

Chapter 6

Bullying and K–12 Students

DOROTHY L. ESPELAGE

Research consistently demonstrates that lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth experience bullying and harassment in U.S. schools at relatively high rates in comparison to their heterosexual peers. In a recent survey study of over 13,000 students in Grades 7–12, the results indicated that LGBTQ youth, as compared with straight-identified youth, were at greater risk of suicidal thoughts, suicide attempts, and victimization by peers and had more unexcused absences from school. However, a study of 23 comprehensive anti-bullying programs aimed at middle and high school students found that none of the programs covered issues of sexual orientation, homophobia, sexual harassment, or sexual violence sufficiently to warrant any efficacy (Birkett, Espelage, & Stein, 2008). Thus, it is imperative that studies be conducted to determine if these programs are more effective when they are complemented with discussions about diversity, sexual identity, and gender expression.

Being a target or victim of bullying in U.S. schools has long been recognized as having short- and long-term psychological effects on children and adolescents (for a review, see Espelage & Holt, 2012). Recent studies support what has been suspected for years. Being a target of bullying can have a major impact on school engagement, achievement, and test scores (Glew, Fan, Katon, & Rivara, 2008). A study of 930 sixth-graders in the first year of middle school found that students who were bullies, victims, or both (bully-victims) showed poorer school adjustment (e.g., with regard to doing well on schoolwork, getting along with classmates, following rules, doing homework) than did their uninvolved peers over three assessments into the end of seventh grade (Nansel, Haynie, & Simons-Morton, 2003).

A large percentage of bullying among students involves the use of homophobic teasing or slurs, name-calling, or other victimization (Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012; Poteat & Espelage, 2005; Poteat & Rivers, 2010). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) youth in American schools report being targets of bullying and homophobic victimization more often than straight-identified youth (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009; Kosciw, Greytak, & Diaz, 2009). In a recent survey study of more than 13,000 students in Grades 7–12, the results indicated that LGBTQ youth, as compared with straight-identified youth, were at greater risk of suicidal thoughts, suicide at-

tempts, and victimization by peers and had more unexcused absences from school (Robinson & Espelage, 2011, 2012). It stands to reason that the prevalence of bullying is preventing many talented children and adolescents from achieving their full academic potential. However, some LGBTQ youth are at elevated risk, given the lack of attention to promoting safe school environments with respect to sexual orientation and gender expression. In the following sections, I review the extant research literature and note gaps in the research and in our understanding of bullying among LGBTQ youth.

Prevalence of Bullying Among LGBTQ Youth

School-Based Bullying and Harassment

Research has consistently shown that sexual minority youth report high rates of peer victimization and bullying in comparison to their straight-identified peers (Robinson & Espelage, 2011). The Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network's (GLSEN) National School Climate Survey of 7,261 middle and high school students found that nearly 9 out of 10 LGBTQ students experienced harassment at school in the past year; nearly two thirds felt unsafe because of their sexual orientation; and nearly a third had skipped at least one day of school in the past month because of safety concerns (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010). Fifty-nine percent of LGBTQ youth reported verbal abuse in high school because of sexual orientation, 24% were threatened with violence, 11% had objects thrown at them, 11% reported being physically assaulted, 2% were threatened with weapons, and 20% were threatened with being outed (D'Augelli, Pilkington, & Hershberger, 2002). Individuals who were more "out" during high school or who exhibited less gender-typical behavior reported more verbal abuse.

Sexual minority youth have been found to be at greater risk for bullying, harassment, and peer victimization than their heterosexual counterparts, even after adjusting for age, race/ethnicity and weight (Berlan, Corliss, Field, Goodman, & Austin, 2010; Bontempo & D'Augelli, 2002; Hanlon, 2004; Poteat, Mereish, DiGiovanni, & Koenig, 2011). As compared with peers, these studies found, sexual minority adolescents were more likely to report being physically threatened, injured with a weapon, and fearful of attending school and of having property stolen or damaged by peers; 33% had been threatened with a weapon at school, as compared with 7% of other youth; 50% reported property damage, as compared with 29% of other youth (Berlan et al., 2010; Garofalo, Wolf, Kessel, Palfrey, & DuRant, 1998; Robinson & Espelage, 2011). Thus, LGBTQ youth are a particularly vulnerable group in relation to peer victimization (Espelage, 2013).

Espelage, Aragon, Birkett, and Koenig (2008) found that even questioning students who had not decided that they were lesbian, gay, or bisexual were exposed more frequently to general peer victimization than were heterosexual peers. Similarly, a British study found that levels of bullying victimization did not vary with sexual orientation identity (Rivers & Noret, 2008). However, they did find differences in the content of the bullying, and also in the psychological maladjustment that resulted from it. In addition to general peer victimization, LGBTQ students were teased about their sexual orientation significantly more often than heterosexual peers (Espelage et al., 2008). Eighty-two percent of LGB adults who were bullied reported retrospectively on experiences of mostly homophobic verbal abuse; 60% reported physical assault, and 58% reported teasing (Rivers, 2001). In addition, 59% of participants reported being the victim of rumors and 27% experienced social isolation. The bullying occurred over extended periods, with an average duration of five years. The bullying was perpetrated by groups of peers rather than by individuals (Rivers, 2001).

Demographic differences have been found in the rates of homophobic harassment. Poteat, Aragon, Espelage, and Koenig (2009) found that among heterosexual and questioning students, boys reported higher victimization than girls. Levels of victimization were significantly higher for questioning boys than for gay, bisexual, or heterosexual boys. Questioning girls were victimized more than lesbian or bisexual girls, who in turn were victimized more than heterosexual girls. In a national survey of LGBTQ secondary school students, Kosciw, Greytak, and Diaz (2009) found that female youth were less likely to report victimization than male youth, and that gay, bisexual, or questioning male youth were less likely to report victimization than transgender male youth. Finally, older youth were less likely to report at-school victimization based on sexual orientation or gender expression. The authors also found that LGBTQ youth in rural communities and in communities with lower adult educational attainment faced more hostile school climates. Very little research has been conducted on the victimization experiences of ethnic minority LGBTQ youth; conflicting findings have emerged as to whether they experience different rates of victimization than their straight-identified peers (Kosciw et al., 2009; Mustanski, Newcomb, & Garofalo, 2011). One emerging piece of the picture is that ethnic minority lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth report less disclosure of their sexual orientation than do their ethnic majority lesbian, gay, and bisexual counterparts (Mustanski et al., 2011).

These trends have been found in both national and international samples (Finlinson, Colón, Robles, & Soto, 2008). In a study in England and Wales, 59% of lesbian, bisexual, and gay youth reported being insulted at school, and 41% reported being bullied at school. More specifically, 31.6% described

being insulted on the basis of sexual orientation, while 17.9% described being bullied on the basis of sexual orientation (Warner et al., 2004). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning adolescents in a Canadian school-based sample reported more bullying, peer sexual harassment, and peer physical abuse over a two-month period than did heterosexual students (Williams, Connolly, Pepler, & Craig, 2003). In addition, a British study found significant increases in rates of LGBTQ bullying over two decades: Compared with rates in 1981, youth in 2001 were four times more likely to feel isolated at school, seven times more likely to be teased, and five times more likely to experience verbal abuse (Ellis & High, 2004). It is not clear what contributed to this increase.

Technology-Based Bullying

Despite the growing interest in cyber-bullying or electronic aggression, very little is known about rates of cyber-bullying among LGBTQ youth. In a recent study conducted by Blumenfeld and Cooper (2010) with 350 self-identified nonheterosexual and 94 “straight ally” participants (ages 11–22 years), 54 reported being cyber-bullied in the past month because of their sexual identity or because of their identification with LGBTQ youth. Almost half of the participants who were cyberbullied reported feeling depressed as a result; 38% were embarrassed, 28% were anxious about simply going to school; and 25% reported having suicidal thoughts. Although these figures are startling, it is important to consider that the sample was limited in size and was limited to LGBTQ youth and straight allies; it is not clear how the rates would differ in a general study population. Ongoing and future national studies on the rates, correlates, and trends associated with cyberbullying need to extend their assessments to include self-identified sexual orientation, same-sex and opposite-sex attraction, and actual sexual activities with same-sex and opposite-sex partners. It is imperative that we advance the research base on how technology is used to target LGBTQ youth and how face-to-face bullying at school co-occurs with cyberbullying.

Summary

Overall, it is clear that sexual minority youth are at greater risk for bullying and peer victimization than heterosexual youth. The difference has been theorized to be a result of prevailing homophobic beliefs and attitudes, especially during early adolescence (Poteat & DiGiovanni, 2010). Many youth are exploring their sexual identity or coming out during middle school, when student attitudes about same sex attraction are less favorable than as students mature (Heinze & Horn, 2009; Horn, 2006; Poteat, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009). For example, in a study of middle and high school students, 30% of seventh

graders, as compared with 10.8% of 12th graders, indicated that they would not remain friends with someone who disclosed being gay (Poteat, Espelage, et al., 2009). Further, 44.5% of seventh graders, as compared with 20.6% of 12th graders, said they would prefer to attend a school where there were no gay or lesbian students. These findings suggest that LGBTQ students are likely to lose sources of support—friends—when they risk disclosing their sexual orientation, especially in early adolescence (Poteat, Espelage, et al., 2009). It appears that as youth enter adolescence and puberty, their bullying tendencies begin to incorporate gendered and sexual content. Individual, peer, and cultural homophobia provide bully perpetrators with easy and vulnerable targets in LGBTQ youth. Homophobic teasing and use of bias-based language was found to be associated with endorsement of sexual prejudices among adolescent populations (Poteat & DiGiovanni, 2010). Moreover, general bullying has been found to be causally predictive of future homophobic teasing and bullying in a middle school sample (Espelage, Rose, Colbert, Little, & Rao, 2015).

Psychological and Academic Outcomes

Peer victimization and homophobic teasing have been found to affect educational and psychological outcomes in LGBTQ youth (D'Augelli et al., 2002; Poteat et al., 2011; Robinson & Espelage, 2011; Warner et al., 2004). A study by the California Safe Schools Coalition (CSSC) and the 4-H Center for Youth Development (2004) examined bullying based on actual or perceived sexual orientation. Bullied students, as compared with students who were not bullied, reported more grades at or below C (24% versus 17%) and more frequent absenteeism (27% versus 7%). Other studies have documented as many as 72% of bullied LGBTQ children playing truant or sick to avoid at-school victimization (Birkett et al., 2009; Rivers, 2000).

In addition to the educational costs endured by victimized LGBTQ adolescents, studies have documented more substance abuse, depression, and suicidality among these students than among heterosexual students (Birkett et al., 2009; Bontempo & D'Augelli, 2002; Espelage et al., 2008; Poteat, Espelage, et al., 2009). In a sample of youth bullied for their perceived or actual sexual orientation, 45% seriously considered suicide and 35% developed a plan for suicide in the year prior to the survey (CSSC & 4-H Center for Youth Development, 2004). D'Augelli et al. (2002) found that 9% of the variance in mental health of LGB high school students was accounted for by victimization. Bullying victimization has been found to mediate the relation between gender-role nonconformity and suicidality in gay male adolescents (Friedman, Koeske,

Silvestre, Korr, & Sites, 2006). This relation was present at all grade levels but was strongest at the middle school level. In addition, bullied LGBTQ students were twice as likely to engage in risky behaviors (CSSC & 4-H Center for Youth Development, 2004). Some demographic differences have been found. Homophobic victimization was found to be related to suicidality for LGBTQ White youth, but not for LGBTQ youth of color (Poteat et al., 2011).

An examination of the protective factors that can buffer LGBTQ youth from negative outcomes is warranted. Psychological outcomes for LGB, heterosexual, or questioning high school students exposed to bullying and homophobic attitudes were found to depend on the social system in their environment (Espelage et al., 2008; Safren & Heimberg, 1999). Some research has begun to document variables in the individual, peer, family, and school contexts that may protect LGBTQ youth from the negative consequences of peer victimization. For example, family support and self-acceptance have been found to mediate the relation between victimization and mental health in LGBTQ youth (Hershberger & D'Augelli, 1995; Ryan, Huebner, Diaz, & Sanchez, 2009) and have inspired projects like the Family Acceptance Project to facilitate resilient families (Ryan, 2009).

School-level variables have also been found to play an important role in the psychosocial adjustment of victimized LGBTQ youth. A study by Poteat et al. (2011) with a high school sample found that suicidality and school belonging mediated the relations between homophobic victimization and reported grades, truancy, and belief in the importance of graduating. Although, homophobic bullying had negative effects on school belonging for all groups, a positive school climate was found to moderate the association between bullying and psychological consequences, including depression, suicidality, and drug use in several studies (Birkett et al., 2009; Espelage et al., 2008; Poteat et al., 2011). Adolescents attending schools with LGB support groups (e.g., Gay-Straight Alliances, or GSAs) have been found to report lower rates of victimization at school and suicide attempts (Goodnow, Szalacha, & Westheimer, 2006; Heck, Flentje, & Cochran, 2011). These adolescents were also less likely to miss school because of concerns for physical safety than those attending a school without a GSA (Walls, Kane, & Wisneski, 2010). The behaviors of the individuals at the schools also affected LGBTQ youths' psychosocial adjustment. At-school victimization and perceptions of teacher and staff support were found to predict suicidal behaviors (Goodnow et al., 2006). However, although a majority of teachers are aware of homophobic bullying, most report being either unable or unwilling to address the phenomenon (Meyer, 2008, 2009; Warwick, Aggleton, & Douglas, 2001).

School-Based Bullying Prevention: Frameworks and Approaches

A multitude of school-based bullying prevention and intervention programs and frameworks are available for use in K-12 settings, but relatively few have been systematically evaluated. These programs range from simple one-time efforts (theatrical productions, guest speakers, musical performances) to comprehensive school-wide frameworks (such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports; see Ross & Horner, 2009; Ross, Horner, & Stiller, 2008) and comprehensive programs that address bullying through social-emotional learning instruction (e.g., Steps to Respect and Second Step; see Committee for Children, 2001, 2008).

Whole-school or primary-grades preventive interventions for bullying have slowly been introduced over the past few decades, following the introduction of the Norway-based Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP; Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 2000) and Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program (STR), which was designed to help students build supportive relationships with one another through social-emotional learning instruction (Committee for Children, 2001). Although widely implemented in America, the OBPP has extremely limited empirical support in U.S. schools, despite consistent efficacy in other countries (Ttofi, Farrington, & Baldry, 2008). In contrast, the STR program is demonstrating positive changes in U.S. schools. STR promotes a whole-school primary- and secondary-level approach to bullying prevention by addressing four factors: school staff, peer group membership or friendships, the individual child, and family. Intervening at multiple levels, the program developers believe, is the most effective way to reduce school bullying. Empirical evidence has shown reductions in acceptance of bullying behavior, playground bullying, and argumentative behavior in schools that use STR programs. At the same time, it has demonstrated increases in agreeable interactions and perceptions that adults will be responsive to bullying incidents, in comparison with control schools (Frey et al., 2005). More recently, it has demonstrated higher teacher ratings of peer social skills and reductions in observed aggression, as well as reductions in incidents where bystander assist the bully in directing aggression toward the victim (Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011; Hirschstein & Frey, 2006; Hirschstein, Edstrom, Frey, Snell, & MacKenzie, 2007). However, it is not clear whether these programs have an impact on the homophobic victimization directed toward LGBTQ youth or if the programs can affect climates that are not supportive of LGBTQ youth.

Some interventions are contraindicated in bullying prevention. What has been learned to date is that zero tolerance policies (policies that provide for punishment regardless of the basis of the problem behavior) are not effective

in curbing aggressive behaviors (Casella, 2003), and expulsion appears to be equally ineffective (Morrison, Redding, Fisher, & Peterson, 2006). Despite this, Furlong, Morrison, and Greif (2003) noted that most formalized legislation addressing bullying and peer aggression in schools continues to emphasize taking action with bullies to the exclusion of addressing the needs of victims or addressing the larger school climate. For example, many bullying interventions have tended to allocate more resources to identifying individual bullies and addressing their behavior than to developing universal programs that address the entire student body. Interventions that may be effective with other types of violence do not translate to effectiveness with bullying. These include conflict resolution, peer mediation, and group therapy (Espelage, 2012).

Meta-Analytic Studies of Bullying Prevention and Intervention

Despite a long history of published studies on what predicts bullying involvement in school-age children and adolescents (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2001; Espelage & Holt, 2001), systematic evaluations of large-scale prevention programs are only now appearing in the literature. In 2008, a meta-analytic investigation of 16 studies published from 1980 to 2004 yielded disappointing results regarding the impact of anti-bullying programs (Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008). This meta-analysis included data from over 15,000 students (Grades K–12) in Europe, Canada, and the United States. Positive effect sizes were found for only one third of the study variables, which primarily reflected favorable changes in knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of bullying. No changes were found in actual bullying behaviors. These authors indicated in a tentative fashion that school bullying interventions showed modest evidence of enhancing student social competence, self-esteem, and peer acceptance. In addition, it appears that programs had a positive effect on teachers' knowledge of effective practices and on the efficacy of their interventions and responses to bullying incidents at school.

Ttofi et al. (2008) simultaneously conducted a larger meta-analysis that included more studies. In a report for the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, they evaluated 44 bullying intervention studies. Results indicated that bullying and victimization were reduced by 17–23% in schools with interventions, as compared with control schools. Ttofi et al. found that reductions in bullying were associated with classroom rules, classroom management, parent training, increased playground supervision, home-school communication, classroom rules, classroom management, and the use of training videos. Further, there was a dosage effect; the more elements included in a program, the greater the likelihood of reducing bullying.

There is, sadly, a huge gulf between research and practice in bullying prevention and intervention. We believe that the next generation of bullying scholarship needs to move beyond an exclusive focus on individual children, attempting instead to change the contextual variables that are promoting bullying in our society. Bullying also needs to be addressed by scholars both within and outside education.

None of the studies included in these meta-analyses assessed victimization directed toward LGBTQ youth, and none assessed homophobic teasing and bullying. Thus, it is not clear whether existing programs can reduce homophobic teasing and bullying directed at LGBTQ youth. Given the vulnerability of sexual minority youth, very little research has focused on the effectiveness of generic bullying prevention efforts with subgroups, such as LGBTQ or ethnically diverse populations. *Generic* refers to programs that do not specifically address bias-based bullying (beyond a mention that certain subgroups of individuals can be bullied) such as that related to race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, cultural practices, disabilities, gender expression, or gender. We believe that these programs are failing in large part because they are failing to address a very prevalent form of bullying: that directed toward LGBTQ youth. Adapting bullying prevention programs to address diversity in sexual orientation and gender expression and the use of homophobic epithets that create hostile school environments is a necessary next step.

Because bullying prevention programs do not specifically address LGBTQ youth, educators will need to rely on resources such as those I will describe in this section. Several independent organizations have been concerned with the climate of U.S. schools for LGBTQ and gender-nonconforming youth for decades. Their efforts have been slow to reach the schools because of resistance to discussing sexuality and gender identity within schools and because of the surrounding political landscape. But active steps have been taken to address the issue of bullying and harassment of LGBTQ youth in schools, with increasing attention to preventing widespread discriminatory and prejudiced beliefs.

The Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network (GLSEN; www.glsen.org) is a national organization that seeks to end discrimination, harassment, and bullying based on sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression in K-12 schools. GLSEN's work targets policy makers, educators, community leaders, and students, providing them with the information, skills trainings, and outreach programming to advance their efforts to create safer schools for LGBTQ youth. Some of GLSEN's programming includes nationwide awareness campaigns such as the National Day of Silence and No Name-Calling Week. In addition, local GLSEN chapters and GSAs organize and educate at the community level. Participants in these chapters are trained to be effective advocates of GLSEN's

mission. In combination with its outreach and activism, GLSEN conducts national-level research examining the experiences of LGBT youth, identifying positive and negative practices and policies that affect school environments for LGBT youth, examining the effectiveness of GLSEN's own programs, and so forth. GLSEN also has a strong online presence through which it creates awareness and opportunities for involvement in the organization.

GLSEN has received funding from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to implement its Safe Space initiative, a school-based program that provides educators with strategies for creating a positive learning environment for LGBT students, supporting LGBT students beyond academics, and reducing anti-LGBT bias in the larger school population. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also funds a similar program called the GLSEN Lunchbox, which provides strategies to address the negative outcomes of anti-LGBT biases in schools.

Other prominent national organizations that include a focus on LGBT issues in schools are Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (www.pflag.org) and the Human Rights Campaign (www.hrc.org). Current intervention and educational programming for LGBT issues include the Respect for All Project (www.groundspark.org) and the Welcoming Schools project (www.welcomingschools.org). The Respect for All Project includes several educational films on LGBT issues in education (*It's Elementary*), homophobic bullying (*Let's Get Real*), family diversity (*That's a Family!*), and gender norms, transphobia, and homophobia (*Straightlaced*), as well as accompanying curricula, activity guides, and workshops. The Welcoming Schools pilot program was initiated through the Human Rights Campaign to address LGBT issues in elementary schools. It includes lesson plans, professional development for teachers and administrators, and additional educational resources for families.

Conclusion

Research consistently demonstrates that LGBTQ youth experience bullying and harassment in U.S. schools at relatively high rates in comparison to their heterosexual peers. However, a study of 23 comprehensive anti-bullying programs aimed at middle and high school students found that none of them covered issues of sexual orientation, homophobia, sexual harassment, or sexual violence beyond mentioning that youth can be victimized because of their presumed or assumed sexual orientation (Birkett, Espelage, & Stein, 2008). Thus, it is imperative that studies be conducted to determine if these programs are more effective when they are complemented with discussions about diversity, sexual identity, and gender expression. In addition, parents, teachers, stu-

dents, and community members need to support legislation funding the implementation of anti-bullying policies that specifically include protections based on students' actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity. Finally, researchers need to continue to study bullying directed at LGBTQ students, especially in the form of ongoing longitudinal national studies and studies that address bullying through technology and social media sites.

References

- Berlan, E. D., Corliss, H. L., Field, A. E., Goodman, E., & Austin, S. B. (2010). Sexual orientation and bullying among adolescents in the Growing Up Today Study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 46*, 366–371.
- Birkett, M., A., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. (2009). LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*, 989–1000.
- Birkett, M. A., Espelage, D. L., & Stein, N. (2008, August). Have school anti-bullying programs overlooked homophobic bullying? Poster presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Boston, MA.
- Blumenfeld, W. J., & Cooper, R. (2010). LGBT and allied youth responses to cyberbullying: Policy implications. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3*(1), 114–133.
- Bontempo, D. E., & D'Augelli, A. R. (2002). Effects of at-school victimization and sexual orientation on lesbian, gay, or bisexual youths' health risk behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 30*, 364–374.
- Brown, E. C., Low S., Smith B. H., & Haggerty K. P. (2011). Outcomes from a school-randomized controlled trial of Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program. *School Psychology Review, 40*(3), 423–443.
- California Safe Schools Coalition & 4-H Center for Youth Development. (2004). *A safe place to learn: Consequences of harassment based on actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender non-conformity and steps to making schools safer*. San Francisco and Davis, CA: Authors. Retrieved from <http://homeless.samhsa.gov/resource/a-safe-place-to-learn-consequences-of-harassment-based-on-actual-or-perceived-sexual-orientation-or-gender-non-conformity-and-steps-for-making-schools-safer-32996.aspx>
- Casella, R. (2003). Zero tolerance policy in schools: Rationale, consequences, and alternatives. *Teachers College Record, 105*, 872–892.
- Chesir-Teran, D. (2003). Conceptualizing and addressing heterosexism in high schools: A setting-level approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 31*, 269–279.
- Committee for Children. (2001). *Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Committee for Children. (2008). *Second Step: Student Success Through Prevention Program*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- D'Augelli, A. R., Pilkington, N. W., & Hershberger, S. L. (2002). Incidence and mental health impact of sexual orientation victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths in high school. *School Psychology Quarterly, 17*, 148–167.

- Ellis, V., & High, S. (2004). Something more to tell you: Gay, lesbian or bisexual young people's experiences of secondary schooling. *British Educational Research Journal*, 30, 213–225.
- Espelage, D. L. (2012). Bullying prevention: A research dialogue with Dorothy Espelage. *Prevention Researcher*, 19(3), 17–19.
- Espelage, D. L. (2013). Bullying and sexual violence: Definition, prevalence, outcomes, and moderators. In Rivers, I., & Duncan, N. (Eds.), *Bullying: Experiences and discourses of sexuality and gender* (pp. 31–44). London: Routledge.
- Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., Birkett, M., & Koenig, B. W. (2008). Homophobic teasing, psychological outcomes, and sexual orientation among high school students: What influence do parents and schools have? *School Psychology Review*, 37, 202–216.
- Espelage, D. L., Basile, K. C., & Hamburger, M. E. (2012). Bullying experiences and co-occurring sexual violence perpetration among middle school students: Shared and unique risk factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 50, 60–65.
- Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2001). Short-term stability and prospective correlates of bullying in middle-school students: An examination of potential demographic, psychosocial, and environmental influences. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 411–426.
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(3), 123–142.
- Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2012). Understanding and preventing bullying and sexual harassment in school. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, S. Graham, J. M. Royer, & M. Zeidner, *APA educational psychology handbook: Vol 2. Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors* (pp. 391–416). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Espelage, D. L., Rose, C. A., Colbert, C. L., Little, T. D., & Rao, M. A. (2015). Longitudinal associations between bullying perpetration and homophobic name-calling perpetration in middle school. *Manuscript submitted for publication*.
- Finlinson, H. A., Colón, H. M., Robles, R. R., & Soto, M. (2008). An exploratory study of Puerto Rican MSM drug users: The childhood and early teen years of gay males and transsexual females. *Youth & Society*, 39, 362–384.
- Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Edstrom, L. V., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect program. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 479–491.
- Friedman, M. S., Koeske, G. F., Silvestre, A. J., Korr, W. S., & Sites, E. W. (2006). The impact of gender-role nonconforming behavior, bullying, and social support on suicidality among gay male youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 38, 621–623.
- Furlong, M. J., Morrison, G. M., & Greif, J. L. (2003). Reaching an American consensus: Reactions to the special issue on school bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 3, 456–470.
- Garofalo, R., Wolf, R., Kessel, S., Palfrey, J., & DuRant, R. (1998). The association between health risk behaviours and sexual orientation among a school-based sample of adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 101, 895–902.

- Glew, G. M., Fan, M., Katon, W., & Rivara, F. P. (2008). Bullying and school safety. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 152, 123–128.
- Goodnow, C., Szalacha, L., & Westheimer, K. (2006). School support groups, other school factors, and the safety of sexual minority adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 43, 573–589.
- Hanlon, B. M. (2004). *2003 Massachusetts Youth Risk Behavior Survey results*. Malden, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education.
- Heck, N. C., Flentje, A., & Cochran, B. N. (2011). Offsetting risks: High school gay-straight alliances and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) youth. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 26, 161–174.
- Heinze, J. E., & Horn, S. S. (2009). Intergroup contact and beliefs about homosexuality in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(7), 937–951.
- Hershberger, S. L., & D'Augelli, A. R. (1995). The impact of victimization on the mental health and suicidality of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 65–74.
- Hirschstein, M. K., Edstrom, L. V. S., Frey, K. S., Snell, J. L., & MacKenzie, E. P. (2007). Walking the talk in bullying prevention: Teacher implementation variables related to initial impact of the Steps to Respect program. *School Psychology Review*, 36, 3–21.
- Hirschstein, M. K., & Frey, K. S. (2006). Promoting behavior and beliefs that reduce bullying: The Steps to Respect program. In S. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *The handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 309–323). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Horn, S. S. (2006). Heterosexual adolescents' attitudes and beliefs about homosexuality and gay and lesbian peers. *Cognitive Development*, 21, 420–440.
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., & Diaz, E. M. (2009). Who, what, where, when, and why: Demographic and ecological factors contributing to hostile school climates for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 976–988.
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York: GLSEN. Retrieved from <http://www.siecus.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Feature.showFeature&featureID=1938>
- Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 26–42.
- Meyer, E. J. (2008). Gendered harassment in secondary schools: Understanding teachers' (non)interventions. *Gender & Education*, 20(6), 555–572.
- Meyer, E. J. (2009). *Gender, bullying, and harassment: Strategies to end sexism and homophobia in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Morrison, G. M., Redding, M., Fisher, E., & Peterson, R. (2006). Assessing school discipline. In S. R. Jimerson & M. Furlong (Eds.), *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 211–220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mustanski, B., Newcomb, M. E., & Garofalo, R. (2011). Mental health of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: A developmental resiliency perspective. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian*

- Social Services: The Quarterly Journal of Community & Clinical Practice*, 23(2), 204–225.
- Nansel, T. R., Haynie, D. L., & Simons-Morton, B. G. (2003). The association of bullying and victimization with middle school adjustment. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 45–61.
- Olweus, D., Limber, S. P., & Mihalic, S. (2000). *The Bullying Prevention Program: Blueprints for violence prevention* (Vol. 10). Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Poteat, V. P., Aragon, S. R., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. W. (2009). Psychosocial concerns of sexual minority youth: Complexity and caution in group differences. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 77, 196–201.
- Poteat, V. P., & DiGiovanni, C. D. (2010). When biased language use is associated with bullying and dominance behavior: The moderating effect of prejudice. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 1123–1133.
- Poteat, V. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2005). Exploring the relation between bullying and homophobic verbal content: The Homophobic Content Agent Target (HCAT) Scale. *Violence and Victims*, 20, 513–528.
- Poteat, V. P., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. W. (2009). Willingness to remain friends and attend school with lesbian and gay peers: Relational expressions of prejudice among heterosexual youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(7), 952–962.
- Poteat, V. P., Mereish, E. H., DiGiovanni, C. D., & Koenig, B. W. (2011). The effects of general and homophobic victimization on adolescents' psychosocial and educational concerns: The importance of intersecting identities and parent support. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 58(4), 597–609.
- Poteat, V. P., & Rivers, I. (2010). The use of homophobic language across bullying roles during adolescence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 31(2), 166–172.
- Rivers, I. (2000). Social exclusion, absenteeism and sexual minority youth. *Support for Learning*, 15, 13–18.
- Rivers, I. (2001). Retrospective reports of school bullying: Stability of recall and its implications for research. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19, 129–142.
- Rivers, I., & Noret, N. (2008). Well-being among same-sex- and opposite-sex-attracted youth at school. *School Psychology Review*, 37, 174–187.
- Robinson, J. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Inequities in educational and psychological outcomes between LGBTQ and straight students in middle and high school. *Educational Researcher*, 40, 315–330.
- Robinson, J. P., & Espelage, D. L. (2012). Bullying explains only part of LGBTQ-heterosexual risk disparities: Implications for policy and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(8), 309–319.
- Ross, S., & Horner, R., (2009). Bully prevention in positive behavior support. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 42(4), 747–760.
- Ross, S., Horner, R., & Stiller, B. (2008). *Bully prevention in positive behavior support*. Eugene, OR: Educational and Community Supports. Retrieved from http://www.pbis.org/common/pbisresources/publications/bullyprevention_ES.pdf

- Ryan, C. (2009). *Supportive families, healthy children: Helping families with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender children*. San Francisco: Family Acceptance Project, San Francisco State University.
- Ryan, C., Huebner, D., Diaz, R. M., & Sanchez, J. (2009). Family rejection as a predictor of negative health outcomes in white and Latino lesbian, gay and bisexual young adults. *Pediatrics*, 123(1), 346–352.
- Safren, S. A., & Heimberg, R. G. (1999). Depression, hopelessness, suicidality and related factors in sexual minority and heterosexual adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 859–866.
- Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Baldry, A. C. (2008). *Effectiveness of programmes to reduce school bullying*. Stockholm: Swedish Council for Crime Prevention, Information, and Publications.
- Walls, N. E., Kane, S. B., & Wisneski, H. (2010). Gay-straight alliances and school experiences of sexual minority youth. *Youth and Society*, 41, 307–332.
- Warner, J., McKeown, É., Griffin, M., Johnson, K., Ramsay, A., Cort, C., & King, M. (2004). Rates and predictors of mental illness in gay men, lesbians and bisexual men and women: Results from a survey based in England and Wales. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 185, 479–485.
- Warwick, I., Aggleton, P., & Douglas, N. (2001). Playing it safe: Addressing the emotional and physical health of lesbian and gay pupils in the U.K. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 129–140.
- Williams, T., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2003). Questioning and sexual minority adolescents: High school experiences of bullying, sexual harassment and physical abuse. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 22, 47–58.

