

2022

Perspectives of Religious Faith Leaders on Hate Crime Policies

Alphonso Manns
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Law Commons](#), [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Health Sciences and Public Policy

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Alphonso Manns

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Anne Hacker, Committee Chairperson,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Hilda Sheppard, Committee Member,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Lori Demeter, University Reviewer,
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

Perspectives of Religious Faith Leaders on Hate Crime Policies

by

Alphonso Manns

JD, Indiana University, 1972

MPA, Indiana University, 1975

BS, Fisk University, 1964

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2022

Abstract

Prejudice and discrimination stigmatize members of the lesbian gay bisexual transgender and queer (LGBTQ) community as abnormal, which has been attributed to religious opposition and the exercise of ministerial privileges or religious liberty within the law. Religious organizations may indirectly contribute to the public legal rights of members of the LGBTQ community. But little is known about the perspectives of religious faith leaders (RFLs) and how they influence the development and implementation of pro-equality and hate crime policies. The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of RFLs from one community in a midwestern state. The narrative policy framework (NPF) provided the theoretical foundation for the study. The key research questions focused on the insights of participants toward pro-equality, hate crime policy, and religious tenets of faith regarding the LGBTQ community. Applying a qualitative non-experimental method, data were collected from interviews of nine Christian clergy participants. Key findings include RFLs' engage in political action to affect public policy; the same-sex relationship issue has caused divisions within religious denominations subject to theological diversity within the Christian faiths; education, inclusion, and spiritual love remain as their guiding principles; and as a matter of due process RFLs prefer public policies that promote the safety and welfare of the LGBTQ community. Recommend a study with non-Christian RFLs' participation. Current study implies that a humanistic perspective may develop among RFLs for positive social change.

Perspectives of Religious Faith Leaders on Hate Crime Policies

by

Alphonso Manns

JD, Indiana University, 1972

MPA, Indiana University, 1975

BS, Fisk University, 1964

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

November 2022

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my dear wife, Dollie; my beloved family; and our diverse community.

Acknowledgments

I am deeply grateful to my dissertation committee, Dr. Anne J. Hacker, Dr. Hilda Sheppard, and Dr. Lori A. Demeter. Dr. Hacker has been a wonderful mentor to me in providing wisdom, knowledge, and guidance that I can never repay. I am appreciative of my student success advisor, Mr. Binh Ngo, and the faculty and administrative staff of Walden University for the services that I have been provided to complete this project. My dear wife, Dollie Stafford Manns, whom I love with all my heart and soul, has been a constant, patient, and understanding companion to me on this academic journey. She, our extended family, friends, and former teachers have been the source of my inspiration. I also thank my daughter, Sojourner Ann Manns, and my office associate, William R. Morris, Jr. for their assistance with a class project. I am also eternally grateful to all the religious faith leaders who participated in my research. Foremost, I am thankful to the Almighty for the blessings that I have received, and to whom all praises are given for the gift of my life.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study	1
Background.....	2
Problem Statement.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions	5
Theoretical Framework for the Study.....	6
Nature of the Study.....	14
Concepts and Derived Definitions.....	15
Assumptions	18
Scope and Delimitations.....	18
Limitations.....	19
Significance	20
Summary.....	21
Chapter 2: Literature Review	22
Literature Search Strategy	24
Theoretical Framework	25
Previous Research Methodologies Using NPF.....	29
Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts.....	33
Discussion About Definitions.....	33
Religion and LGBTQ	39

Hate Crime Policies and Political Action	42
Summary and Conclusions	47
Chapter 3: Research Method	49
Research Design and Rationale	49
Role of the Researcher.....	51
Methodology.....	53
The Population.....	53
Instrumentation.....	54
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection.....	55
Data Analysis Plan	57
Issues of Trustworthiness	61
Ethical Procedures	62
Summary.....	64
Chapter 4: Results.....	66
Setting.....	66
Demographics.....	67
Data Collection.....	68
Data Analysis.....	68
Evidence of Trustworthiness	70
Results.	71
A Theory on Religious Faith Leaders’ Perspectives about Public Policy.....	71
Further Assertions Based on the Evidence.....	81

Summary of Results	87
Summary.....	90
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	91
Interpretation of the Findings	91
Findings Related to Theoretical Framework	93
Social Determinates of Health Regarding the LGBTQ.....	95
Limitations of the Study	96
Recommendations	97
Implications	98
Conclusion.....	99
References	100
Appendix A: Protocol for Questioning Participants.....	109
Appendix B: Coding Frequency.....	110

List of Tables

Table 1. Preliminary Coding Framework for Key Legal Concepts.....59

Table 2. Preliminary Coding Framework for NPF Form60

Table 3. Preliminary Coding Framework for NPF Content60

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Prejudice and discrimination continue to stigmatize members of LGBTQ community as abnormal. The characterization carries more than simply negative connotations. The phenomenon also has effects on some members that impair their mental health, safety, and professional station in life. This group of people are unable to acquire the full benefits of hate crime policies and equal protection of the law because of religious opposition to their being who they are. In the exercise of their ministerial rights, religious organizations may indirectly contribute disparately to the legal rights of members of the lesbian gay bisexual transgender and queer (LGBTQ) community. But little is known about the perspectives of religious faith leaders (RFLs) and how they affect the development and implementation of pro-equal and hate crime policies to protect the LGBTQ community. This qualitative study's purpose was to explore and understand the perspectives and worldviews propounded by RFLs in Indiana toward pro-equality and hate crime public policies that are proposed or designed to protect the LGBTQ community. Within the federal constitutional dichotomy that mandates separation of the church and state, RFLs encroach on the principles supporting the free exercise and establishment clauses of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. As moralists, RFLs perform roles in their civil engagement as political actors to influence social attitudes among the citizenry and policy makers that are reflected in public policies. Consequently, there is a conflict between moral principles of religious beliefs and due process and equal protection principles of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The main research question is "How did RFLs participate or influence the

development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate crime for the protection of members of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12)?”

Background

In the case of *Witmer v. State of Indiana*, 800 N.E.2d 571 (Ind. 2003) the Indiana Supreme Court held that the state’s criminal sentencing statute is not exclusive of aggravating circumstances for which a judge may enhance the penalty for an offense that constitutes racially motivated behavior toward the victim. In this case, the target of the offender was a member of a different race. However, the implication is that the court has the discretion upon an evidence-based finding to enhance the penalty for an offense that constitutes a hate crime. Nonetheless, without specific statutory authority the application of *Witmer* to other cases would probably produce inconsistencies and disparities in sentencing of offenders charged for an enhancement beyond a standard statutory sentence to the principal charge.

The State of Indiana describes what is considered a bias crime as follows:

As used in this chapter, bias crime means an offense in which the person who commits the offense knowingly or intentionally:

- (1) selected the person who was injured; or
- (2) damaged or otherwise affected property:

by the offense because of the color, creed, disability, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation of the injured person or the owner or occupant of the affected property or because the injured person or owner or occupant of the

affected property was associated with any other recognizable group or affiliation.

(Indiana Code 10-13-3-1)

These provisions are coupled with Indiana Code 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12) to authorize a court to provide sentencing enhancement to a crime as terms of Indiana hate crime law and enforcement of hate crime policy. The statute states the following:

The person committed the offense with bias due to the victim's or the group's real or perceived characteristics, trait, belief, practice, association, or other attribute the court chooses to consider, including but not limited to an attribute described in IC 10-13-3-1.

A gap exists in the literature about the influence RFLs have on public policy regarding pro-equality and hate crime as these concepts relate to the LGBTQ community. In the absence of listing specifically gender identity and perhaps other categories, some would consider these statutes and the case law as ineffective in protecting the rights of members of the LGBTQ community and attribute the status of the state's hate crime policy upon the influence of RFLs. If so, gaining a better understanding of the perceptions, perspectives, attitudes, and beliefs of RFLs toward hate crime policies to protect members of the LGBTQ community may provide knowledge about the role of RFLs' intent to shape attitudes toward policy making within the constitutional concept or principle of separation of church and state dichotomy. Such knowledge may provide means to overcome barriers to constructive dialogue as to the extent and how RFLs had, if any, impact on Indiana policy toward hate crime regarding the protection of the LGBTQ community. This study was needed to determine whether improvements are

necessary in policy design to assure due process and equal protection may be addressed by generating awareness. The study may reveal possible restorative approaches for intervention that may enrich Indiana with a positive social change in its legal system.

Problem Statement

Discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community has fostered hate crimes against them. From the Federal Bureau of Investigations, the 2018 Hate Crime Statistics show that law enforcement agencies report 1,404 hate crime offenses based on sexual orientation and 184 offenses resulting from gender-identity (ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s./2018). Some scholars find that religious organizations perpetuate stigmatization and cultural norms that drive discriminatory attitudes and perceptions about homosexuals and other members of the LGBTQ community (Toorn et al., 2017). Newspaper media accounts suggest that RFLs' attitudes toward pro-equality policies on hate crimes contribute to the stigmatization and social attitudes regarding gays, lesbians as well as other members of the LGBTQ community. Consequently, some factors may be religious opposition, bias, and stigmatization of individuals based on their sexual identity or preferences affecting the design and implementation of hate crime policies resulting in members of the LGBTQ community denied due process and equal protection of the law.

Although researchers have investigated this issue, the topic has not been explored through an investigation of RFLs' perceptions of their role in shaping attitudes and beliefs of citizens and service providers toward pro-equality and hate crime policies. Peer-reviewed articles on the topic were not found in the literature. Researchers have found that religion stigmatizes the social as well as political attitudes of people and

policymakers regarding members of the LGBTQ community (Swan, 2019). However, RFLs' perspectives on their role in influencing the design and implementation of such policies are unknown. This study was conducted to gain knowledge about the perspectives, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of religious faith leaders influence or impact the implementation of pro-equality and hate crime policies in Indiana. My study may contribute knowledge to the literature to inform policy makers to consider whether RFLs' perspectives, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs are susceptible to change or modifications, such that strategies may be developed to revise hate crime policies and laws to eliminate discrimination more effectively against the LGBTQ community.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives and worldviews of a segment of the RFLs in Indiana toward pro-equality and hate crime policies that are designed to protect targeted groups, such as members of the LGBTQ community. A need exists to better understand that potential dichotomy in the requirement to maintain separation of church and state, where the conflicting dimensions of the principle may play to influence social and political attitudes and acceptance of public policies affecting the LGBTQ community. The concept or phenomenon of interest is RFLs' ministerial exception in the exercise of religious liberty that contributes discrimination against the LGBTQ.

Research Questions

RQ 1: How do religious faith leaders participate or influence the development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate or protection of members

of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12)?

RQ 2: In what ways, if any, do religious faith leaders' personal perspectives on public policy in the exercise of their ministerial liberties differ from the tenets of their religious denominations regarding pro-equality and protection from hate crime for the LGBTQ community?

Theoretical Framework for the Study

The theoretical framework for this study was Jones and McBeth's (2010) narrative policy framework (NPF). The study of public policy from narratives has evolved over the years to the development of this formal theory. After an extensive review of the literature on narratives, Jones and McBeth concluded that policy narratives can be systematically studied using an empirical approach. It became obvious to them that the issues debated over government reform shaped public opinion, which eventually led to policy outcomes. Citing other scholars, they defined a narrative as a story with a sequence of events over time that unfolds with a plot with the drama of characters, personalities, and symbols, which result in a moral to a story. According to these authors, narratives are a style or means of communicating reality through exchange and understanding of ideas. They concluded from their research that since the narrative is a reliable means to convey information, narrative cognition has a meaningful place in human existence. They raise the question of how narratives translate into the study of public policy, noting that the lack of attention by public policy analysts of narratives is a misstep in policy science.

Policy scholars support that policy formation is the result of design, formation, and implementation. But Jones and McBeth (2010) observed that policy studies at the time did not include empirical study of narratives. Even though stories are central to the postpositivist school of public policy, the positivists did not develop methodological approaches to study narratives. Consequently, Jones and McBeth developed what they described as a quantitative, structuralist, and positive approach to the study of policy narratives. They wanted to demonstrate that narratives should be studied in a systematic empirical manner. In their critique of prominent scholars through their debates over positivism and post-positivism, they found that some theorists shared ideas but disagreed about others. For example, they pointed out that the need for prediction as an important feature to the positivists who rely on quantitative methods to study objective reality, but for post-positivists qualitative research relies on social construction from facts that may be attributable to human perceptions of reality. The authors concluded that the narrative's role is important to policy theory because policy studies that focus on using narratives as the database should be considered as post-positivism. From their point of view the policy process is most effectively understood by utilizing social construction of facts and the primacy of values.

With their critique of previous scholars, Jones and McBeth (2010) settled their debate after Paul Sabatier excluded a discussion about post-positivism in his book, *Theories of the Policy Process*, published in 2000 for which other scholars criticized him for this omission. According to Jones and McBeth, Sabatier responded to his detractors by arguing that post-positivism did not meet the standards of three concepts of science:

clear concepts, testable hypothesis, and falsification. He argued that post-positivism was not clear enough to determine reliable results. Jones and McBeth contended that it was not their intention to reopen the debate about positivism and post-positivism but to acknowledge the contributions that scholars have made to the study of narratives and public policy. They also wanted to lessen the tensions between the two schools of public policy science to advocate that post-positivist approach utilizing narratives can comply with Sabatier's standards and that narrative scholarship can meet the clarity test. In setting out the task to meet these standards, these researchers were expected to develop a framework for a theory that has explanatory and predictive power.

When developing their framework, Jones and McBeth (2010) had to ensure that the philosophical foundations of the framework could withstand an attack of its logical premises. Jones and McBeth declared that the definitions of narrative are in dispute among scholars from various disciplines. They discussed the concept of structuralism as a factor that a theorist may understand from discourse and language utilizing the text as the primary unit of analysis. However, they concluded from a variety of disciplines that structuralists search for components in narratives that are generalizable across varied contexts. Just as with positivists and post-positivists, poststructuralism develops to critique structural accounts of narrative. The issue is the problem of categorization that results in separation of the components of text through individual interpretations. According to the poststructuralist, the primary unit of analysis is the human interpretation of the text because each person's interpretation of the narrative or text is unique. Thus, rather than seeking generalizations, researchers should engage in a process of

deconstruction of narratives to discover hidden meaning. Jones and McBeth contended that the mainstream of public policy literature regarding narrative scholarship has been with the poststructuralist tradition. The logical connection between narratives and structuralism is the interpretation derived from the formation and context of language.

The comparison of the development between the ideas of positivism and post-positivism and structuralism and poststructuralism on narratives and public policy are similar but nevertheless complex. Jones and McBeth (2010) explained that the capacity of measuring objective reality is the core of positivism. In attempting to develop policy theory with methodological techniques, positivists engage in rigorous prescriptions for testing hypotheses, causal analysis, model of the individual, applying multiple theories, empirical testing, examination for internal consistency, and replicability. The research approach aims at minimizing bias by asserting objectivity and seeking error correction. In contrast, post-positivists find normative values in policy processes along with conflict. One criticism of positivism and its empirical methods is the exclusion of marginalized groups, which contributed to the development of inductive methods and qualitative studies that rely on the researcher's interpreting skills. Given that post-structural narrative techniques rely on interpretive skills, they relate to post-positivism, which transited from literary studies to public policy as post-positivism. However, in public policy, the study of narratives can still rely on a structural conception that is positivistic.

In the development of a new theoretical framework in the study of public policy and narrative scholarship, these scholars used findings in the literature. Jones and McBeth (2010) discovered that research on narratives can be categorized in the literature into two

sets of works for research design: (a) qualitative and post-structural approach consistent with postpositivist ontology and epistemology and (b) quantitative and structural approach consistent with positivist ontology and epistemology. The post-structural category uses an inductive process without hypotheses testing with a qualitative design and the structural category uses a deductive process, examines elements of structure, tests hypotheses, seeks evidence of reliability and falsification with a quantitative design. Even though the categories are not perfectly fitted with these conceptions, they sought the development of broader theory and hypotheses that would heuristically lead to the specifications of a coherent framework. First, they acknowledged that main players of poststructuralism on narrative research recognized the importance of focusing on the elements of reality as socially constructed. The analyst must define the policy problem and resolve it from the interpretation of language. For example, a unit of analysis can be devised to study a discourse coalition. Such a group is a set of actors who use their skills to influence others by incorporating their ideas in a particular setting. To achieve success, the coalitions utilize a combination of story lines to create a coherent whole for a plausible discourse which is acceptable to the recipients. The incorporation of the coalition discourse into institutions can have a domineering effect whereas to guide policy outcomes. The scholarly predecessors to Jones and McBeth building on such lines of work would lead to the development of narrative policy analysis.

Methodology was the next significant step in the process of developing a theoretical framework. Jones and McBeth (2010) examined a study in which the researchers first described a methodology specifically for narrative in policy

controversies. These scholars used the term narrative policy analysis (NPA) to examine the political problems that emerged in the development of irrigation policy in a California community. According to Jones and McBeth, the researchers engaged in a post-structural approach with an interviewing process that treated each interviewee as a test for a devised causation model, and each story was treated as an element of a larger narrative that represented reality. By applying a network analysis to show the linkages between narratives, they produced what was represented as reality. Though this research exhibits some structural characteristics, it established that reality can be socially constructed from individual stories. Further, Jones and McBeth explained that Roe (1994) applied narrative literary techniques to public policy analysis in creating the NPA and publication of his ideas. NPA has four phases: (a) policy narratives and arguments contain the assumptions that are identified; (b) alternative narratives to the dominant narrative are identified; (c) from a comparison of narratives a grand policy metanarrative is derived; and (d) the policy analyst decides where the new metanarrative fall into conventional policy analytical tools, such as economics, legal, statistical, organizational, or public management. The post-structural orientation in the NPA is viewed as diametrically opposed to positivistic standards of social science and has a normative tilt, and therefore, the tenets they put forth for a positivistic empirical approach for the NPF does not coincide with the NPA methodological approach. Nevertheless, Jones and McBeth viewed the adherents to the NPA as contributors to the development of public policy studies through narrative approaches.

Jones and McBeth (2010) also acknowledged that the foundation laid by other scholars, such as the poststructuralists, provided the primary philosophical and methodological orientations applied to narrative studies of public policy. They pointed out that the post-structural work demonstrates the usefulness of narrative techniques for applied policy analysis. This includes how narrative define problems and find solutions, the use of interviews and document for case study, use of metaphor theory, and problem solving with competing narratives. Their work has also shown how narratives lead to improve understanding of values and their integration, analyzation of media narratives, logical argumentation, usefulness of historical narratives, discovery of who participates in policy issues, and how story lines influence participatory deliberation. Discovering the underlying assumptions of stories can help resolve difficult policy controversies, which can lead to the inclusion of unknown ideas from non-participants and achieve democratic goals. However, Jones and McBeth critiqued poststructuralists for using methodologies that are not systematic and lacking in validity and reliability. Though they recognized the criticism of the work of poststructuralists, Jones and McBeth acknowledged that scholars have already found ways to make the study of narratives scientific.

After considering the critiques against poststructuralism, Jones and McBeth (2010) turned to structural approaches to the study of narrative research and public policy. They described structuralist studies as basically deductive where hypotheses are tested with clear concepts to operationalize narrative structure or content. They found that many of the studies can quantify variables, and the researchers apply statistical techniques. These studies fall into the category of using positivistic theories and

methodologies, which can apply to the study of public policy. Using narratives as a distinct form of communication as a treatment in an experiment allows for the development of standards for experimental replication and falsification. For example, a study can analyze in a population the effectiveness of a narrative safety warning in comparison to a method used in the traditional manner of publicizing a notice requiring cautionary measures. These types of studies also assess values of individuals. Contrary to Jones and McBeth's view, researchers' capability measuring perceptions and values in assessing technical policy information takes on the attributes of a social constructive model or framework.

Other areas of interest regarding public policy where structuralists have contributed is the use of content analysis. For example, Jones and McBeth (2010) found where studies applied narrative theory to perform content analysis of newspaper coverage. This form of communication reveals newspaper stories in which narrative elements, such as drama, conflict can be tested. In another study, they found that the researcher coded student narratives as falling into four structural categories of stories: action, expressive, moral, and rational. The authors specified their procedures and used methods to test reliability. In this case, the researchers listened to individual narratives of conflict and were the instruments used to perform their narrative analysis. Jones and McBeth also found some structuralists attempted to integrate their narrative research design with other known theories such as the advocacy coalition framework (ACF) using content analysis and engaged in testing hypotheses. Despite disagreements due to the blending theories and methodologies in the deployment of narratives, Jones and McBeth

concluded that structuralists have a positivistic agenda with theoretical assumptions, hypotheses, and concern for falsification, but the research is from qualitative approaches.

This study provides justification for the NPF. The major theoretical proposition is that anti-LGBTQ attitudes among RFLs regarding equality and religious liberty is demonstrated, defined, and identified as discrimination that likely has a negative impact on hate crime policy. The theory relates to the study and research questions by engaging in deductive and inductive inquiries through the narratives of RFLs of different denominations to seek knowledge about the variations and strategies affecting public policy issues concerning pro-equality and hate crime related to the LGBTQ community. Inductively using the NPF, the research helped identify victims and harms, villains, and heroes, blame attribution, and the determination of possible policy solutions. Deductively using the NPF, the study may allow the research to find emerging and competing values as cultural ideologies, which may have behavioral consequences or outcomes. The combination of deductive and inductive approaches through a qualitative design may best answer the research questions and produce ideas for legislative proposals generated from the analysis of the narrative data. Normative solutions consistent with due process and equal rights would be substantial steps toward effective hate crime policies regarding the safety and welfare of the LGBTQ community.

Nature of the Study

The nature of the study was a qualitative methodology to explore the perspectives of RFLs on pro-equality policies regarding hate crime targeting members of the LGBTQ community. Because religious opposition to rights such as same-sex marriage may have a

link to ideological concerns, some scholars claim that such opposition may tend to maintain the status quo. For example, Toom et al. (2017) determined through a quantitative survey study of participants under laboratory conditions that religiosity predicted opposition to same-sex marriage. However, they also found that opposition to equality is not a factor contributing to religious opposition to same-sex marriage. They also determined that the relationship between religiosity and opposition to same-sex marriage is mediated through conservative ideology and sexual preference. Though there may be social norms of tolerance to suppress antigay bias, religious attendance is associated with antigay bias where moral considerations, such as sinner-sin religious justification plays a prominent role (Hoffrah et al., 2017). Exploring the viewpoints of RFLs may provide an understanding of how they reconcile their belief systems with secular public policies regarding hate crime.

The concepts of discrimination and hate crime are the broad concepts related to this dissertation. Following a qualitative methodology using a generic qualitative design, data were collected from RFLs in Monroe County, Indiana. A snowball sampling technique was used to select at least 15 participants. A researcher developed instrument was used to conduct individual interviews via interviews in person or through Zoom based on the participants' choice. Data were coded using theoretical coding and narrative coding (Saldana, 2016).

Concepts and Derived Definitions

Bias crime: An injury against a person based upon color, creed, disability, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation (Indiana Code 10-13-3-1).

Characters: Actors who may be labelled as heroes, villains, or others or thing perceived as performing some action (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Content: Policy context and subject matter (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Discrimination: Prejudice or differential treatment that results in pervasive and disparate treatment or no legitimate aim, whereas harm is produced as an outcome or not objectively and reasonably justified (Gurbal, 2020).

Due process: Fair treatment and protection of individual rights, recognition of the limitation of police powers, and respect for the legal process (Wilkerson & Peters, 2018).

Equality: A methodological and ideological construct and commitment based on acknowledged that human beings are the reciprocal beneficiaries of equity, fair treatment, and non-discrimination in a society (Sealy-Harrington, 2021).

Form: The structure on narratives (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Harm: Psychological, emotional, or physical effects that are detrimental to the personal health, safety, and welfare of a person, groups, communities, and social norms and values (Bell & Perry, 2015).

Hate crime: A criminal offense committed against a person or property that is motivated in whole, or in part, by bias or prejudice against race, national or ethnic origin, religion, sexual orientation, or disability (U.S. Hate Crime Statistics Act) or an enactment of prejudice against others categorized in the law coupled with violence or intimidation which constitute a mechanism of power and oppression, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchical structure that characterizes a given social order (Bell & Perry, 2015).

Hero: A potential fixer of the policy solution (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Moral of story: A policy solution (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Plot: Some organized action that affect policy (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Policy narrative: A communication found in some contextual medium of form and content of a discussion composed of elements characterized as settings, actors, plots, and moral outcomes with at least one character and a policy referent (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Religious liberty: A situation whereas people may practice any religion or religious belief without control, regulations, hindrance, undue influence, or constraint to the right of worship by public or government authorities without physical harm to others (Makridis & Gao, 2020).

Setting: The context of space and time in which scenario of action takes place (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Social construction: The acquirement of an understanding of people's similar and dissimilar perspectives and variable meanings of their experiences that they assign to various objects or processes associated with public policy (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Victim: The one harmed by an actor identified as a villain (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018).

Assumptions

A fundamental concern of this project is whether the main research question for a policy analysis study is sufficiently compatible for exploration within the assumptions adhered to within the NPF. Jones and McBeth (2018) contended that the basic assumptions of the NPF are that people construct reality through their perceptions of social events. But their meanings of events are bounded because of embedded beliefs about their social lives. Furthermore, structural elements of society influence perceptions that may be generalized to some extent along with noted exceptions. These authors also contended that three levels of analysis composing of individuals, groups, and cultural composition exist that have an interacting connection with the policy process. The final assumption is that the human entity is the individual model who communicates from cognition recognized from perceptions of experiences. The study's subject is the RFL, who is likely associated with a group characterized by denominational beliefs interacting within the domain of the policies and laws of American democracy.

Scope and Delimitations

The qualitative method was used to guide interviews with RFLs from a variety of denominations to understand their involvement in public policy processes exercising their religious liberty to influence hate crime policy in Indiana affecting the LGBTQ community. An implicit assumption exists that RFLs may directly or indirectly influence their followers and shape public opinion. I focused on RFLs because Indiana statutory law on bias crime appears inadequate to some public commentaries to address effectively hate crime against the LGBTQ community because of their speculation. Such spoke

persons like RFLs may contribute to policy outcomes from prejudices and stigmatization in exercising their religious liberty during events within contexts analyzed through the NPF for a process that has social change implications (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018). Nevertheless, the participation of RFLs in the policy process can provide meaning to them about the actors, events, contexts, and outcomes from their perceptions while performing their roles in a democratic society. This sets the boundary of the study because no other class of persons was invited to participate in the study to produce narrative data. Even though the study is limited to participants residing in Indiana, the results may be transferable in terms of drawing inferences about other populations of RFLs because of common or similar belief systems. Nevertheless, the goal is to complete a trustworthy study using a rigorous, credible, and replicable methodology to produce valid results.

Limitations

The qualitative component of this study allowed me to gain a better understanding of the phenomenon that RFLs perform regarding hate crime policies. However, the analysis involves a certain amount of subjectivity, which includes my reflections (Rudestam & Newton, 2015). Nevertheless, the conduct of the research must have comparable form of validity and reliability. I had the responsibility to acquire evidence of informed consent from the participants and perform a rigorous analysis of the data. In this case, the careful examination, coding, and categorization of information for meaningful thematic development and the emergence of theories from narratives will be a tedious

process. The results are limited with respect to generalizability but should be reproducible for further exploration and study.

Reflexivity, which is my self-reflection upon the study, addressed possible bias and underlying personal assumptions. My friendship with RFLs and members of the LGBTQ community or past personal experiences could have influenced subjective interpretations of the data. The study also depended on my effort to recruit RFLs to participate in the study. Therefore, I maintained a journal to note interesting thoughts and observations that indicate some personal bias or reliance upon previously unknown or unaware assumptions as well as mistakes or change in interpretation of the data. For these reasons, adherence to the elements of the NPF was particularly important to meet the scientific standards required for the study.

Significance

This study can advance knowledge in public policy science by applying and testing a rigorous theoretical framework, as the NPF is relatively new to social science research in public administration. In addition, the exploration of hate crime policies and the perspectives of RFLs may provide an understanding on how a democratic society can deter hate crime toward a marginalized group like the LGBTQ community. Coupling the theoretical framework with a study of RFLs narratives has never been done before. The examination process of the RFLs' self-stories or experiences reflecting their perspectives about the diverse lifestyles or identities of the LGBTQ community within the boundaries of embedded belief systems may generate conflicting values. Perhaps through the inductive and deductive processes new theories may be found that explain the social

behavior of RFLs exercising their religious liberty within acknowledgement of the principle of separation of church and state and solutions beneficial to the LGBTQ community.

Summary

Chapter 1 provided a review of the background, problem, questions, theoretical framework, nature, concepts and definitions, assumptions, scope of delimitations, limitations, and significance of the study. The subjects of discrimination and crime are necessary to a discussion about hate crime against the LGBTQ community. Policy decision-makers need the best understanding to implement policies that are enforced through laws that may carry a variety of outcomes to accomplish justice for community safety. Regardless of denominational differences among RFLs, they contribute forms of moral leadership to communities and policymakers through the context of narratives that may impact public policies. The study joins the exploration to understand the meanings of the participants in the exercise of their ministerial liberties with the development of the NPF. This framework may explain policy development toward hate crime and the LGBTQ community. The potential implications for positive social change is that the participants' learning capability may reconcile their views consistent with policies to deter effectively hate crimes against members of the LGBTQ community. The literature, which will be explored more in Chapter 2, reveals a reason to explore the subject matter as a policy concern in a democratic society.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives and worldviews of RFLs in Indiana toward pro-equality and hate crime policies designed to protect targeted groups such as members of the LGBTQ community. History has shown that RFLs perform roles in civic engagement (Freeman & Houston, 2018). As political actors, they influence social attitudes among the citizenry and policy makers that are reflected in public policies. Consequently, the policy making process may face conflict between religious beliefs and the due process and equal protection rights of the LGBTQ community. The main research question is “What ways did RFLs participate or influence the development or prevention Indiana policy regarding hate crime for the protection of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12)?”

In the United States, the principle of separation of church and state has been a fundamental constitutional mandate for protecting citizens’ right to practice their choice of religious belief. However, the choice of religious beliefs exercised through discourse about church-state relationship has resulted in considerable disagreement about the LGBTQ community (Freeman & Houston, 2018). As a practical matter, a society that attempts to exercise democratic principles develops conflicts between diverse cultures, religions, and worldviews. For example, research on the archives of the Church of Latter-Day Saints showed that a reciprocal relationship exists between religion and sexual politics (Sumerau & Cregun, 2015). Based on this study, leaders of this church over the years engaged in advocacy, media, offerings, activism, and negotiating laws to participate

in shaping public policy. In contrast to theocratic societies, separation of church and state is not a valued principle, as authorities seek guidance from religious leaders to support certain kinds of public policies (Alturki & Hamza, 2018). In some authoritarian societies, such as mainland China, a clear line of separation of church and state exists, whereas the government regulates the behavior of church leaders (Reny, 2018). The church and state dichotomy in the United States has developed policy outcomes that generate negative consequences directed at the LGBTQ community, which may be regarded as defiance for their safety and welfare. Religious leaders have had input into the policy-making processes to protect religious beliefs resulting in discrimination against the LGBTQ (Campbell et al., 2016). Thus, religion as a cultural feature may contribute to the complex dynamics between the interplay of the private and public rights regarding disclosure or nondisclosure of being LGBTQ member (Lim et al., 2020).

Much of the research literature on discrimination and hate crime against the LGBTQ and other targeted groups has left scholars unsatisfied with the theoretical and practical research resulting from academics and practitioners. For example, Chakraborti (2015) analyzed the data on an ongoing field research on hate crime victimization, which excluded some abuses from conventional hate crime frameworks, and many victims were not within the concept of hate crime. Significant problems exist regarding real world work to develop policies designed for educational programs and interventions. Likewise, some scholars discussed the difficulties and misunderstandings between hate crime academics and practitioners. There is a lack of public information about policies, laws, and support services regarding hate crime (Chakraborti & Hardy, 2017). But

academicians and practitioners can develop interventions that address the harms of hate crime (Garland, 2016). There is a necessity for community-based researchers, community development workers, and policy makers to act for positive social change against discrimination and hostility in a multi-cultural society (Kaushik et al., 2018).

A preview of the major sections of the chapter includes the purpose of the study and a discussion about the dichotomy of constitutional principles for the protection of religious liberty as a conflicting principle with pro-equality and due process for the LGBTQ. In addition, the concern for the possible impact that the exercise of religious liberty has on shaping public policy affecting the interest of the LGBTQ community and their relationship is a formable problem. The engagement of RFLs in the public policy process calls for political action necessary to bring a solution to hate crime against the LGBTQ community.

Literature Search Strategy

The literature search strategy involved articles that I found using the browsing on the Walden University Library. The search was indexed for peer-reviewed, full-text articles published in English during between 2015 through 2021. The database under the subject of the Public Policy and Administration was examined. However, the library database for LGBTQ & Sources was more productive. The approach was taken upon the use of Boolean/phrases in combination of keywords, such as *legislative and hate crime*, *religious leaders*, and *LGBTQ or lesbian or homosexual, hate crime against LGBT, church and state*, and *narrative framework and religion*. I also designated where requested for expansion to equivalent subjects with full text. In addition, the Criminal

Justice Database was also searched using similar keywords with a focus on *religious faith leadership* and *hate crime*. Under Dissertations and Theses database, two dissertations thought relevant to the research topic were available. I also searched with the keywords *narrative policy framework* and *qualitative studies*. Researchers have had little interest in the topic of RFLs' perceptions about the LGBTQ community and hate crime as indicated by me having found only one article. To overcome this problem, I attempted to search for information about *religion* or *the church* and their impact on the life of LGBTQ community.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that guided this research is the NPF, which is used to examine the robustness of the truth claim that emerges from narratives (Weible & Sabatier, 2018). The NPF was named by Jones and McBeth (2010) and emerged from debates about what constitutes public policy theory between post-positivists declaring that policy is contextualized through narratives and social construction and positivists-oriented theorists who rely on clear concepts and propositions, causal drivers, prediction, and falsification. The NPF has developed in form and content from policy narratives with core assumptions for building knowledge about the policy process.

The NPF has four policy core elements: settings, characters, plot, and moral of the story (Shanahan, Jones, McBeth, & Radelli, 2018). The setting may include legal and constitutional parameters, and other features that appear to serve as policy phenomena in this study. The characters that are concerned with in this study are RFLs and their relationship with the LGBTQ community. The plots are the interaction that take place

between actors and the settings. Finally, the morals of the stories involve the policy solutions from which the narratives or stories present purpose derived from the actions and motives of the characters (Weible & Sabatier, 2018). The public policy referent in this study is the application of pro-equality and hate crime policy to protect the LGBTQ community. RFLS are known to engage in narrative strategies to influence the policy process which has an impact on the LGBTQ community (Swan, 2019).

Scholars of the NPF focus on three kinds of strategies: scope of conflict, causal mechanisms, and the devil-angel shift (Weible & Sabatier, 2018). As a component of the theory for which the scope of conflict plays a role, the question is whether the actors expand or reduce conflict to serve their interest as well as the nature and to what extent. With causal mechanisms the research is concerned with the assignment of responsibility and blame for a problem policy. The devil shift predicts that actors will exaggerate the malicious motives, behaviors, and influence of opponents. The angel shift is observed as actors emphasize their capability to solve problems and de-emphasize the influence of opposing parties. Accordingly, the NPF assesses the devil-angel shift by the interviewee's identification with opposing forces as heroes or villains. Policy beliefs, as in the current study, would be measured operationally through narratives of RFLs and contextual means, which are theoretically grounded in religious cultural theory, political ideology, or political identity.

Further, the NPF has five core assumptions, as described by Shanahan, Jones, and McBeth (2018). First, social constructions matter in public policy. Though NPF acknowledges that reality exists separately from human perceptions, how people perceive

the objects of reality is relevant. As such, social construction is concerned with various meanings that individuals and groups characterize objects and processes in the development of public policy. Second, bounded relativity from which variations assigned to objects and policy realities through conceived social construction are not random. They are bounded by belief systems, ideologies, norms, and normative axioms. Third, policy narratives have generalizable structural elements. Consequently, narratives have structures through plots and characters in multiple scenarios. Four, policy narratives operate simultaneously at three interacting levels: individual, group and coalitional, and cultural and institutional. At the group and coalitional level, the current study focused on the policy narratives that RFLs composed of religious groups and advocacy coalitions within the community. As the macrolevel the study involved how policy narratives are embedded in the religious cultures, community, and institutions shape public policy regarding pro-equality and hate crime and the LGBTQ community. And finally, Homans' model of the individual, that is, the narrative plays a central role in how individuals process information, communicate, and reason. The assumptions are essential to the application of the NPF to this research project as a guiding theory.

A research-based analysis of how the NPF has been applied previously in ways similarly to the current study was found in the literature. In one study applying a qualitative NPF, Gray and Jones (2016) examined the policy narratives of U.S. campaign finance regulatory reform. They claimed to demonstrate how qualitative criteria can be used to illustrate the rigor and legitimacy of studying 29 narrative interviews of elite participants competing in political campaigns. Where quantitative methods may not be

feasible, the NPF provides amenable means through approaches that address normative concerns. They concluded that the NPF stands as a bridge between rival methodological approaches, such as positive and post-positivism, in public policy analysis. Further, the process is deductive and inductive. In their study, Gray and Jones applied the NPF deductively to show the variation between the competing narratives that identify victims and harms, attribute blame to villains, and declare heroes and policy solutions. On the other hand, they used the NPF inductively to show how different strategies between the groups disseminate narratives to the public.

The rationale for the choice of the NPF as applicable to the present study is that narratives of RFLs of different denominations may provide knowledge about the variation and strategies affecting public policy issues concerning pro-equality and hate crime related to the LGBTQ community. Inductively using the NPF, the research helped identify victims and harms, villains and heroes, blame attribution, and the determination of possible policy solutions. Deductively using the NPF, the study allowed me to find emerging and competing values as cultural ideologies which may have behavioral consequences or outcomes. The combination of deductive and inductive approaches may produce ideas for legislative proposals that are generated from analysis of the data. The development of normative solutions consistent with due process and equal protection of rights would be ideal. Thus, the NPF provides the support, foundation, and structure needed for the dissertation research (Weible & Sabatier, 2018). The analysis from the narratives of religious faith leaders can be made within the core assumptions of the NPF

and meet the challenges of credibility, trustworthiness, and transferability (Gray & Jones, 2016).

Previous Research Methodologies Using NPF

Even though multiple NPF quantitative studies have been published in the literature, scholars have given less attention to qualitative studies deploying the NPF. The NPF has been primarily a quantitative framework (Jones, 2018), and only a couple of qualitative studies have been found to examine. Nevertheless, the NPF is structured with form elements within policy narratives that researchers must theorize as generalizable across all contexts. The elements include the concepts of settings, characters, plots, and morals of the stories as components of the policy narrative, and as such will be coded within the current qualitative study. However, the contents of policy narratives vary, but limited to belief systems, ideologies, and strategies. Thus, qualitative studies using the NPF to explore policy narratives must also feature these concepts, and they must be analyzed accordingly.

Researchers have mainly used the NPF as a theoretical construct coupled with content analysis to examine narrative data. For example, Merry (2018) leveraged the NPF to analyze policy narratives of gun debate in the social media. This researcher conducted the study at the micro and meso level of analyses of various organizations and demonstrated with the deployment of content analysis that various organizations perceived gun violence differently. In another example, Peterson (2018) developed an institutional conception of the NPF along with the ideas of punctuated equilibrium theory (PET). From this study Peterson proposed another theory, narrative attention theory

(NAT), to study policy process. Peterson contended that individual preferences are fixed, and persuasion is unlikely found at the macro level where the results are more reliable. The innovative approaches of these scholars demonstrate the value of the NPF as a tool for future explorations.

Case studies at the meso level of analyses have also become the particular interest of some scholars on various topics. By incorporating the concept of risk in the NPF's structure, Lawlor and Crow (2016) found evidence of risk-related framing in the policy narratives studied. Furthermore, they learned that risks are related to NPF's concepts of setting, plot, and the moral of policy narrative. In another example, McBeth and Lybecker (2018) studied the compatibility of NPF with the multiple streams approach (MSA). This was a mix-method case study using content analysis to examine newspapers, congressional hearings, and Google trends from which they found that the MSA and NPF are congruent in the integration of theoretical concepts. These scholars' work led to the development of the concept known as narrative translation. Narrative translation is the movement of policy narratives from one agenda to another, such as information from a newspaper translated to congressional party debates. The combination of theoretical schools of thought with the NPF should support the move toward generalization of policy narrative theory.

Mix-method approaches at the meso level of the NPF has also found its way to topology with content analysis, but generalization may be fleeting. For instance, Smith-Walter (2018) demonstrated the complexity of achieving generalization from policy narratives on the matters of characters who strategically used them within. Their

examination of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) through various government venues integrated a typology of rhetoric to the NPF to study its deployment and the competing values of liberty and equality within the ACA debate. However, their study about victims is inconsistent with other existing studies applying the NPF. Such an outcome is particularly concerning to the present study in terms of the values of religious liberty and equality.

Fleeting generalization has also been demonstrated in another study at the micro-level applying the NPF with an experimental design using a multi-survey. Zanocco et al. (2018) applied narratives on hydraulic oil fracturing issues as treatments to sample populations in Arkansas and Oregon. These scholars coupled cultural theory and NPF along with a statistical model to study policy narratives regarding policy preferences. They also applied a causal mediation model to determine whether villainous perceptions affect preferences. Even though they found some villain effect, they did not find that the NPF reveals a hero effect. Here, the generalizability of NPF is called into question on the concept of character, and consequently, accentuates the importance of contextual matters.

Of course, the traditional quantitative methods of testing hypotheses, where generalizations are sought, is an acceptable feature of the NPF to demonstrate its scientific acumen. Jones (2018) provided an example with the micro and meso levels of analyses study concerning strategies of Gottlieb et al. (2019) studying narratives about hydraulic oil fracturing in New York between 2008 and 2012 to test traditional NPF hypotheses. Jones (2018) described the research as an eloquent comparative design that showed concern for endogeneity, which most often NPF scholars are inattentive. Gottlieb

et al. (2018) found that the treatment of winning and losing strategies within the NPF and amendments to hypotheses in the direction of exploring heresthetic applications of policy narratives with idea of winning rather than acting based upon position of winning or losing is less pervasive or preferable, or at least challenging. However, Jones (2018) gave these scholars credit for moving the NPF closer to assessing the role of narratives in policy outcomes even though some of the above-referenced studies have shown some weaknesses with the NPF.

Closer to the interests of the study herein are qualitative studies using interviews, surveys, or both for narrative data. Jones (2018) discussed the work of Shanahan, Raile, French, and McEvoy (2018). They analyzed data from interviews of Montana decision-makers regarding flood preparation on the Yellowstone River. These scholars explored at the meso level the relationship between frames and policy narratives. They made the case for demonstrating the capability of using issue categorization frames as a mechanism bounding policy narratives. The study showed how an individual internal cognition schema is exposed through the combination of clarification definition of issue categorization framing, the component of narrative setting, and characters identified in the space. They contended that framing theory can be coupled with NPF to demonstrate that individuals may state perspectives on policy issues that can at the same time maintain many internal cognitive schemas that fit external policy realities. Jones (2018) contributed them with having provided theoretical ideas about the setting element of policy narratives. On the other hand, Jones (2018) acknowledged the findings of Kirkpatrick and Stoutenborough (2018) using interviews and surveys of stakeholders of

seven new micro-level NPF hypotheses which would assist with future inquiries into policy narrative strategies. Inspired by what they considered a gap in policy narrative strategy research and theory, they investigated the policy issues of the Portneuf River located in Southeast Idaho. They studied the third-party effects, social distance, and intellectual distance to explain why individuals would change their policy narratives. Nevertheless, the traditional use of a quantitative approach appears to dominant NPF research with the sampling of interviews and surveys for narrative data.

Literature Review Related to Key Variables and/or Concepts

Discussion About Definitions

The constructs of discrimination and hate crime are engaging in the sense that the definition of hate crime incorporates the meaning of discrimination. For example, Cabeldue et al. (2016) derived and applied their definitions from the federal Hate Crime Prevention Act (HCPA) of 2009, cited as P. L. No. 111-84.

Hate crime is an enactment of prejudices against others categorized in the law coupled with acts of violence (Cabeldue et al., 2016),

Discrimination is prejudice that has a perverse meaning to its connotation (Cabeldue et al., 2016).

Harm is an outcome of human action that constitutes injury (Cabeldue et al., 2016).

The idea of discrimination regarding hate crime presents a specific sense of unfair treatment under the law or policy regarding a class of human beings.

The term bias crime in Indiana statutory law is used instead of the words hate crime. Indiana Code 10-13-3-1 provides that a bias crime means the following:

[An] offense in which the person who commits the offense knowingly or intentionally: (1) selected the person who was injured; or (2) damaged or otherwise affected property by the offense because of color, creed, disability, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation of the injured person or owner or occupant of the affected property was associated with the other recognizable group or affiliation.

The words discrimination, prejudice, or violence are not included in the definition of bias crime. The Indiana statute refers to the act, selected the person who was injured or whose property is damaged or affected. The reason or motivation is also provided through the clause because of color, creed, disability, national origin, race, religion, or sexual orientation of injured person occupant of the affected property. Conceivably, the clause that states that any other recognizable group or affiliation allows a prosecutor to charge an offense to protect a class of unknown persons can be labelled and identified as a protected group under the statute. However, the lack of specificity makes the statute ambiguous and possibly vague if given an interpretation that provides no clear meaning of a targeted class or persons harmfully affected.

Another provision of Indiana law enlarges the scope of an inclusive definition of bias crime based upon the offender's perceptions. Indiana Code 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12) provides that a court may enhance a sentence as an aggravating circumstance for the conviction of a bias crime if:

The person committed the offense with bias due to the victim's or group's real or perceived characteristics, trait, belief, practice, association, or other attribute the

court chooses to consider, including but not limited to an attribute described in IC 10-13-3-1.

The federal definition of a hate crime is distinguishable from a bias crime defined by the words used and the convicting offense. The federal hate crime definition applies to charging principal offense based on prejudice and violence. The purpose of Indiana's bias crime law is to allow a court to increase a sentence after determining the conviction of the principal offense. After the court applies a standard sentence based on an advisory or presumptive sentence considering that finding aggravating or mitigating circumstances, it may enhance the sentence. Consequently, the difficulties with the Indiana criminal procedures also raise questions about whether the judge or the jury should be the finder of facts for a second part of a bifurcated proceeding for sentencing and whether double jeopardy is an issue (Bell & Perry, 2015). Nonetheless, the policy concerns for harm and lack of safety are related issues in both hate crime and bias crime definitions.

The key concepts or constructs include harm to the protected class or community and their safety because these concerns and the lack thereof are phenomena that may require the provision and application of public resources to resolve. Researchers have determined that violence against LGB victims affects members who are not direct victims and experience harms which they describe as psychological and emotional, which cause behavioral changes, including the reluctance to share information about their sexual orientation to acquaintances (Bell & Perry, 2015). These authors recommend a definition of hate crime that is meaningful and applicable to this dissertation within the proposed

theoretical framework. Bell and Perry (2015) proposed the following definition of hate crime:

Acts of violence and intimidation, usually directed toward already stigmatized and marginalized groups. As such,[hate crime] is a mechanism of power and oppression, intended to reaffirm the precarious hierarchies that characterize a given social order. It attempts to re-create simultaneously the threatened (real or imagined) hegemony of the perpetrator's group and the 'appropriate' subordinate identity of the victim's group. (p. 100)

Multiple forms of harms are possible. Bell and Perry (2015) found through their studies five harms that hate crime generates: harm to the initial victim, harm to the initial victim's group in the neighborhood, harm to the initial victims beyond the neighborhood, harm to other targeted communities, and harm to societal norms and values. According to their study, the community finds difficulty to achieve a sense of public safety. LGB individuals prefer to hide their sexual orientation and pursue strategies for their protection rather than rely upon public resources to protect them. The scope of the individual harm, however, carries over to the creation of an unsafe community.

Due process for the LGBTQ community is also a key concept of this dissertation. However, scholars have demonstrated that in cases of hate speech, conflict exists between prosecuting a crime and the protection of free speech and thought (Wilkinson & Peters, 2018). As Wilkinson and Peters (2018) pointed out this conflict concerns beliefs about the primary role of the legal system which scholars refer to as crime control/due process orientation (CCDPO). The concept has three components:

suppression of crime, defending actions of law enforcement officials, and distrust of court proceedings with the underlying presumption of the offender's innocence. On the other hand, due process beliefs are concerned with protection of individual rights, fallibility, and limitations on the exercise of police powers, and respect for the court's process for determining the guilt or innocence of an alleged criminal offender. From this conflict emerges a debate about whether hate crime legislation (HCL) is desirable, and if so, should it be a principal law or an enhanced penalty upon conviction of a prescribed crime. While this issue is relevant to the study it does not address whether members of the LGBTQ community are able to sense the idea of due process within their general environment that protects their interests from potential harm.

The point of view that hate crime is a mechanism for the exercise of power and oppression of the LGBTQ community reflects a concern for this study to examine due process from a different perspective than CCDPO. Social dominance orientation (SDO) maintains that it is legitimate and desirable for some groups to dominant others (Wilkinson & Peters, 2018). The attitude is antithetical to the interests of the LGBTQ community. Researchers have found that high SDO individuals, for example, heterosexuals with socially dominant groups, generate and foster myths that include prejudiced attitudes and ideological beliefs to rationalize inequality between social groups. The legal definitions of due process as expressed in the conflict of ideas within the concepts of CCDPO do not address whether members of the LGBTQ community receive within the law fair treatment regarding their safety. Preferably, this study's concept of due process is defined as a concern for investigating the dominant source of

institutional attitudes that fosters oppressive treatment within the policy process inconsistent with the protection of the individual rights of the LGBTQ community.

Equality of rights for the LGBTQ community is another key concept of this study. Masri (2018) contended that over the years American social consciousness has developed such that the acceptance and legal equality have become more prevalent in recognition of the LGBTQ community. While the attitudes of homophobia and transphobia still pervade the legal landscape, the LGBTQ community has had many successes in battle over equal rights. The fight for legal equality through an agenda composed of same-sex marriage, anti-discrimination laws, hate crime laws, and military service has been supported through arguments with statistical data (Spade & Rohifs, 2016). Equality is an essential value of democratic society. Public policy should be directed to protect this feature, not only in the legal system, but also social awareness of the disparities that result from domination and oppression. This study does not engage in equal protection jurisprudence to explain the framework of its analysis in the American legal system but defines equality as a social construct based upon acknowledgement that human beings have equal rights by their mere existence and are the reciprocal beneficiaries of equity and fair play in a democratic society free of domination and oppression.

Finally, among the broad key concepts of this study is religious liberty. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States says that Congress shall not establish a religion or prohibit the freedom to exercise thereof. Coupled with principles of freedom of speech, press, and peaceable assembly, religious liberty is a fundamental feature of American democracy that underlies the dichotomy of separation of church and state.

From the research of Makridis & Gao (2020) a definition of religious liberty may be defined as a situation whereas freedom of liberty exists for people to practice any organized religion or religious belief without control, regulation, hindrance, undue interference, or constraint to the right of worship by public or government authorities without physical harm to others.

Religion and LGBTQ

The literature over the recent years continues to indicate that a relationship exists between religion and anti-LGBTQ attitudes. For example, Anderson and Koe (2015) explored the relationship between Islam and explicit anti-gay attitudes. They found a strong relationship between Islam and explicit anti-gay attitudes. However, they found also that the relationship between religion and implicit anti-gay attitudes more complex. As previously discussed, because religion has a significant impact on their lives, Malaysian Malay-Muslim men who have sex with men, the participants in a study viewed same-sex a sin (Lim et al., 2020). In another research project, Toorn et al. (2017) performed five quantitative studies of the United States and Canada to analyze the relationship between conservative ideology and opposition to same-sex marriage. They found religious opposition to same-sex marriage is explained best through resistance to change than opposition to equality. Apparently, the complexity between religion and anti-gay attitudes involves maintenance of the status quo through resistance to alter fundamental religious beliefs.

Nevertheless, the relationship between religion and LGBTQ may be described as a condition of intergroup intolerance to equality. Using a Justification Suppression Model

(JSM), Hoffarth et al. (2018) studied the relationship between religious attendance, anti-gay attitudes, and religious justification that suppresses pro-equality policies across different countries. They found that the variation between same-sex social groups within the context of toleration is accounted for by religious righteousness for anti-gay bias. On the other hand, Bell and Perry (2015) engaged a pilot study of a focus group of people who described themselves as lesbians, gay, bisexual, or pansexual. The information acquired from their inquiries revealed the extent to which the harms of anti-LGB hate crime indirectly affected others who were not direct victims. These scholars found that anti-LGB hate violence can have negative psychological and emotional effects on non-victims with dramatic behavioral changes as well. Also, hate violence prevented affected participants' decisions to disclose their sexual orientation to others. The diverse, religious, cultural phenomenon and the variety of LGBTQ people have a mix relationship that crime affects victims and non-victims with personal and property harms attributable to a terrorist syndrome.

Public sentiment toward the LGBTQ can be shaped through religious dialogue among the many denominational concern with issues about people's welfare over that of sin. Mbote et al. (2018) published a study about the leadership of religious faith leaders and how they played a significant role in framing public discourse on sexuality in the social life of Kenya. These authors explored the perspectives of Kenyan religious leaders regarding sexual and gender diversity with a self-administered questionnaire. The sample was composed of 212 Catholic, Islamic, and Protestant, urban and rural leaders. The researchers found some acceptance among them about same-sex relationships who did

not engage in sexual practices that are considered sinful. However, they found that 37% of the religious leaders condone the use of violence to maintain conformity with social values. Nevertheless, they concluded that religious faith leaders could be affected through the intervention of intergroup contact to advance human rights and health for sexual and gender minorities. Perhaps, such attitudinal modification of religious faith leaders may be the result of an epiphany or enlightenment within their basic ideological humanitarian beliefs.

The research literature includes studies of change of attitudes over time that appears promising for positive social change regarding the LGBTQ community. For example, Gay et al. (2015) found that there is a dramatic change in U.S. adults' attitude toward same-sex marriage as being more supportive. They examined the data from the 2012 and 2014 General Social Surveys regarding the differential impact of religiosity and spirituality in comparison to the 1988 General Social Survey among groups on attitudes toward same-sex marriage. The groups were classified as Millennials, Generation X, Baby Boomers, and Silent Generation. The Millennial cohort exhibited significant differences from the other birth cohorts. Schnabel (2016) performed another longitudinal study of the data taken from the General Social Survey during the period of 1970 to 2014 to compare gender and homosexuality among American religious groups. The researcher found some similarities, as well as differences with change over time, but differences that diverged. The subject of same-sex marriage appears to have drawn a more tolerable acceptance of equality among religious groups.

Political affiliation and ideology associated with conservative and liberal forces in religious communities may account for the degree of anti-bias attitudes toward the LGBTQ community. Gay et al. (2015) also found that Evangelical gender attitudes were more conservative than other groups toward work and family issues, but adaptive to other trends. But the dynamics among evangelicals is a three-stage process of similarity, distinction, and adaption. Interestingly, Donaldson et al. (2017) found through their individual and cross-cultural study of factors that affect attitudes toward homosexual people across European countries an interaction between individual and country level variables. Political affiliation, religiosity, and self-enhancement values are strong predictors in liberal countries. However, openness to change values, younger age, and higher education are strong predictors in conservative countries. To support their findings, these researchers induced their results from the date of the Sixth Biennial European Social Survey across 28 countries. In any case, the globalized spectrum regarding LGBTQ people warrants concern for the regulatory production of their rights internationally through human rights, hate crime laws, asylum law, and equal protection treatment.

Hate Crime Policies and Political Action

The development and implementation of hate crime policies begin with political action to address the sources of the problem. Manson and Maher (2016) investigated the implementation, recruit training, and community perceptions of prejudicial motivated crime strategies in Victoria, Australia. These authors analyzed the nature of evidence to establish the motives of prejudice beyond a reasonable doubt as well as augmenting the

legal threshold with the interest and expectation of vulnerable and minority communities. They found that legal standards and community expectations can be developed through strategies to implement effective hate crime policy. Levy and Levy (2017) researched and addressed the question of whether public policy on gay and lesbian rights affect hate crimes based on sexual orientation. They found that hate crime and employment non-discrimination laws reduce incidences of hate crime upon the inclusion of sexual orientation as a category. The outcome of these studies indicate that the design of the law and policy is crucial. The protection of targeted and marginalized diverse groups such as the variety among the LGBTQ community may rely upon proper semantic labelling in the law.

Some authors contended that political action must not characterize or treat members of the LGBTQ as no different than ordinary people. Mayers (2018) argued that the connection between judicial and ideological frameworks through which state action that constructs the labeling of the diversity among LGBTQ people must not racialize them culturally. Along with the U.S. led global LGBT human rights campaign that was initiated on International Human Rights Day in 2011, Mayers (2018) contended that the world must engage in human rights policing with political action, and military and financial intervention to protect them. Thus, equality may triumph with fairness through the legal processes whereby political action is undertaken.

Political action must engage with strategies that penetrate the psychological inhibitions to social change about sexual identity. Looy (2018) analyzed some of the key psychological barriers to constructive dialogue and decisions about sexual gender

diversity (SGD). This researcher determined that awareness is a necessary first step in moving forward constructively through barriers to understanding and using sex/gender categories to organize the social world. The determination led to the resolution that variability in tolerance for ambiguity and change and differences in the foundations use frame and novel concerns, particularly, the avenues to emotions that motivate and reinforce our responses to sexual gender diversity. A possible example is where a small community of citizens disagree about the 2015 U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Oberjefell v. Hodges*, in favor of same-sex marriage. Barton and Currier (2019) drew on 11 interviews of queer women in Rowan County, Kentucky to explore how they challenged the intolerance and religious homophobia that eventually changed the community to become more progressive toward sexual minorities. Perhaps, because of close proximities between groups, political action in small rural communities to alleviate intolerance and religious homophobia may be more effective than in urban settings.

Nevertheless, the combinations in the relationship between intolerance and religious homophobia and the relationship between heterosexism and transphobia may have similar effects upon the LGBTQ. Nadal (2019) reported from a study that even though the U.S. Supreme Court legalized same-sex marriage, heterosexism and transphobia have continued to survive throughout our system with a lack of federal protection. Apparently, this is true about the states also. Nadal (2019) contended that heterosexism and transphobia discrimination manifest themselves as forms of hate crime and bullying. They are known as microaggressions which impacts LGBTQ people with depression, low-self-esteem, and trauma. Also, this author discussed Microaggression

Theory as an interdisciplinary approach along with intersectional identities, psychological outcomes, and research methods. Prejudice against the idea of same-sex marriage is generated from the same emotions and intolerance of religious homophobia that motivate hate crime.

Hate crime against the LGBTQ community may result from more than one motive. For example, the literature includes the study of Anderson et al. (2018) who researched self-reported hate victimization among Swedish university students. They found that every fifth crime victim reported having experienced more than multiple motives. Consequently, these victims are more likely to report their assaults than those with single motives. The authors concluded that their results show that if a person belongs to more than one socially vulnerable group, they are more likely to experience hate crime with multiple motives. Thus, the process of explaining to others the circumstance of their oppression is conflicted with the mix of motives that contributed to despotism experiences and conditions.

Constructive dialogue may be an effective means through which conflict between groups in values and lifestyles lead to a positive approach to dispute resolution. For example, Ethengoff (2017) explored through a study on how sociocultural conflicts are mediated between gay men and their families from Christian and Jewish communities. The 25 participants in the study wrote letters to specific religious leaders challenging their denominations' sexual minority policies and raising concerns about the humanitarian needs of the writers. While the letters were not actually presented to the religious leaders and the exercise may have some therapeutic value for the participants,

Ethengoff (2017) concluded from analyzing the writings that new concepts emerged that provided ideas for the participatory research, policy initiatives, and clinical applications. Responses to such letters from religious faith leaders, however, may likely lead to recommendations for the participants to engage in sexual orientation change.

Sexual orientation change efforts (SOCE) are attempts to engage in conversion intervention therapy or treatment. Caitlin et al. (2020) performed a cross-section study of 245 LGBT White and Latino participants between the ages of 21-25 whose parents/caregivers forced them to participate in SOCE with therapists and religious leaders. The researchers found that the conversion intervention efforts lead to depression, suicidal thoughts and attempts, and less educational success among the participants. Caitlin et al. (2020) concluded that instead of SOCE for the children, parents/caregivers needed parental educational guidance. In these cases, the perceptions of therapist and religious leaders within the applications of their social construction frameworks produced drastic results. Research methods to study the religious components that influence the development of hate crime have been conducted. For example, Valcore (2018) applied social construction theory and content analysis to study the variations that exist with the social and political status of gays and lesbians that have a relationship with inclusion of sexual orientation in state hate crime laws. The author found that some states demonstrate a positive social construction associated with the effort to acquire protections against hate crime within the law and political influence may be factor. Such findings indicated that the degree of political influence of religious faith leaders in the implementation of hate crime policy and law regarding the LGBTQ community is significant.

A need exists methodologically to evaluate and assess the components of discrimination that influence hate crime. In another study, Cabeldue et al. (2018) created and evaluated a proposed Hate Crime Belief Scale to determine its usefulness to measure hate-crime-related beliefs that would provide research consistency and an understanding of public attitudes. Applying factorial analysis, they found the proposed HCBC loaded on four sub-scale: negative views, offender punishment, deterrence, and victim harm. The quantitative study provides a means through the HCBC to assess legislative-related beliefs and attitudes of the participants in the study. These series of studies support the accusation that religious faith leaders as political actors may generate prejudices against LGBTQ people that eventually affect the outcome of hate crime public policies.

Summary and Conclusions

NPF studies include many different topics and subject areas for research. Jones (2018) found that environmental policy has been the primary focus along with content analysis. He explains, however, that studies exist on nuclear energy, campaign finance reform, e-cigarette regulation, and education policy. Along with content analysis, traditional NPF data surveys and interviews as limited as they might be applied. However, Jones (2018) found in his survey of the literature on NPF that no one directly addressed the problem of endogeneity. The Gottlieb et al. (2018) study is unique in that they set up a comparative design with the selection of cases analyzed with the intention of minimizing endogeneity. The problem of endogeneity is generally defined as the circumstances in which the independent variable that explains changes in the dependent variable holding all other external factors assumed constant is correlated with the error

term of a statistical model. If one takes policy narratives as the independent variable and policy outcome as the dependent variable in a model, and if holding all other extant factors or variables constant, that is, somehow their effects are eliminated, then the policy narratives fully explain the policy outcomes. In the real world, this may not be possible in studies of social science because other factors other than policy narratives contribute to the policy outcome. In the present study, the policy narratives of RFLs are unlikely to explain fully the policy outcomes in the State of Indiana, but the problem of endogeneity is a challenge to consider with the research design of this study. On the other hand, endogeneity may be only a problem with quantitative methods in the study of NPF projects which engage the search for generalization with statistical methods. A generic qualitative design that is non-experimental is not expected to contribute to generalization, but scholars explore to achieve understanding that is transferable in terms of expectations or propositions to other studies, settings, and contexts.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives and worldviews of a segment of RFLs in Indiana toward pro-equality and hate crime policies that are designed to protect targeted groups, such as members of the LGBTQ community. A need exists to better understand potential dichotomy in the requirement to maintain separation of church and state whereas the conflicting dimensions of the principle may play to influence social and political attitudes and acceptance of public policies affecting the LGBTQ community. The concept or phenomenon of interest is RFLs' exercise of religious liberty or ministerial prerogatives that result in discrimination against the LGBTQ community. In this chapter, I provide a discussion about the research design, rationale, my role as researcher, methodology, and issues of trustworthiness along with some summary remarks.

Research Design and Rationale

The research questions were:

- RQ 1: How did religious faith leaders participate or influence the development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate crime or the protection of members of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7-1(a)(12)?
- RQ 2: In what ways, if any, do religious faith leaders' personal perspectives on public policy in the exercise of their ministerial liberties differ from the tenets of their religious denominations regarding pro-equality and protection from hate crime for the LGBTQ community?

In addressing these questions, the study is both policy-centered to examine a policy process issue through narrative elements and strategies and theory-centered by exploring the role of narratives in the policy through the NPF (Shanahan et al., 2018). The generic qualitative research design and rationale complied with the five major assumptions of the NPF as outlined by Shanahan, Jones, and McBeth (2018). First, social construction from which perceptions of the participating RFLs are the social constructs of reality to produce the data. Second, I assumed bounded relativity because RFLs are expected to have stable ideologies or belief systems from which they practice their faith. Third, the narratives taken from the participants through individual interviews were expected to have generalizable structural elements that are specific and identifiable that can be analyzed. Fourth, even though the level of analysis was at the micro level, it is possible that information acquired would include some development at the meso and macro levels of analysis. Finally, I assumed that the RFLs act with behavior attributable to their human cognition and communicate in such a manner as to give narratives of their lived experiences in the form of stories which influence the policy process.

The research tradition of this study was qualitative with a generic non-experimental design studying transcribed narrative data from interviews of voluntary participants in the project and analyzed within the theory of the NPF. I could not control or operationalize the relevant variables of the topic of the study, so an experimental or quasi-experimental method would be difficult to design. Using a cross-sectional approach, the research questions are more likely answered with a non-experimental design because I determined how narrative components explain the development of

policy and perform according to a theory (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018). The NPF is a theory of the policy process that examines the robustness of the truth claim that emerges from narratives (Weible & Sabatier, 2018). Coupling the theoretical framework with a study of RFLs narratives was an objective of the research. Engaging in a recursive process of induction and deduction to address a gap in the literature about RFLs' perspectives about the LGBTQ community within the dichotomy or separation of church and state is a meaningful and challenging task for a public policy study. The topic and the research design may produce unknown scientific policy knowledge to the study of public policy and may contribute to positive social change.

Role of the Researcher

My role in this study was to perform in compliance with the approved design of the project ethically and astutely within the policies of Walden University. I was the investigator who performed, recorded, and transcribed all interviews of the participants. I intended to perform the analytical process recommended by Rubin and Rubin (2012). I also maintained a journal to document the process of research activity, observations of interest, notes upon reflection and on reflexivity, and examination of underlying assumptions.

I am a lawyer who engages in the general and appellate practice of civil and criminal law. I was born into the Baptist's tradition and acquired memberships in the Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches. I have an office associate who is an ordained deacon of the Episcopal Church. I have other friends and acquaintances who identify themselves as RFLs.

I anticipated the possibility of recruiting participants who I may know in some way personally or who may know of me as a public figure, but with no personal or professional relationship of direct involvement between them other than the study. If a potential interviewee had a direct personal or professional relationship with me, if necessary, that RFL would have been excluded from the study to minimize the potential for bias and to avoid any conflict of interest or the relationship would have been noted in my journal.

The fact that I am a lawyer licensed to practice law in Indiana and the federal courts, I also considered my ethical obligations to the disciplinary code of professional conduct in dealing with the public. The interviewees were informed that I am a non-government practicing attorney who has interviewed many witnesses for the purpose of litigation, but in this case the interview is for the study of a government policy under the supervision of Walden University. The research is not for the benefit of my legal practice, but the experience is always a learning process that benefits me personally as a scholar. I wanted the participants to know my credentials to make it clear about my role in the project and my nonthreatening intentions and professional obligations to them. If a participant disclosed criminal or abusive behavior, I would remind the participant that we do not have an attorney–client relationship, I cannot give legal advice, and that there are provisions of Indiana law that require disclosure of information that indicates potential harm or abuse of another person to proper law enforcement agencies.

Further, I recognized that I am living a preferred lifestyle of my choosing that may differ from the manner and culture of the participants. Regardless of how objective

and rigorous that I may attempt to perform my role in the project, I am likely to have had some implicit biases and assumptions, particularly about power relationships, that may find their way into my analysis. To control any subjective applications of personal tenets, I reflect upon my work to match and adhere to the standards of the NPF theoretical framework.

Methodology

The Population

The population of this study was intended to be composed of RFLs from the major religious denominations, such as the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish faiths, who reside in Indiana. A snowball sampling strategy was intended to be used to identify potential participants who are recognized within a religious community or organization as a RFL. The participant must be an adult and have a willingness to be interviewed regarding their perspectives about government policies. I proposed to select 15 participants and seek their voluntary participation for a representative sampling of RFLs from the major religious denominations. I intended to select four or five from each of the major denominations in Monroe County, Indiana, and extended areas if necessary. These individuals were to be identified through contacting local religious organizations that are published and listed in a Monroe County's local newspaper, *The Hoosier Times*, along with the organizations' addresses and telephone numbers. This newspaper listing does not include names of the RFLs; thus, I searched the religious organizations online to determine the names of their RFLs. I also contacted RFLs known to me and ask them for their participation as well as requested from them the names and contact information for

other religious leaders who may be interested in participating in the study. I contacted each potential participant with a letter of invitation as a recruitment tool by explaining the study and the required criteria for participation. More detail about the specific recruitment procedure is included in the procedures section that follows. The Walden University IRB approval number for this study is 03-18-22-0987667.

Instrumentation

After proper arrangements had been made between me and the participants, I scheduled a meeting to conduct the individual interview in person in their natural setting or through Zoom, recorded and transcribed the interview based on the participant's preference. The purpose of the interview was to obtain policy narrative data from the participants of their stories and experiences with LGBTQ members and public policy. An interview guide instrument for the research (see Appendix A) was used to conduct individual interviews with RFLs. The interview guide format is an adequate format to use in a qualitative study because the questions are open ended, but targets narrative components, and allows for probing further with follow up questions that can focus on key concepts without suggesting possible answers.

I recorded and transcribed the interviews with Otter.ai dictation software through my Apple laptop computer with a plug-in external microphone. I also had planned to record the sessions with a microcassette recorder along with taking handwritten notes in a journal, if possible.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

I composed a list of religious organizations or persons who are identified as RFLs. I contacted each religious leader identified with a recruitment letter and two copies of the informed consent. The religious organization have no role to serve in the study other than to identify a potential participant from their organization. Under no circumstances was a religious organization contacted to serve as a partner to this study.

The selection process included the criterion that the RFL had attempted or desire in some way to influence public policy in the exercise of religious liberty. I expected that many would not express an interest to participate. I also anticipated that some religious organizations may require their RFLs to obtain consent or approval from their superior leaders or stakeholders to whom they may be accountable before consenting to participate or on terms incompatible to this study. The strategy described here allows for a criteria and selection process upon which the research is based.

I intended for the original letter mailed to the RFLs identified to solicit their cooperation and notification of the research project. The letter included a request for the RFL's willingness to participant in the study and information provided for their name, position, address, telephone number, e-mail address, and signature, and a stamped self-addressed envelope for the return of the informed consent to participate in the study within 2 weeks. Along with the recruitment letter, I included copies of Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7-1(a)(12) for the potential participant's review. If necessary, I intended to expand my recruitment effort to surrounding Lawrence, Brown, Morgan, Owen, and Greene counties geographic regions in Indiana. The list of potential

participants was used strictly for recruitment, selection, and interviewing. I expected the relationship between saturation and sample size would occur when the number of interviews provided sufficient information such that I am finding redundancy and repetition. However, I was only able to acquire the participation of nine Christian faith leaders for the study. Those who indicated their willingness to participate in the study were assigned a combination of a letter and number for purposes of confidential identification. I followed through with a telephone call to thank those RFLs who responded to the letter along with a signed informed consent.

Regardless of the number of RFLs who indicate their willingness to participate, I intended to interview each one of them, unless the number of interviews become overly burdensome in terms of physical or psychological stress, time, and resources. In such an event, I would have written a letter with an explanation to those who consented to an interview but were excluded. I expected to ask the participants open-ended questions to learn of their perspectives or stories about their role in exercising their religious liberties and their views on pro-equality and hate crime policies concerning members of the LGBTQ community. However, in most cases I followed-up with structured questions, where necessary, in such a way that targets specific components of the NPF. With this approach, I anticipated that each interview would take 20–40 minutes. I attempted my best to extract as much information from each participant as I can with relevant probing questions to ascertain the stories of their experiences about members of the LGBTQ and public policy. Before completion and analysis of the transcribed narrative data, I provided

by U.S. mail each participant a copy of their transcribed interview for their review and necessary corrections.

While only one interview was planned for each participant, if recruitment results in too few participants, more in-depth second interviews with the interviewees may be more appropriate to complete the study. This is covered in their letter of informed consent. However, a follow-up with more questions presented to the participants would have been more likely necessary for details, and perhaps, broaden the scope of the coding process. However, a second approach may be more appropriate and necessary by seeking new contacts from religious organizations found in surrounding counties through a search if the internet. I planned that a decision based upon the experience and cooperation that I received from potential participants would have to be made about which approach is most likely the best. The decision was made upon consultation with my committee chairperson.

I provided each participant a copy of their transcribed interview and allowed them five days to respond with changes or additions, and any questions that should be shared about the conduct of the research. I also send a brief letter indicating a note of appreciation to each participant.

Data Analysis Plan

Data from the transcribed narratives was coded and categorized for meaningful thematic development for a preliminary analysis of narrative components regarding form and content. I applied a continual iterative process for transcribing and coding the data to examine for elements demonstrating policy and theoretic implications. I examined the

data for the emergence of policy development and theories that may explain the phenomenon of discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community by RFLs within the context of secular public pro-equality and hate crime policies that may be explained through the NPF. A search was made to detect support or refutation to my expectations or propositions generated through the analysis of the data. I have specifically pointed out and addressed with objectivity discrepant cases.

Participating RFLs were allowed to provide liturgical literature, their writings, personal correspondences to public policy makers, and other materials for review. However, I intended to prepare an analysis of the narrative data and literature that may include descriptive statistics about the distribution of the narrative source and components, translation of information, and network analysis. Literature, writings, and correspondence may be objects that contain subjects for content analysis to identify elements or components of the NPF. None of the participating RFLs, however, provided liturgical literature and none were used from the websites of the religious organization.

I applied a coding process using the Theoretical Coding and Narrative Coding methods (Saldana, 2016) without software. In doing so, consideration should be given to the guidelines and coding procedures that Shanahan, et al. (2018) recommend for a research project to improve the NPF as a theoretical approach to understanding the policy process.

I transcribed and recorded each interview. The verbatim transcribed interviews produced from the questions constituted the policy narratives for examination of their components and elements of the NPF. I analyzed the narratives through categorization of

seven key concepts along with elements identified as demonstrating form and content. I proceeded with a preliminary manual coding using codes related to Key Concepts, Form, and Content.

Table 1 represents preliminary codes that I attempted to use for the data analysis in this study. I recognize that more codes may emerge, but this outline provides a starting point. In Table 1, the term key concepts are those codes that describe the legal phenomena of discrimination, hate crime, bias crime, harm, due process, equality of rights, and religious liberty. I engaged in a process of interpretation adhering to the deductive process of theoretical coding (Saldana, 2016, p. 251) seeking the development of categories and themes, and possible network analysis to explain their relationships to policy development.

Table 1

Preliminary Coding Framework for Key Legal Concepts

Key legal concepts	Interview questions
Discrimination	1-4
Hate crime	1-4
Bias crime	1-4
Harm	1-4
Due process	1-4
Equality of rights	1-4
Religious liberty	1-4

I prepared a journal and engaged a secondary process to find and mark in the text excerpts that have the relevant key legal concepts from which I may interpret meaning or the essence of the interviewees' perceptions of their social construction of reality as they relate to research questions. I attempted to confirm expectations for possible propositions.

The core NPF narrative components are described as form and content (Shanahan, et al., 2018). In terms of policy narrative form, I coded for narrative elements, such as setting, space and time; characters, such as heroes, villains, and victims; plot or organized action; and moral of the story or a policy solution (See Table 2). In addition, I coded for policy narrative content, such as belief system, set of values, or beliefs as well as strategies, such as manipulation or control policy processes (Shanahan, Jones, & McBeth, 2018). For this process I applied the Narrative Coding method found in Saldana (2016, p. 154) (See Table 3). From across the interviews, I will find the excerpts marked with the same code, and sort them into a single data file. I will summarize the contents of each file; sort and resort the material within each file, comparing the excerpts between different subgroups, and the summarize the results of each sorting to confirm expectations or draft propositions.

Table 2

Preliminary Coding Framework for NPF Form

Form	Interview questions
Setting	2–5
Character	2–7
Plot	2–7
Moral of the story	4, 8
Victim	6
Villain	5
Hero	7

Table 3

Preliminary Coding Framework for NPF Content

Content	Interview questions
Benefit	2, 3, 4, 7
Oppression	3, 4
Strategy	2, 4, 8

Beliefs	3, 4
Values	3, 4
Culture	3, 4
Ideology	3–5
Dominance	3, 4, 7
Control	3, 4, 7, 8

After weighing different versions, I integrated the descriptions from different interviewees to create, if I could a complete picture. I combined concepts and themes to generate my themes or theories to explain the descriptions presented. While doing so, I constantly test ideas by examining them considering the variations in components; and see how far results generalize beyond the individuals and narratives studied, and the relationship between policy narratives and policy decision. The analytical process was an effort to engage iteratively with a heuristic approach in inductive reasoning to search for plausible themes and propositions which may assist in answering the research questions.

In sum the key elements of data analysis for coding are discrimination, hate crime, bias crime, due process, equality of rights, harm, benefits, religious liberty, setting, character, plot, moral solution, beliefs, values, culture, ideology, strategy, villain, victim, hero, domination, power, oppression, manipulation, conflict, persuasion, control, goals, purpose, recruit, devil-shift, angel-shift, and others that may be determined from examination of the narrative data and contexts of the participants' stories.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Qualitative studies are evaluated by the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Rudestam & Newton, 2015). The research design is structured to adhere rigorously to a scientific framework accepted by scholars in the policy literature. It is the intention of the design to present a research process that

produces sound results which are reliable. The effort was to ensure that my interpretation of the narrative data is empirically grounded from the transcribed interviews of the participants. Credibility, the equivalent to internal validity, may be established by rechecking the narrative data with the participants for possible corrections and accurate interpretation to acquire the meaning of their perceptions of reality from their personal experiences. I also recognized that a thick description to describe behavior as well as context giving meaning to settings in sufficient detail is important to allow transferability, the equivalent to external validity, to other settings. The sampling of a variety of denomination religious leaders should contribute to this effort. Dependability may be established with an audit trail with the maintenance of the intended journal keeping a detail record of the research procedures and processes. This record may include evidence of how the induction and deduction efforts were achieved to analyze and synthesize the data. As ideas and personal observation emerge, I wrote them down in the journal or paper also. The dissertation committee is the best entity to provide an external audit upon which I may rely. Confirmability may be achieved to assure objectivity with reflexivity on my personal biases which may have impacted the study through critical self-reflection. To maintain privacy of the participants, I have not requested a peer reviewer. Unless the dissertation committee recommends that one should be selected for this study, none will be requested, and none has been requested.

Ethical Procedures

I expect no documents that constitute agreements other than the informed consent and the potential participant's agreement will be necessary to gain access to their

narrative data. No entity other than Walden University and the Code for Professional Conduct as a licensed lawyer by the State of Indiana for whom I am accountable. I will continue to treat all potential participants and participants with professional respect and absolute honesty in their oral communications and correspondences. Upon conversing with participants, I asked them to consider any risks to which they may be exposed from participating in the study. In my judgment, no real benefit other than a learning experience is acquired from their participation. Upon approval of the committee chairperson, I applied for URR approval and the associated documents were included with the dissertation.

I anticipated that potential participants may have questions. With the best of my knowledge, I answered the questions forthrightly. If I am unable to provide a correct and proper answer, I will consult with my committee chairperson, or if necessary, identify and direct the potential participant to the proper person in the administration of Walden University who is qualified to answer the question. If a participant provides recruitment materials or any other kind to me, I will appropriately label and simultaneously identify the documents with the provider and maintain them in a confidential file made accessible only to me. I will examine the materials to assess their relevance to the study and usefulness for further investigation along with questioning the participant-provider about them. If a participant informs me that their participation is no longer desirable for the study, then, I will destroy their recorded and transcribed interview and any materials provided.

Ethical concerns related to data collection and intervention activities, including participants refusing participation or early withdrawal from the study, is to ensure their privacy during data collection and all records are secured by storing them in my combination lock metal office safe. No demographic data is necessary for this study other than the religious denomination of the potential participant. The anonymity of potential participants or participants will remain in force throughout the project, such that matching of interviews with interviewees remains confidential. Only I and my committee chairperson will have access to the participants and the data. After five years, all records of any kind, except the dissertation which will absolutely exclude any possible indication of who was interviewed, will be destroyed.

Unpredictable events can occur for which I cannot or have not planned to address. If necessary, I will consult with my committee members for advice and discuss possible alternative solutions to problems that may arise. Nevertheless, the approach to this research will adhere to the procedures as stated herein with the rigorousness that I have planned.

Summary

This study deploys a generic qualitative non-experimental design. The purpose of the method is to explore religious faith leaders' (RFLs) perspectives and influence on public policy attested through narratives concerning the safety and welfare of members of the LGBTQ community as presented under Indiana hate crime policy. The research is both policy-centered by examining a policy issue through the narrative elements and theory-centered by studying the role of narratives in the policy process through the

Narrative Policy Framework (NPF). The basic assumptions of the NPF are incorporated within my understanding in applying its theoretical elements. I am the author, researcher, and data analyst who intends to serve these roles with rigorous objectivity and ethical compliance to scientific research. The chosen methodology in the process of recruitment, participation, data collection, and analysis are my sole responsibility. Accordingly, I have and will assess the risks and benefits to each participant selected to participate in the study and treat them with respect and dignity. No participant was allowed to participate in this study without having submitted to me a written and signed informed consent. My goal is to achieve the purpose of the study in compliance with the standards and criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Chapter 4: Results

I conducted a qualitative study to explore and understand the perspectives of RFLs about hate crime and pro-equality public policies regarding the safety and welfare of the LGBTQ community in Indiana. Applying the NPF as a conceptual framework and methodological procedure to guide the study, I analyzed their perspectives regarding pro-equality and hate crime policies. The main research questions were:

- RQ 1: How do RFLs participate or influence the development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate crime or protection of members of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12)?
- RQ 2: In what ways, if any, do RFLs' personal perspectives on public policy in the exercise of their ministerial liberties differ from the tenets of their religious denominations regarding pro-equality and protection from hate crime for the LGBTQ community?

In this chapter, I will discuss the setting, demographics, data collection, data analysis, evidence of trustworthiness, limitations of the study, recommendations, and the implications and conclusions derived from the research.

Setting

Upon consent forms being returned to me, I was able to arrange and acquire nine interviews in person or recorded through Zoom. I received two other responses in writing as a note and a letter. Because these invitees did not submit written approved consents, the information contained in the note and letter was not used or discussed for this study.

The interviews were dictated, recorded, and transcribed with an Otter.ai software from which I acquired data to code, interpret, and analyze. I provided a copy of the respective transcript to each participant for review and return. I also provided my chair with a copy of each transcript. Except for the problem of one participant having difficulties with the reading of a transcript, I observed no personal or organizational conditions that influenced the participants or their experiences at the time of the study that may influence interpretation of the study results.

Demographics

All the participants were adult men and women RFLs of denominations serving the Christian faith. Even though I mailed over 100 invitations to a variety of RFLs to participate, only nine accepted. The participating sample is composed of ministers from ideologically or theologically different religious organizations. A couple of the participants have studied law. All participants reside or had lived in Monroe County, Indiana. Six are pastors of their churches. Three participants administer their faith without assignment to a particular congregation. Since the pool from which I drew the participants is quite large and consisted of multiple faiths, I am concerned as to whether the final selection is an adequate numerical sampling. Nevertheless, the variety of experiences of the participants and sufficient informational depth appear to provide a satisfactory pool for determining whether the conditions for saturation most likely have been met.

Data Collection

Nine participants provided data acquired through interviews on the average of one or two per week. I took two interviews in person at the church offices of the participants, which were recorded with a laptop using Otter.ai software to dictate and transcribe the interviews. I took seven interviews at my home with a laptop through Zoom and recorded them along with Otter.ai software. I attempted also to record the interviews with a separate handheld Sony recording device. However, on occasions I forgot to turn the device on or would start it late after realizing that I had not turned on the recorder. However, I have maintained complete recordings of all interviews for review. The duration of the interviews varied from 20 to 40 minutes. No variations in data collection procedures as presented in Chapter 3 was necessary. No unusual circumstances incurred doing data collection.

Data Analysis

The interviews are preserved through transcriptions prepared on files on my computer in word and pdf format. I prepared two analytic memorandums or journals. In one I divided the word printout such that the left half of the page contains narrative of the interviewee and treated for descriptive coding that highlighted particular words in yellow that the participant expressed. The right side of the page was divided into vertical columns identifying narrative primary coding, subdivided into categories composed of form and content, and theoretical secondary coding. I hand coded each transcript based upon the pre-codes established from the NPF and the key concepts, respectively. I then tabulated their numbers to determine the frequency of each code. In the second analytic

memorandum or journal for each interviewee, I divided each page into two with a vertical line down the middle. I headed the left side of each page as secondary coding composed of my interpretations of the interviewee's statements. Upon reflection I attempted to capture inductively the meaning or essence of each listed statement. On the right side of the pages, I wrote upon deductive reflection the themes that emerged from my mind about the interviewee's listed statements. In sum, using the pre-codes derived from the NPF and literature review, I guided my interpretation of the data applying inductive narrative coding for meaning and deductive theoretical coding for short emerging themes.

The key concepts are due process, religious liberty, harm, discrimination, equality of rights, hate crime, and bias crime. The frequency of coding (f) of key concepts is not the equivalent number of themes derived from these abstract ideas. Applying the NPF, a narrative must be composed of at least one character along with a policy referent. I interpreted the data to indicate that the code, character ($f = 186$), as may be expected, had the highest frequency coding designation. Though all the key concepts in this study are considered as being policy referents, due process ($f = 93$) was tabulated to have the highest frequency. The significance of the frequencies may be related to the reflexivity between me and the participants in deriving themes to answer the research questions. However, multiple themes emerged deductively from the data about the key concepts, that is, the general from the particular. They were selected and drafted for their positivity or normativity. The themes may be structured as hypotheses or components of assertions or development of theory which can be researched and studied quantitatively, qualitatively, or mix-mode.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

The effort to achieve trustworthiness of the study was attempted by adhering to the principles of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. As stated in Chapter 3, credibility, which is equivalent to internal validity, may be established by rechecking the narrative data with the participants for possible corrections and accurate interpretation to the meaning of their perceptions of reality from their personal experiences (See Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I alone conducted the interviews and provided each participant a copy of their transcribed narratives. I requested the participants to review the documents for mistakes and errors. I also requested the participant to review the transcript and make whatever substantive changes they wish to make to their narrative in pen or pencil and return the document to me within two weeks in an enclosed self-address stamped envelope. I also invited the participant, if they so wished, to prepare and enclose a written additive statement. I reviewed the transcripts returned to me for verification of accuracy.

Transferability is equivalent to external validity (See Rubin & Rubin, 2012). I recognize that a thick description to describe behavior as well as context gives meaning to settings in sufficient detail is important. Even though there are no methodological problems with performing this same study in another geographical region of similar size, the problem of acquiring information from RFLs within a period about the subject of hate crime and the LGBTQ community is somewhat strained depending upon the experiences of the participants. However, I was able to acquire a variety of RFLs from the Christian denominations.

I maintained an analytical memorandum or journal to document my work and provide an audit trail with some record of my research. Though I found myself unable to record everything, I attempted to write notes to myself and maintained all paperwork, notes, and drafts. I also followed the guidelines of the NPF and the recommendations of my chair. I attempted to be as objective as I could be with attention to reflexivity regarding my personal biases in the effort to achieve confirmability.

Results

A Theory on Religious Faith Leaders' Perspectives about Public Policy

Expectations are compiled and produced from all the narratives as a theory or set of axioms from the themes about the key concepts generated and presented as follows.

Due Process (f = 93)

Holding perpetrators accountable is due process, and punishment for hate crime is a legitimate exercise of due process. Thus, accountability is likely the outcome of due process. Due process assures a safe environment for all from harm and discrimination. The different tools to resolve hate or bias crime is due process through rehabilitation and deterrence. Policies against hate crime should be enforced at state and local level as a matter of due process. Due process includes contacting legislators about public policy issues. Due process requires that law enforcement protect members of the LGBTQ from hate or bias crime. A multi-pronged approach to due process to enforce equality of rights for the LGBTQ community should be established in the process or public policy to prevent hate or bias crime. Equality of rights should be granted to everyone and provide the protection of the law as a matter of due process to solve hate crime.

Religious liberty is restrictive according to the rules of the church as a matter of due process. But religious liberty does not mean that a RFL cannot act independently of their faith to engage in due process; religious liberty includes educating the members of the faith to shape its culture to engage due process to prevent harm.

Comprehensive sexual education may be extended to the public domain as a matter of due process. Participation in community service clubs is a means to bring due process to resolving conflict. Due process is provided through counseling and coordination of affairs. Due process requires us to be non-judgmental of others.

Religious Liberty (f = 84)

The exercise of religious liberty leads to religious beliefs that policy should be exclusive as well as inclusive. Religious liberty includes exercising pride among the church membership. Religious liberty includes the privilege to join in activities as well as not to engage. The exercise of religious liberty is control by the rules of the church. Religious liberty is exercised within the bounds of conservatism. Religious liberty includes the right to choose leadership regardless of the qualifications of leaders. Religious liberty is a means to support public policy as a matter of due process.

Religious liberty includes speaking out on public policy to protect victims and benefit society. Religious liberty of ministers is restrained by the rules and policies of the church. The exercise of religious liberty affects people in different ways. Religious liberty includes demonstration in public places to support public policies. The exercise of religious liberty will likely generate disagreement within the religious setting as well as outside the community. Religious liberty means also theological diversity within as well

as outside the church denomination. Religious liberty includes preaching God's inclusive love for all and against all phobisms, such as homophobia, transphobia, sexism, racism, and antisemitism.

As a matter of religious liberty there are perfectly valid theological ways of perceiving members of the LGBTQ community by different religious communities. Religious liberty provides the benefit of having a conversation with other religious leaders of different faiths. Religious liberty may involve dialogue between ministers of different faiths. Religious liberty should overcome the impasse between progressive and conservative religious leaders who fail to engage in dialogue. Religious liberty involves the application of ideology and values in dialogue with others.

In some settings the exercise of religious liberty can be harmful. The exercise of religious liberty concerning public policy is engaging in political action. Religious liberty should not be deployed to engage politics. Sometimes the exercise of religious liberty to talk or preach politics is necessary. Religious liberty is essentially talking or preaching politics. Religious liberty should not involve partisan politics. Religious liberty can be properly engaged to promote public policy. Religious liberty does not mean that religious faith leaders cannot act independently of their faith to engage in due process. Religious liberty includes educating the members of the faith to shape its culture to engage due process to prevent harm.

Religious liberty has evolved into divisions of religious faith or issues concerning the LGBTQ. Religious liberty practiced under the idea of fundamentalism is the root of the problem with discrimination against the LGBTQ community. Fundamentalism is the

villain that drives the culture and control over religious liberty. Fundamental interpretation of biblical scripture has harmed the LGBTQ community, and as such religious liberty is discriminating. Religious liberty has been exercised through Christian nationalism to discrimination that causes harm against the LGBTQ community. Religious liberty exercised through proponents of Christian nationalism use fundamentalism and racism to enforce social norms with false ideology and beliefs to back their homophobia against keeping members of the LGBTQ safe from harm. There is a need to understand how the exercise of religious liberty through fundamentalism, racism, and Christian nationalism weave together to discriminate against the LGBTQ community.

Religious liberty may result in cultural division within denominations over values and control over church policy. Religious liberty can lead to inclusion and engagement of all people and groups regardless of the diversity of religious faiths. Religious liberty may be practiced through the lens of humanistic perspective. The paradox of religious liberty is learning to respect each other's values whereas no offense is taken leading to harm. Religious liberty is sharing your theology along with your feelings in a pastoral way. Theology plays a role in religious liberty because it involves ideology as a strategy of healing humanity's brokenness. Religious liberty includes speaking about the environment. Discrimination is exercised in the church because of ideology regarding religious liberty. Religious liberty can lead to change in beliefs which benefits the church.

Religious liberty can lead to harmful polarization of the church. Religious liberty may be exercised to overcome alienation and estrangement. Religious liberty includes the practice of same sex relationships. Strict compliance with rules or taboos are values of

religious liberty. Religious liberty may be exercised and include association without common religious beliefs and values. Religious liberty may cause theological schism of the church or denominations. Religious liberty is restrictive according to the rules of the church as a matter of due process. Religious liberty should be practiced based on biblical traditional understanding of scripture in the church. Religious liberty is exercise in accordance with disciplinary rules through sermons. The practice of same-sex relationship is harmful according to religious liberty and beliefs. Individual religious liberty means finding your own way according to your own religious values. New fundamentalism is progressive religious teaching. Revelation of empathic support for the LGBTQ may lead to the discharge of a religious faith leader. Teaching from scriptures of the bible is a study to care for the earth.

Harm (f = 72)

Harm is likely the result of intolerance of others who are different. Discrimination in the form of non-acceptance is likely to cause a lot of harm to various people in the community. A policy of inclusion instead of exclusion is likely to overcome discrimination and harm to the LGBTQ community. Potential harm is evoked by lack of information and resources. Due process assures a safe environment for all forms of harm and discrimination. Denial of due process leads to harm for which bad behavior must be controlled to benefit victims. Acts of microaggression are harmful and disrespectful of the full dignity of human beings which is a violation of the equality of rights for the LGBTQ community.

Public policy should be designed to protect the public from harm. Hate crime does not respect the rights of people to be safe from harm. Harm is created through discriminating behavior strategies of politicians who use tacit permission to preclude the society with benefits. Harm can result from evil intentions of legislators who are empowered by society with power to do harmful things. Advocacy of LGBTQ rights can be a painful experience that harms the individual spirit within some cultures.

The church is harmed when it ignores the benefits to be achieved from the deployment of the gifts of the people for the common good. Harm is overcome by deploying the gifts that we have for public goods including the LGBTQ community. In some settings the exercise of religious liberty can be harmful. Legislative due process can lead to undesirable public policies with serious harmful consequences. Religious liberty includes educating the members of the faith to shape its culture to engage due process to prevent harm.

Fundamental interpretation of biblical scripture has harmed the LGBTQ community and as such religious liberty is discriminating. Religious liberty has been exercised through Christian nationalism to form discrimination that cause harm against the LGBTQ community. Religious liberty exercised through proponents of Christian nationalism use fundamentalism and racism to enforce social norms with false ideology and beliefs to back their homophobia against keeping members of the LGBTQ safe from harm.

Everyone is affected with harm or hurt when violence is perpetrated. The paradox of religious liberty is learning to respect each other's values whereas no offense is taken

leading to harm. Promotion for non-discriminating policy can generate cognitive dissonance with possible harmful feelings or effects. Discrimination harms the community by reducing the availability of quality services. Discrimination based on hate is the result of fear and conflict of values with harmful consequences to the LGBTQ community. The lack of effective legislation brings harm to many victims. Religious liberty leads to harmful polarization of the church. Coming out has potential harmful effects upon others. Separation or alienation from God harms us. Polarization creates harm through discrimination. A resolution may call for a strategy to minimize harm and to benefit the relevant person of concern or victim from distraught or suicidal thoughts. Practice of same-sex relationships is harmful according to religious liberty and beliefs.

Discrimination (f = 68)

Discrimination is explained for by the LGBTQ community having to confront difficulties. Discrimination is the outcome of oppression resulting from lack of tolerance. Discrimination in the form on non-acceptance is likely to cause a lot of harm to various people in the community. Policy of inclusion instead of exclusion is likely to overcome discrimination and harm to the LGBTQ community. Building coalitions is an approach to achieve success over discrimination against the LGBTQ community. Due process assures a safe environment for all from harm and discrimination.

The church tries to engage its followers without discrimination. Discrimination is often the result of how people are perceived differently than how people perceived themselves. Penalization is not an effective policy to eliminate discrimination. Harm is created through discriminating behavioral strategies of politicians whose tacit permission

preclude society from having benefits. A transgender person should not be discriminated against or subject to discrimination. Religious liberty practiced under the idea of fundamentalism is the root of the problem with discrimination against the LGBTQ community. Fundamentalistic interpretation of biblical scripture has harmed the LGBTQ community and as such religious liberty is discriminating. Religious liberty has been exercised through Christian nationalism to form discrimination that cause harm against the LGBTQ community. A need exists to understand how the exercise of religious liberty through fundamentalism, racism, and Christian nationalism weave together to discriminate against the LGBTQ community.

The outcome of fear and hate is discrimination. Lack of effective due process through legislation to prevent discrimination against the LGBTQ community is problematic. Racial discrimination is an historical feature of the church. Discrimination is a prominent feature of our society such that addressing the issue of inclusion of the LGBTQ in isolation is not reasonable or practical. Inclusion is the solution to discrimination. A campaign against discrimination may be engaged through both team and pastoral efforts to educate people. Discrimination is about differences between people. Discrimination in the policy statement or law lacks due process. Promotion for a non-discriminating policy can generate cognitive dissonance with possible harmful feelings or effects. Discrimination harms the community by reducing the availability of quality services. Discrimination based on hate is the result of fear and conflict of values with harmful consequences to the LGBTQ community.

Discrimination is exercised in the church because of ideology regarding religious liberty. Discrimination emerges from hostility, prejudice, and homophobia.

Discrimination can be portrayed through art. Polarization creates harm through discrimination. Indiana law provides for due process for the LGBTQ against discrimination. Discrimination exists as a principle as to who can engage in sex as a technical rule. Rejection of family, community, and associates is oppressive and is a discriminating culture. Discrimination and hate crime against the LGBTQ community produce an oppressive culture. Life of privilege is absence of discrimination.

Equality of Rights (f = 22)

Equality of rights means that all persons are inclusive to be treated the same as a matter of public policy. Accountability is likely the outcome of due process and equal treatment under the law. Equality of rights means that everyone is subject to the enforcement of the law. The idea of equality of rights is not always shared in the church as well as outside the church. Acts of microaggression are harmful and disrespectful of the full dignity of human beings which is a violation of the equality of rights for LGBTQ community.

A multi-pronged approach to due process to enforce equality of rights for the LGBTQ community should be established in the process of public policy to prevent hate or bias crime. Equality of rights should be granted to everyone and provide the protection of the law as a matter of due process to solve hate crime. The Declaration of Independence describes the way we should live as a matter of due process with the application of equality of rights. Due process requires equality of rights among all

persons regardless of their gender identification. Equality of rights and due process should be enforced. Distinguishing the LGBTQ from others in society violates the sense of equality of rights.

Hate Crime (f = 21) and Bias Crime (f = 4)

Punishment for hate crime is a legitimate exercise of due process. Hate crime does not respect the rights of people to be safe from harm. The different tools to resolve hate or bias crime is due process through rehabilitation and deterrence. Policies against hate crime should be enforced at state and local level as a matter of due process. The category of choice of gender identity should be included as a protected class in Indiana bias or hate crime statutes. A multi-pronged approach to due process to enforce equality of rights for the LGBTQ community should be established in the process of public policy to prevent hate or bias crime. Due process requires that law enforcement protect members of the LGBTQ from hate or bias crime. Due process requires the proper and appropriate authority that goes with dominance and control of power to protect the LGBTQ community from hate or bias crime.

Education as a strategy is essential to the prevention of hate or bias crime. Equality of rights should be granted to everyone and provide the protection of the law as a matter of due process to solve hate crime. Discrimination and hate crime against the LGBTQ community produce an oppressive culture. Hate crime has become politically acceptable through the rhetoric of politicians who appear to be biased and prejudiced. Government protection through hate crime policies and laws is reasonable and

acceptable. Hate crime against transgender class of persons should be listed specifically as a group for protection.

A combination of the foregoing propositions regarding the relationships between the key concepts may explain the behavior of religious faith leaders' perceptions about their relationship and influence on public policy. Recycling coding through inductive heuristic analysis attending to the particular to the general provides evidence to support the following findings.

Further Assertions Based on the Evidence

The evidence supports the findings that the religious faith leaders' participation in activities addressing public policy issues concerning hate crime and the LGBTQ community depends upon the personal experiences, support, and expectations of the members of their congregation or denomination. An example is demonstrated by this statement of a pastor: "I haven't had a lot of experience in that area. I've had acquaintances and stuff that were in the LBG community, but not a lot of interaction as far as in the community itself."

And nothing in particularly involved in public policy.

Contrast this excerpt:

I have done everything ranging from encouraging and participating and letter writing campaigns on particular policy issues to participating in educating, talking to groups. I've also I've gone to Capitol Hill, to educate different policymakers and representatives on various policy issues from the perspective that our

community of faith has on those issues. And I've participated in civil demonstrations on policy issues, kind of all of those things.

The participant went on to say:

I have participated in sort of a faith Action Day. This was when I was in Utah, of all places, in Salt Lake City, in support of anti-hate crime laws in support of greater recognition for LGBTQ rights and things like that, where we I went, along with many other faith leaders up to the Capitol for a specific day, demonstration of teaching and a prayer. And I took a couple of my parishioners with me and, you know, we sort of documented the whole thing and, and just were a big part of that. So that was a pretty important thing to do.

While talking about using social media, another pastor said, "We also have suddenly all become experts on things we know very little about, like I would not get on Twitter and go on and on about the bias codes because I don't actually know enough."

But the experience of another pastor provides the observation:

[W]hen, I was doing campus ministry . . . I've worked with . . . an interface team that responded to hate crimes on campus. And we would go in and do education with students, and sometimes it was regarding the LGBTQ issues . . . but I was with a team that we would go and respond both in a pastoral way.

This pastor further said,

And I've certainly been up at the Statehouse regarding LGBTQ issues and what's there for a lot the gay marriage piece, I am a member of the LGBTQ community. So, this has been both personal and professional for me. And so, there's just has

been a lot that I have done. And we certainly in this congregation of course, it's very progressive, and as the denomination started off their work with LGBTQ issues back in early 1980's, if not before that, I mean, certainly there was some before but formally making policy as a governing no, but as a denominational board.

In contrast, another pastor responding to the question, "How have you participated in the community to influence public policy in any way?" answered, "I'd say I probably haven't to this point. I've not felt that calling." In another case, the mere discussion about LGBTQ members of the congregation led to the termination of the participant's services as pastor. Consequently, the level of congregational support has an impact on religious faith leaders' experiences in public policy matters.

The spectrum of RFLs' experiences with public policy and their role as leaders depends upon the range of their limitations and risks consciously concerned with social justice. LGBTQ being associated with a congregation that led to a pastor's discharge after many years of service appears rather extreme. However, having a theological debate about the status of the LGBTQ within a denomination has also led to an internal dispute which may eventually split its congregations from having a unified administrative organization. The findings are also supported by the variation of participation in the exercise of religious liberty ($f=84$) within and outside the church setting.

The evidence supports the finding that religious faith leaders stand for the proposition that members of the LGBTQ as a matter of public policy, due process ($f=93$)

and equality of rights ($f=22$), should be provided services for their welfare and safety. For example, a pastor said

I think they should be treated like any other individual with their rights and responsibilities. I do not agree with their sexual choices, of course based on my biblical beliefs, but other than that, they are still people who deserve courtesy and respect.

Another comment such as, “[E]very body else should be involved in their lives to solve their problems of safety and their welfare. There is something out there that keeps them from doing what they want to do in life.” It is:

Ludicrous to me to put the onus of protection upon the persecuted group . . . it’s not right to put the onus upon the persecuted community for their safety. . . the people in power are fully responsible, not partly, but fully responsible.

One exception or discrepant case has been found reported from a pastor that knows a group of Christians who do not support the idea that members of LGBTQ community should not have the benefit of a policy that protects them people harming them. However, in general due process ($f=93$) and equality of rights ($f=22$) are concepts that adhere to the principle of fair play in democratic governance seems to convey the meaning that society should provide services to the LGBTQ community for their protection and safety from harm.

The evidence does not support a finding that the phenomenon of anti-LGBTQ attitude among RLFs regarding equality ($f=22$) and religious liberty ($f=84$) is demonstrated, defined, and identified as discrimination that likely has a negative impact

on hate crime policy. Equality of rights (f=22) and religious liberty (f=84) are generally perceived by RFLs in the context of same-sex relationships and whether ministerial prerogatives to accept them within the canons, rules, or tenets of the religions denominal faith in the exercise of religious liberty. The evidence suggests that RFLs prefer deterrence in the form of education and spiritual love rather than punishment to enforce hate or bias crime (f=25). One minister said: “I try to preach on God’s inclusive love for everyone . . . everyone is a beloved child of God.” Another said, “There are certain things I do to educate my congregation and hope that it motivates them.” “There is power spiritually when we come together and work and focus in one particular area.” The pastor further said,

Trusting in the spirit and trusting in grace to transform me and came to a place where I loved and accepted my friends and realize that if I was loving, accepting that friend, I going to also have to you know, love and accept all people who are LGBTQIA plus, and that slowly that turned into advocacy roles.

A pastor made the argument that: “The church is political. Jesus was political and continues to call us to be active in the politics around us to bring about the gospel and to bring about the Kingdom of Heaven, right here on Earth.” One religious faith leader said,

I don’t understand why you would be required by God to live your whole life and not have someone to love you. I just don’t get that. And personally, I don’t care if two men marry or two women marry. I have known a number of gay couples who weren’t allowed or were able to marry and live happy happy lives together. I don’t care if they sleep together and they have sexual relations. It’s just none of

my business. But as people I love them and accept them. And I think that we all are better off as a society when we accept the marginalize people into our lives as part of the community, faith community or regular community.

Education about discrimination ($f=68$) and spiritual love advocated within the church and interaction in the public sphere or domain with citizens and policy makers are the RFL's preferred strategies ($f=196$) for social change in reducing hate, and therefore, hate or bias crime ($f=25$). A participant shared the following: "[W]e offer a comprehensive sexuality education church, and that is sometimes used by other members of the public domain because it's so good."

Nevertheless, different interpretations of biblical scripture and meaning of sin have theological significance for the various religious faiths. Generally, the problem of sin, even though viewed with different meanings, is a phenomenon to all human experience subject to decision-making fallibility. Rather than a fundamentalistic understanding of biblical belief in original sin, acts against God's will, some would describe sin as brokenness or alienation from God, which is the villain ($f=39$) among human experiences. All human beings are the victims ($f=65$) of sin. From the Christian perspective, Jesus Christ is the hero ($f=45$) who has redeemed society's fall from the grace of God. Redemption is achieved through spiritual love of all human beings, which includes all members of the LGBTQ. The narrative components of the narrative policy framework may explain the development of the current Indiana policies in terms of the language in the statutes. If RFLs had any impact on Indiana policies, then a legislative

preference for defining and characterizing the topic in less offensive terms as bias crime rather than hate crime may have been an outcome.

In the main RFLs perceive exclusion of people from the benefits ($f=53$) of society as a form of discrimination ($f=68$) that should not be tolerated. For example, in terms of Indiana hate or bias crime statutes one pastor criticized the language of the statutes for failure to include transgender persons as a protected class. Another pastor asserts, “I believe you know, to fix the problem, society really has to be more inclusive instead of exclusive. . . Build on the similarities while valuing people’s differences.” An example of a reframe from an advocate for the rights of LGBTQ:

Everybody has God given gifts. That’s a beautiful thing. To see that finally coming out and being honored by the church really made me feel like yeah, we are doing the right thing. We’ve all been given a variety of gifts for the common good.

Inclusion of members of the LGBTQ over exclusion has emerged from the data sampling of Christian religions faith leaders as giving recognition as the preferred policy within the faith as well as the secular sphere.

Summary of Results

The first research question is “How do religious faith leaders participate or influence the development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate crime or protection of members of the LGBTQ community as provided in Indiana Codes 10-13-3-1 and 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12)?” The answer to this question is that the religious faith leaders have done little, if anything, to participate or influence the

development, prevention, or implementation of Indiana policy regarding hate crime or protection of members of the LGBTQ community. RFLs have engaged in political action to influence specified public policy issues, such as Medicaid, healthcare, strip mining, gun safety, or the environment, something that does not offend the ministry's sense of social justice. But two participants out of nine indicated an effort to influence public policy regarding hate crime against the LGBTQ community. In contrast, one participant said, "I know there's a conversation going but I've not seen any personal evidence of hate crime being perpetrated against the LGBTQ." The inference is minimal concern or interest for engaging in political action to address public policy regarding hate or bias crime and the LGBTQ community. Contrary to the literature, the degree of political influence of RFLs have had on hate crime policy and law regarding the LGBTQ community in Indiana has not been significant.

The second research question is "In what ways, if any, do religious faith leaders' personal perspectives on public policy in the exercise of their ministerial liberties differ from the tenets of their religious denominations regarding pro-equality and protection from hate crime for the LGBTQ community?" The answer is complex because only the religious faith leader knows the perspectives on public policy that are consistent with a sense of social justice expected to be exercised through ministerial liberties in conformity to the tenets of their religious faiths. Some faiths permit theological diversity, but as others without such a span on control also have rules of discipline or canons to govern the relationship with their leaders. One participant admitted that ministers of their faith have been known for a variety of reasons violated the rules of the church. Regarding the

LGBTQ, “Give a little bit I could probably come up with some clergy, who have outspoken and taken risks.” A pastor accused of having violated church theology regarding LGBTQ members reported having been discharged by a committee of church leaders who convened in secret. As a matter of church policy of one denomination, “if you were a gay man or women . . . you wouldn’t be allowed to be an elder or a deacon and certainly not a minister.” However, the minister of that denomination admitted having married two men after many years of commitment to the contrary devoted to church rules. The views of that minister changed over the years because of new experiences with lay members of the faith. Another minister acknowledged that according to the tenets of their faith same-sex relationships are incompatible with Christian teaching. Nevertheless, the leader believes to the contrary and acclaims a lifestyle differently to the faith. Another indicated that God does not intend for anyone to go through life without loving someone and someone to love them. In any case, evidence exists that religious faith leaders develop perspectives differently than the tenets of their faith.

By and large, however, with some noted exceptions, religious faith leaders adhere to the tenets of their faith community. After many years of ministerial experiences with their congregations they learn more about others and themselves concerning social justice. Most avoid the specter of disagreement with the tenets of their faith community by avoiding preaching politics upon the delivery of sermons. They also withhold public expressions of sentiment for government policy, such as same-sex marriage or relationships which conflict with the tenets of their faith. Even though the faith

community may consider same-sex intercourse as a sin against God, in contrast to fundamentalism and perhaps conservatism, progressive religious faith leaders tend to be non-judgmental, unless privately consulted. According to the rules of the faith, ministerial or pastoral consultation may or may not be provided by a religious faith leader without specialized training or professional education and experience.

Summary

Religious faith leaders engage in political action to influence public policy if they feel a sense of calling and commitment to social justice consistent with the tenets of their faith. Same-sex relationship issues have been the focus of conflict within religious faiths to which RFLs have had to contend, but little attention is given to having an impact on hate or bias crime public policies regarding the LGBTQ community. Deterrence through education or restoration rather than punishment appears to be the preferred strategy for social change in public policy. Only a strong or overwhelming sense of social justice will a RFL act contrary to the tenets of their faith. Mainly, religious faith leaders respect the established constitutional dichotomy that exists between church and state in the governance of American democratic society.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to explore and understand the perspectives and worldviews of a segment of the RFLs in Indiana toward pro-equality and hate crime policies that are designed to protect targeted groups, such as members of the LGBTQ community. I used a qualitative non-experimental methodology to explore the perspectives of RFLs as interviewees to answer two research questions. The study was conducted to acquire information that would contribute to scientific knowledge about the relationship between religious faith leaders and public policy.

Interpretation of the Findings

Generally, anti-LGBTQ attitudes among religions faith leaders is minimum in the sense of a preference for inclusivity over exclusivity. This study was unable to assess non-Christian RFLs' anti-LGBTQ attitudes. However, Christian religious faith leaders view same-sex relationships as a sin against God, which can refer to alienation, separation, or estrangement from God, disobedience or against the will of God, and the phenomenon of societal brokenness. The focus on these various definitions appears to affect the outlook of religious faith leaders and their congregations. Polarization has also resulted from conservative and progressive forces in religious communities that have generated anti-bias attitude toward the LGBTQ community. However, no evidence indicates that RLFs promote violence to maintain conformity with social values. In any case, inclusivity of LGBTQ in the various denominations appears to be the preferred intra-faith and inter-faith policy regardless of ideological beliefs.

The study does not produce sufficient information to determine whether hate crime is a significant concern among religious faith leaders about a possible terrorist syndrome against the LGBTQ. RFLs are concerned about the safety and welfare of members of LGBTQ, whereas public policy should be designed to protect them as it should for any person. Even though the findings are such that RFLs have pay little attention to hate or bias crime statutes, they support due process and the enforcement of equality rights for the LGBTQ community. Some RFLs find same-sex marriage tolerable under the principle of equality of rights. The sense of fair play appears to be derived from their humanitarian perspective promoted through the Christian faith regardless of denomination or differences in theological beliefs.

Concerns among the LGBTQ among religious faith leaders also suggested problems involving gender identity. As one participant observed, transgender individuals are not specifically identified in Indiana bias crime statutes as a protected class of targeted persons. The cases of transgender persons are also complex since the class involves at least two types of persons: cisgendered men or women who dress like women or men, respectively, or those who undergo treatment or surgery to present differently than their cis physical appearance. There may be other forms of intersectionality that involve gender identity not discussed here. None of the participants suggested that sexual orientation change efforts (SOCE) should be advocated. However, one RFLs raised a safety concern about the use of church facilities wherein temporary sleeping quarters and bathing rooms are provided for men and women. But it appears that, if necessary, the provisions of Indiana bias crime statutes are enforceable to protect transgender persons.

Furthermore, the principle of separation of church and state is an example where the state should not intervene without specific request from the faith community to do so regarding a transgender person.

Findings Related to Theoretical Framework

How political actions of RFLs evolve from their stories that shape public policy was a concern of this study. I attempted to determine how narrative components explain the development of policy and perform according to a theory, the NPF. The NPF has the potential to explain antigay attitudes among religious faith leaders. However, I was limited to nine interviews of Christian RFLs from the Monroe County, Indiana to develop data for my analysis.

The categories of form (f_x) and content (f_y) were coded in conformity to the NPF. The stories of characters ($f = 196$) from the sample narratives having received the highest coding designation in multiple settings ($f = 96$) with plots ($f = 30$) of interaction among victims ($f = 65$), heroes ($f = 45$), and villains ($f = 30$) were compiled for analysis. The basic assumptions of the NPF are substantiated with the designation of ideologies ($f = 65$) and beliefs ($f = 53$) captured within bounded relativity; and the narratives have generalizable structural elements that in some cases lead to scenario moral outcomes or proposed solutions to the issues ($f = 65$). Each narrative was received and coded at the micro level of analysis which reflect strategies ($f = 196$) of characters ($f = 186$) engaging as presented in the interviews. Some evidence of meso and macro level of analysis may exist, but not much without other kinds of data other than individual interviews. The

participants are capable of reasoning and sharing their stories and experiences through their perceptions of reality.

While discrimination ($f=68$) and hate and bias crime ($f=21$; $f=4$) are the broad key concepts intended for this dissertation, my interpretation and analysis of the perceptions of RFLs are that due process ($f=93$) is perhaps the most significant regarding public policy related to the LGBTQ community. Due process ($f=93$) is defined as fair treatment and protection of individual rights, recognition of the limitations of police powers, and respect for the legal process (Wilkerson & Peters, 2018). The significance of this assessment is that RFLs are likely to perceive due process ($f=93$) as the public policy means to overcome discrimination ($f=68$) and hate or bias crime ($f=25$) against members of the LGBTQ community.

A theoretical proposition of this dissertation states that the phenomenon of anti-LGBTQ attitudes among RFLs regarding equality ($f=22$) and religious liberty ($f=84$) is demonstrated, defined, and identified as discrimination ($f=68$) that likely has a negative impact on hate crime policy. In the main this assertion was derived as a base phenomenon from the literature review prepared for this dissertation of the last five years. Religious faith leaders are known to engage in narrative strategies to influence the policy process which has an impact on the LGBTQ community (Swan, 2019). This study reveals that the policy process of religious organizations begins within the internal functioning of the faith. The basic ideology and beliefs of the denomination derived from interpretations of scriptures of the bible has little do with, if anything, to hate crime policy. The idea of same-sex relationships creates cognitive dissonance for members of the faith about their

values concerning permissible relationships. The claim that RFLs' ministerial exception to the constitutional principle of separation of church and state in the exercise of religious liberty contributes to discrimination ($f=68$) against the LGBTQ must stand against due process ($f=93$) afforded to them within and outside the church. Due process ($f=93$) within a congregation devoted to faith may lead to administrative division of the religious organization regarding the issue of same-sex relationships and discrimination ($f=68$). Due process ($f=93$) outside the church in the secular environmental setting ($f=96$) may require devotion to the provision of public resources and services to address discrimination ($f=68$) whereas no evidence is found of RFLs having a negative impact on hate or bias crime in Indiana.

Social Determinates of Health Regarding the LGBTQ

Casey et al. (2019) reported the results of their study in a special publication on the experiences of discrimination that contributed to the health care of adult members of the LGBTQ in the United States. Using telephonic interviews to obtain their data, they calculated the percentages of LGBTQ who reported experiences of discrimination from a pool of 489 performed during the period between January and April 2017. They found that the determinants included the following: slurs (57%), microaggressions (53%), sexual harassment (51%), violence (51%), and harassment regarding bathroom use (34%). They also reported that 18% avoid health care because of anticipated discrimination; 22% of transgender adults avoid health care for the same reason; and 16% of LGBTQ adults experienced discrimination in health care encounters. The researchers concluded that adult LGBTQ experience widely based discrimination throughout the

health care system, including compound forms of discrimination and especially racially/ethnic minorities. Steel, et al (2019) also reached this conclusion from their study of 1596 women, wherein they suggested that discrimination and harassment are widely experienced among LGBTQ and racial/ethnic minority women in the health care system during the same period in the United States.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations to the trustworthiness that arose from execution of the study involve numerous factors which upon reflection and reflexivity are considered in chapter I. Trustworthiness of the study depends upon credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. With these concerns in mind, I attempted to listen very carefully to the participants, record their stories treated as data, simultaneously transcribe the interviews, and code the information for meaningful thematic development based on categories derived from the narrative policy framework (NPF). I established the categories of form and content from the framework to adhere to a rigorous application approach to analysis of the narratives. I acquired the key concepts from my literature review and used them to code for thematic development from the data. Guided by this methodology, I am attempting to not only gain knowledge, but also to answer the research questions.

The factors include my own implicit assumptions and propositions derived from the literature review. One assumption exists that the RFLs may in some manner directly or indirectly influence their followers and shape public opinion. From the literature the choice of religious beliefs exercised through discourse about the church-state

relationships has resulted in considerable disagreement about the LGBTQ community (Freeman & Houston, 2018); religion influence public debate about sexual controversies (Sumerau & Cregun, 2015); leaders of churches engage in advocacy, media, activism, and negotiate laws to participate in shaping public policy (Sumerau & Cregun); religion as a cultural feature of our society may contribute to the interplay of the private and public rights regarding disclosure or nondisclosure of being a LGBTQ member. The sampling size of the study composing of nine Christian faith leaders in Monroe County, Indiana limits the application of generalizability of the findings and results. Furthermore, the underlying assumptions and propositions are gauges that may have influenced my perceptions in the coding process of the stories derived from the interviews.

Recommendations

I recommend that further research can be undertaken concerning the perceptions of religious faith leaders regarding their ministerial duties and public policy, particularly, with respect to the constitutional principle of separation of church and state. The theoretical paradigm developed from the data guided within the narrative policy framework can be used to study the key concepts quantitatively or mix-mode if they can be operationalized. However, the present study may be reengaged using other methods of data collection, such as surveys, to attract greater participation. The strength of the present research is that a gap in knowledge about the perceptions and views of religious faith leaders allowed some understanding about their relationships with the LGBTQ community considering the literature review. The weakness of the present study is the

size of the sampling and lack of non-Christian religious leaders' participation. A more extensive effort to conduct the study with non-Christian participants is recommended.

Implications

The potential impact for positive social change is evident from the micro level of analysis if the study can serve as a barometer for change in RFLs' perspectives about policy and the LGBTQ community. More favorable treatment of these persons who are making themselves known in religious organizations is a sign of progress towards humanitarianism and the development of due process policies to assure equality of rights. However, consequences have developed for religious faith leaders, religious organizations, and members of the faiths as a result over a conflict in values and biblical beliefs concerning the LGBTQ. Depending upon the denomination, RFLs may lose their positions with their faith, religious organizations may have to administratively divide their structure and resources, and members may have to make choices about where to declare their membership with the faith. This means that families are likely to be affected with such disclosures, but the public policies in support of hate or bias crime will not have a significant impact upon them.

The methodological, theoretical, and empirical implications of the study have their challenges. First, methodologically, using a generic qualitative design required identifying and collecting data from a field of potential participants who are uncomfortable about submitting to interviews about their faith community and the LGBTQ. It would be difficult to secure a large sampling. Second, the narrative policy framework is a theoretical approach which is useful for a quantitative design to study

hypotheses rather than expectations as compatible with qualitative design. However, this study produced a theoretical paradigm that provides hypotheses or axioms that can be studied quantitatively or with mix-mode. The implication is that other ways may be deployed to study the research questions. And third, empirically, the implication is that other means can be used to collect data to answer the research questions. Even though I had only nine participants, I recommend the deployment of a coding software for a similar qualitative study.

Conclusion

The key essence of this study was to explore and gain an understanding about the influence that religious faith leaders have on Indiana public policy regarding pro-equality, hate crime, and the LGBTQ community. The implicit assumption that RFLs may in some manner directly and indirectly influence their followers and shape public policy is true. However, RFLs' participation in political action depends upon the internal rules of the faith, their own conscience and sense of social justice regarding specific public policies, and their commitment or obligation to superiors and followers. In general, based upon due process principles, Christian religious faith leaders prefer public policies that promote the safety and welfare of the LGBTQ. Divisions have occurred within the various Christian faiths regarding same-sex relationships and gender identity issues, but religious faith leaders' humanitarian perspectives consistent with secular and non-secular civility appear most prevalent toward developing, influencing, and implementing private and public policy.

References

- Anderson, M., Ivert, A., & Mellgren, C. (2018). When there is more than motive: A study on self-reported hate crime victimization among Swedish university students. *International Review of Victimology*, 24(1), 67–81.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758017736393>
- Anderson, J., & Koc, Y. (2015). Exploring patterns of explicit and implicit anti-gay attitudes in Muslims and Atheists. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 687–701.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2126>
- Bell, J. C., & Perry, B. (2015). Outside looking in: The community impacts of anti-lesbian, gay and bisexual hate crime. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 62(1), 98–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2014.957133>
- Burch, L. (2016). Challenging ‘hate crime’: Research, policy, and practice. International criminological research unit. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 10(1), 113–116.
<https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2016.9>
- Cabeldue, M. K., Cramer, R. J., Kehn, A., Crosby, J. W., & Anastasi, J. S. (2018). Measuring attitudes about hate: Development of the hate crime belief scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(23), 3656–3685.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516636391>
- Caitlin, R., Toomey, R. E., Diaz, R. M., & Russell, S. T. (2020). Parent initiated sexual orientation change efforts with LGBT adolescents: Implications for young adult

mental health and adjustment. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(2), 159–173.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1538407>

Campbell, D., Hackett, U., Karakaya, S., Layman, G. C., Lewis, A. R., Olson, L.R., Raymond, C. D., Weaver, C. L., & Wilcox, C. (2016). Symposium introduction: The politics of religious alliances. *Politics and Religion*, 9(2), 423–425.

Casey, L. S., Reisher, S. L., Finding, M. G., Blendon, R. J., Benson, J. M., Sayde, J. M., & Miller, C. (2109). Discrimination in the United States: Experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer Americans. *Health Services Research*, 54(6), 1454–1446.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13229>

Chakraborti, N. (2015). Rethinking hate crime: fresh challenges for policy and practice. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(10), 1738–2754.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514548581>

Chakraborti, N., & Hardy, S. (2017) Beyond empty promises? A reality check for hate crime scholarship and policy. *Safer Communities*, 16(4), 148–154.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/SC-06-2017-0023>

Donaldson, C., Handren, L. M., & Lac, A. (2017). Applying multilevel modeling on understanding individual and cross-cultural variation in attitudes homosexual people across 28 European countries. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 48(1), 93–112.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116672488>

- Etengoff, C. (2017). Petitioning for social change letters to religious leaders from gay men and their family allies. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(2), 166–194.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1174022>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. (2018).
ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2018
- Freeman, P. K., & Houston, D. J. (2018). US public opinion regarding religious involvement in politics. *Journal of Church and State*, 60(2), 248–270.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s175504839000030>
- Garland, J. (2016). One step forward, two steps backward? Difficulties and dilemmas with connecting hate crime policy and research. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 27(6), 627–639.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403415601474>
- Gay, D. A., Lynxwiler, J. P., & Smith, P. (2015). Religiosity, spirituality, and attitudes toward same-sex marriage: A cross-sectional cohort comparison. *Sage Open*, 5.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582444015602520>
- Gillian, K. S., Finding, M. G., Bleich, S. A., Casey, L. S., Blendon, R. J., Benson, R. J., Sayde, J. M., & Miller, C. (2019). Gender discrimination in the United States: Experiences of women. *Health Services Research*, 54(6), 1442–1453.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.13217>
- Gottlieb, M., Oehninger, E. B., & Arnold, G. (2018). No fracking way vs. drill baby drill: A restructuring of who is pitted against whom in the Narrative Policy Framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 798–827.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12291>

Gray, G., & Jones, M. (2016). A qualitative narrative policy framework? Examining the policy narratives of US finance regulatory reform. *Public Policy Administration*, 31(3), 193–220.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076715623356>

Gurbai, S. (2020). Beyond the pragmatic definition? The right to non-discrimination of persons with disabilities in the context of coercive interventions. *Health & Human Rights: An International Journal*, 22(1), 279–292.

Hate Crime Prevention Act (HCPA) of 2009, P.L. No. 111-84.

Hoffarth, M. R., Hodson, G., & Molnar, D. S. (2018). When and why is religious attendance associated with antigay bias and gay rights opposition? A justification suppression model approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 225(3), 526–563.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000146>

Indiana Code 10-13-3-1.

Indiana Code 35-38-1-7.1(a)(12).

Jones, M. D. (2018). Advancing the Narrative Policy Framework? The musings of a potentially unreliable narrator. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 724-746.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj12296>

Kaushik, V., Lee, Y., & Lemon, E. C. (2018). Diversity in Canada: Predictors of the perceptions of social interactions. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(7), 840-855.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2018.1465005>

Kirkpatrick, K. J. & Stoutenborough, J. W. (2018). Strategies, narratives, and reading the public developing a micro-level theory of political strategies within the Narrative Policy Framework. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 949-977.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12271>

Lawlor, A. & Crow, D. (2018). Risk-based policy narratives. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 843-867.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12270>

Levy, B. L. & Levy, D. L. (2017). When love meets hate: The relationship between state policies on gay and lesbian rights and hate crime incidence. *Social Science Research*, 61, 142-159.

<http://dx.doi/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.06.008>

Lim, S. H., Brown, S-E., Shaw, S. A., Kamarulzaman, A., Altice, F. L., & Beyrer. (2020). "You have to keep yourself hidden": Perspectives from Malay-Muslim men who have sex with men on policy, network, community, and individual influences on HIV risk. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 67(1), 104-126.

<https://doi:1080/00918369.2018.1525946>

Looy, H. (2018). Why is sex such a big moral deal? Psychological barriers to constructive dialogue on sex. *Social Justice Research*, 1(3), 290-310.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-018-0315-8>

Makridis, C. A. & Gao, Y. (2020). Human flourishing and religious liberty: Evidence from over 150 countries. *Public Library of Science (PLoS One)*, 15(10).

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239983>

Mason, G., McCulloch, J., & Maher, J. M. (2016). Policing hate crime: markers for negotiating common ground in policy implementation. *Policing and Society*, 26(6), 680-697.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2015.1013958>

Masri, A. (2018). Equal rights, unequal protection: institutional failures in protecting and advocating for victims of same-sex domestic violence in post-marriage equality era. *Law & Sexuality*, 27, 75-90.

Mayers, L. (2018). Globalized imaginaries of love and hate: Immutability, violence, and LGBT human rights. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 26(2), 141-161.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s1069-018-0375-2>

Mbote, D. K., Sandfort, T. G. M., Wawera, E., & Zapfel, A. (2018). Kenyan religious leaders' views on same-sex sexuality and gender nonconformity: Religious freedom versus constitutional rights. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 55(4/5), 630-641.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10224499.2016.1255702>

McBeth, M. K. & Lybecker, D. L. (2018). The Narrative Policy Framework, agendas and sanctuary cities: The construction of a public problem. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 868-893.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12274>

McMorris, C., Zanocco, C., & Jones, M. (2018). Policy narratives and policy outcomes: An NPF examination of Oregon's ballot measure 97. *Policy Studies Journal*,

46(4), 771-797.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12263>

Merry, M. K. (2016). Constructing policy narratives in 140 characters or less: The case of gun policy organizations. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 373-395.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12142>

Nadal, K. (2019). A decade of microaggression research and LGBTQ communities: An introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 66(10), 1309-1316.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2018.1539582>

Peterson, H. L. (2018). Political information has bright colors: Narrative Attention Theory. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 828-842.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12272>

Reny, M. (2018). Complaint defiance informality and survival among Protestant house churches in China. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 27(111), 472-485.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2018.1410985>

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative Interviewing*. (3rd ed.). Sage.

Rudestam, K. E. & Newton, R. R. (2015). *Surviving Your Dissertation*. (4th ed.). Sage.

Saldana, J. (2016). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. (3rd ed.). Sage.

Schnabel, L. (2016). Gender and homosexuality attitudes across religious groups from the 1970's to 2014 similarity, distinction, and adaption. *Social Science Research*, 55, 31-47.

<https://doi.org/10.31235/10sf.io/3p6wt>

Sealy-Harrington, J. (2021). The alchemy of equality rights. *Constitutional Forum*, 30(2),

53-83.

<https://doc.org/10.21991/cf29422>

Shanahan, E. A., Jones, M. D., & McBeth, M. K. (2018). How to conduct a narrative framework study. *The Social Science Journal*, 55(3), 332-345.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2017.12.002>

Shanahan, E. A., Jones, M. D., McBeth, M. K., & Radaelli, C. M. (2018). The narrative policy framework. In *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4th ed., edited by Weible, C. M. & Sabatier, P. A., 173-213. Westfield Press.

Shanahan, E. A., Raile, E. D., French, K. A., & McEvoy (2018). Bounded stories. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 922-948.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12269>

Smith-Walter, A. (2018). Victims of health care reform: Hirschman's rhetoric of reaction in the shadow of federalism. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 894-921.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12273>

Spade, D. & Rohifs, R. (2016). Legal equality, gay numbers and the (after?) math of eugenics. *S & F Online*, 13.2(1).

Sumerau, J. E. & Cragun, R. T. (2015). 'Don't push your immorals on me': Encouraging anti-porn advocacy on The Church of Jesus of Latter- Day Saints. *Sexualities*, 18(1/2), 57-79.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/136340714531433>

Swan, W. (2019). *The Routledge Handbook of LGBTQIA Administration and Policy*. (1st ed.) Routledge Handbooks.

Toorn, J., Jost, J. T., Packer, D. J. Noorbaloochi, S., & Bavel, J. J. V. (2017). In defense of tradition: Religiosity, conservatism, and opposition to same-sex marriage in North America. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(10).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217718523>

Valcore, J. L. (2018). Sexual orientation in state hate crime laws: Exploring social construction and criminal law. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65(12), 1607-1630.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2017.1380992>

Weible, C. M. & Sabatier, P. A. (Eds.) (2018). *Theories of the policy process* (4th ed.). Westview Press.

Zanocco, C., Song, G., & Jones, M. (2018). Fracking bad guys: The role of narrative character affect in shaping hydraulic fracturing policy preferences. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(4), 978-999.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12278>

Appendix A: Protocol for Questioning Participants

1. A public debate exists about the safety and well-being concerning members of the LGBTQ community as result of hate crimes. Are you aware of the Indiana Codes related to this? Can you explain in your own words what they are?
2. How have you participated in the community to influence public policy?
3. Please tell me about your experiences with members of the LGBTQ?
4. Would you please share with me your perspectives on this issue?
5. Who do you think is the root of this problem?
6. Who do you see as being hurt?
7. Who can or should fix the problem?
8. How should the problem be fixed?

Appendix B: Coding Frequency

		Narrative Coding Inductive		Theoretical Coding Deductive		
		Form (x)	Content (y)	Key Concepts (z)		
		<i>f_x</i>	<i>f_y</i>	<i>f_z</i>		
1.	Character	186	Strategy	196	Due Process	93
2.	Setting	96	Culture	185	Religious Liberty	84
3.	Moral	65	Values	77	Harm	72
4.	Victim	65	Ideology	65	Discrimination	68
5.	Hero	45	Beliefs	53	Equality of Rights	22
6.	Villain	39	Benefit	43	Hate Crime	21
7.	Plot	30	Oppression	38	Bias Crime	4
8.			Control	35		
9.			Conflict	19		
10.			Dominance	16		
11.			Civility	3		
12.			Angel-shift	1		
Totals		526		731		364