGBTQ+ antidiscrimination policies, local population size is most common but not the sole factor in determining such policy adoption (Cravens 2015). Factors such as partisanship, issues salience, and electoral competition also play an important role in explaining diffusion at the municipal level (Cravens 2015). This is a central reason why the sample of this study includes the top 10 municipalities by population size. Yet recent demographic trends indicate that this is beginning to change, and up to 20 percent of the LGBTQ+ population in the United States now resides in rural America (Fadel 2019). Though the dispersion of LGBTQ+ individuals is changing, a significant majority of the LGBTQ+ population remains in urban areas, where members of this demographic enjoy greater civil rights protections. Often, large municipalities serve as examples for other jurisdictions to follow.

A key example of LGBTQ+ policy diffusion is local-level transgender protections. Since 1975, when Minneapolis became the first city in the United States to prohibit discrimination based on gender identity or expression, the number of states and local jurisdictions protecting transgender individuals has steadily increased (Colvin 2007). Currently, 98 jurisdictions—including local and state jurisdictions—have policies that ban, at a minimum, public employment discrimination against transgender people (Colvin 2007). *Public Integrity* recently published a symposium addressing one of the most prevalent issues impacting local-level LGBTQ+ administration and

policy, youth homelessness. Some specific examples of local-level LGBTQ+ municipal efforts in this symposium involve policing methods (McCandless 2018), learning from the success of other municipalities (Dolamore and Naylor 2017), multisector approaches to address the pressing challenges of homelessness among LGBTQ+ youth (Norman-Major 2018), absent inclusion policies for problems facing homeless transgender youth (Sellers 2018), public library services for LGBTQ and gender variant youth (Robinson 2016), and public ethics and administration approaches to ethical dilemmas in dealing with homeless LGBT youth in the twenty-first century (Johnson 2018; Johnson, Rivera, and Lopez 2018).

Though the academic literature on the topic of LGBTQ+ civil rights is limited, the scholarship targeting local-level efforts from an administrative and policy perspective is even more limited. The *Public Integrity* symposium and other recent studies have identified fruitful approaches to promoting LGBTQ+ civil and human rights. Pomeranz (2018) puts forward constitutional arguments against local government legislation that does not uphold or promote the civil rights of the LGBTQ+ population based on the establishment clause and equal protection clause. He explains that the establishment clause and equal protection clause together can challenge larger municipal efforts to deny LGBTQ+ civil rights on the basis of policy vagueness, religion, and discriminatory classification (Pomeranz 2018). Monro (2007) posits that lesbian, gay, and bisexual equality initiatives in the local government arena derive from modernization and recent statutory and policy changes. These initiatives are increasingly implemented through interagency and institutional partnerships, or “institutional hybridization” as a means of understanding the collaborative, and sometimes conflicting, processes associated with governance in the field of sexualities equalities work (Monro 2007).

On the other hand, some municipalities expressly limit LGBTQ+ civil rights. In 2015, the U.S. Supreme Court, in its ruling in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, upheld that the U.S. Constitution protects the right of same-sex couples to marry. Since then, some municipalities have proposed or enacted legislation that permits residents to discriminate against LGBTQ+ individuals (Pomeranz 2018). For example, Arkansas’s Intrastate Commerce Improvement Act of 2015 prohibits local governments from enacting increased civil rights protections for LGBTQ+ individuals who are not listed in the state’s civil rights act (Pomeranz 2018). Often created under the guise of religious freedom, these measures seek to protect those who claim that their religious beliefs are incongruent with serving members of the LGBTQ+ community (Pomeranz 2018). Some state and local laws largely protect against discrimination based on sexual orientation but exclude protections based on gender identity. This absence of protections for gender-nonconforming individuals is particularly problematic when jurisdictions target LGBTQ+ individuals with “religious freedom bills” or “bathroom bills.” Religious freedom bills allow for discrimination against LGBTQ+ individuals in the name of religious beliefs being inconsistent with nontraditional male/female, heteronormative identities. Likewise, bathroom bills that are closely linked to religious beliefs and traditional definitions of sex and gender harm transgender and gender-nonconforming individuals, because they are required to use the bathroom that corresponds to their sex assigned at birth, rather than the bathroom that matches their gender identity.

Understanding how municipalities can thwart discriminatory efforts is critical to protecting LGBTQ+ civil rights. Only within the past decade have local efforts begun to focus on LGBTQ+ employment protections. Riccucci explains the equalizing impact of employment rights: “civil rights laws, and litigation have no doubt helped to create some equity in terms of entry into government jobs and, in some cases, pay but legislation, and even litigation also must be aimed at the upper, higher-paying levels of government jobs” to further this social change (Riccucci 2009, 379). This policy arena becomes even more complex when considering state and federal policy that impacts municipality efforts targeting the LGBTQ+ population. The federal government, along with many states, largely does not explicitly protect LGBTQ+ individuals in many aspects of public and private life (Elias 2017; Elias et al. 2018). However, The Equality Act was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on March 13, 2019. This bill “prohibits discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity in areas including public accommodations and facilities, education, federal funding, employment, housing, credit, and the jury system. Specifically, the bill defines and includes sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity among the prohibited categories of discrimination or segregation” (H.R. 5, S. 788, 116th Congress [2019–20]). Federalism often makes LGBTQ+ policy contentious and confusing for LGBTQ+ individuals and even government actors (see appendix A and appendix B for major LGBTQ+ federal and state laws). This emerging and complex policy environment in U.S. municipalities deserves greater exploration.

Methods

To explore municipal efforts to promote equity and civil rights for the LGBTQ+ population, the following research question is posed: how are major U.S. municipalities addressing the civil rights needs of the LGBTQ+ population? To answer this question, an analysis of government websites of the top 10 U.S. cities by population was conducted, examining the policies, programs, and services that municipalities offer LGBTQ+ constituents and the language used to frame these policies, programs, and services as expressions of power, representation of identity, and the website presentation itself. The goal of this research is to produce a rich, qualitative analysis of public-facing web content. However, this analysis does not take into account the construction and implementation of the policies, programs, and services. The website content analyzed serves as a foundation to inform future LGBTQ+ policy and administrative behavior, consistent with previous work (Elias 2013; Elias et al. 2018). The following section presents an overview of discourse analysis as a method and its fit with this study. Then, the means by which data was collected and strategies for analysis are detailed.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a framework to study “the relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships” (van Dijk 1993, 249). This interpretivist approach to exploring discourse “combines a critique of discourse and explanation of how it figures within and contributes to the existing social reality, as a basis for action change that existing reality in particular respects” (Fairclough 2015, 6). Unlike other discourse analysis lens, CDA does not assume that language is a neutral vehicle that represents reality (Darweesh and Abdullah 2016, 87). Rather, language

serves to reproduce structures of power and dominance, both at the individual level and at the structural or societal level (van Dijk 1993).

A critical lens is appropriate for the study of efforts related to the LGBTQ+ population, as several scholars highlight the utility of CDA being “especially valuable for studies of sexuality” and “for language-centered studies, especially” (Leap 2013, 644). Language “occupies multiple domains within the everyday lives of social subjects claiming a non-normative sexuality” or gender identity (Leap and Provencher 2011, 711). The language used to describe LGBTQ+ individuals and groups reifies these identity constructs. Conversely, heteronormativity and cisnormativity, as well as homophobia and transphobia, typically perpetuated by the dominant heterosexual and cisgender groups—are largely rooted in language as well (Provencher 2011). Ultimately, discourse plays a critical role in social systems: it is linked to and structures society (Bucholtz 2003, 50) and shapes the construction of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and meaning (Jorgenson and Phillips 2002, 67). CDA is utilized for this study, because the research question aligns with the major themes and goals of CDA. Namely, CDA goes beyond an inventory of text and “addresses social wrongs in their discursive aspects and possible ways of righting or mitigating them” (Fairclough 2010, 10–11).

Data Collection

This research includes public-facing municipal website content obtained by internet searches of official government websites. This is the most appropriate research design, because it provides a means to analyze not only what policies, programs, and services municipalities offer LGBTQ+ individuals but also how these policies programs and services are shared publicly. Taking a “citizen perspective” affords the researcher the ability to apply a critical lens to website content and format. During the course of this project, the websites of the top 10 U.S. municipalities by population were identified (see appendix D). From the main municipality webpage, a search for the keyword “LGBT” was performed. From this search, all pages that yielded comprehensive results were examined. These search results ranged from approximately 13 to 803 results, depending on the municipality. The pages that detailed policies,² programs,³ and services⁴ were included in the sample. Press releases, news articles, and official statements were not included. For example, New York City’s Police Department LGBTQ Outreach Unit was included, because it provides information on the New York City Police Department program intended to build relationships with the LGBTQ+ community through direct links to a series of available services. Alternatively, a news article by the New York City press office praising New York City for receiving a perfect score for LGBT Inclusivity by Human Rights Campaign for the fifth year in a row was not included, because it does not provide site visitors with direct links or access to policies, programs, or services. A “one-click” rule was used for links embedded in front-facing web pages that included scant information, such as titles and lists of programs with very little substantive content.

Data collection was performed during March 2019, and the final sample included 30 policies, programs, and services from 10 municipalities. In addition to website searches, each municipality was called by phone on a weekday within normal business hours

using a specific script seeking out available LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services (see appendix E). The purpose of this additional research step was to gain insight on the accessibility of LGBTQ+ policies, programs and services from the resident perspective, particularly those who do not have access to or did not opt to visit the .gov website.

Data Strategies

To analyze web content, the data strategies in this analysis “involve continuous construction and reworking on categories and textual interpretation,” consistent with previous approaches (Elias et al. 2018, 60). Like (Hsieh and Shannon 2005), this project utilizes immersion techniques in which categories are not predetermined and instead rely heavily on the researchers’ intuition and interpretive capabilities. From the .gov homepage of each major municipality, a search of “LGBT” was performed to identify policies, programs, and services targeting the LGBTQ+ population. “LGBT” was used rather than “LGBTQ,” “LGBTQ+,” or any other variation of the acronym, because “LGBT” is the most widely used term, even though it is not the most inclusive.

The data strategies of this analysis involved continuous construction and reworking of coding categories while immersed in the data. Marshall and Rossman (2006, 159) describe this type of analysis: “For editing and immersion strategies, [the researcher] generates the categories through prolonged engagement with the data—the text. These categories then become buckets or baskets into which segments of the text are placed.” The coding scheme began with the following categories that emerged from the literature review: legal protections; community/outreach education; quality of life; expressions of power; representation of identity; and website presentation, content, and imagery. An initial examination of the website content was performed by reviewing all sites from the 10 jurisdictions consistent with the search parameters outlined earlier. The coding scheme began with seven major categories. After testing for intercoder reliability, those seven major categories were refined, and 41 subcategories were developed.

The more detailed coding scheme was developed using emergent themes within these major categories by comparing the policies, programs, and services across jurisdictions. To refine and test the coding scheme for reliability, three researchers analyzed the same set of five documents from three jurisdictions. During this test, three coders analyzed sites from Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York. Then, notes and justifications were compared for the given codes and the coding scheme for greater clarity and specificity. This test was repeated once more and then the remaining website content from all jurisdictions was coded using the final coding scheme. Text was coded as single terms, phrases, sentences, or whole paragraphs. If text fit multiple codes, it was coded with all that applied. After coding was complete, each major category and then subcategory was analyzed across jurisdictions for code frequency and substantive content (table 1).

Findings and Analysis

The analysis presents an overview of the coding frequency and substantive content, then findings from the analysis organized by the seven major categories. The key subthemes that emerged as most pertinent are explained in greater detail. It is important to

Table 1 Frequency of Codes

Jurisdiction	Number of LGBTQ+ Policies, Programs, and Services	Codes
New York, NY	14	432
Los Angeles, CA	2	13
Chicago, IL	5	40
Philadelphia, PA	4	44
Houston, TX	1	23
Phoenix, AZ	0	0
San Antonio, TX	1	8
San Diego, CA	1	44
Dallas, TX	2	4
San Jose, CA	0	0

note that two jurisdictions, Phoenix and San Jose, did not have any LGBTQ+ policies, programs, or services available online. New York City had the most content and codes, with 432 codes. A general pattern emerged: larger jurisdictions tended to have more policies, programs, and services, and codes, with some exceptions. The findings point to the importance of local policies, programs, and services to engage and protect LGBTQ+ individuals and the need to further develop these efforts, particularly as public-facing web content.

Legal Protections

Legal protections provide the basis for civil rights. This category was defined as civil rights mandated for LGBTQ+ individuals by local, state, or federal law or administrative policies. Only 3 out of 10 jurisdictions had codes with legal protections: New York City, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Most codes under legal protections were specific to the local level, with scant reference to federal or state policy. Local-level legal protections are important, because federal laws do not explicitly ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and many states have no LGBTQ+ antidiscrimination laws (Steinmetz 2019). In New York City, for example, the city’s identification card, IDNYC, provides a nonbinary gender identity option available as of January 15, 2019 (Generation NYC n.d.). New York City also has a health care bill of rights, which states that “it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of a person’s sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression in public accommodations, including in health care settings” (New York City Health n.d.). This bill of rights outlines the types of services and treatments that LGBTQ+ New Yorkers are entitled to receive from health care providers, regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. The health care bill of rights is important, because, again, federal laws do not explicitly protect LGBTQ+ in health care settings (Steinmetz 2019). Furthermore, New York State, while offering protections for LGBTQ+ residents in employment, housing, credit, education, and public accommodations, does not explicitly prohibit discrimination against LGBTQ+ New Yorkers in health care settings (New York State Office of the Attorney General n.d.). This health care content from New York City is positive because it affirms and protects the rights of LGBTQ+ individuals where state and federal protections are lacking. The language used to present these health care rights is explicit and easy to understand, which makes the knowledge and utility of this protection more impactful for LGBTQ+ individuals in New York City.

Taking this approach to legal protections further than New York City, in Chicago, the Advisory Council on Women and LGBT

advises the mayor and city council “on policy matters regarding civil rights with a focus on equal access to employment, housing, and public accommodations, and to help identify means to educate the public about Chicago’s Human Rights and Fair Housing Ordinances, which offer protections against discrimination and hate crimes” (City of Chicago n.d.-b). The Advisory Council allows LGBTQ+ individuals to have a voice in policy making. However, it should be noted that no information is presented on how this is accomplished, and there is no contact information for those who are interested in learning more about the Advisory Council or becoming involved in these efforts. This Advisory Council is worth highlighting, because it takes a comprehensive approach to legal protections and is at least in part informed by the target population impacted.

Departing from most municipalities in this study, Philadelphia emphasized the city’s efforts to go above and beyond state and federal civil rights protections by creating robust local legal protections. Pennsylvania does not have explicit legal protections for LGBTQ+ people at the state level, but Philadelphia’s laws make it illegal for employers, housing providers, businesses, providers of public accommodations and city services to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation, sex, or gender identity (City of Philadelphia 2017). Philadelphia also has numerous other protections, including protections for transgender individuals in schools and public accommodations and protection from discrimination that occurs under the guise of “religious freedom” (City of Philadelphia 2017).

Few websites made reference to state- and federal-level legal protections, which can be confusing and require additional research and hesitation for LGBTQ+ individuals seeking to understand their protections and benefits. New York’s Commission on LGBTQ Runaway and Homeless Youth webpage made reference to the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was enacted in 2009 under President Barack Obama (see appendix S1). This act “gives the Department of Justice (DOJ) the power to investigate and prosecute bias-motivated violence by providing the DOJ with jurisdiction over crimes of violence where a perpetrator has selected a victim because of the person’s actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability” (Human Rights Campaign 2010). With so few LGBTQ+ state and federal protections in place, local protections are paramount.

Community Outreach/Education Policies, Programs, and Services

Community outreach/education policies, programs, and services are critical for including the LGBTQ+ population in civic life. In the absence of such policies, programs, and services, LGBTQ+ individuals are often marginalized and disconnected from their communities. As a consequence of systemic marginalization and disconnect, LGBTQ+ individuals may internalize this lack of inclusion, which will impact future LGBTQ+ community engagement. As Harris and Battle (2013) emphasize, feelings of belonging within a community can have important implications for sociopolitical involvement. This code was defined as policies, programs, or services that aim to engage or educate LGBTQ+ individuals in their communities. There were four subcodes in

this category: civic awareness, building community, educational institutions, educational awareness, and other. Six out of 10 jurisdictions were coded in this category, and the jurisdictions that did have this code had many subcodes. The most frequent subcodes were building community, defined as policies, programs, or services that aim to engage or grow the LGBTQ+ community (such as community centers, activities, celebrations), and educational awareness, defined as policies, programs, and services related to LGBTQ+ related to educating the general public and/or LGBTQ+ community on issues impacting LGBTQ+ individuals (such as cultural competencies and opportunities for involvement in the LGBTQ+ community). This points to the pattern of the larger jurisdictions generally having more robust policies, programs, and services for LGBTQ+ individuals within their jurisdictions. New York City, Philadelphia, and Chicago had the largest number of subcodes in this category.

Content coded as educational awareness was largely focused on educating the public about LGBTQ+ issues and educating LGBTQ+ individuals about issues affecting them, such as HIV/AIDS and discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. Examples of this subtheme come from New York City LGBT Community Center and Chicago’s #NoRoom4Stigma campaign. In 2016, the New York City Human Rights Commission and the LGBT Community Center “launched a shared effort to educate New Yorkers about the history and rights of the transgender community” (New York City Human Rights Commission n.d.). These trainings focus on basic knowledge, the impact of discrimination on transgender people, and an overview of the protections in New York City’s Human Rights Law. This was coded as educational awareness because it is an effort to educate the public about issues that impact the transgender community. Chicago’s #NoRoom4Stigma campaign, developed by the Chicago Department of Public Health, “highlights and challenges stigma and common prejudices against LGBTQ youth that often lead to health disparities like increased risk for homelessness, violence, HIV, and suicide” (City of Chicago n.d.-a). This was coded as educational awareness, because, similar to the New York City Human Rights Commission and LGBT Community Center initiative, #NoRoom4Stigma seeks to both educate the public about challenges that LGBTQ+ individuals face and eliminate the stigma surrounding those challenges. The #NoRoom4Stigma campaign is unique in that it not only provides education to LGBTQ+ individuals, but it also seeks to educate the non-LGBTQ+ public and eliminate stigma attached to LGBTQ+ identity; in this sense, it also improves the quality of life for Chicago’s LGBTQ+ community.

Only three jurisdictions were coded as undertaking community outreach/education policies, programs, and services: Philadelphia, San Antonio, and Houston. San Antonio had the most comprehensive information presented in this code. The San Antonio LGBT Chamber of Commerce was coded as building community and was unlike any of the other policies, programs, and services analyzed. The San Antonio LGBT Chamber of Commerce “exists to foster and promote a positive image of LGBT persons as well as the economic development and vitality of LGBT businesses and the businesses and professional organizations that support them, and, to facilitate the personal, professional and social growth of its Members via the exchange of ideas, resources, information

and networking opportunities throughout the greater San Antonio metropolitan area” (San Antonio LGBT Chamber of Commerce n.d.). This program is particularly unique, because it is the only program, policy, or service analyzed that specifically fosters an LGBTQ+ business community. The other policies, programs, and services coded with building community were largely sociopolitical and focused on very general community outreach efforts.

Quality of Life Policies, Programs, and Services

This was the most frequent major code, with 7 out of 10 jurisdictions coded: New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Houston, San Diego, and Dallas. Quality of life policies, programs, and services were defined as policies, programs, or services targeting LGBTQ+ individuals in aspects of everyday life. New York had both an LGBTQ Runaway and Homeless Youth Commission and a 60-page PDF document titled “All Our Children: Strategies to Prevent Homelessness, Strengthen Services and Build Support for LGBTQ Youth,” which were both coded extensively under the quality of life codes—primarily housing and homelessness. The importance of programs, policies, and services aimed specifically at preventing LGBTQ+ homelessness, particularly for youth, cannot be understated: LGBTQ+ youth disproportionately experience homelessness (Johnson 2018).

Health, health care, and safety are important issues facing the LGBTQ+ community. Within this umbrella, important issues include mental health, homelessness, drug abuse, and lack of safe spaces. In Chicago, there was an office specifically dedicated to addressing some of these pressing issues: the Chicago Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Health seeks to enhance the well-being of and health care delivery for the LGBTQ+ community; this was coded under health, health care, and safety, which is defined as policies, programs, or services that target LGBTQ+ health and health care issues (such as health care coverage, transition health topics, or personal safety recommendations).⁵ Alternatively, in Philadelphia, these programs, policies, and services were housed under the Philadelphia Office of LGBT Affairs, where they were given far less attention. The Philadelphia Office of LGBT Affairs, which “works to foster equal working and living conditions for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) people and to advocate for LGBTQ issues in all areas of City government” (City of Philadelphia n.d.), was coded with three quality of life subcodes: health, health care, and safety; employment; and housing and homelessness.

Compared with Chicago’s dedicated office, most jurisdictions provided very broad statements relating to health and safety. For example, in Houston, the LGBTQ Advisory Board serves as a liaison between the LGBTQ+ community and Mayor Sylvester Turner (Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board n.d.). This was coded with the subcode other, defined as quality of life policies, programs, and services that target LGBTQ+ individuals not listed in the other subcodes because the website simply lists that the board “works to improve the quality of life for the LGBTQIAP+ community” (Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board n.d.). This website used inclusive language, with one of the most inclusive acronyms listed (LGBTQIAP+). These quality of life programs are noteworthy, because they not only reflect the numerous challenges that LGBTQ+ individuals face, but also the range of efforts local governments make to ameliorate those challenges.

Expressions of Power

Beyond the policy, programs, and services found on public-facing websites, this critical discourse analysis explores expressions of power, defined as institutionalized structures or actions that promote the distribution of goods, services, and authority to individuals within a jurisdiction. Surprisingly, this was the least coded major category, with 3 out of 10 jurisdictions coded. LGBTQ+ individuals have historically and arguably continue to be marginalized, and there are inherent power differentials when delving into the details of LGBTQ+ programs, policies, and services. This code is pertinent to policies, programs, and services that gave formal power to LGBTQ+ individuals or communities. In Chicago, artist and advocate Taylor Bennett worked with the Chicago Department of Public Health “to give a voice to LGBTQ youth who are facing bullying or discrimination” (City of Chicago n.d.-a). This was coded as empowering LGBTQ+ individuals. Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board in Houston was also coded this way, as the board “serves as a direct link between the Mayor’s office and the LGBTQIA+ community, providing advice and recommendations on issues” (Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board n.d.). Many of the jurisdictions that had LGBTQ+ programs, policies, and services did not give any form of formal power to the LGBTQ+ individuals being impacted. LGBTQ+ individuals know best the challenges they face and the assistance they require from their governments. None of the programs, policies, or services were coded as limiting the power of LGBTQ+ individuals, which was defined as an institutionalized structure or action that limits the distribution of goods, services, and authority to LGBTQ+ individuals within a jurisdiction by reinforcing heteronormative and binary identity power. In many cases, the involvement of LGBTQ+ constituents was either unknown or unclear even if it was stated as part of a policy, program, or service. The voices of LGBTQ+ individuals are integral in crafting and implementing effective LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services.

Representation of Identity

The way identities are represented, especially for marginalized groups, matter in power dynamics and future construction of policies, programs, and services. The representation of identity code was defined as the characteristics, qualities, beliefs, personality traits, and expressions that contribute to one’s subjective representation of self, whether they are self-designated or attributed to a person by society. Generally speaking, the longer the acronym, the more inclusive it is, as more identities are being represented. All eight jurisdictions with web presences were coded under this major category. Many of the same jurisdictions varied in the acronyms used to represent LGBTQ+ identity in each policy, program, or service. For example, in San Diego, the LGBTQIA Library Services used both “LGBTQIA” and “LGBT” on their webpage (The City of San Diego n.d.). In New York City, the Human Resources LGBTQI Page uses the acronym “LGBTQI,” while the New York City LGBTQ Runaway and Homeless Youth Commission uses “LGBTQ” (New York City Department of Youth and Community Development n.d.; New York City Human Resources Administration n.d.). This inconsistency may point to a lack of communication or collaboration between city agencies, or, perhaps an unawareness of what the acronyms represent. It may also be indicative of the fast pace at which LGBTQ+ identity and language evolves over time.

Acronyms used ranged from the most limited, “LGBT” to the most inclusive, “LGBTQIAP+” on Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board’s (n.d.) webpage. However, this was also coded as exclusion of LGBTQ+ identity, because the Advisory Board webpage included “straight allies,” who are not LGBTQ+ in the acronym intended to represent LGBTQ+ identity. Straight allies do not face the unique challenges and discrimination that the LGBTQ+ community does, and including straight allies in the LGBTQ+ acronym essentially makes the program, policy, or service applicable to the general public. Including straight individuals in efforts to address the needs of the LGBTQ+ community negates the particular subjectivity of the LGBTQ+ community, as it simply describes *all* people regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Website Presentation

Beyond the substantive content of municipality policies, programs, and services, it is important to consider the way this content is presented. If the content is vague, limited, or nonexistent, the efforts can be less impactful. The code for website presentation was defined as the way LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services are presented in public-facing web space on .gov municipality sites. Subcodes included accessibility, website layout, website substantive content, and website imagery. Accessibility described whether individuals were able to easily access the policy, program, or service information. The majority of the sites in this analysis were accessed with a search of “LGBT” on the jurisdictions’ .gov websites, and as such, easy to find. Website layout examined how clear the presentation of the policy, program, or service website was, including spacing and formatting. Most websites were coded as clear presentations, but a few were coded as unclear presentation. The New York City Police Department’s (NYPD) LGBT Outreach Unit had both a front-facing webpage and a PDF document that was linked on the page, and both used vague language, with information that was generally disorganized in the .pdf document.

Website content was also coded as easy or difficult to understand: policies, programs, and services that used clear, plain language was considered easy to understand. The NYPD’s LGBT Outreach Unit front-facing webpage details the ways the unit builds a relationship with the LGBTQ+ community; however, this was coded as difficult to understand, because it uses vague language and it is unclear what, exactly, these activities entail. The New York City Department of Social Services’ LGBTQI policy went above and beyond to provide clarity by presenting a list of terms and definitions at the beginning of their policy. Clarity and simplicity is important for all websites, but it is especially important on sites that target marginalized communities to ensure those individuals are able to access the policies, programs, and services they need. Likewise, website clarity is also critical for a community as complex and diverse as the LGBTQ+ community, with its range of identities and unique needs associated with each identity.

The last subcode for website presentation was website imagery. This code was applied to assess whether LGBTQ+ imagery that was diverse (see appendix C, section VI for coding definitions). Website imagery can make individuals feel excluded if they do not see someone who is representative of themselves. Many webpages had no imagery at all and were coded as such; however, some websites had rainbow or transgender flags, such as the NYPD’s LGBT

Outreach Unit website. New York City’s Unity Project for LGBTQ youth had photos of youth presumably representing diverse sexual orientations and gender identities. Website imagery is often the first thing a person notices on a webpage, and imagery that is reflective of the LGBTQ+ community makes the LGBTQ+ viewer feel welcomed and included. Of the sites that did have imagery, it was more inclusive than not, demonstrating less conformity to traditional heteronormative presentation by presenting individuals who do not neatly conform to traditional “male” and “female” standards, and represent a spectrum of ages, races, and orientations. This analysis provided rich data and insight into how we understand what is taking place at the local level as well as how we can improve.

Conclusion and Future Research

LGBTQ+ issues at the local level pose some of the most pressing civil rights challenges in the current U.S. context. This analysis provides insight into what is taking place in major municipalities and how these efforts can be improved to bolster equity and civil rights for LGBTQ+ populations. As individual and group identities change over time, public administrators must adapt alongside the changing population to pursue civil rights and promote public sector values. Overall, a general pattern emerged: larger jurisdictions tended to have more policies, programs, and services, and codes, with two exceptions. This may be indicative of the resources available to larger governments, both in terms of budgets and staff. Yet, as Cravens (2015) cautions, local population size is an important factor, but not the sole factor, in determining policy adoption. Other factors including partisanship, issues salience, and electoral competition also impact diffusion at the municipal level (Cravens 2015). Nearly all of the governments with website content available for analysis had at least one policy, program, or service dedicated to improving the quality of life for their LGBTQ+ populations, and many had policies, programs, and services dedicated to community outreach and engagement. The importance of government efforts to improve the lives of their LGBTQ+ populations and to engage the LGBTQ+ community cannot be overstated. LGBTQ+ individuals have historically and largely continue to be marginalized in public life, as such, government programs, policies, and services that specifically aim to mitigate the challenges LGBTQ+ individuals face should be further developed to address the unique needs of these populations within their given jurisdictions.

One of the most fundamental ways public administrators can promote equity in serving this population is using inclusive language. LGBTQ+ is an acronym that stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer. The plus sign acknowledges that there are a wide range of identities that are not represented in this acronym. The language used by public administrators should be carefully considered and as inclusive as possible, because language has the potential to create trust between administrators and their LGBTQ+ residents. Language is essential in constructing identity, particularly LGBTQ+ identity that is new to the public consciousness and continuously evolving. This analysis only coded one instance of exclusive language, which is an encouraging finding. Yet, the public-facing web presence of LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services was lacking in detail, and 2 of the 10 municipalities included in this project have no LGBTQ+ policies, programs, or services on their official government websites.

Public administrators are entrusted to serve their constituents by promoting equity and fairness, and to serve professionally with competence, efficiency, and transparency (Molina and Mckeown 2012). LGBTQ+ individuals are arguably more visible and influential in the national agenda than they have ever been, and more local governments are responding where federal and state efforts are lacking. LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services are often uncharted territory for public administrators as identities and needs change. In the twenty-first century, public servants should protect and engage LGBTQ+ individuals within their jurisdictions. Local governments should not only develop more inclusive LGBTQ+ policies, programs, and services, but also work to improve their accessibility and web presence so that knowledge of these efforts are readily available to LGBTQ+ individuals.

This research contributes to both the academic and practical understandings of LGBTQ+ civil rights and what local governments can do to promote them. Public administrators can use this research to inform their own programs, policies, and services. LGBTQ+ individuals, advocacy groups, and nonprofits can use this research to learn more about programs, policies, and services available in different jurisdictions and how to evaluate and potentially contribute to government efforts in their own jurisdiction.

Limitations and Future Research Questions

This study is only a cursory glimpse into LGBTQ+ civil rights efforts at the local level. Several limitations of this research provide direction for future scholarship. This analysis includes public-facing municipality website content from the 10 largest U.S. municipalities by population. Identifying web content in the form of policies, programs and services without the capacity to dig deeper into the construction and implementation of the policies, programs, and services poses more questions. Beyond answering the “what” question of what municipalities are doing to promote LGBTQ+ civil rights, future research should answer the “why” and “how” questions—namely, why are these efforts taking place in some jurisdictions and not others; how are policies, programs, and services created, adopted, and implemented from the perspectives of administrators and the LGBTQ+ population served. Also, analyses similar to this one could be conducted in non-urban and more geographically and politically diverse municipalities. A recent study from the Movement Advancement Project (2019) found that there are 2.9 million to 3.8 million LGBTQ+ people living in rural America, a number that accounts for up to 5 percent of the rural population and up to 20 percent of the LGBTQ+ population (Fadel 2019). Further, the content analyzed in this study was available online and does not account for the lived experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals accessing, interpreting, and utilizing this publicly available information.

Future research should address how the LGBTQ+ population within jurisdictions responds to the accessibility of services on their municipalities websites. This analysis is a first step in understanding what takes place in the realm of LGBTQ+ civil right in municipalities by identifying what municipalities purport they are doing (i.e., the policies, programs, and services put forth on public-facing websites). A critical next step for extending this analysis entails comparing what is presented publicly with how the policies, programs, and services are implemented, and in turn, impact LGBTQ+ populations. Exploring

the “practice” of local-level policies, programs, and services will include some important health and safety issues, police mistreatment and the lack of safety within intended “safe spaces,” for example. In addition to including the LGBTQ+ lived experience, future studies should seek perspectives from LGBTQ+ advocacy groups and nonprofits by exploring their relationships with city government and their understandings of how LGBTQ+ individuals are treated when they seek to access services. This is a promising time for research and practice surrounding LGBTQ+ civil rights at the local level with policy, programs, and services evolving at a rapid pace. In this volatile environment, the normative concerns of inclusion and access should remain at the forefront.

Notes

1. The 10 largest U.S. cities by population are New York City, New York; Los Angeles, California; Chicago, Illinois; Houston, Texas; Phoenix, Arizona; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas; San Diego, California; Dallas, Texas; and San Jose, California.
2. For the purpose of this analysis, an LGBTQ+ policy is a plan or course of government action that has the potential to directly impact LGBTQ+ individuals.
3. For the purpose of this analysis, an LGBTQ+ program is a government-administered or government-sponsored activity or project that has the potential to directly impact LGBTQ+ individuals.
4. For the purpose of this analysis, an LGBTQ+ service is a service, such as mental health counseling, that is provided by or funded by the government and has the potential to directly impact LGBTQ+ individuals.
5. While “transgendered” is the term used by the Chicago Office of LGBT Health, it is not a widely accepted term. Rather, “transgender” is an adjective describing a person’s gender identity and is commonly accepted.

References

- Blessett, Brandi, Marc Fudge, and Tia Sherée Gaynor. 2017. Moving from Theory to Practice: An Evaluative Assessment of Social Equity Approaches. Report submitted to the Center for Accountability and Performance and National Academy for Public Administration’s Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance. <https://aspacap.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/cap-theory.pdf> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Bradford, Judith, Sarah L. Reisner, Julie A. Honnold, and Jessica Xavier. 2013. Experiences of Transgender-Related Discrimination and Implications for Health: Results From the Virginia Transgender Health Initiative Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 103(10): 1820–9.
- Broadnax, Walter. 2000. *Diversity and Affirmative Action in Public Service*. New York: Routledge.
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Theories of Discourse as Theories of Gender: Discourse Analysis in Language and Gender Studies. In *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 43–68. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- City of Chicago. n.d.-a. #NoRoom4Stigma. https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/cdph/supp_info/lgbt/-noroom4stigma.html.
- City of Chicago. n.d.-b. Advisory Council on Women and LGBT. https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/cchr/provdrs/advisory_councilonwomenandlgbt.html [accessed August 21, 2019].
- City of Philadelphia. 2017. City of Philadelphia Action Guide: Philadelphia’s LGBTQ Protections. December 4. <https://www.phila.gov/2017-12-04-philadelphias-lgbtq-protections/> [accessed March 28, 2020].
- City of Philadelphia. n.d. Office of LGBT Affairs. <https://www.phila.gov/departments/office-of-lgbt-affairs/> [accessed August 20, 2019].

- City of San Diego. n.d. LGBTQIA Library Services. <https://www.sandiego.gov/public-library/lgbt> [accessed August 28, 2020].
- . 2007. The Rise of Transgender-Inclusive Laws: How Well Are Municipalities Implementing Supportive Nondiscrimination Public Employment Policies? *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 27(4): 336–60.
- Cravens, Royal. 2015. Morality Politics and Municipal LGBT Policy Adoption: A Rare-event Analysis. *State and Local Government Review* 47(1): 15–25.
- Creamer, Lisa. 2018. Mass. Votes “Yes” on Question 3 to Keep Law Protecting Transgender People in Public Accommodations. WBUR, November 6. <http://www.wbur.org/news/2018/11/06/question-3-transgender-ballot-yes-wins> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Darweesh, Abbas Degan, and Nesaem Mehdi Abdullah. 2016. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump’s Sexist Ideology. *Journal of Education and Practice* 7(30): 87–95.
- Elias, Nicole M. Rishel. 2013. Shifting Diversity Perspectives and New Avenues for Representative Bureaucracy. *Public Administration Quarterly* 37(3): 331–73.
- Elias, Nicole M. Rishel. 2017. Constructing and Implementing Transgender Policy for Public Administration. *Administration & Society* 49(1): 20–47.
- Elias, Nicole M., and Roddrick Colvin. 2019. *A Third Option: Understanding and Assessing Non-Binary Gender Policies in the United States. Administrative Theory & Praxis*. Published online September 12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2019.1659046>.
- Elias, Nicole M., Rana Lynn Johnson, Danny Ovando, and Julia Ramirez. 2018. Improving Transgender Policy for a More Equitable Workplace. *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy* 24(2): 53–81.
- Fadel, Leila. 2019. New Study: LGBT People A “Fundamental Part of the Fabric of Rural Communities.” National Public Radio, April 4. <https://www.npr.org/2019/04/04/709601295/lgbt-people-are-a-fundamental-part-of-the-fabric-of-rural-communities> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Fairclough, Norman. 2010. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, 2nd ed. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.
- . 2015. *Language and Power*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Frederickson, H. George. 1990. Public Administration and Social Equity. *Public Administration Review* 50(2): 228–37.
- . 2005. The State of Social Equity in American Public Administration. *National Civic Review* 94(4): 31–8.
- Generation NYC. n.d. LGBTQ Youth: NYC Unity Project. <https://growingupnyc.cityofnewyork.us/generationnyc/topics/lgbtq/> [accessed September 3, 2019].
- Gooden, Susan T. 2015. *Race and Social Equity: A Nervous Area of Government*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- . 2017. Social Equity and Evidence: Insights from Local Government. *Public Administration Review* 77(6): 822–8.
- Grant, Jaime M., Lisa A. Mottet, Justin Tanis, Jack Harrison, Jodi L. Herman, and Mare Keisling. 2011. Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey. http://www.thetaskforce.org/static_html/downloads/reports/reports/ntds_full.pdf [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Green, Erica L., Katie Benner, and Robert Pear. 2018. “Transgender” Could Be Defined Out of Existence under Trump Administration. *New York Times*, October 21. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/21/us/politics/transgender-trump-administration-sex-definition.html> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Grigolo, Michele. 2017. Local Government and Human Rights: Some Critical Reflections. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 49(1): 67–98.
- Guy, Mary E., and Vanessa M. Fenley. 2013. Inch by Inch: Gender Equity since the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 34(1): 40–58.
- Guy, Mary E., and Sean A. McCandless. 2012. Social Equity: Its Legacy, Its Promise. Special issue. *Public Administration Review* 72: S5–S13.
- Harris, Angelique, and Juan Battle. 2013. Unpacking Civic Engagement: The Sociopolitical Involvement of Same-Gender Loving Black Women. *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 17(2): 195–207.
- Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. 2005. Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis. *Qualitative Health Research* 15(9): 1277–88.
- Human Rights Campaign. 2010. Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act. <https://www.hrc.org/resources/matthew-shepard-and-james-byrd-jr.-hate-crimes-prevention-act> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Human Rights Campaign. n.d.-a. Municipal Equality Index. <https://www.hrc.org/mei> [accessed September 3, 2019].
- Johnson, Olatunde C. A. 2016. The Local Turn; Innovation and Diffusion in Civil Rights Law. *Law and Contemporary Problems* 79(3): 115–44.
- Johnson, Richard Gregory, III. 2018. Public Administration’s Ethical Dilemma: Homeless LGBT Youth in the Twenty-First Century. *Public Integrity* 20(6): 539–41.
- Johnson, Richard Gregory, III, Mario Antonio Rivera, and Nancy Lopez. 2018. A Public Ethics Approach Focused on the Lives of Diverse LGBTQ Homeless Youth. *Public Integrity* 20(6): 611–24.
- Jorgenson, Marianne, and Louise J. Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Katz-Wise, Sabra L., and Janet S. Hyde. 2012. Victimization Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Individuals: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Sex Research* 49(2–3): 142–67.
- Kioko, Sharon N., Justin Marlowe, David S.T. Matkin, Michael Moody, Daniel L. Smith, and Zhirong J. Zhao. 2011. Why Public Financial Management Matters. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21: i113–24.
- Knauer, Nancy J. 2012. Legal Consciousness and LGBT Research: The Role of the Law in the Everyday Lives of LGBT Individuals. *Journal of Homosexuality* 59(5): 748–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2012.673947>.
- Leap, William L. 2013. Commentary II: Queering Language and Normativity. *Discourse & Society* 24(5): 643–8.
- Leap, William L., and Denis M. Provencher. 2011. Language Matters: An Introduction. *Journal of Homosexuality* 58: 709–18.
- Marshall, Catherine, and Gretchen B. Rossman. 2006. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mayor Turner’s LGBTQ Advisory Board. n.d. <https://www.lgbtqhouston.org/> [accessed September 4, 2019].
- McCandless, Sean. 2018. LGBT Homeless Youth and Policing. *Public Integrity* 20(6): 558–70.
- Merritt, Cullen. 2014. Specifying and Testing a Multi-dimensional Model of Publicness: An Analysis of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Treatment Facilities. PhD diss., University of Kansas.
- Molina, Anthony Deforest, and Cassandra L. Mckeown. 2012. The Heart of the Profession: Understanding Public Service Values. *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 18(2): 375–96.
- Monro, Surya. 2007. New Institutionalism and Sexuality at Work in Local Government. *Gender, Work and Organization* 14(1): 1–19.
- Movement Advancement Project. 2018a. Local Non-discrimination Ordinances. http://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/non_discrimination_ordinances.
- . 2018b. Non-discrimination Laws. http://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/non_discrimination_laws [accessed September 4, 2019].
- . 2019. Where We Call Home: LGBT People in Rural America. April. <http://lgbtmap.org/file/lgbt-rural-report.pdf> [accessed March 28, 2020].
- Nabatchi, Tina, and Lisa Blomgren Amsler. 2014. Direct Public Engagement in Local Government. *American Review of Public Administration* 45(4 Suppl): 63S–88S.
- Naylor, Lorenda A. 2020. Counting an Invisible Class of Citizens: The LGBT Population and the US Census. *Public Integrity* 22(1): 54–72.
- New York City Department of Youth & Community Development. n.d. Runaway & Homeless Youth. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/dydc/services/runaway-homeless-youth/lgbtq-commission.page> [accessed September 4, 2019].

- New York City Health. n.d. LGBTQ Health Care Bill of Rights. <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/ah/lgbtq-bor-wallet.pdf> [accessed September 4, 2019].
- New York City Human Resources Administration. n.d. LGBTQI. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/hra/help/lgbtqi.page> [accessed September 3, 2019].
- New York City Human Rights Commission. n.d. NYC LGBT Community Center. <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/cchr/community/nyc-lgbt-community-center.page> [accessed September 4, 2019].
- New York State Office of the Attorney General. n.d. LGBT Rights: Laws Protecting Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) New Yorkers. <https://ag.ny.gov/civil-rights/lgbt-rights> [accessed September 3, 2019].
- Nisar, Muhammad A. 2018. Children of a Lesser God: Administrative Burden and Social Equity in Citizen–State Interactions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 28(1): 104–19.
- Norman-Major, Kristen. 2018. Thinking Outside the Box: Using Multisector Approaches to Address the Wicked Problem of Homelessness Among LGBTQ Youth. *Public Integrity* 20(6): 546–57.
- Piatka, Jaelyn Schede. 2014. Altruism by Job Sector: Can Public Sector Employees Lead the Way in Rebuilding Social Capital? *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 25(3): 877–900.
- Pomeranz, Jennifer L. 2018. Challenging and Preventing Policies That Prohibit Local Civil Rights Protections for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer People. *American Journal of Public Health* 108(1): 67–72.
- Provencher, Denis M. 2011. “I Dislike Politicians and Homosexuals”: Language and Homophobia in Contemporary France. *Gender and Language* 4(2): 287–321.
- Riccucci, Norma M. 2009. The Pursuit of Social Equity in the Federal Government: A Road Less Traveled? *Public Administration Review* 69(3): 373–82.
- Riccucci, Norma M., and Gregg G. Van Ryzin. 2016. Representative Bureaucracy: A Lever to Enhance Social Equity, Coproduction, and Democracy. *Public Administration Review* 77(1): 21–30.
- Robinson, Tracey. 2016. Overcoming Social Exclusion in Public Library Services to LGBTQ and Gender Variant Youth. *Public Library Quarterly* 35(3): 161–74.
- Ross, Loretta J. 1999. Beyond Civil Rights: A New Vision for Social Justice in the United States. *Human Rights Dialogue* 2(1) https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/publications/archive/dialogue/2_01/articles/607 [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Ruijter, Erna. 2012. Social Equity, Policy Intentions and Unanticipated Outcomes: A Comparative Analysis of Work–Life Balance Policies. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice* 14(4): 311–29.
- San Antonio LGBT Chamber of Commerce. n.d. About Us. <http://www.salgbtchamber.org/pages/AboutUs> [accessed September 2, 2019].
- Saunders, Romona. 2011. Measuring the Effectiveness of Affirmative Action in Federal Agencies, 1979–2002. PhD diss., Arizona State University.
- Sellers, Mitchell Dylan. 2014. Discrimination and the Transgender Population: Analysis of the Functionality of Local Government Policies That Protect Gender Identity. *Administration & Society* 46(1): 70–86.
- . 2018. Absent Inclusion Policies: Problems Facing Homeless Transgender Youth. *Public Integrity* 20(6): 625–39.
- Shipan, Charles R., and Craig Volden. 2006. Bottom-Up Federalism: The Diffusion of Antismoking Policies from U.S. Cities to States. (Author Abstract). *American Journal of Political Science* 50(4): 825–43.
- Steinmetz, Katy. 2019. Why Federal Laws Don’t Explicitly Ban Discrimination against LGBT Americans. Time, March 21. <http://time.com/5554531/equality-act-lgbt-rights-trump/> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Sullivan, Emily. 2018. New York City Creates Gender-Neutral Designation for Birth Certificates. National Public Radio, October 17. <https://www.npr.org/2018/10/17/658047295/new-york-city-creates-gender-neutral-designation-for-birth-certificates> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- Tafoya, Ben. 2018. The Importance of the Public Sector to Economic Success of Women. *PA Times*, September 28. <https://patimes.org/the-importance-of-the-public-sector-to-economic-success-of-women/> [accessed March 27, 2020].
- van, Dijk, Teun A. 1993. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–83.
- Wallmeier, Franziska, Bernd Helmig, and Mary K. Feeney. 2019. Knowledge Construction in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis of Public Value. *Public Administration Review* 79(4): 488–99.
- Warner, Mildred. 2001. Building Social Capital: The Role of Local Government. *Journal of Socio-Economics* 30: 187–92.
- Waterfield, Allison. 2017. Gender Transitioning in the Workplace: Employer Obligations and Best Practices. Bloomberg BNA, December 13.

Supporting Information

Supplementary appendices may be found in the online version of this article at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/puar.13188/full>.