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Punitive and exclusionary discipline practices, ranging from school suspension to incarceration in the juvenile justice system, are directed disproportionately toward certain minority youth populations. There is robust evidence for this bias against racial minority youth: they are overrepresented in school and legal sanctions and face harsher discipline sanctions than white youth who report similar offenses.\textsuperscript{1-5}

Few studies have considered discipline disparities among sexual minority youth (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning [LGBQ] youth). These youth experience similar challenges in schools as those faced by racial minority (heterosexual) youth.\textsuperscript{6} Emerging findings show that sexual minority youth are more likely to report school expulsion and juvenile arrests than heterosexuals.\textsuperscript{7} Also, those in the juvenile justice system often face discrimination and barriers to service.\textsuperscript{8-10} In view of this evidence, we ask...

\textbf{Why are LGBQ youth overrepresented in school suspension and juvenile justice system involvement?}

In our study we tested for evidence of...

- the \textit{underlying factors} that contribute to discipline disparities among LGBQ youth; and
- their \textit{more sizable negative effects for LGBQ youth} compared to heterosexual youth.

Our findings underscore the need for educators, psychologists, and juvenile justice professionals to give greater attention to discipline disparities faced by LGBQ youth and suggest ways to address them.
Data are from the 2012 Dane County Youth Assessment. The population-based sample included 13,645 high school students (Grade 9–12) from 22 schools of Dane County, Wisconsin. The county is expansive and geographically diverse, ranging from rural farming areas to a large city (Madison, WI).

Sexual orientation

- 93.6% heterosexual, 1.2% gay or lesbian, 3.2% bisexual, and 2.0% questioning (see Figure 1).

Race/ethnicity

- The majority of youth identified as White (73.7%), whereas the remaining youth identified as African American/Black (5.3%), Hispanic (5.1%), non-Hmong Asian (2.7%), Hmong (1.6%), Native American (0.6%), Middle Eastern (0.6%), bi/multiracial (7.3%), or ‘other’ (3.1%).

Gender

- There was an equal representation of male and female participants (50.2% female).

Figure 1. Number of Students by Sexual Orientation
LGBQ youth were 2.41 times more likely to be suspended and 9.21 times more likely to be involved in juvenile justice system than heterosexual youth (see Figure 2).

To understand why LGBQ youth were more likely than their heterosexual peers to report exclusionary discipline, we must understand the stressors experienced by LGBQ youth.
It has been well established that LGBQ youth experience greater marginalization in schools and society. 11

Congruent with past studies, LGBQ youth in our study reported more victimization than their heterosexual peers. 12-14

In connection with more victimization...

LGBQ youth were at higher risk than heterosexual youth for engaging in these strategies.

Lacking access to resources and support, victimized LGBQ youth may

- use substances as a means to cope with trauma (e.g., discrimination);
- skip school for serious safety concerns and to avoid victimization;
- carry weapons to school for self-defense.
CONSEQUENCE

These particular coping behaviors for victimization constitute punishable infractions.

- These unhealthy coping strategies placed LGBQ youth at heightened risk for more serious forms of discipline.

Disproportionate Punishment of LGBQ Youth

Even with the same level of infractions committed...

- LGBQ youth faced disproportionately higher rates of punitive discipline compared to heterosexual youth.

Responses to punishable infractions may be biased against LGBQ youth (e.g., victim blaming, harassment, harsher treatment).
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these factors contributing to exclusionary discipline disparities for LGBQ youth, we present the following recommendations and resources:

Create safe school communities...

- Support youth to lead and participate in Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs)

  - Provide training for school administrators, teachers, and staff on how to foster LGBTQ affirmative environments (e.g., creating Safe Zones, supporting GSAs, implementing anti-bullying policies, increasing LGBTQ inclusivity in school curricula)

- Consider ways to address instances of school-based discrimination and other contributors to exclusionary discipline for LGBTQ youth using approaches such as restorative justice, school-wide anti-bullying programs, and inclusive curricula

Connect youth to effective resources and strategies to promote resilience...

- Connect LGBTQ youth with community resources

  - Explore ways of addressing infractions that acknowledge their underlying causes that may be tied to victimization/discrimination
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APPENDICES

I

The proportions of LGBQ youth who reported being suspended were 9.8%, 4.8%, 13.9%, 10.0%, and 9.0%, respectively, within each racial group (Black, Latino, Asian, Other, and White); whereas those for heterosexual youth were 4.9%, 3.1%, 4.3%, 3.2%, and 4.1%, respectively.

The proportions of LGBQ youth who reported being involved in the juvenile justice system were 2.2%, 10.9%, 10.5%, 13.5%, and 8.9%, respectively, within each racial group (Black, Latino, Asian, Other, and White); whereas those for heterosexual youth were 1.2%, 1.1%, 1.3%, 1.2%, and 1.0%, respectively.

II

The multigroup comparison of our structural equation model indicated these coefficients for LGBQ and heterosexual youth could not be constrained to be equal.

The association between punishable infractions (including substance use, truancy, and weapon carriage) and school suspension was stronger for sexual minority youth than heterosexual youth (standardized effects = 0.47 vs. 0.40).

Similarly, the association between punishable infractions and juvenile justice involvement was stronger for sexual minority youth than heterosexual youth (standardized effects = 0.57 vs. 0.12).

Note: Range of standardized effects = 0–1.